POLITICS, NETWORKING AND FRAMING: A STUDY OF KARNATAKA RAJYA RAITHA SANGHA

A Thesis submitted during June 2014 to the University of Hyderabad in partial fulfillment of the award of a **Ph.D. degree** in Department of Sociology, School of Social Sciences

By

NILOSHREE BHATTACHARYA

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF HYDERABAD
(P.O.) CENTRAL UNIVERSITY, GACHIBOWLI
HYDERABAD- 500 046
ANDHRA PRADESH
INDIA

DECLARATION

I Niloshree Bhattacharya hereby declare that this thesis entitled “Politics, Networking and Framing: A Study of Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha” submitted by me under the guidance and supervision of Professor Vinod. K. Jairath is a bonafide work which is also free from plagiarism. I also declare that it has not been submitted previously in part of in full to this Univeristy of any other University or institution for the award of any degree or diploma. I hereby agree that my thesis can be deposited in Shodganga/INFLIBNET.

Date:

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled "Politics, Networking and Framing: A Study of Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha" submitted by Niloshree Bhattacharya bearing Regd. No. (10SSPH01) in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology is a bonafide work carried out by her under my supervision and guidance which is a plagiarism free thesis.

The thesis has not been submitted previously in part or full to this or any other University or Institution for the award of any degree of diploma.

//Countersigned//

Head of the Department

List of Abbreviations

WTO	World Trade Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
G7, G8	Group of Eight, Group of Seven
GMO	Genetically Modified Organisms
GM	Genetically Modified
KFC	Kentucky Fried Chicken
TAM	Transnational Agrarian Movement
LVC	La Via Campesina
PGA	People's Global Action
IPC	International Planning Committee
IFAP	International Federation for Agricultural Producers
BKU	Bharatiya Kisan Union
TVS	Tamil Vyasayigal Sangam
SS	Shetkari Sangathana
DSS	Dalit Sangharsh Samiti
NAPM	National Alliance for People's Movements
AGMK	Adivasi Gothram Mahasabha, Kerala (led by C.K. Janu)
NBA	Narmada Bachao Andolan
RFSTE	Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Ecology
NSM	New Social Movement
TRIPS	Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
MST	Landless Worker's Movement in Brazil or *Movimento Trabalhadores Sem Terra* (Portugese)
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
FTA	Free Trade Agreements
JDS	Janata Dal (Secular)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
ICCFM	Indian Coordination Committee of Farmer's Movements (chapter of LVC) including KRRS, BKU, TVS and Kerala Coconut Farmer's Association
SICCFM	South Indian level Coordination Committee of Farmer's Movement s including KRRS, TVS, Kerala Coconut Farmer's Association and Adivasi Kerala Gothram Mahasabha

CONTENTS

Declaration
Certificate
Acknowledgements
List of Abbreviations
Chapter 1: Introduction

- Introduction
- Selecting a Social Movement
- Research Problem
- Theoretical Framework
- Fieldwork
- Chapter Organisation

Chapter 2: Mapping the Field of Study

- Introduction
- Social Movement Theories
- Globalisation and Social Movements: Emergence of Transnational Movements
- Globalisation and Agriculture: Emergence of Transnational Agrarian Movements
- Social Movement Studies in India
- Emergence of Farmer's Movements
- Globalisation and Farmer's Movements
- Conceptualising Class, Caste and Gender in Farmer's Movements
- Field of Study: Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha (KRRS)
    - Mapping Karnataka
    - Class, Caste and Gender in KRRS
    - Structure and Organisation
    - Major Agitations of KRRS
    - Engaging with Mainstream Politics
- La Via Campesina

Chapter 3: Engaging with State, Political Parties and Factions: Shifting Relations **73-113**

- Introduction
- Globalisation, State and Social Movements
- Response of KRRS to transformation in the State
- Engaging with the State and Electoral Politics
- KRRS, Dalit Movement and Language Movement

- *Naya Netas* (New Leaders): Power of the Green Shawl *?*
- KRRS, Caste and Politics
- Drain of Movement Activists to Political Parties
- Split and Factions
- Conclusion

Chapter 4: Process and Politics of Networking

- Introduction
- Understanding Process and Politics of Networking: Social movements 'webs'
- Need for International Networking: Information and Solidarity
- Role of Transnational Activists (Leaders): Rooted or Alienated Cosmopolitans?
- Question of Representation
- Negotiating Identities and Ideologies
- Relationship with NGOs
- Local-Global Linkage
- Conclusion: Effectiveness of Networks

Chapter 5: Framing and Ideology: Exploring Post-Globalisation Shifts 157-197

- Introduction
- Framing Perspective
- Collective Action Frame of KRRS
- Globalisation and Exposure to the Transnational Anti-Globalisation Frame
- Involvement of KRRS in LVC
- Linking with the Transnational Frame: Perceiving and Resisting Globalisation
- Framing and Resisting GMOs
- Search for Alternatives: Food Sovereignty and Natural Farming
- Resisting Land Acquisition
- Ideology and Role of Intellectuals
- Conclusion

Chapter 6: Conclusion

References

Chapter 1
Introduction

Introduction

This study is an attempt to understand the processes of transformation in social movements post globalisation. The widespread protests against neoliberal globalisation since 1990s, characterised by diverse actors including social movements, NGOs, transnational networks, targeting the WTO, IMF, World Bank and on the sites of meetings of G7, G8, etc. have been broadly termed as 'anti-globalisation movement' or the 'global justice movement' in literature. This study has explored the transformations within a particular movement in India, which emerged before 1990 and is now involved in the anti-globalisation movement, with respect to first, engagement in politics, second, networking with diverse actors and third, framing and formation of collective identity at multiple levels- the local, the national and the transnational. To understand the processes of the transformation, the study has primarily focused on the simultaneous forces of fragmentation and integration within a movement- the contradictions, tensions and divisions and also the ways in which those differences are negotiated and formation of a 'collective identity'. It has been argued here that two distinct changes have taken place among social movements- increased alliance building and networking with diverse actors at multiple levels and the evolution of transnational 'anti-globalisation' (linked with the notion of 'development') discourse. These changes have affected the internal dynamics of social movements, including disconnect and contradictions between the local and the global and fragmentation.

The Zapatista uprising in Latin America in 1994 and the burgeoning anti-globalisation protests, especially Battle of Seattle in 1999 encouraged several scholars (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Sassen 2002; Tarrow 2006; Smith 2008) to explore the nature of social movements during globalisation, looking at transnational networks and social movements, cyber activism, changing nature of the state, the emergence of new actors and new modes of protest in the transnational plane and the growth of a global civil society. The anti-globalisation movement is characterised by diverse actors who are all protesting against various aspects of globalisation in different ways. Despite the diversity, the commonality of cause and enemy is emphasised, as though there is 'one voice' of all people against capitalist globalisation, MNCs and imperialism. The ideological, social, geographical diversity within is celebrated as it is an evidence of the adverse effects of globalisation on 'all' people. Advanced technologies of communication have facili tated exchanges between movements across territorial boundaries. Also, movements of different issues are linked with each other where the commonality is emphasised, for example peasant movements, women's movements and environment movements often support each other, engage in discussions as it is a common struggle against one common enemy, that of capitalist globalisation. Thus, movements are linked to other movements, NGOs, civil society and transnational networks at multiple levels, through a common 'anti-globalisation' discourse. It is not that such transnational links were absent before globalisation or that it is specific to the anti-globalisation movement. But there is no doubt that globalisation has created common problems for many people and opportuni ties for communication which has encouraged many movements to 'globalise' or 'internationalise' their struggles.

The anti-globalisation movement seems to be one common struggle where different people are linked together and are fighting one common battle. When the big phenomenon of globalisation is sliced into pieces, it is no longer 'one' voice against all aspects of globalisation. Jackie Smith conceives of this struggle as one between two major transnational networks: a neoliberal network more densely linked and rich in material resources, and a democratic one that is loosely integrated around somewhat diffuse and vaguely conceptualised goals' (Smith 2008: 5). This is because different people have different experiences and perceptions of globalisation. Thus within a movement there are multiple views and consequently multiple strategies, and also, with regard to building alliances with different groups, different degrees of importance are attached to different aspects of globalisation. Conflicting views emerge at three levels- between movements (similar or dissimilar), within a movement and also between NGOs and movements, political parties and movements. Thus there are conflicts and tensions in alliances between indigenous struggles and farmer's movements on issues of land ownership, environment movements and forest rights of indigenous communities on the issue of conservation of forests, between anti-dam struggles and farmers who support irrigation, between women's movements and farmer's movements, peasant and farmer's movements. It is by studying a specific movement which engages in the anti-globalisation movement, we can understand the complex interaction of different identities, perceptions and actions which makes the anti-globalisation struggle at the national and transnational level, diffuse and loosely integrated. According to Levien (2007) 'we are still left with the thorny question of whether and in what form disparate social groups, who might share similar objective interest in transforming neoliberal globalisation, can perceive some kind

of unity among the diversity of their experiences…[because] unhappy experiences of neoliberalism take different forms for different people in different places. The result is a proliferation of grievances' (2007: 127). The challenge is to move beyond these 'militant particularisms' (Harvey 1996) and perceive and construct common frames.

While several studies have been done to understand the new forms of protest at the global level, this study attempts to explore how does pre-existing movement engage at the global level and consequently what are the implications for the movement. Several pre-existing movements (movements which emerged before 1990), for example the environment movements, indigenous, women's, peasant and human rights movements, which were questioning the development model and constructing 'alternatives to' development, started resisting against globalisation and became active at the transnational level, and 'globalised' their struggle. Organisations like World Social Forum, Third World Network, La Via Campesina and Focus on Global South among several others emerged, comprising social movements, national and international NGOs, intellectuals, scientists among others. While scholars have explored these organisations, this study is an attempt to understand how a movement, engaging with such organisations and the anti-globalisation movement, negotiates the elevation of politics, networks and frames to the global level. When one movement rooted in a specific social and geographical setting engages with new issues and/or interacts with diverse set of actors in the field, certain processes of transformation are at play within the movement. The class, caste and gender identities, regional belonging, linguistic abilities and education become important to understand perceptions, experiences, and strategies of actors. The purpose of this study is to illustrate the various differences, contradictions and politics of identity inherent and to demonstrate the

multiple divisions within a movement based on different perceptions and framing, different strategies of alliance building and networking, different views on participation in politics and support to political parties.

Selecting a Social Movement

This study has selected Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha (KRRS), a farmer's movement from Karnataka. To understand what the processes of transformation are, of a movement *which emerged before globalisation* and is *engaging in the transnational networks*, it is important to choose a movement which emerged before globalisation and has also participated in the anti-globalisation protests, engaging with transnational networks. KRRS was chosen as a field of study because, it is a part of a transnational agrarian movement (LVC) and it led the struggle against globalisation among farmer's movements in India, giving the opportunity to explore how a movement interacts with transnational actors post globalisation.

KRRS, a product of post Green Revolution context, was formed in 1980 under the leadership of M.D. Nanjundaswamy, H.S. Rudrappa and N.D. Sundaresh. Comprising middle and rich farmers from the dominant castes of Lingayats and Vokkaligas, KRRS in its initial years was concerned primarily about prices, loans, electricity and water. Rooted in Lohiaite and Gandhian ideology, with new modes of protest directed against the state, KRRS participated in mainstream politics and won two seats in 1989, one seat in 1994 and one seat in the recent assembly polls in 2013. Since the early '90s, the movement organised many protests against globalisation. Under the leadership of M.D. Nanjundaswamy, the movement burnt crops in field trials of genetically modified (GM) seeds, ransacked Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC) outlet and Cargill offices, held protests

in Delhi along with other farmer's movements against the Dunkel Draft [1] and also organised Intercontinental Caravan in Europe where 400 farmers went to Europe to protest against meetings of WTO and interacted with other activists. *Beeja Satyagraha* (Seed Satyagraha), *Bandi* March (Cart March), Mumbai Resistance, and protest against Enron were other important campaigns. It was in this period that the movement received acclaim from other groups in the world who were also protesting against globalisation and new transnational ties were built. KRRS became a founder member of People's Global Action (PGA) in 1999 and La Via Campesina (LVC) in 1996. Corporate led globalisation and its effect on farmers came into the ambit of the movement's issues. Now KRRS organises protests against land acquisition and GMOs and free trade agreements.

While several other movements like the environment, women's and indigenous rights have engaged with transnational actors and protested against globalisation, why was a farmer's movement selected? The literature on transnational social movements, globalisation and social movements has focused more on movements and networks of human rights, indigenous rights, women, environment and labour and it is surprising that despite the vibrancy, agrarian movements have received less attention relatively, barring a few scholars like Edelman (1998, 2003, 2005), Borras (2004), Philip McMichael (1994, 2008), and Desmarais (2007). According to Borras et. al., 'despite increasing scholarly attention to transnational social movements, the agrarian dimension of these has remained significantly understudied' (2008: 12). Borras et. al. define transnational agrarian movements (TAMs) as ''movements', 'organisations', 'coalitions', 'networks' and 'solidarity linkages' of the rural poor and some of the national agrarian movements

[1] Dunkel Draft named after Arthur Dunkel, the Director General of WTO who played a vital role in the Uruguay Round negotiations of GATT (General Agreement on Tar iffs and Trade).

directly linked to these movements' (2008: 2). The acceleration of these TAMs in the past two decades indicates a decisive shift in peasant activism and these TAMs have emerged as important political actors internationally. The largest agrarian-based and agrarian oriented network today is the International Planning Committee (IPC) for Food Sovereignty, with more than 500 rural social movements and NGOs, radical and conservative, as members (www.foodsovereignty.org). La Via Campesina is the most well-known of all the contemporary movements. International Federation for Agricultural Producers (IFAP) is one of the oldest networks of farmer's formed in the post war era. There are also agriculture based numerous civil society networks like Food First Information and Action Network (FIAN), the Land Research and Action Network (LRAN), the Erosion, Technology and Concentration Group (ETC Group), the Genetic Resources Action International (GRAIN), Focus on Global South and Friends of the Earth. Hence this study has focused on how a farmer's movement has *engaged with the growing transnational agrarian movements post globalisation*.

With the emergence of women's, environment, farmer's and Dalit movements in In dia among several other grass roots struggles in the 1970s and 1980s, some scholars (Guha 1989; Baviskar 1995; Omvedt 1984, 1993; Wignaraja 1983) have focused on new social movements. According to Omvedt (1993) a class of new social movements emerged that defined exploitation and oppression in relation to traditional Marxism but also focused on the plural organising base located in caste, gender and other socio-economic identities. KRRS is considered to be a 'new farmer's movement' by some scholars (Lindber g 1994; Omvedt 1993; Brass 1994). However, others argue that farmer's movements have the same class discourses like the 'old' social movements and participate in politics unlike

'new' social movements (Assadi 1997; Arora 2012). I argue that farmer's movements share commonalities with struggles that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, as the question the development model and the state, employ new strategies and methods, and have a new ideology different from traditional Marxism, but are different because of their class composition and engagement in mainstream politics. This makes farmer's movements distinct and worth exploring.

Ray and Katzenstein (2005) argue that a new phase of social movements started since 1989 marked by neoliberal restructuring and rise of communal forces in India. The new phase of activism post globalisation is characterised by increased alliance building with diverse groups at multiple levels, and by linking with the anti-globalisation frame. In this new phase, not only have new kinds of movements emerged protesting against displacement, but new social movements of the 1970s and 1980s have also reinvented themselves by 'globalising' their struggle. Farmer's movements have constructed new frames to link with the anti-globalisation struggle indicating processes of transformation which need to be explored.

Bharatiya Kisan Union (BKU), Tamil Vyasayigal Sangam (TVS), Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha (KRRS) and Shetkari Sangathana (SS) are the new farmer's movements which emerged during the late 1970s and early 1980s, post Green Revolution. Of the new farmer's movements, KRRS emerged as a strong voice against globalisation though they are often considered to be 'old' movements. Here I have chosen KRRS as it led the struggle against globalisation along with other farmer's movements in the 1990s under the leadership of M.D. Nanjundaswamy, and also became a member of La Via Campesina (LVC) and was a founder member of People's Global Action (PGA). This is

worth exploring, as KRRS 'globalised' its struggle by simultaneously engaging in transnational and local politics, networking at multiple levels with diverse actors, and linking multiple frames with the 'anti-globalisation' frame.

Research Problem

To understand the processes of transformation within a movement during globalisation, this study will focus on three aspects- engagement with the state and political parties, process and politics of networking, and framing and ideology of a movement.

Transformation of the political opportunity structure at the international level has created opportunities for social movements for expressing dissent at multiple territorial levels - with not only the state and political parties at the local and national level, but also with supra-national institutions at the transnational level. While several scholars have debated about the transformed role of the nation-state during globalisation, how does a movement perceive and interact with the state post globalisation? Is the trend towards transnationalism and globalising within movements related to the perception of the state, and if so, how? While social movements are engaging with other supranational institutions at the transnational level, it is also important to see the engagement with local and regional level politics. I have attempted to analyse the relationship of a social movement not only with the state but with a broader lens of understanding the interaction between institutionalised and non-institutionalised politics. It is important to see how politics is practised in everyday life- how interpersonal networks and identities of caste, language and regional belonging are intertwined with practice of politics, institutional and non-institutional. How do movement participants perceive mainstream politics and what

is the relationship with political parties at the local and national level? Consequently, what are the inherent dilemmas and conflicts within the movement?

Though movements have always built alliances and networks, post globalisation, networking has taken a new shape and character, with new modes of communication, agendas, actors and methods, with diverse actors and at multiple levels. Why, and which movement actors perceive networking to be necessary and how does networking enable a movement, if at all? As a movement networks with diverse groups at different levels, the process of networking entails negotiation of differences of class, caste, regional or linguistic identity and ideologies. How are the identity and ideological differences negotiated? Also, how do the local and the global interact, negotiate, contest each other and exist simultaneously? How are the different levels connected with each other, if at all? In the process of networking, leaders play an integral role in maintaining links between the local and the global in negotiating differences and hence it is important to see the role of leaders who become 'transnational activists'. Finally, what are the implications of such transnational networking for the movement?

Movements protesting against globalisation, though on specific issues, link their struggle with the broader transnational discourse on anti-globalisation, by incorporating new issues, or constructing new discourses. How are new issues incorporated within the agenda of a movement and what are the implications? Experiences and perceptions about globalisation and its related aspects differ among members of a movement. Thus, how are identities of class, caste and gender related to different experiences and perceptions about globalisation and also about related issues like land acquisition, genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in agriculture and free trade agreements? Also, ideology and frames

of a movement are constantly evolving. By incorporating new issues, has there been any change in the ideology and if so, what roles have leaders played in constructing new ideologies and frames?

Theoretical framework

Scholars of social movements have emphasised the importance of 'political opportunity structures' at the *macro* level (Tilly 1978; Tarrow 1989; Meyer 1990), or the capability of a movement to mobilise 'resources' at the *meso* level (McCarthy and Zald 1977, Zald 1992, McAdam et al 1996), or the framing, collective identity, culture and emotions at the *micro* level (Melucci 1988; Snow and Benford 1988; Goodwin 1997; Polletta and Jasper 2001) in emergence and trajectory of a social movement. By 1990s, it was recognised by scholars that 'political opportunities', 'mobilising structures' and 'framing' were all equally important conceptual tools required to understand a social movement. However, Morriss (2000) argues that studies of social movements neglect the role of human agency and hence questions of leadership should be explored further. I have used three concepts from social movement literature: political opportunity structure, social movement networks and framing.

Theories of political opportunity structure look at how changes in the political environment affect social movements, which I have used to understand the change in perception and relationship with the state post globalisation. This theory tries to understand the 'dimensions of the political environment that provide incentives for people to undertake collective action by affecting their expectations for success or failure' (Tarrow 1994: 85). Movements face the dilemma of choosing the mode of engagement with politics- institutional or non-institutional. Goldstone thus says that there is 'only a

fuzzy and permeable boundary between institutionalised and non-institutionalised politics' (2003: 2). It is the 'fuzzy and permeable boundary', the overlap and interpenetration of movement actors and conventional politics that I have attempted to explore. Politics is constitutive of culture as political actors derive meanings which are historically and culturally shaped. To understand this overlapping interdependent relationship between culture and politics, it is important to see how politics is practiced in everyday life, how cultural practices and interpersonal networks are intertwined with practice of politics, institutional and non-institutional.

Most *theories of social movements and networks* aim to understand how networks emerge, operate and how effective they are, how they work as advocacy networks, how information is shared and 'frames' are aligned (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Diani and McAdam 2003). Scholars have looked at coalition building (Rucht 1989; Diani 1990, 1995), on networking activities whether real or 'virtual' (Melucci 1984; Taylor and Whittier 1992; Hampton and Wellman 2001). Networks have been seen as forms of convergence spaces Routledge (2003), or 'broad umbrella spaces' (Juris 2005) within 'which movements from many parts of the world and diverging place-based experiences strive to craft collective visions and strategies of mobilisation which actively negotiate differences' (Escobar 2008: 266). Using theories of social movement networks I have looked at the process and politics of networking post globalisation.

The *framing perspective* in social movement studies draws from interactionist school especially Goffman (1974) for whom frames denotes 'schemata of interpretation' (ibid.: 21). These theorists explore the processes involved in construction of meanings and it entails a notion of the participant as an active agent who negotiates . This framing activity

is dynamic, constantly evolving and contentious as it involves generation of frames which differ from each other and existing frames. Framing theorists call this framing activity 'collective action frames' which are 'action oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organisation (SMO)' (Benford and Snow 2000: 614). By using framing perspective I have looked at how a movement constructs its collective action frames, what are the shifts, contestations and negotiations in framing processes post globalisation, when some leaders get exposed to the larger anti-globalisation frame. Framing processes are closely linked with ideology of a movement where ideology points to the content and framing to the process.

I have focused on the varied experiences of globalisation and multiple perceptions of different actors, the role of leaders, the contradictions, tensions and ambiguities within a movement, and how differences are negotiated. Though this study uses the three most dominant concepts of social movement theory, the broader theoretical underpinning of this study is to understand the micro level of social construction processes, how meanings are constructed, how situations are interpreted and consequently how people act within a movement. I have attempted to understand the dynamic processes associated with the practice of politics in everyday life focusing on social construction, negotiation, contestation and transformation. Actors of a movement are constantly constructing meanings about engagement in politics, about different networks at the transnational, national and local levels, and also regarding the larger phenomenon of globalisation and the related issues of GMOs, land acquisition, free trade, natural farming etc. It is based on these set of meanings that people act within a movement. By looking at three aspects of social movement organising, I have tried to use both structural and interpretive

approaches as they are not contradictory, but rather they are complementary (Benford 1993). It is the dynamic interplay of structure and agency within a movement which I have tried to explore. Some scholars argue that 'most movements mobilize within a political context that exerts strong determining influence, but also in which movement framing plays an important role- recursively feeding back to affect political opportunities' (Noakes and Johnston 2005 :22). While there are differences in perception and contradictions there is also a sense of collective identity of actors which binds different participants together. It is here that role of leaders become crucial- in constructing ideologies and notions of collective identities, which I have tried to explore in this study. It is by exploring these complexities within a movement, that one can delineate certain trends which explain processes of transformations.

Multiple perceptions within a movement are often related to identities of class, caste, regional belonging and linguistic identities. I have explored how differing caste and class interests within a movement have a relationship with the perception of the state, engaging in mainstream politics, in networking with different groups at different levels, in framing issues and ideologies, and formation of collective identity.

Conceptualising Class, Caste and Gender: As, Etienne Balibar put it: 'in a capitalist world class relations are *one determining* structure, covering *all* social practices, without being the *only* one' (cited in Bernstein 2010). Bernstein continues the argument that 'class relations are *universal but not exclusive* "determinants" of social practices in capitalism. They intersect and combine with other social differences and divisions' like caste, gender, race and ethnicity. While 'class' has been the most used concept in understanding farmer's movements, it is also important to bring in other identities like caste, religion,

gender, linguistic and regional and it is important to understand which identity becomes dominant in which context. In case of KRRS, it is primarily the intersection of caste and class. Due to lack of participation of women in famer's movements in general and also in KRRS, I have focused only on caste and class relations. It is extremely complex to map the possible combinations of relation to land and labour along with caste identities, but it can be said that KRRS consists of farmers who *definitely own* land and *produce marketable surplus*, may or may not employ labour, may or may not take or give land for lease, and are primarily belonging to Lingayat or Vokkaliga community though a few backward caste members are present. The primary defining character of KRRS members is that of ownership of land (small or big), comprising members from the dominant castes- Lingayats and Vokkaligas.

The global agrarian resistance takes a stance that overlooks differences of class, caste and gender and race within movements and represents farming populations everywhere as a single social category, the 'people of the land'. It emphasises a common demand, enemy and alternative of all farmers and peasants all over the world. But it is impossible to understand not only a farmer's movement but also a transnational movement like LVC without acknowledging social differences of class, caste, gender and race within a movement and also between networks of movements. According to Bernstein (2009), today there are 'classes of labour' where the distinction between the categories of 'urban' and 'rural', wage labour and self-employed, agricultural and non-agricultural work, 'worker' and 'peasant' are difficult to draw as they are no longer mutually exclusive. The three-class model of peasant differentiation is no longer applicable as small farmers and classes of labour intersect and are extremely heterogeneous. These various classes of

labour experience the impact of globalisation differently and sometimes even in conflicting social position within the local community. Agrarian restructuring in the era of globalisation has also led to formation of new classes in the rural communities. Hence a single movement with a single identity is likely, in reality, to have plural class interests. Thus this study has focused on the association between identity, perception and actions where different identities and difference in perception often lead to contradictions and ambiguities in a movement, and hence a movement is not a monolithic, homogeneous entity. However, despite differences, there is a shared understanding, a collective identity and shared memories in a movement, and it is the interplay of simultaneous forces of fragmentation and integration that have been explored.

Fieldwork

The focus of the study being to understand people's perceptions, contradictions and tensions within the movement, I have used the participant observation method. Fieldwork was carried out for a year from August 2011 with KRRS in Karnataka. Doing ethnography of KRRS entailed interviews and casual conversations with respondents, participating in meetings and programmes and volunteering with the movement. Besides attending state level and informal meetings of KRRS, I also attended the international meeting of LVC held at Ooty in March 2012, where I got the opportunity to interview some LVC leaders from different countries. I have participated and volunteered in programmes organised by KRRS, one on natural farming where farmers from Asian countries visited Karnataka's natural farms for a week, South Asian level seminar on GMOs, protest against global agri-business meet in Bangalore, meeting of KRRS with other groups against land acquisition in Mysore among others.

I visited and interviewed KRRS members in the districts (Raichur, Gulbarga, Dharwad) in the Northern and Western region, Mysore, Chamrajnagar and Ramnagar in the Centre and South. Raichur and Gulbarga are dry regions of the state, where Raichur has been a stronghold of KRRS in the northern region. Several leaders of the movement like Hanuman Gowda, Baba Gowda Patil, Chenbasappa Bettadoor came from the Northern regions. Dharwad district is in the western region of the state and it was in Dharwad that the movement started. Members of KRRS in Mysore have a different character not only because Mysore has its distinct socio-cultural history but also because many of the academics, poets and writers of Mysore and Mysore University were involved in KRRS, at least in its initial years. Chamrajnagar is in the south of the state where currently Amritbhoomi (global centre of sustainable agriculture conceptualised by Nanjundaswam y and recently formed by his daughter Chukki Nanjundaswamy) is situated. Ramnagar is a district which is close to Bangalore and was the place where movement against illegal granite mining was organised. Besides visiting these districts, I have interviewed members and leaders coming from other districts, when I met them in different meetings and programmes organised by KRRS.

The profile of respondents included- (a) KRRS (late) leader's family who are active in the movement, (b) representative members of LVC from Indonesia, France, Canada and Sri Lanka and also a founder member of PGA from Geneva, (c) KRRS leaders and office bearers from different districts, dealing with different issues and belonging to different factions, (d) members and small scale farmers from different social groups in villages, (e) state and national level allies and friends of KRRS, which included activists of other movements, NGOs and individual activists and researchers, making it a total of 73

respondents. Key respondents were Chukki Nanjundaswamy (daughter of M.D. Nanjundaswamy, and currently Vice-President of KRRS), Ashlesha Khadse (technical assistant, La Via Campesina, South Asia) and Kannaiyan Subramaniam (coordinator of SICCFM, South Indian Coordination Committee of Farmer's Mov ements).

I have not used names of respondents or any reference to the place of interviews taken as it may reveal the identity respondents. I have used initials as codes to refer to a particular individual except a few leaders whose names were absolutely necessary for describing the field.

Chapter Organisation

In Chapter 2, *Mapping the Field of Study*, I have explored the key concepts in social movement theories and the emerging sub field of studies on transnational social movements, globalisation and social movements. It has been identified that while several studies have been done to understand emergence of new kinds of social movements post globalisation, the processes of transformation within an already pre-existing movement needs to be explored. Also, while several studies have been done on human rights, indigenous, women's and environment movements, transnational agrarian movements have received relatively less attention. Next, I have looked at the emergence of transnational agrarian movements like La Via Campesina, IPC, IFAP which have become important international political actors today.

Studies on social movements in India have attempted to understand the new social movements that emerged in 1970s and 1980s in India. By mapping the social movement s of the 1970s, 1980s and in the recent times against land acquisition, displacement to protect right to livelihood and natural resources, I have looked at how post globalisation

social movements are characterised by increased alliance building with diverse actors at multiple levels, and linking with the 'anti-globalisation' frame. Next, I have mapped the trajectory of farmer's movements in India, their emergence post Green Revolution and the state of farmer's movements during globalisation, and conceptualised class, caste and gender in farmer's movements. Next, I have attempted to give a description of field of study, KRRS, by looking at the social-historical context of Karnataka, the structure and organisation of the movement, the class, caste and gender composition and the major agitations.

In Chapter 3, *Engaging with the State, Political Parties and Factions,* I have explored the changing perception of the state and relationship with political parties post globalisation. Here I follow the argument that the state has assumed new roles during globalisation and hence it is important to understand how a social movement has responded to this. Liberalisation was a puzzle for farmer's movements and there was a split in the movements, with Shetkari Sangathana supporting globalisation with the argument that it would free the farmers from the clutches of the state, while KRRS and BKU were against globalisation and the state was perceived to be a puppet in the hands of transnational capitalist class. Till late 1980s, for KRRS, the state was conceptualised as a function of the government, which at all levels, national and local has been perceived as an instrument of the capitalist class which necessarily exploits farmers. But post liberalisation, critique of the state by KRRS shifted, and it asked for a 'strong but autonomous state' and the changed perception of the state made KRRS expand its network transnationally.

I have looked at the multiple perceptions with regard to mainstream politics and also engagement of KRRS with mainstream politics historically. Since its initial years there was a dilemma in the movement, whether to participate in politics or not. There are two opposing views within the movement, one which thinks it is more powerful to engage in movement politics alone and also necessary for survival of the movement. The other group considers achieving some power in the government is necessary and hence contests elections under the banner of Sarvodaya Karnataka which is an alliance between Dalit Sangharsh Samiti (DSS) and KRRS. Though KRRS and DSS represent two fundamentally antagonistic communities, rich dominant caste farmers and poor dalits, the common historical origin of the two movements rooted in Lohiaite ideology is an important factor behind the formation of Sarvodaya Karnataka. The different views have created a vertical division and groups within the movement and thus the movement has an ambiguous position regarding participation in politics.

Identities of caste, political affiliation, membership in a social movement, interpersonal networks and faith in charismatic leaders are all inextricably linked to each other, making it a challenge to decipher complex political behaviour of people. It has been seen that KRRS members in villages emerged as leaders in villages because they have 'political power'. KRRS members who are *naya netas, may or may not be* economically well-off, or *may or may not be* from upper caste. These leaders in villages derive the 'political power' from being members of KRRS, for having more information and contact with the district and state level bureaucracy and politicians. These leaders form the middle layer in maintaining the vertical political linkages that exist between political leaders and villagers, between state level KRRS leadership and ordinary KRRS members in villages.

Though the old patrons have changed giving rise to *naya netas* or new leaders, but vertical linkages between leaders of political parties (Congress, BJP and JDS), KRRS leaders and people are maintained.

Next, I have attempted to explore the relationship between caste, class and politics and the role KRRS leaders play here. It has been seen that besides caste and patronage politics, faithfulness for a leader is a major factor. There is also a trend in KRRS wher e some leaders have left the movement and joined political parties. This has weakened the movement in some regions. Here, I argue that there is a thin line between institutional and non-institutional methods of practicing politics i.e between a movement an d a political party in the local level. Alongside, 'we -feeling' of a caste community makes the boundary between a movement and a political party even more permeable. Finally I have looked at the splits and factions in the movement and though the movement h as merged back, factions exist at the village level making the movement fragmented.

In Chapter 4, *Process and Politics of Networking* by exploring the multiple levels and diverse actors with whom KRRS networks, I have attempted to understand the complexities of process and politics of networking. Movements engage in networking at transnational levels as transnational networking is not only about exchange of information, learning strategies and ideas, but it is also about a feeling of 'solidarity'. The crucial role of leaders is explored here who emerge as 'rooted cosmopolitans' and KRRS leader Nanjundaswamy had emerged as one such transnational activist. Few leaders from different movements form the intellectual driving force behind a transnational network, who coordinate, strategise, exchange information and ideas and have emerged as

transnational actors. Today, there is a 'networking core' in the movement which functions independently and most leaders are not aware.

By looking at the different levels of activism, with different actors I have explored the politics of inclusion and exclusion, the way the shared understanding of 'us' keeps changing in different contexts indicates the challenge of all networks (of whatever scale) to deal with multiple divisions based on identities. I have explored the networks of KRRS, in the past and currently, at the transnational level with LVC and PGA, at the national level with other farmer's movements and other movements like Kerala Gothram Mahasabha, NAPM, NBA, Dalit Sangharsh Samiti (DSS), at the national level with NGOs like Greenpeace, Gene Campaign, RFSTE (Vandana Shiva) and several other national level coalitions.

Actors negotiate differences of class, caste, regional or linguistic identity and ideology by forming collective identities and by emphasising the commonality of struggle and ego problems, personal friendships and enmities are usual in all the levels, transnational, national and local. It has been seen that in different contexts, different collective identities are constructed, ranging from 'farmers and peasants of the world', 'poor peasants', 'adivasis and farmers-people who are losing their land', 'Lingayats', 'Vokkaligas', 'non-violent Gandhian movements' and so on. In fact, it is the diversity in networks and coalitions against globalisation that often make integrated struggle impossible.

One challenge of engaging in networks at transnational and national levels is maintaining a link between different levels, such that there is a local-global linkage. It has been seen that building networks have become an end in itself, rather than a means to an end and it depends on leaders and organisational strength that can ensure local-global linkage. I have

looked at how certain issues attain importance and are interpreted differently at certain platforms depending on the context. In case of KRRS, the simultaneous existence of the local and the global has created multiple cleavages within the movement. Another challenge is that of question of representation - who represents whom in which context and why. There have been instances where members have questioned the leadership within the movement. I have also explored the relationship of social movements with NGOs and the politics of funding involved. Social movements have a love-hate relationship with NGOs because they need NGOs and also fear the domination of NGOs. Finally I have explored whether and how engaging in networks enable or empower movements in any way. For KRRS, it has been seen that though national and international networks may provide information and solidarity, only the networking core is involved in the processes of networking now, and earlier it was a one man show of Nanjundaswamy. Multiple divisions and cleavages formed within KRRS since Nanjundaswamy got involved in the international level. Thus at the local level, networks has not enabled the movement, but has rather created struggles that are more locally rooted. Several small struggles happen in different villages and districts which are neither connected with the state level nor with other districts.

In Chapter 5, *Framing and Ideology: Exploring Post-Globalisation Shifts*, I have explored how members of KRRS perceive and resist globalisation, view involvement in LVC and the linkage between transnational and local issues. I have attempted to understand how new issues were incorporated in the movement and shifts in framing activity. Nanjundaswamy, the leader of KRRS, framed globalisation as a western process (extending and amplifying the frame of *Bharat vs. India*) where the state was facilitating

the imperialism of the west the struggle against globalisation by invoking slogans of the Indian National Movement and by emulating Gandhian campaigns like *Bandi March*, *Beeja Satyagraha* etc. Though Nanjundaswamy played a key role in constructing the frame against globalisation, and linking it with the larger anti-globalisation movement in the world, the transnational frame did not resonate with the local level. In fact the simultaneous existence of two frames within the movement created different groups within the movement. Also, as it was only Nanjundaswamy who was involved in the transnational networks a distance was created between the leader and other members.

Though several protests were organised against globalisation by KRRS members, the differences in perception and experience of globalisation and its various aspects are evident with regard to specific issues like GMOs, free trade, land acquisition and natural farming. By looking at the three issues- GMOs, natural farming and land acquisition, I have attempted to understand how class positions (among other identities) are related to experiences of globalisation and hence there has been a mismatch in the framing at the leadership and grass root level. In other words, there is a missing link between the big frame of opposing globalisation and between the sub-frames and multiple contradictory ideas exist simultaneously. Next I have looked at the ideological trajectory of the movement by looking at the relationship between framing, collective identity, ideology and role of intellectuals/leaders in the movement. Though there are multiple divisions within the movement, it is the collective identity, the shared meaning and memory that binds the movement together still.

In Chapter 6, *Conclusion*, I have discussed certain issues comparing with other movements and cases to understand under which conditions and in which context, which

trends are visible. Drawing from studies of the Zapatista movement, struggle by Dongria Kondhs of Niyamgiri Hills in Odisha, ASOCODE (a transnational peasant organisation in Central America), the global indigenous movement and the Koel-Karo Movement among others, I have highlighted the processes of transformation, the challenges and opportunities that a movement faces when it 'globalises' its struggle.

Transnational networking is not new but it intensified post globalisation primarily because the perception of the state changed. Directing protest against the state was no longer considered to be sufficient. This entailed two distinct changes- networking with diverse actors at multiple levels and linking with the transnational anti-globalisation frame. Such trends of transnational networking have been seen in the anti-dam protests that emerged in India and in other parts of the world in the 1970s and 1980s. Networking and globalising struggle definitely enables a local movement as it 'balloons' up the local issue to a global one, adding new dimensions to the movement. In some cases, like the Zapatistas or the Niyamgiri Hills protests transnational networking has empowered the movement. While the local issues get national and global attention empowering the movement, the process of networking also entails certain processes of transformation and in case of KRRS it led to fragmentation and disintegration within the movement.

In leader-oriented movements like KRRS, the question of representation becomes intensified as only a few leaders are involved in transnational networking. If there is a class difference between the leader and members of the movement there is a tendency that the movement becomes top-down rather being bottom up. The leader becomes the face of the movement and 'represents' the movement in international meetings and this creates discontent among other members of a movement. These leaders become transnational

activists and become distant elites creating a gap between the leadership and grassroots and this makes the movement fragmented.

There is also a difference in perception regarding what constitutes the 'local' and the 'global'; the leaders and more specifically the 'networking core' tend to stress the importance of linking 'global' to 'local' and interpreting the local problems as a reflection of the 'larger' process of globalisation. While grassroots farmers highlight the distinction between the 'local' and the 'global' and hence focus on the 'local'. This difference in perception is a reflection of different material conditions and class positions of different members within the movement.

Also, global discourses often do not match with the demands and ideologies of movements which differ in class composition, are located in specific contexts and have a different history and the leader plays a crucial role in negotiating identities and ideologies. Though such differences and heterogeneity are recognised, global discourses are built around commonality of different struggles and notions of a 'global' collective identity often leading to divergence between the local identity and the 'global' collective identity. It is a tight rope walk; interpreting the local as an extension of the global, forming a global collective identity including different local identities and emphasising the commonality *and* recognising the local specificities, the different contexts, histories and identities of movements.

Also, movements which have multiple hierarchies within, based on class, caste and gender tend to get more fragmented in the process of building alliances with NGOs, political parties and other movements at different levels. As KRRS got involved in transnational networks and started participating in mainstream politics, two kinds of

cleavages were formed within the movement during 1990s; one based on differences of class, education and linguistic abilities and two based on caste, segmentation and difference between Lingayats and Vokkaligas, resulting in fragmentation within the movement. It can thus be argued that a movement which has relatively homogenous community or members' composition, less hierarchy and a more horizontal form of leadership emerging from the community, does not get easily fragmented. Without a strong sense of collective identity among the members of a movement, the movement disintegrates to become a 'collective of networks' of small groups connected to each other through some common individuals.

Chapter 2

Mapping the Field of Study

Introduction

With wide spread protests against globalisation, scholarship in social movements has also evolved to explore the effervescence in transnational social movements post 1990s all over the world. This chapter will first look at key concepts and theories in social movement literature i.e. political opportunity structure, resource mobilisation, framing and new social movements literature and then the literature on globalisation, social movements and transnational social movements. This chapter will next explore the literature on transnational agrarian movements and briefly map the emergence of La Via Campesina. This chapter will next look at the studies on social movements in India focusing on the new social movements literature in India. There has been several studies to understand new social movements in India, it is debated whether farmer's movements can be called new farmer's movements, falling within the ambit of new social movements. Here, I will explore the different debates relating to new social movements and farmer's movements in India. Finally, this chapter has described the field of study by mapping Karnataka's social, cultural background, structure and organisation of KRRS, caste, class and gender composition in KRRS and highlighting the major agitations and also structure and organisation of LVC.

Social Movement Theories

The worldwide political effervescence of the 1960s including the American Civil rights Movement, the anti-Vietnam war protests, the peace movement, the 1968 revolt in France, students' protest in Germany, Britain and Mexico, the stu dent coalitions of 1969 'Hot Autumn' in Italy, the early signs of women's and environment movements, the rise of Maoism under the 'cultural revolution' in China 'created a new movement [and] its beginnings were so vague that it was often called merely "the movement' and by the 1970s one began to speak in the plural of the "new social movements"' (Wallerstein 2006: 41). For Wallerstein (1990) the year 1968 was a turning point in history of social movements and it marked the beginning of new kinds of movement s different from the old working class movements. Since then several theories and concepts have emerged in different regions of the world to define social movements, to understand emergence, modes of protest, outcomes and participation. The concepts and theories of political opportunity structure, resource mobilisation, framing and new social movements emerged in this context.

In Europe Marxism's view of class struggle and conflict in society as a fundamental clash between two classes did not apply to the movements of the 1960s as the activists were from different classes. In this theoretical vacuum, two paradigms emerged by mid 1970s- identity oriented or European paradigm (termed new social movements) and the resource mobilisation or the American paradigm. The term 'new social movements' refers to 'a diverse array of collective action that have presumably displaced the old social movement of proletarian revolution associated with classical Marxism' (Buechler 1995: 442). The advocates of new social movement s (Habermas 1976; Melucci 1980; Touraine 1981, 1985; Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Castells 1997)

delineated characteristics that were particular to new social movements and were distinctly different from the earlier working class, labour movements. ' Although the 'old' labour movement upheld class as the primary social cleavage, category of analysis, organisational principle, and political issue, the NSMs emerge out of the crisis of modernity and focus on struggles over symbolic, informational, and cultural resources and rights to specificity and difference' (Edelman 2001: 289).

This perspective focused more on the structural factors, the notion of 'collective identity' in movements and on the relation to advanced capitalism (Tarrow 1988: 423). Some advocates of NSM theory drew from the constructivist approach and focused on the construction of new collective identities like Melucci (1988). The new social movement (NSM) perspective cannot be conceived of as a coherent school as it has theoretically diverse directions. Broadly new social movement theories stress the importance of autonomy rather than strategies to achieve state power, emphasise post - materialist values and propose that grievances are socially constructed. Though initially NSM theorists were 'anti-politics' but 'with the decline of many of the more radical movements of the 1970s and shift of some like the Greens into institutional politics, new social movement theorists have begun to pay more attention to the links between these organisations and politics' (Tarrow 1988: 425). As the NSM theories have diverse trends, there are certain debates regarding NSMs - the validity of calling these movements 'new', and what is so 'new' about them, whether NSMs are

defensive and reactive or progressive and proactive, whether culturally oriented NSMs are inherently apolitical, relationship between social class and NSMs [2].

In the United States, scholars pointed out that only presence of grievance cannot explain emergence of social movements. These scholars (McCarthy and Zald 1977, Zald 1992, McAdam et. al. 1996) argue that emergence of a movement depends upon how well the movement can mobilise resources - material, human, cognitive, technical, and organisational and this came to be called resource mobilisation (RM) theory. These scholars looked at how 'social movement industries' made up of 'social movement organisations', expanded, recruited participants and gave rewards to them, and thus understood success as achievement of policy objectives. They regarded 'collective action as interest group politics played out by socially connected groups rather than by the most disaffected' (Edelman 2001: 289). In doing so, this theory could not explain the spontaneous movements of the 1960s, or even the informally organised ones, or even the movements of the poor and marginalised who hardly have any resources. However, the 'most distinctive contribution of resource mobilisation theory has been to emphasise the significance of outside contributions and the cooptation of institutional resources by contemporary social movements' (Jenkins 1983: 533). It cannot be denied that resources are important for collective action, but it is not a framework that can explain all kinds of social movements.

[2] See Buechler, Steven M. 1995. 'New Social Movement Theories', *The Sociological Quarterly*, 36(3): 441-464 for an elaborate discussion on such debates.

Several scholars incorporated a focus on states and 'political opportunity structure' (POS) examining how movements strategise according to the POS. This theory tried to understand the 'dimensions of the political environment that provide incentives for people to undertake collective action by affecting their expectations for success or failure' (Tarrow 1994: 85). While the resource mobilisation theory looked at the importance of mobilising resources, this theory emerged as a corrective to point out that social movements do not form in vacuum but within a political context which influences emergence and functioning of the movement. It arose to predict variance, content and periodicity of movements in different contexts and many studies were done to understand longitudinal and temporal variance (Eisinger 1973; Tilly 1978; McAdam 1982; Tarrow 1989; Meyer 1990; Costain 1992; Kreisi 1995). There has also been significant research on studying 'repertoires of contention' Tilly (1978), 'cycles of protest' Tarrow (1989), decline of movements Meyer (1993), the outcomes, consequences and success and failure of movements (Piven and Cloward 1977; Gamson 1990; Guigni 1998), process of movement-movement influence (Meyer and Whittier 1994), and movement-countermovement interaction (Meyer and Staggenbourg 1996).

There are diverse approaches to identify which contextual factors affect the development of social movements (see Tarrow 1988). However, according to Meyer and Minkoff, there exists some conceptual confusion over the importance of political opportunities for whom in which context, about the 'mechanisms by which conditions in the polity can translate into collective action' (2004:1461), and analysts use 'different dependent variables, looking to political opportunities to

explain outcomes that are likely to respond differently to the same factors' (ibid.:1461). Critics argued that the POS was too broad and imprecise (della Porta and Diani 1999) and 'is in danger of becoming a sponge that soaks up every aspect of the social movement environment' (Gamson and Meyer 199 6: 275). It is also argued that the political process model is 'conceptually muddled' and overly biased towards 'structural' factors (Goodwin and Jasper 2003: 80; Goodwin, Jasper and Khattra 1999). Critics pointed out that with this model one can only anal yse backwards (the political conditions which facilitated protest) after the movement has emerged and the challenge is to identify the important political factors as every case is context dependent (Meyer 2004). Thus the critique against POS revolves aroun d the definition and identification of political opportunities, state -centeredness, and ignoring or misunderstanding the relationship between culture, identity and structure in social movements. Critics also questioned that though this theory can only identify some factors in a given political environment which facilitate protest, but given an enabling political context what causes protest?

In the early 1980s, a need was felt to engage with issues of social construction which the earlier theories of resour ce mobilisation and political opportunity structure did not engage with. Though the rational actor theory indicated that individuals made rational and strategic choices, it was required to understand how meanings were constructed which influenced actions a nd choices. 'This mutual influence of context and strategy appropriately directs attention to the large theoretical tensions in political sociology, stated broadly between structure and agency' Meyer 2004: 125). In this context social constructionist theor ies emerged in

social movements and they are organised broadly around four concepts - framing, identity, culture and emotions.

Framing theorists (Snow and Benford 1988) view movement actors 'as signifying agents actively engaged in the production and maintenance of meaning for constituents, antagonists, and bystanders or observers' (Benford and Snow 2000: 613). The concept of framing draws from interactionist school especially Goffman (1974) for whom frames denotes 'schemata of interpretation' (ibid.: 21). These theorists explore the processes involved in construction of meanings and it entails a notion of the participant as an active agent who negotiates. This framing activity is dynamic, constantly evolving and contentious as it involves generation of frames which differ from each other and existing frames. Framing theorists call this framing activity 'collective action frames' which are 'action oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organisation (SMO)' (Benford and Snow 2000: 614). Framing theorists use several concepts to understand collective action frames, how frames are generated, elaborated and get diffused, the factors that facilitate the framing processes and the implication of framing processes for other movement processes and outcomes. 'Thus, mobilisation depends not only on the existence of structural strain, availability and deployment of tangible resources, opening or closing of political opportunities, and a cost-benefit calculus, but also on the way these variables are framed and the degree to which they resonate with targets of mobilisation' (Snow and Benford 1988: 213, cited in Oliver et. al 2003). By 1990s, all these trends (American and European) of social movement research fused as it was recognised by scholars

that ‘political opportunities’, ‘mobilising structures’ and ‘framing’ were all equally important conceptual tools required to understand a social movement. Though these concepts are all used, it is increasingly becoming important to focus on questions of human agency. According to Aldon Morriss, studies on social movements have neglected the role of human agency in its analysis, and hence analysis should incorporate role of ‘agency-laden institutions, frame lifting, tactical solutions, leadership configurations, pre-existing protest traditions and transformative events’ (2000: 452). In fact he argues that social movement studies should bring in the question of leadership and ‘unpack the “black box”’ (ibid.: 451) as leadership plays a major role in emergence, outcome and continuation of a movement.

Some scholars (Polletta 1999; Polletta and Jasper 2001; Armstrong and Bernstein 2008) have engaged with the question of ‘cultural traditions, ideological principles, institutional memories and political taboos’ that influence perceptions of movement actors and also create political opportunities. They have looked at how culture affects the origins, trajectories and outcomes of social movements, when culture may facilitate or impede collective action. These scholars argue that culture is a symbolic dimension of all structures, institutions and practices. It is ‘patterned and patterning’, ‘enabling and constraining’ (Polletta 1999: 67). This conception of culture enables one to understand resonance of particular frames at particular points in time, how movements perform and produce culture through their actions.

The concept of ‘collective identity’ forms a key concept in social movement analysis and Polletta and Jasper have defined it as ‘an individual’s cognitive, moral, and emotional connection with a broader community, category, practice, or institution

(2001: 285). It is a perception of a shared status or relation, which may be imagined rather than experienced directly, and it is distinct from personal identities, although it may form part of a personal identity'. For scholars of new social movements like Melucci (1988) the concept of collective identity in movements refers to the understandings people have about the meaning and purpose of a particular group or movement, and it is a discursive process. He is insistent that 'new social movements be seen as ongoing social constructions rather than as unitary empirical objects, givens or essences, or historical personages acting on a stage' (Buechler 1995: 446). It is here that one can draw similarities between the concept of framing and identity, how through interactions in a discursive space identities and frames are created (Oliver et. al. 2003: 231). In fact it is important to understand how collective identities are formed because not only are they integral to social movements, but they are relevant for understanding the movement's goals, strategies, and tactics. Some scholars (Goodwin 1997; Jasper 1998; Goodwin, Jasper and Polletta 2000; Robnett 2004) have also pointed out the relevance of incorporating emotions in the understanding of social movements and argued against the binary between emotion and reason. This is because in social movements, emotions play a mediating role between communication and interpretation and they often determine the actions that activists engage in.

When these theories travelled to Latin America, it was the new social movement (NSM) perspective which was more widely used than the resource mobilisation approach or the political process approach. Diverse Latin American struggles led scholars to reconsider approaches to collective action and NSM theory and a range

of studies explored the state (Fals Borda 1992), democratisation (Calderon et al 1992), cyber-politics (Ribeiro 1998) and transnational organising (Alvarez 1998). When NSM perspectives were used to understand movements of human rights and democratisation, indigenous and minority groups, urban poor and street-children it was recognised that economic and power inequalities were fundamental aspects of collective action. Though this did not mean a one dimensional class analysis as participants came from different class origins, but it led Latin American scholars to eschew the NSM terminology and speak instead of 'popular' or 'people's movements'.

Globalisation and Social Movements: Emergence of Transnational Movements

Globalisation can be defined as 'a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions - assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact-generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power' (Held et al., 1999: 16). Globalisation has been conceptualised by Leslie Sklair as a 'dominant global system structured around transnational corporations, a transnational capitalist class and the culture ideology of consumer-capitalism' (Sklair 2002: 1). Very broadly it can be said that globalisation has two equally important faces, two processes which are at the core; technological and economic. The impacts of these core processes are felt in other spheres of human life. While the technological changes have led to the growth of inter-linkages and networks between different spheres, economically, there has been an increase of global capitalism through flow of capital

and commodity exchange leading to integration of the international market (Robinson 1998: 563).

Several transnational movements, organisations, networks and coalitions have emerged since 1990s to protest against domination by supra-national institutions like GATT, IMF, World Bank and WTO like the World Social Forum (opposing neo-liberalism), Jubilee 2000, (a coalition of groups including many religious based ones to cancel the Third World foreign debt), European social Forum, Asian Social Forum, People's Global Action, Friends of the Earth, Third World Network, Focus on the Global South, La Via Campesina, Amnesty International, Peace Brigades, Green Peace, ATTAC (Association for the Taxation of financial Transaction for the Aid of Citizens). The much talked about Seattle protest on November 30 1999, against the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI), with slogans "No Globalisation Without Participation", and "We Are Citizens, Not only Consumers", brought together 1387 groups on a common platform, indicating that these groups can act as a pressure group in international politics. Similar protests and demonstrations were held in Prague (against the World Bank and IMF in 2000) and Genoa (against the G8 in 2001) (della Porta et. al. 2006).

The Zapatista uprising in Latin America in 1994 and the burgeoning anti-globalisation protests, especially Battle of Seattle in 1999 inspired new theorisations about social movements looking at emerging transnational networks and coalitions, indigenous movements, cyber activism, changing nature of the state etc. Falk (1993) introduced the phrase 'globalisation from below' to describe the several transnational protests, movements, coalitions and networks directed against corporate-led globalisation from

above. Research on transnational organising flourished in the mid to late 1990s with scholars exploring the ways in which transnational collective action is different from its predecessors, focusing on its transnational networks (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Ayers 2001; Edwards and Gaventa 2001; Tarrow 2002; Smith and Johnston 2002; Smith 2008). A plethora of terms have been used to describe these protests that have emerged in the last decade:

> 'transnational social movements', 'transnational advocacy networks' (Keck and Sikkink 1998), 'globalisation from below' (Falk 1999), 'grass roots globalisation' (Appadurai 2006), 'virtual activism' (Tarrow 1998), 'global civil society' etc.

Garner in this regard notes that, 'movements are changing from fairly coherent national organisations into transnational networks, with highly fragmented and specialized nodes composed of organisations and less organised mobilisations, all of which are linked through new technologies of communication' (Garner 1994: 431). Appadurai remarked that 'sociology of these emergent social forms - part movements, part networks, part organisations - has yet to be developed' (2000: 15). Most of these networks are built around social movements, civil society organisations and NGOs that attempt to resist corporate globalisation and neo-liberalism. They are attempts by marginalised groups and social movements at the local level to make alliances, protesting against their growing exclusion from the neoliberal economic decision making.

According to Jackie Smith (2008) this struggle may be seen in terms of a global society versus a world economic system. 'People have come together to articulate and promote ideas of a global society that differ dramatically from the world economy promoted by far more powerful corporate and political actors. These people and the

movement they comprise have been labelled 'anti-globalisation movement'. Smith conceives of this struggle as one between two major transnational networks: a neoliberal network more densely linked and rich in material resources, and a democratic one that is loosely integrated around somewhat diffuse and vaguely conceptualised goals' (Smith 2008: 5). According to Rucht, 'from the viewpoint of social movement engaged in a struggle with oppositional forces, it is more accurate to speak of a pairing of an internally differentiated 'alliance' and a 'conflict' system. In a similar vein, the relations between these two systems can rarely be characterised as just being hostile. Rather, they include various kinds of interactions, ranging from bargaining to competition to open and bloody confrontations' (2004: 212 -13, cited in Smith 2008: 20). Similar to the conception of an alliance and a conflict system, is Maney's (2001) conception of 'rival transnational networks' where he explores rival transnational networks with respect to resources, the political opportunities and constraints that a network faces, and the nature of inter-organisational dynamics within a network. According to Smith, by looking at the dynamics of interactions within networks one can understand the trajectory of networks and related movements.

Attempts have been made to describe the nature of networks emphasising on the diffuse, loosely connected, non-hierarchical structure, which are more like 'meshworks' and are 'rhizomatic' (Escobar 2008). Some scholars have also categorised the kinds of transnational collective action differentiating between transnational networks, movements and coalitions (Tarrow 1998; Keck and Sikkink 1998; della Porta and Tarrow 2005). Scholars have also looked at the role of new

technologies of communications that has facilitated not only transnational networks and coalitions but also new forms of cyber-activism (Myers 2002; Rheingold 2002; Almeida and Lichbach 2003; Langman and Morris 2003; Tilly 2004). It has also been suggested that this has resulted in the growth of a 'virtual public sphere' and 'global civil society' (Wapner 1996; Florini 2001; Gaventa 2001; Naughton 2001; Said and Desai 2003; Sassen 2002). The role of new actors and activists, the new modes of collective action (Buechler 1997; Koopmans 1993; Staggenbourg 1988) and the constraints and possibilities of the transnational networks and coalitions have also been analysed.

While there are ample studies done on the transnational forms of collective action after 1990s, it needs to be explored how movements which emerged before 1990s have responded and tackled the new challenges and opportunities after globalisation. Are there new dimensions in those movements? What are the processes of transformations? Not only have new kinds of movements emerged, but also movements which emerged before globalisation have also globalised their struggle by participating in transnational networks to protest against corporate led globalisation. This study attempts to explore the changes within a movement, which emerged before globalisation and has participated in the anti-globalisation movement through transnational networks and coalitions. Also, looking at the rapidly growing transnational social movements literature one can see that recent studies have focused mainly on networks concerned with human rights, women's and indigenous rights, labour, environment, migrant and international financial institutions (see, for example, Keck and Sikkink 1998; Smith and Johnston 2002; Mayo 2005; Tarrow 2006). It is

surprising that given the dynamism and high profile of transnational agrarian movements (TAMs), scholars have given them less attention barring a few that include Edelman (1998, 2003, 2005), Borras (2004), Philip McMichael (1994, 2008), and Desmarais (2007). The recently published collection of articles on transnational agrarian movements attempt to address this lacuna in literature (Borras et al. 2008: 12). According to them, 'despite increasing scholarly attention to transnational social movements, the agrarian dimension of these has remained significantly understudied. Meanwhile, the broader field of agrarian studies has been slow to catch up with the phenomenal rise of TAMs' (ibid.). This study is an attempt to address this gap in literature.

Globalisation and Agriculture: Emergence of Transnational Agrarian Movements

Agrarian restructuring all over the world has affected agrarian movements which have responded in a variety of ways. Movements which used to operate within local communities and national borders and continue to do so have 'localized their struggles in response to partial decentralization', others have started focusing on social service delivery, and some have 'internationalised their struggles in response to global agrarian restructuring' (Borras et. al. 2008: 2). In the past two decades transnational agrarian movements (TAMs), loosely defined to mean *''movements', 'organisations', 'coalitions', 'networks' and 'solidarity linkages' of the rural poor and some of the national agrarian movements directly linked to these movements'* (ibid.) have emerged as important political actors internationally. The acceleration of these TAMs indicates a new phase, a decisive shift in peasant activism and emergence

of new structures of collective action. These movements today sit in the consultative bodies of some United Nations (UN) agencies such as Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and the United Nations Commission on Human Rights (UNCHR) and also negotiate with international bureaucrats and NGOs for a variety of agendas that range from policy making and funding support (Borras et. al. 2008: 3).

The 1990s marked a shift in agrarian movements all over the world as they started voicing their protest in global arenas. KRRS was one of the first to object to the TRIPS followed by Confederation Paysanne of France which dismantled Mc Donald's outlet and even MST of Brazil which uprooted field trials of GM crops. These demonstrations of different movements against neoliberal policies were directed against a common enemy, WTO, IMF and World Bank. This rural effervescence developed from transnational networking and cross-border links between different movements and NGOs on issues of agrarian reform, food security, trade, biotechnology, environmental and human rights issues. Perhaps the largest agrarian-based and agrarian oriented network today is the International Planning Committee (IPC) for Food Sovereignty, with more than 500 rural social movements and NGOs, radical and conservative as members[3]. La Via Campesina is the most well-known of all the contemporary movements. International Federation for Agricultural Producers (IFAP) is one of the oldest networks of farmer's formed in the post war era. There are others which are more regional in focus like (Latin American Coordination of Peasant Organisations) CLOC and Asian Peasant Coalition (APC).

[3] See www.foodsovereignty.org

There are also agrarian based numerous civil society networks like Food First Information and Action Network (FIAN), the Land Research and Action Network (LRAN), the Erosion, Technology and Concentration Group (ETC Group), the Genetic Resources Action International (GRAIN), Focus on Global South and Friends of the Earth. Many of these networks and movements differ and are rivals based on ideological and political orientation and class base. For example, LVC and IFAP differ as IFAP has members who are middle and rich farmers, while LVC has mainly small farmers and peasants. But these networks also have overlapping memberships, even those that are rivals, such as LVC and IFAP (Borras et. al. 2008).

How did these transnational networks develop? According to Marc Edelman, 'transnational networking accelerated in the 1980s and 1990s but is neither a new phenomenon nor simply an outcome of recent revolutions in communications technology, the emergence of supranational governance institutions or weakening of the contemporary state system under globalisation' (2003: 98). He traces back the origin of transnational networking to the Associated Country Women of the World (AICWW) which developed in the 1920s. In the pre-war period it worked with the League of Nations and after the war it consulted and worked with several UN agencies. The International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) was founded in the post-war era with the optimism of global cooperation and fears of impending food shortages and agricultural depression like that of the 1930s. IFAP being dominated by well-to-do farmers of north Europe worked closely with newly formed UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), but backed centre-right political parties.

According Edelman (ibid.) the upsurge in TAMs during 1980s and 1990s was a direct result of worldwide farm crisis. The farm crisis was a result of high prices of petroleum and fossil based inputs and oil price shocks which set the stage for a r apid expansion of global food trade and liberalisation of economies. Economic liberalisation and growing export orientation of highly subsidized farm sectors in Europe and United States enlarged markets and led to falling commodity prices of key internationally traded commodities such as grains, oil seeds and cotton. Falling commodity prices boosted the profitability of and encouraged mergers among giant agribusiness corporations such as Cargill, ConAgra among others. Neoliberal reforms devastated small scale agriculture which was accustomed to guaranteed prices, low-interest loans and state support. Also the rise of supranational governance institutions as decision making bodies triggered farmers who were already organising transnationally as a result of the farm crisis to forge transnational links with NGOs and other movements.

The corporate food regime concept was first developed by Friedmann (1987, 1989) and then by Philip McMichael (2009). 'The 'food regime' concept historicises the global food system by looking at the pivotal role of food in global political-economy, and identifying the key historical contradictions in particular food regimes that produce crisis, transformation and transition (McMichael 2009). The first food regime is conceptualised to be during the colonial period (1870-1930s) when food and raw materials were imported to Europe which facilitated the emergence of the English industrial classes. The second food regime (1950s–70s) re-routed flows of (surplus) food from the United States to its informal empire of postcolonial states on strategic

perimeters of the Cold War by giving food aid, subsidised wages, encouraging selective Third World industrialisation, and securing loyalty against communism and to imperial markets. 'Development states' internalised the model of national agro-industrialisation, adopting Green Revolution technologies, and instituting land reform to dampen peasant unrest and extend market relations into the countryside (McMichael 2009).

The third possibly emerging food regime (1980s-), is characterised by 'supermarket revolution' for privileged consumers generating a population of displaced slum dwellers as small farmers leave the land, biotechnology in agriculture, an emerging global food/fuel agricultural complex and simultaneously one can see the emergence of global counter-movements like Slow Food, Food Sovereignty, Community supported agriculture all of which broadly support organic, sustainable and locally produced food etc. In every period the politics of development has been reframed along with the scope of agricultural technologies and its future implications. In every period tensions between opposing geo-political principles are brought forward by social movements of that time- colonial/national in the first, national/transnational in the second and now between 'world agriculture' and agro-ecology (ibid.).

Affected by the debt crisis and neoliberal reforms, in early 1991 peasant leaders from Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador formed the Central America-wide association called the Association of the Central American Peasant Organisations for Coorporation and Development (ASOCODE) which became a successful model of transnational small farmer organising. Although the initial enthusiasm subsided it formed the basis for two other networks in future- La Via

Campesina (LVC) and Latin American Coordinator of Rural Organisations (CLOC). In 1992 in Nicaragua, the National Union of Agriculturalists and Livestock Producers (UNAG) which was ASOCODE's Nicaraguan affiliate invited leaders from farmer's movements from Central America, the Caribbean, Canada, United States and Europe to its second Congress which resulted in the Managua Declaration which condemned the inclusion of agriculture in GATT, the impact of foreign debt on poor countries. Funded by a small Dutch NGO, the Paulo Freire Foundation, it marked the beginning of La Via Campesina (LVC) in Belgium in 1993 with the idea and aim of forming an alternative development model and encouraging Food Sovereignty. Around the same time in 1994, representatives from 84 organisations and 21 countries formed the CLOC and today CLOC and LVC work closely together. It was in this context of worldwide protests by agrarian movements that LVC was formed to coordinate agrarian struggles and encourage an alternative development model.

LVC emerged as a significant international actor during 1995 Global Assembly on Food Security in Quebec city and its second congress in Tlaxcala, Mexico which was attended by representatives from 37 countries, including countries from Asia and Africa. Since 1990s LVC has participated in anti-globalisation marches at the various WTO conferences in Geneva (1998), Seattle (1999), Cancun (2003), Hong Kong (2005) and participated in massive demonstrations in Prague, Washington, Quebec city, Quito against IMF and World Bank. It has grown in strength and has emerged as a visible political actor in the international arena. LVC engages with the UN, FAO, governments to push for issues like food sovereignty, peasants rights, agroecology among others. Since then it has made a place for itself in the burgeoning anti-

globalisation movement participating in protests in Seattle in 1999, and in the World Social Forum processes.

Social movements Studies in India

Even though theorising about social movements, especially in the West, has been rich, there is a 'comparative infancy of social movement studies in India' (Singh 2001: 137). Initially, theorising about social movements was primarily concerned with defining social movements, documenting various types, and classifying them on the basis of either participants, or issues, or outcomes. While some scholars applied Western paradigms of social movements in their work, others have attempted to discover the specificities of Indian society that has facilitated and motivated movements in India, ranging from Dalit movements, to socio-religious movements and peasant insurgencies and farmer's movements (T. K. Oomen 1977; Mukherji 1977; M.S.A. Rao 1978; Omvedt 1984; Singh 1986; Gupta 1988; Shah 1990). Literature on social movements engaged with histories, theories of movements, outcomes of movements and caste, class dynamics within a movement. A.R. Desai (1954) was the first sociologist who contributed to the study of social movements within a Marxian perspective. During the 1970s and 1980s, empirical studies of agrarian, tribal, revolutionary and religious movements were carried out (Oomen 1972; M.S.A. Rao 1978; Gupta 1982; Dhanagare 1983; Sharma 1986; Mukherji 1987; Singh 1988; M.S. Gore 1989) by using primarily Marxist or structural-functionalist approaches.

With the emergence of women's, environment, farmer's and Dalit movements in India among several other grass roots struggles in the 1970s and 1980s, some scholars

(Wignaraja 1983; Omvedt 1984, 1993; Frank and Feuntes 1988; Guha 1989; Escobar and Alvarez 1992; Baviskar 1995) also started analysing the new kinds of movements using NSM theories from a developing countries perspective, and these movements in India came to be called new social movements. According to Omvedt (1993) a class of new social movements emerged that defined exploitation and oppression in relation to traditional Marxism but also focused on the plural organising base located in caste, gender and other socio-economic identities (cited in Ray and Katzenstein 2005: 6). With regard to the study of new social movements, scholars like Rajni Kothari (1984), Harsh Sethi (1984) and D.L. Sheth (2004) have emphasised the 'non-party political process', 'micro-movements' at the grassroots. NSMs in India are considered to be 'expressions of people's struggles', reflection of 'people's search for alternatives', located in civil society independent from the state and its institutions, 'anti-systemic' (Arora 2012).

Ray and Katzenstein (2005: 6) identify three distinct cohorts of movement activism in three phases (1947-1966), (1966-1988) and (1989-present). In the second phase, the several movements that emerged, though may not fit with the Western NSM paradigm but were 'new' in the sense that they questioned the development project of the state, were disillusioned with political parties and were voices of marginalised groups which were ignored by traditional Marxism. Significant movements of the 1970s were the Chipko movement in Uttarakhand (Guha 1989), Kerala Fishworker's Forum, Shramik Sangathana organized by *Bhil* adivasis in Maharashtra (Basu 1987) along with mushrooming of several social action groups which has been called 'new grassroots movement' (Kamat 2002). Several movements emerged in the 1970s and

1980s to protect rights to natural resources like the Silent Valley movement, Appiko movement in South India, Narmada Bachao Andolan, movement against the Tehri - dam and Koel-Karo projects among others, all addressing the question- 'development at whose cost and at what cost, and what constituted development itself' (Sanghvai 2007: 111). The ideas and principles which these 'new people's movements' like Chattisgarh Mukti Morcha and Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan in Rajasth an highlight are a just and equitable, alternative development rather than addressing only the issue of poverty. Though these are called new social movements, do they fit with the Western NSM theories?

In his analysis of NSM in India, Parajuli (1991: 182) argues that the 'political significance of these struggles is that they challenge the notion of the integrationist and developmentalist Indian state'. While several scholars have looked at this aspect of new social movements in India, Nilsen (2007) argues that all these movements, though have questioned the state and development project they have also demanded a greater share in development process and political participation as seen in struggles of various groups demanding representation and reservation i n the state machinery. Thus the distinction must be drawn between the idea of new social movements of the Western scholars (who have stressed on the cultural, anti -politics, identity aspects of NSMs) and the nature and character of NSMs in India. Though NS Ms in India emerged around the same time (late 1960s and 1970s), they are associated with 'subaltern politics' rather than only a middle class composition, they question the state and political parties, they emerged as a response to neglect of traditional Marxism but that does not imply that 'class' is no longer an important category in NSMs in India,

and they may be addressing cultural issues but that does not mean that they are not political. I argue here that it is important to understand new social move ments in India not by borrowing NSM theories which emerged in an European context but by focusing more on the nature of these movements and locating them in the Indian context.

Farmer's movements like BKU, KRRS, Shetkari Sangathana emerged around the same time but because of their class composition and engagement in mainstream politics some scholars have debated whether farmer's movements are 'new'. As the farmer's movements comprise dominant caste and middle, rich farmers and some have also contested elections some scholars argue that they cannot be considered to be 'new'. According to Vibha Arora (2012: 112), 'the class character of the farmer's movement should be regarded as the key to debate on their being a 'new' or 'old' social movement'. Among the farmer's movements agrarian populism has been the dominant discourse, essentialising the 'rural identity' and the 'agrarian myth', 'where populism operates at the level of consciousness where it serves to deflect discourse from class to non-class identity' (Brass 1997: PE 27). Arora (ibid.) emphasises that the impression of an all-encompassing peasant unity was largely due to 'organic intellectuals' (Gramsci 1976) like Nanjundaswamy and Sharad Joshi 'who performed the hegemonic function of deflecting attention from the class contradictions by accentuating rural and urban differences' (Arora 2012: 123). For Lindberg (1994), Omvedt (1993) and Brass (1994) farmer's movements are 'indeed new social movements, but paradoxically because neither are in fact new, being much rather the same old class movements articulating the same old class discourses' (Brass 1994: 6).

These scholars emphasise the new ideology (non-Marxist) and new methods of agitation, anti-state and political parties stance. I argue that farmer's movements share similarities with other new social movements in the country and are new in the sense that they, like other NSMs also had new methods of agitation, new ideology and were questioning the development model. But calling them new social movements is problematic because of their class composition and engagement in mainstream politics. Hence they cannot be understood by using NSM theories.

Ray and Katzenstein (2005) argue that a new phase of social movements started since 1989 marked by neoliberal restructuring and rise of communalist forces in India. Are these movements a continuation of the new social movements of the 1970s and 1980s or are they distinctly different from them? Two inter-related trends are visible among social movements post 1990s in India- increased alliance building with diverse groups and extending and linking the frame of anti-state and development project to anti-globalisation. According to Thakur (2012), the various local struggles are 'framed by certain globally circulating ideas, categories, and discourses, such as environmentalism, human rights, and indigenous rights' (2012: 217). The groups which emerged pre 1990s, for example Narmada Bachao Andolan, Adivasi Gothram Mahasabha, Kerala, KRRS among others started resisting globalisation and incorporating global discourses. National Alliance of People's Movements (NAPM) has been the largest alliance resisting neoliberal globalisation in India, and according to Levien (2007) these movements represent anti-systemic movements (Wallerstein 2006) and counter-movements (Polanyi 2001). Several new movements have emerged post 1990s against MNCs in the mining belt of Chattisgarh, Odisha and Jharkhand,

against Vedanta in the Niyamgiri Hills, POSCO in Jagatsinghpur, also in Nandigram, Singur, Lalgarh in West Bengal, Koodankulam in Tamil Nadu among others.

The commonality of all these struggles have been to protest against displacement and disruption of livelihoods, questioning the neoliberal model of transferring domains of social life from state to market, deregulation of markets and influx of cheap imported food under FTAs and monopoly of agri-business companies, privatization of natural resources and public utilities (Levien 2007). Most of the social movements, whether they emerged pre or post 1990s, organise not only against neoliberalism but also against the state and engage in construction of alternative development models. In that sense, it can be said that these movements are a continuation of the same ideology of the 1970s and 1980s, only that such visions have become more concrete during globalisation allowing for increased alliance building among diverse groups at multiple levels. Also, one distinct feature is that of a multitude of struggles at multiple levels- several of these movements are also engaging in transnational networks, interacting with NGOs and civil society.

Emergence of Farmer's Movements

Farmer's movements in India post-independence are of two kinds- one which is the poor peasant movements, which is local in character with grievances against the local exploiter, while the other is farmer's movements comprising farmers who have marketable surplus and address the state. According to Mukherji and Sahoo (1992), these 'two varieties of agrarian mobilisation in India arise o ut of different agrarian contexts and perceptions of contradictions' (1992: 78). The peasant movements

arose out of the contradictions embedded in feudalistic structures of agrarian society, while the farmer's movements arose out of the contradictions emer ging from capitalist penetration in agriculture (ibid.). In states like Bihar and Andhra Pradesh agrarian system resembles feudalism which have given rise to peasant movements constituting primarily agricultural labourers and poor peasants. Even though the landlord-tenant relationship has been abolished, landlord class or landlordism exists in peasantry through rent from leased out land to cultivators and through usury (ibid.). These movements are generally sponsored by different rural wings of political parties like CPI, CPI(M), CPI(M-L) (Gupta 1988). Apart from the peasant movements like Tebhaga and Telangana movement, the Naxalite movement, there have been several spontaneous micro-mobilisations and individual protests. Significant historic peasant insurr ections against the zamindari, mahalwari, ryotwari and jagirdari systems were the Santhal insurrection, Punjab peasant revolt, Kheda peasant struggle in Gujarat and the Champaran struggle in Bihar (Natarajan 2004)[4].

The farmer's movements, unlike the peas ant's movements emerged post Green Revolution, in the richer states. Green Revolution created internal class polarisation as it was not indisposed to class and crop bias. It entailed mechanisation which displaced large chunks of labour and was designed for the well endowed peasants. The benefits of the new technology filtered down to the rich peasant class making them richer and led to unemployment making the poor poorer. In other words, the Green Revolution

[4] Natarajan, Poarkodi 2004. 'Farmer's Movement, Poor Far mers and Justice: The Role of the Civil-society initiatives- Experiences from Mandya District in Karnataka, India', at.yorku.ca/c/a/m/l/42.htm

benefitted the small percentage of rich farmers in the richer states like Haryana, Punjab, Maharashtra, Karnataka, coastal Andhra Pradesh (Gupta 1988). However growth in agricultural productivity after Green Revolution was not accompanied by commensurate increase in prices of agricultural produce, compared to industry. There was also a decline in agricultural profits and terms of trade (between agriculture and industry) which contributed to the discontent of farmers (Arora 2012). Due to oil price shocks the expenditure on agricultural inputs like fertilisers also went up. It was in this context that farmer's movements like Shetkari Sagathana (SS) in Maharashtra, Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha (KRRS) in Karnataka, Tamil Nadu Vyasayigal Sangam (TVS), and Bharatiya Kisan Union (BKU) emerged around 1970s and 1980s,.

These farmer's movements which emerged in India have been termed 'new farmer's movements' as the movements challenged the traditional understanding of the peasantry as simple, spiritual, pastoral and passive, asserted the identity of the agrarian community. According to Byers, 'agency had passed from 'peasants' to 'farmer's; the central focus of rural agitation had shifted from land to prices; the essential agitational form was a non-party one; and distinctive novel methods of agitation were employed' (1995: 2). Many scholars have looked at farmer's movements in India (Rudolph and Rudolph 1967, 1987; Dhanagare 1983; Nadkarni 1987; Gupta 1988; Sahasrabudhey 1989; Omvedt 1991; Brass 1994; Jim Bentall and Stuart Corbridge 1996; Assadi 1997; Madsen 2001; Pattenden 2005) specifically with reference to BKU, SS, KRRS and TVS. The farmer's movements in India emerged around the 1980s, first being in Tamil Nadu, TVS under the leadership of

Narayanswamy Naidu, then KRRS under the leadership of M.D. Nanjundaswam y, SS in Maharashtra under the leadership of Sharad Joshi and BKU in the northern states of the country under the leadership of Mahendra Singh Tikait. All these movements are primarily composed of rich and middle farmers, dominated by a particular caste or community, the *Gounders* in TVS, the *Lingayats* and *Vokkaligas* in KRRS and the *Jats* in BKU. In case of farmer's movements the enemy is not in the village, but the state or the centre is targeted for attack. The demands revolve around higher prices for agricultural produce, lowering of electricity, fertiliser and water charges, and easier terms for loans for agricultural investment. They employed new forms of agitation like *rail roko* and *rasta roko* and unlike peasant movements, they had a strong non-party stance. Such farmer's movements are often called kulak movements as they do not represent the interest of the vast majority of poor peasants and agricultural workers who do not produce marketable surplus.

These movements also have a strong anti-urban bias; Sharad Joshi, the proponent of farmer's movement in Maharashtra formulated the discourse Bharat vs. India – the rural India vs. urban India dichotomy. The primary contradiction is characterised as that between the rural and the urban. Tikait of BKU used the slogan *Jai Jawan Jai Kisan* aiming at the government policies, the corruption in the administration and many other related issues. The Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha, which originated in 1980, claims to be a village movement and recognises imperialism and modernisation as the cause of rural poverty and agrarian crisis. Their demands have been withdrawal from WTO, GATT etc, formulation of a national agricultural policy, and the general demands mentioned above. Scholars have also highlighted

the role of charismatic leaders like Sharad Joshi, Nanjundaswamy, Tikait and Narayanswamy Naidu, the 'class-ness' of these movements, the new ideology drawing from Gandhi and Lohia, strategy of *rasta rokos,* sit-ins, cart marches, ambiguous position on mainstream politics etc.

Globalisation and Farmer's Movements

Liberalisation and simultaneous withdrawal of the state affected the agrarian economy drastically and one cannot deny the crisis in agriculture, increase in farmer suicides since 1990s. Scholars trying to understand this phenomenon argue that is a direct offshoot of the new economic policy and neglect of agriculture (Chandrashekhar and Ghosh 2004). Others like Vandana Shiva, argue that increased farmer suicides are a result of ecological crisis generated by new economic policies of the globalisation process (Shiva et. al. 1999). During the 1990s international financial institutions like World Bank and IMF encouraged India to undertake economic reforms which included structural adjustment, privatization and liberalization. While this may have led to higher GDP it affected the agrarian sector adversely for various reasons. Integration of the Indian economy in the world market resulted in rupee devaluation and dropped prices which resulted in increased demand for Indian crops. To capture this source of revenue the Indian government encouraged cash crop cultivation making the agriculture sector export oriented. With liberalization and removal of tariffs and duties, imports increased affecting the prices of the domestic agricultural products and the farmers had to compete in the world market, thus becoming vulnerable to the volatility in prices. As the government withdrew the subsidies on inputs, higher input cost also affected the farmers. The government policies also

favoured and facilitated MNCs to invest in agriculture. In a country where farmers relied on the agricultural support through subsidies of the state, the withdrawal of support led many farmers into debt. On hand the farmers were squeezed by the higher input costs and lower output prices and on the other hand privatization of agriculture replaced self-reliant system of agriculture to a system where farmers increasingly depended on fertilisers, pesticides and seeds.

According to Utsa Patnaik (2004), agrarian distress in the country has to do with the sharp decline in public investment and development spending in rural India along with wrong neo-liberal policies of the government and not with drought and farming practices. Economic reform policies of cutting input subsidies, raised input costs, higher cost of credit as the banks giving rural credit were directed to no longer consider farmers and small scale industry as priority sectors for lending. This led small scale farmers to depend more on non-institutional sources of credit like private money lenders where they have to pay a higher rate of interest. Added to these tough conditions were price fluctuations and adverse natural conditions which led to acute economic and social crisis of farmers leading to indebtedness. Farmer suicides owing to indebtedness started around 1997-98 when the world cotton prices crashed in a massive way and thus the root problem is government's neo-liberal policies and lack of public spending. It has been documented that farmer suicides occurred among the small scale farmers. Agrarian distress has become more generalised as a result of which rural purchasing power has decreased massively.

However, Surinder Jodhka argues that though globalisation has had negative impacts on agriculture, the crisis of agriculture is experienced differently everywhere (Jodhka

2006). Experiences of Green Revolution, land reforms and liberalization have been different for different groups, reshuffling the hierarchies of caste, class and gender in rural areas. It has been seen that modern education has spread producing a distinct category of middle class intellectuals of rural origin (Gill 1985). According to Lindberg, 'agriculture and farming are no longer an all-encompassing way of life and identity' (Lindberg 2005 cited in Jodhka 2006). There is also an exodus from agriculture- the marginal and small farmers are moving out of agriculture and the big farmers are moving out of the village (ibid.). There is a considerable rise in non-agricultural occupations, around 24%, along with an exodus from the villages to urban areas for employment (Gupta 2005). This is in fact related to the agrarian distress in the country where farmers prefer to move out of agriculture or move of the village. According to Jodhka, this has had an impact on the agrarian classes and rural social structure has undergone a drastic transformation. There is also a gradual diminution of status of dominant castes in villages and as a result the backward castes and poor peasants have occupied a centre stage in local level politics, substituting the village patrons (Jaffrelot 2003). Contract farming including direct procurement from farmers by Indian retailers such as Reliance, Spencer's, Subiksha, Food Bazaar and also open-source intermediation through initiatives like e-choupal has transformed the systems of hierarchy based on inter-linkage between class, caste and occupation.

Consequently, farmer's movements have also transformed, as several have moved out of agriculture on one hand, and on the other, the old systems of hierarchy in villages have also reshuffled. Thus he says, '*the fragmentation of farmer's movements during the last decade or so cannot be understood without referring to the growing internal*

differentiation within the landowning classes/castes and the changing political and class balance at the local and regional level' (Jodhka 2006: 1536). However, according to Gill (2004), there is also a revival of farmer's movements as the new economic policy has brought farmer's movements ideologically closer to each other.

Conceptualising Class, Caste and Gender in Farmer's Movements

It is impossible to understand farmer's movements without a conceptualisation of agrarian classes. The most straightforward understanding is that of the distinction between the terms 'peasant' and 'farmer'. A peasant implies a cultivator who does subsistence agriculture or small scale agriculture, and/or who takes land for lease from landholders. A farmer is someone who is definitely a land owner, who may or may not work on his own land, may give land for lease, produces surplus and engages with the market where he searches for maximum returns. One of the major part of the discourse on mode of production, was relating to the identification of principal rural classes[5]. Rudra (1978) identified two agrarian classes - the big landowners and the agricultural labourers, Patnaik (1976) perceived rural classes in terms of agricultural labourers, poor peasants, middle peasants, rich peasants and landlords, others argued that caste and class are intertwined (Harriss 1982). While different scholars have identified different agrarian classes, it is important to understand how agrarian classes have transformed in recent years and also, how class identities intersect and combine with other identities. Thus, Etienne Balibar puts it as : 'in a capitalist world class relations are *one determining* structure, covering *all* social practices, without being the

[5] See, Mohanty, B. B. 2011. 'Introduction' in B.B. Mohanty (ed.) *Agrarian Change and Mobilisation*, for a review of agrarian studies literature in India.

only one' (cited in Bernstein 2010). Bernstein continues the argument that 'class relations are *universal but not exclusive* "determinants" of social practices in capitalism. They intersect and combine with other social differences and divisions' like caste, gender, race and ethnicity.

It is important to analyse how rural classes have transformed in recent years in the context of liberalization of the economy, agrarian crisis, contract farming, introduction of GM crops, increase in non-agricultural occupation, government programmes like NREGA among others. One cannot deny that the inter-linkage between caste, class, occupation and hierarchy is under flux in rural India. According to Mohanty, one needs to 'conceptualise power in a framework of dynamic interaction and accordingly look at the structures of domination and the movements for social transformation' (Mohanty 2004: 24). According to Omvedt, caste and class are no longer absolutely correlated, as upper castes are diverse in class terms and lower castes are diverse in class terms (Omvedt 1992: 131). Scholars like Ghurye (1950), Gough (1955), Gupta (1980), Meillasoux (1973), Mencher (1974) and Kapadia (1995) have looked at intersecting relation between caste and class. According to Natarajan, 'it remains to be seen how capitalism in India gives rise to the peculiar configuration of caste-class relations' and hence it is important to analyse class formations within a caste group and how a caste group forms a notion of itself within the space of class (2005: 230). Not only class and caste, but other identities of gender and linguistic also intersect class-caste identities.

Farmer's movements primarily consist of rich or middle farmers and also belong to dominant castes, and usually they are patriarchal in nature. While 'class' has been the

most used concept in understanding farmer's movements, it is also important to understand intersection caste, religion, gender, linguistic and regional along with class to understand which identity becomes dominant in which context. It is important to understand the key determinants of the matrix of power- caste and class as these two are most prominent in case of farmer's movements. This study will thus attempt to see how different identities interact and intersect each other in different situations within a social movement.

Field of study: Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha (KRRS)

From the review of literature above, certain silences in literature theoretically and methodologically are visible. Several scholars have looked at emergence of transnational movements and networks post globalisation, but what are the challenges, negotiations and processes of transformation of a movement *which emerged before globalisation* and is *engaging in the transnational networks and movements* needs to be explored. Hence this study has selected a movement which emerged before globalisation and has also participated in the anti-globalisation protests, engaging with transnational networks and movements.

Many of the new social movements in India have engaged with multiple actors at multiple levels and have linked their struggle with the transnational 'anti-globalisation' frame. Why was a farmer's movement selected? First, literature on transnational social movements shows that transnational agrarian movements have received relatively less attention. Second, while several movements in the country, work in multiple levels with diverse actors, the farmer's movements, especially KRRS, emerged as a strong voice against globalisation. This makes a farmer's

movement worth exploring, as they 'globalised' their struggle by simultaneously engaging in transnational and local politics, networking at multiple levels with diverse actors, and linking multiple frames with the 'anti-globalisation' frame. Of the farmer's movements, KRRS was selected as a field of study because, it is a farmer's movement and is a part of a transnational agrarian movement (LVC) and it led the struggle against globalisation among farmer's movements in India and it emerged before globalisation.

KRRS was formed in 1980 under the leadership of M.D. Nanjundaswamy, H.S. Rudrappa and N.D. Sundaresh when sugarcane growers' association and other farmer's groups in Karnataka came together to protest against the killing of two farmers in Nargund and Navalgund. In the 1980s KRRS was concerned with issues of pricing, water and electricity, repayment of loans. Some of the major campaigns have been against illegal granite mining, recovery of loans, anti-liquor movement, *neera* (coconut sap) movement among others. Ideologically the movement draws heavily from the Lohia movement and Gandhian ideology of self-reliance, self respect, satyagraha and non-violence.

Since the early '90s, the movement organised many protests against the globalisation. Under the leadership of M.D. Nanjundaswamy the movement burnt field trials of GM seeds, ransacked KFC outlet and Cargill offices, held protests in Delhi along with other farmer's movements against the Dunkel Draft and also organised Intercontinental Caravan in Europe where 400 farmers went to Europe to protest against meetings of WTO and meet other activists. *Beeja Satyagraha, Bandi* March, Mumbai Resistance, and protest against Enron were other important campaigns. It

was in this period that the movement received acclaim from other groups in the world who were also protesting against globalisation and new transnational ties were built. KRRS became a founder member of People's Global Action (PGA) in 1999, and La Via Campesina (LVC) in 1996. Corporate led globalisation and its effect on farmers came into the ambit of the movement's issues. Now KRRS organises protests against land acquisition and GMOs and free trade agreements. Nanjundaswamy had conceived of *Amritbhoomi*, a global centre for sustainable development, but could not complete the project. His daughter Chukki Nanjundaswamy recently inaugurated the centre in February 2013 in Chamrajnagar district. The centre will have a school for children of farmer suicide victims, would have a training centre for natural farming and would be a place to have meetings and seminars of farmers. Currently the natural farming training centre has started.

Mapping Karnataka

Karnataka being a considerably large state has linguistic and cultural variations between the North and the South. Today, Karnataka can be divided into Hyderabad - Karnataka region, Mumbai-Karnataka region, Coastal Karnataka and the Old Mysore region. The linguistic and cultural variations in the North and the South owe much to its different history. Geographically, also, there is a clear difference - the coastal area receives much of the rainfall and cultivates paddy, coconut and arecanut, the northern region with black soil is suitable for growing cotton and jowar, the southern region with red soil raises ragi in dry regions and paddy and sugarcane in irrigated areas (Thimmaiah and Aziz 1983). It is also because of these geographical, historical and cultural variations in the state, the character of KRRS is varied in different districts.

Brahmins are the dominant minority who are 4% of the population. Lingayats (14 - 16% of the population) and Vokkaligas (12-14% of the population) form the two dominant castes in Karnataka and constitute a third of the total population of the state (Manor 1977), about 27% of the population (Thimmaiah and Aziz 1983). Other backward castes like Kurubas, Naiks and Yadavas constitute about 39%, Harijans about 16% of the population, Muslims account for 11% of the population, Jains and Christians are about 3% of the population[6] (Thimmaiah and Aziz 1983). 'A caste is said to be dominant when it preponderates numerically over the other castes, and when it also wields preponderant political and economic power. A large and powerful caste group can be more easily dominant if its position in the local caste hierarchy is not too low' (Srinivas 1955: 18). The Vokkaligas, by ritual status are well below the Brahmins and Lingayats, and belong to the category of 'shudras' in the four fold *varna* system (Srinivas 1955). The dominance of Lingayats and Vokkaligas in Karnataka can be traced back to the Non-Brahmin Movement in 1910s and 1920s. Also, the Brahmins were the first to move the urban areas and enter the new white - collar professions (ibid.: 2). These factors are responsible for the power that dominant castes, Lingayats and Vokkaligas, hold in rural areas.

The Vokkaligas, the landed gentry, are primarily present in the Old Mysore region, the South, and form a caste-group comprising many sub-castes. The various sub castes, the most numerically stronger being the *Gangatikaars*, among others like *Namdhari Gowdas, Morasu Vokkaligas* are present in the districts of Mandya, Mysore, Ramnagar, Tumkur, Chamrajnagar, Hassan. Lingayats are born out of the

[6] Based on 1981 census (provisional)

reform movement of 12th century of saint Basavanna, who are spread all over the state and are dominant in the North. Lingayats are vegetarians, are Shaivites (worshipping Shiva) and their primary profession is agriculture and business. The *Kurubas* (shepherd community) are the third largest community in Karnataka.

Before the reorganisation of the state in 1956, most of old Mysore region was dominated by Vokkaligas and as a result that group had slight preeminence over Lingayats (Manor 1977: 1864). After the reorganization in 1956 till 1970s can be described to be an era of Lingayat raj where the dominance of both the groups prevailed (ibid.: 1865). Devaraj Urs became Chief Minister in 1972 and attempted to break the dominance of Lingayats and Vokkaligas in both the Congress Party and the state, by advancing many pro-poor policies by including representatives from disadvantaged social groups in his cabinet. Devaraj Urs belonged to the Arasu community to which the former Rajas or Mysore belonged and had no connections with the Lingayats or Vokkaligas. One of the most important measures taken was land reform act which aimed at providing ownership to tenants who tilled the land, imposed land ceilings and distributed surplus land to tenants and the landless. Land tribunals were also set up in each taluk. According to Thimmaiah and Aziz (1983), though the land reforms were radical, the implementation was not as effective as the dominant communities were present in the state machinery. According to James Manor (2007), caste (jati) has diminished in importance and has increasingly come to denote 'difference' rather than 'hierarchy'. This is because of two reasons - policies of the Devaraj Urs government which favoured the disadvantaged groups since 1970s and economic liberalisation since 1990s. Liberalisation has created opportunities for

farmers- ‘peasants have now become farmers and traditional subsistence agriculture has yielded to agribusiness’ resulting in reshuffling of social and economic hierarchies within the village (Panini 1999: 2169).

Another integral aspect of Karnataka’s social structure is religious monasteries based on caste affiliations. Religious monasteries called *jati mathas*, is a monastery that culturally and religiously represents a specific caste or sub-caste group, most of which are non-Brahmin and backward caste and are spread across Karnataka. It is believed that there are around 100 such mathas in Karnataka belonging to Dalits, Adivasis and Kuruba (the shepherd caste, the largest among other backward classes) (Ikegame 2010). Lingayats and Vokkaligas, have *mathas* spread across the state and these *mathas* organise health camps, run several schools, organise rehabilitation programmes during floods and droughts, and play a big role in politics of Karnataka. Some mathas even organise a weekly court where cases ranging from divorce, family disputes and industrial disputes are solved. It seems as if they comprise almost a parallel state (Sood 2006 cited in Ikegame 2010). It is also institutionalising caste system in a way, where each caste group has its own religious leader and it becomes a way of exercising identity and rights. Aya Ikegame (2010) has explored the complex relationship of these caste-*mathas* and politics in the state. The Adichunchagiri *matha* in Mandya district, a Vokkaliga *matha*, is considered to be most successful and politically powerful in the state. It is believed that his open support to H.D. Deve Gowda led his party the Janata Dal to win the state assembly election in 1994 (Ikegame 2010: 64). It has also become usual to hold caste rallies where the spiritual guru of the caste in invited. Thus in Karnataka there is an overlap between religion

and politics and it also indicates a state-like character of *mathas* making these *mathas* immensely powerful in politics.

Caste, Class and Gender in KRRS

The main support base of KRRS has been the sugarcane and paddy farmers who are primarily rich and middle farmers belonging to the two dominant castes, Lingayats and Vokkaligas. Though ideologically members of KRRS claim to be anti-caste, their caste and class identities often acquire preeminence and there are instances of exploitation by KRRS members on backward castes, Dalits (Janaki Nair 1993). Though the majority in the movement is Lingayats or Vokkaligas, KRRS members belonging to the two dominant castes claim that there are also backward caste members, but interestingly, who are middle or rich farmers. It is extremely complex to map the possible combinations of relation to land and labour along with caste identities, but it can be said that KRRS consists of farmers who definitely own land and produce marketable surplus, who may or may not employ labour, may or may not give or take land for lease and are primarily belonging to the dominant castes in the region.

Farmer's movements have historically been patriarchal because it is the man who owns the land. KRRS, too, lacks active participation from women. Though women are seen in protest marches and rallies, except one woman leader, Anasuyiamma, there are no women leaders in the movement. In fact, KRRS members agree that the movement has not addressed women's issues at all. She says, that "it was me who taught Professor (Nanjundawamy) about women's issues. They talk about decentralization but they do not allow women to come to the forefront and speak in

the dais. When officers would come to collect the belongings of the indebted farmers during the recovery drive, we women refused to give our jewelry as it was our property. If women would take leadership, a lot would be different about the movement and there would not be so many ego clashes". This illustrates that women are devoid of any agency in KRRS, and in fact, the wives and daughters of rich, middle farmers are housewives and are expected to stay indoors. Another woman leader from KRRS, who is currently the woman representative of farmer's movements from South Asia in La Via Campesina, owns a huge natu ral farm, is well-educated and can speak English. Here, her class identity is prominent rather than her gender and she has been made the representative for namesake, as there is no other woman leader. While there have been transformations in the class, cas te hierarchies in the village, the position of women have remained the same, if not worsened post liberalization.

Structure and Organisation

KRRS has a pyramidal structure consisting of President and Working President, four Vice-Presidents and four Gener al Secretaries at the State level. There are Presidents, Vice-Presidents and General Secretaries in the district, village and taluk level also. Due to internal problems KRRS had a split in 1999 and it merged back in 2008 but there was an ego clash between two Presidents of two factions and it was decided that there will be a President and a Working President. Currently there has been a reshuffling and a new committee with new President has been formed. Besides this there is a woman's wing which is almost in active and a Green Brigade (*Hasiru Sene)* consisting of youth (below 35 years of age). Usually a village becomes member as a

whole and a village committee consisting of President, Vice - President, General Secretary and Treasurer is formed with someone who is a senior person, or a person of influence as President. There are no elections, leaders are nominated. Once a person becomes a member of KRRS he wears a green shawl. This idea of wearing a green shawl was borrowed by KRRS leaders from the Tamil Nadu Farmer's Association (TVS). Since then green has become the colour of KRRS. Flags, signboards, number plates on cars of leaders are all always green.

Meetings at the taluk level are held once a month, and once in every two or three months at the state level depending on the issue and urgency. Meetings are held in the district level when required. In the state committee meetings President or General Secretary of districts are present. Members are informed over mobile phone about upcoming meetings. Sometimes during emergency instead of calling every office bearer for the meeting, only a small number of around 20 people meet. State level meetings are held in KRRS office in Bangalore. This office, which is a big room, also serves as a place for KRRS members to stay when they travel to Bangalore for meetings. Documents and newspaper articles of the movement are kept in the house of M.D. Nanjundaswamy in Bangalore.

KRRS has had not only a decentralized, fluid structure but also every district has a different character and strengths. KRRS is present in 23 out of 30 districts now; Gulbarga, Raichur, Bidar, Hassan, Chamrajnagar, Mysore, Bangalore Rural, Mandya, Ramnagar, Dharwad, Koppal, Bagalkot, Bijapur, Chickmagalur, Kolar, Belgaum, Chikballapur, Haveri, Tumkur, Shimoga, Davangere, Bellary, Chitradurga. However, KRRS is strong (in terms of number of members and organizing activities) in

probably 12 districts out of 23 districts. KRRS does not have a count of total number of members. A count of number of members is kept at the taluk level and sometimes at the district level. Till 1996 out of 300 villages more than 100 villages had KRRS unit, says B. Nagendra from Mysore, but now there are less activities and less numbers. Puttaswamy from Ramnagar district says that earlier around 70% of villages had KRRS unit, now it less than 40%.

Major agitations of KRRS

The no-tax or non-corporation campaign was the first major agitation after KRRS was formed. They adopted the strategy of non-repayment of land revenue to land development and commercial banks, withholding other taxes such as land, water and betterment levy, withholding levy grain to the government and withholding supply of agricultural produce to the market for a minimum period of two months. This strategy brought KRRS in direct confrontation with the government and the government resorted to attaching property of farmers and confiscation of property. Though the primary motive was to collect dues it led to suppression of farmers as the bank officials would collect household items forcefully. This confrontation between KRRS and the government persisted for some time and several rallies and marches were organised all across Karnataka in the period 1982-1985. In Shimoga and Hasan districts KRRS members fought pitched battles, forcing bureaucrats to flee and thousands of farmers courted arrest.

KRRS like other farmer's movements in the country has been concerned about getting remunerative prices for agricultural produce and writing off loans. However, like all the other movements, KRRS too had a crop bias as all the agitations and programmes

to fight for remunerative prices have highlighted only two crops, sugarcane and paddy. Also, most of the agitations have remained confined to certain districts of Mandya, Shimoga, Hasan, and Raichur which are considered to be the 'strong' districts of KRRS and they also constitute the sugarcane producing region of the state. This preoccupation with prices has been an issue which has existed for the last three decades, the reason being that the main support base of KRRS is the sugarcane and paddy farmers who are middle and rich farmers. Several agitations were held like road blocks, jail bharo and innovative method of squatting inside Vidhana Soudha in 1983. KRRS had an ambivalent attitude towards other crops like tobacco, jowar, oil seeds, ragi etc. and except for tobacco these crops did not receive much attention in the state level and protests were held only at district level (Assadi 1997).

KRRS engaged in protecting and controlling natural resources of the village for attaining self-reliance and also by rejecting goods manufactured by textile, sugar, sandal industries. It was believed that the residents of the villages are the owners of the natural resources in and around that village. In fact KRRS demanded that 80% of the national revenue should be resourced back to the villages as 80% of the people lived in villages. This was a part of the larger Gandhian discourse on self-rule and self-reliance and an effort to create an alternative model which KRRS being a Gandhian movement followed. During 1982 and 1983 the anti-liquor movement under the leadership of women primarily led to prohibition of alcohol in many villages in Dharwad, Belgaum, Hasan and Mandya districts. It was argued that alcoholism was a major problem in villages KRRS advanced a new discourse that

alcoholism was a design of the capitalist class to destroy rural life and also to make huge profits, hence villagers should be allowed to make alcohol at home.

From 1982 to 1986 KRRS agitated against monoculture of social forestry system i.e. eucalyptus plantation on the grounds that eucalyptus converts lands into dry areas by reducing the water level of the soil, toxic roots affect both the grass and the land, it is unsuitable as fodder and fuel and it affects the output in food production due to shift in cultivation. Women and children were in the forefront of the movement and lakhs of eucalyptus saplings were destroyed in the districts of Shimoga, Hasan and Chickmagalur. KRRS claimed that profits derived from the sale of minerals, water and forest products falling within the vicinity of the village panchayats ultimately belonged to the village panchayats concerned and the panchayats were at a liberty to use the amount for overall development of the villages (Assadi 1997). One of the major agitations was against illegal granite mining in Karnataka which started in 1982. Nearly 13000 peasants courted arrest and stopped and unloaded granite from lorries. To stop illegal granite mining KRRS advanced a few proposals: nationalization of natural resources, non-renewal of licenses and reverting the rights over natural resources to the people belonging to surrounding areas and decentralizing the power over natural resources (ibid.). Under the pressure from KRRS the government stopped mining in these regions. A Gram Swaraj Samiti was also formed in Kanakapura for controlling natural resources in the region.

In 2001 the Neera Movement was launched as a protest against government's policies on coconut prices. Coconut trees had been attacked by insects which had destroyed all the trees in some regions of the state and the farmers were at a loss. As the coconuts

were getting affected, before they could ripe, the sap of the coconut was collected and sold as neera which helped the coconut farmers to survive. Against this the government said that neera is alcoholic and hence it is illegal to sell neera. As a protest, KRRS activists sold neera in front of the High Court. Neera when fresh is non-alcoholic and when fermented becomes alcoholic. The movement could not be sustained as refrigerators were needed to prevent neera from getting fermented. In 2003 *Namdu* project was started with the aim of providing a direct link between producers and consumers. Local shops were opened in the city where consumers could buy directly from the farmers to do away with the problem of middlemen. However this project did not last long and KRRS is currently trying to revive the project.

Engaging with mainstream politics

From its inception till 1983 KRRS projected itself as a movement which did not believe in electoral politics and political parties. In fact this was a new trend post - Emergency contempt for all political parties irrespective of their ideologies. Political parties were considered to be allies of the industrial class and hence did not understand problems of peasantry and the politicians were concerned with only electoral gains and lacked the ability to address the problems of the peasantry (Assadi 1997). Thus in the early 1980s KRRS was more concerned with criticising the policies and failures of the state and confronting the state in various ways. However in 1983 it supported Janata Dal to vote Congress out of power. That was the first time that KRRS got involved in mainstream politics. After conducting two major agitations

in 1984 KRRS adopted twin strategies of doing agitational politics and electoral politics and conceived the Voter's Forum. The idea behind forming a political party and participating in electoral politics was that of creating an alternative third force with a 'new' political culture and structure, with a vision of new politics and creating a new Karnataka. In fact, post Green Revolution, the rich farmers wanted a piece of the political cake. They were upper castes but had no foothold in national parties and hence new parties were formed at the regional level.

In 1989 it decided to contest elections under the banner of Kannada Desha without aligning with any political party. It had conceived of forming a party with coalition of other social movements in the state, the Dalit movement and the Language movement, but it did not materialise. 'Its political agendas centered around seeking the dismissal of the party in power and also preparing the peasantry for a peasant government in future and it emphasised that the peasants had reached the stage of forming their own government' (Assadi 1997: 89). In 1989 elections, it won two seats and won one seat in 1994 elections. During this period KRRS was concerned with its political agendas of removing the party in power and held massive rallies and demonstrations, one of which was the 'laughing stayagraha' in 1992 or laughing in front of the Vidhan Soudha as a symbol of laughing at the government. Since 2005 KRRS has been contesting elections in alliance with Dalit Sangharsh Samiti, under the banner of Sarvodaya Karnataka and recently, Puttanaiah won one seat from Mandya in 2013 polls.

La Via Campesina

LVC currently has over 200 member organisations from more tha n 70 countries, divided into nine regions: East and South East Asia, South Asia, North America, Central America, South America, the Caribbean, Europe, Africa (I) and Africa (II). Two representatives, one man and one woman, form the International Coordinati on Committtee (ICC) which is the key decision making and coordinating body of LVC. The ICC meets twice a year anywhere in the world to plan the agenda of the next six months, and usually there is a seminar before ICC meeting so that the ICC can meet and discuss about issues in the country in which the meeting is hosted. International conferences are held every four years where delegates from all regions come. LVC does not have fixed head quarters; every four years the International Operative Secretariat (IOS), the head quarters, also shifts to a different region. First, head quarter was in Europe, second in Honduras, third in Latin America, now in Asia (Indonesia).

Every region has few countries and every country has two or three movements as members. Every region has a technical assistant who is in charge of coordinating programmes, networking, and the required paper work. The regional office of LVC keeps rotating among these movements in a region. The South Asia region consists of- India (KRRS, TVS, Kerala Coconut Farmer's Association, eight organizations of BKU), Bangladesh (two movements), Nepal (one movement) and Sri Lanka (one movement). Movements can become members by applying for membership, working with the regional movements and the decision of gra nting membership is up to the other regional movements. These regions jointly decide on two representatives every four years and hence the ICC also changes every four years. The regional secretariat is

hosted by KRRS in Bangalore. So LVC does not have any paid staff and the technical assistants and IOS staff are the only full time workers for LVC who are expected to raise their salaries through programmes that are organised in their respective regions as administration costs. The idea is to prevent bankrupt cy even when there is a financial crisis.

Internationally LVC has seven working committees; Food Sovereignty, Agrarian Reform, Agroecology, Biodiversity, Women, Migrant Worker, Human Rights and Youth (which is not yet an international working committee). There are also five or six campaigns of LVC internationally, for example global campaign on agrarian reform, Food Sovereignty campaign among others. Every region can decide which campaign they can implement regionally and it is the job of the technical ass istant to implement the programmes, raise funds, maintain website and communication etc.

Chapter 3
Engaging with the State, Political Parties and Factions: Shifting Relations

---

Introduction

Transformation of the political opportunity structure at the international level has created opportunities for social movements for expressing dissent at multiple territorial levels. Farmer's movements like KRRS are engaging in polit ics not only at the local and national level but also at the transnational level in relation to supranational institutions like World Bank, WTO, IMF and with governments and bureaucracy at the national, state and local level, and with political parties. Fo r farmer's movements like KRRS, since its emergence, the state has been the focal point for its agitations and demands regarding prices, loans and subsidies. Post globalisation farmer's movements in India split into two, one led by Sharad Joshi of Shetkari Sangathana in favour of globalisation and the other led by Nanjundaswamy of KRRS against globalisation. Since then KRRS has been questioning the neoliberal policies of the state and the state has been perceived to be a 'weak' state, like a puppet in the hands of the global capitalist class.

The new social movements that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s tended to work outside political parties or even rejected mainstream politics to retain autonomy. But currently KRRS contests elections under the banner Sarv odaya Karnataka (an alliance between KRRS and Dalit Sangharsh Samiti) and one KRRS leader, Puttanaiah, won a seat in the recent Karnataka polls in 2013. KRRS contested elections in the past and

KRRS leaders Baba Gowda Patil, Nanjundaswamy and Puttanaiah ha ve been MLAs. It is important to understand the shift within the movement from being 'anti -politics' to an active engagement in electoral politics. However, this shift has not happened without any contestations within the movement - there are some members who do not support participation in mainstream politics; on the other hand, some who have left the movement to join mainstream political parties. As the major support base in KRRS are Lingayats and Vokkaligas, two dominant castes in Karnataka, members of KRRS, in their individual capacities, play a major role in providing support to political parties at the local level. The relationship between a social movement, caste and class identities and political parties at the local level is explored here.

This chapter will first explore the relationship of KRRS with the state, and, in general, relationship of farmer's movements with the state post globalisation. The chapter will next look at the multiple modes of engagement of different participants with mainstream politics, where some contest elections, some prefer to stay outside of mainstream politics, some support political parties resembling a patron -client relationship, some leave the movement to join political parties. How do these diverse modes of engagement and difference in perception determine the trajectory of the movement? In the past KRRS has undergone a split within the movement owing to difference in opinion, different experiences and ego clashes. Though the movement has merged back, certain factions and groups exist which I will attempt to explore here.

Globalisation, State and Social Movements

Scholars of social movements have looked at the relationship between states and social movements focusing especially on political opportunity structures (POS) (Kreisi 1995; Mc Adam, McCarthy and Zald 1996) and conditions under which state and political environment influence and create opportunities for mobilisation. 'Political opportunity theory promises a means to predict variance in the periodicity, style, and content of activist claims over time and variance across institutional contexts' (Meyer and Minkoff 2004: 1458). Political opportunity implies the political environment which provides incentives for collective action. Goldstone (2003: 20 -24) has listed the possible ways in which states can respond to social movements - repression with institutional change, repression with no institutional change, toleration or encouragement, influence of social movements with no institutional change, influence with institutional change, influence through ongoing alliance and influence through movement spin-off of political parties. It is this mutual relationship between state and social movements that makes it impossible to study a movement without looking at the political context, the relationship of the movement with the state and how that shapes the trajectory of the movement.

I have attempted to analyse the relationship of a social movement not only with the state but with a broader lens of understanding the interaction between institutionalised and non-institutionalised politics. The most crucial change in the political environment in the last two decades has been the growing power of supra -national institutions. It is first important to understand how the political env ironment has changed after globalisation and what it means for the nation-state. Second, as there is a mutual relationship between social movements and states, influencing each other, it

is required to explore how the change in the role of the state influences the nature and response of social movements.

Globalisation implies two distinct phenomena - 'political, economic and social activity is becoming worldwide in scope' and 'there has been an intensification of levels of interaction and interconnectedness among the states and societies which make up an international society' (McGrew 1988 cited in Held 1991). Scholars have debated and there has been an outpouring of literature to analyse the nature and role of the state post globalisation: has the state become 'weak' and its power, control and influence declined, or has the role of the state been merely transformed. Globalisation has been portrayed as a homogenising, flattening force, where nation states, due to interconnectedness, have no power to act independently and as a result the nation-state is declining. Globalisation threatens the autonomy of national governments by placing too much power in the hands of business and international financial institutions (IFIs) (Cox 1997; Amin 1998; Hirst and Thompson 1999). The theory of capitalist state argues that with expansion of capital beyond territorial limits, the nation state loses its capacity to control capital and hence we are in a 'borderless' world. Internationalisation of capital entails consumption of space by capital (represented by TNCs and MNCs) (Harvey 1989; Lefebvre 1991) and capital becomes 'stateless', 'placeless'. State autonomy is also challenged in other ways by the proliferation of NGOs which provide welfare services which governments are no longer able to provide. In fact the growing importance of NGOs in providing services has also been encouraged by donor agencies and in the process most NGOs have been incorporated in the neoliberal architecture.

Yeung (1998) in this regard argues that while the state may lose some of its traditional functions, it also gains some new role in engaging with political actors at the regional and international level. 'It is not a question of whether capital's internationalisation *results* in the decline of the state, but rather of how the state continues to *participate* in capital's internationalisation in order to sustain the reproduction of capitalism itself' (ibid.: 296). Thus, rather than simplistically arguing that the state power has declined, it is important to see how the state has assumed new roles and participates in the process of globalisation. According to David Held (1991), this idea of decline of the nation state is an uneven process and is restricted only to certain Western countries, and nationalisation of global politics and war between nations are a testimony to the continuing power of nation states. Thus the argument that the nation-state has declined is too simplistic, and it is required to see, how the political agency of nation-states have been affected by international forces. Nation-states today have certain constraints within which they function. Internationalisation of economy, international organizations, international law, and hegemonic power blocs affect international and national policies of the state. It implies that the nation-state has to be perceived in relation to the global economy, as there is increased interconnectedness, rather than arguing that the power of the nation-state has declined.

In such a case, social movements not only address the state but also feel the need to address international authorities and financial institutions today. This implies that many contemporary issues have to be addressed globally indicating the trend towards transnationalism in many social movements now which has been termed as 'cosmopolitan democracy' (Held 1995) and 'globalisation from below' (Falk 1999).

Yeung (1998) argues that globalisation can be seen as a dialectical process of homogenisation and differentiation, giving rise to 'new forms of local resistance and expression, reinforcing the interconnectedness of the local and the global, and the multiplicity and hybridisation of social life at every spatial scale' (Cox 1997 quoted in Yeung 1998). Thus, he continues, 'what appears to be a local phenomenon can simultaneously be a regional or global event elsewhere' (ibid.: 292). However, this approach 'tends to focus on the structural changes at the macro level, neglecting the importance of agency and political strategy at the micro level' (Pratt 2004: 313), and hence it is required to understand how participants of a movement engage in politics at local, national and transnational levels.

Engaging with mainstream politics at the local and national level entails certain dilemmas and contradictions within the movement. One view is that, social movements are 'challengers' (Tilly 1978), 'outsider groups' (Gamson 1990) whose goals are considered to be successful in one sense if they become 'recognised actors in institutional politics' (Goldstone 2003: 1). This implies that protest tactics of social movements are non-institutional and the way to implement reforms must be through institutional modes. However, there is also the other view that when social movements get adopted in the institutional system, then protest tactics fade away and the movement comes to an end or becomes ineffective. Thus there are movements which prefer to stay away and 'outside' of institutional politics; however, there are also several instances of movements which have evolved to become political parties and even become governments (for example Anna Hazare movement, a part of which evolved to become the Aam Aadmi Party recently). Movements face the dilemma of

choosing the mode of engagement with politics - institutional or non-institutional. Goldstone thus says that there is 'only a fuzzy and permeable boundary between institutionalised and non-institutionalised politics' (2003: 2). *It is the 'fuzzy and permeable boundary', the overlap and interpenetration of movement actors and conventional politics that needs to be explored*; how actors of a movement sometimes act as protest groups, sometimes as lobbies, sometimes as parties and party auxiliaries, sometimes as part of government committees.

Jeffrey Rubin similarly highlights the fuzzy boundary between social movements, states and political parties and suggests that the multi-facetedness of political actors make them less distinct, separate and internally coherent from one another (2004:107). He draws from Judith Butler's conception of subject and culture where 'individuals or groups are continually being constituted out of the phenomenon of the world- discourses, representations, experiences, material conditions, by the force in these very phenomena' (1992: 108). Political actors create multiple meanings which makes social movements ambiguous and contradictory. The conventional and convenient analytical boundaries that we draw between state and social movements, political party and social movements are often in reality more blurred. This is because politics is constitutive of culture as political actors derive meanings which are historically and culturally shaped. Culture is also political as 'meanings are constitutive of processes that, implicitly or explicitly, seek to redefine social power' (Alvarez et. al. 1998: 7) and is a 'set of material practices which constitute meanings, values and subjectivities' (Jordan and Weedon 1995 cited in Alvarez et. al. 1998: 3). Jenny B. White questions the 'usefulness of analytically separating "modern" civil

society and party politics from "traditional" communalistic practices, institutional from individual relations or political ideology from cultural beliefs' (2002: 5). To understand this overlapping interdependent relationship between culture and politics, it is important to see how politics is practiced in everyday life, how cultural practices and interpersonal networks are intertwined with practice of politics, institutional and non-institutional.

This chapter will look at how movement participants perceive and engage with the state post globalisation. Here I follow the argument that the state has been transformed and it has assumed new roles with globalisation and hence it is important to understand how a social movement has responded to this: is the trend towards transnationalism and globalising within movements related to the perception of the state, and if so, how? I will explore how movement participants perceive mainstream politics and the relationship with political parties at the local and national level and the inherent dilemmas and conflicts within the movement. I will also focus on the relationship of caste, politics and clientelism in local level politics. There is indeed a fuzzy boundary between a movement, political party and the government, primarily because these analytical categories are intertwined with interpersonal networks and relationships, identities of caste, language and regional belonging in this case. I will attempt to highlight this interplay between culture and politics, multiple perceptions and experiences and the resulting factions and groups within a movement.

Response of KRRS to transformation in the State

In the Nehruvian era, poverty alleviation and democratic socialism was the prevailing idea that formed the basis for many policies, political claims and social movements

were also responding to this discourse. Scholars (Atul Kohli 1987; Ashis Nandy 2000; Partha Chatterjee 1989) have been primarily concerned with the nature of the state, competitors of the state and economic elites (Ray and Katzenstein 2006: 5) but only few studies (Omvedt 1990; Shah 1990) have looked at the changing character of social movements in response to changing nature of the state and dominant discourse. Ray and Katzenstein design a framework to understand the response of social movements in India to the shifting master frame of the state - from the state to market; from secular and social democracy to religious nationalism coupled with liberalisation and they identify three phases (1947-1966; 1967-1988; 1989- the present) (Ray and Katzenstein 2006: 6). The twin discourses of poverty alleviation and development along with the ideas of Marx, Gandhi, Nehru, Ambedkar and Lohia form the broad framework from which movements designed their ideologies, strategies and demands. In the first phase, the labour movement, the women's movement and cooperative movement 'succumbed to the strong hand of Nehruvian state' (ibid.: 14). In the second phase social movements in India entered a transition phase, 'one in which the ideological underpinnings of poverty alleviation still reigned supreme…[and] segments of Indian society came to believe that neither the political parties of the Centre nor of the Left adequately represented the interests of excluded groups' (ibid.: 17). Naxalite movement, Jharkhand Mukti Morcha, Chipko movement, people's science movements, Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA), Dalit Panthers and various regional farmer's movements were all formed during this period indicating a break from Nehruvian socialism and traditional Marxism, even while remaining pro-poor. These movements have been called 'new social movements' as

they organised new sections of the population, around new issues, with new methods and discourses with an explicit rejection of 'class' as the main basis for struggle and disillusionment with political parties (Omvedt 2006: 183). In the third phase, Hindu nationalism and neoliberalism changed the political environment drastically and consequently, some of the old social movements adopted new strategies and, some new social movements were born. With liberalization, some movements, bureaucrats and intelligentsia placed far greater faith in market, NGOs and civil society and private sector rather than the state. It is important to see how social movements in general and farmer's movements (being the focus of this study) responded to the change in the political opportunity structure, as they had emerged before liberalisation. Did they reinvent political ideologies and strategies, or did they decline and fade away? I argue that with liberalisation, perception of the state and relationship with the state transformed and this change was associated with the trend of globalising movements, expanding networks in the transnational plane. Directing protest against the state was no longer considered to be sufficient and hence movements started exploring possible networks beyond the national territory to protest against the 'global capitalist class'.

Liberalisation was a puzzle and like most social movements, even farmer's movements experienced decline, also because of ideological and ego clashes, splits and lack of leadership. From the 1980s to the 1990s farmer's movements had worked together but they split into two post liberalisation and this weakened the position of the farmer's movements nationally. With Sharad Joshi went Gujarat Khedut Samaj, a developing farmer's movement in Haryana and one section of Punjab BKU, whereas

Nanjundaswamy allied with Tikait and other section of Punjab farmers. The split within the farmer's movements was 'centred around very concrete issues, linking technology, seeds, irrigation, and development to the question of liberalisation' (Omvedt 2006: 192). But even after two decades of liberalisation, the farmer's movements, especially KRRS and BKU still mobilise thousands of farmers in their agitations. KRRS has been declining since the movement suffered splits and death of Nanjundaswamy. But it was KRRS among the other farmer's movements which reinvented, reconstituted their frames and political strategies responding to the change in the political environment.

Assadi (1995) argues, that in the initial years the unifying theme of most farmer's movements was anti-Nehruvian and a reliance on Gandhian alternatives such as decentralisation of power, support for cottage industries and eliminating market dependency. But with post liberalisation, Sharad Joshi supported liberalisation as an extreme form of anti-statism, while KRRS and BKU carried Gandhism a step forward by opposing MNCs and all forms of neo-colonial control. Assadi quotes Nanjundaswamy who says "major decisions that affect our farmers are no longer being made by farmers and their organisations or state legislatures or even by the Parliament…[but] in Washington and Geneva and IMF/World Bank headquarters and the GATT" (1994: 73). For Sharad Joshi, liberalisation and free market would promote freedom and self-reliance for the farmer and remove poverty, being free from the clutches of the state. It would prepare farmers for global competition which will transform India from 'weak capitalism' to 'competitive capitalism' and hence Joshi supported biotechnology in agriculture, patents, reduction of subsidy etc. For

Nanjundaswamy, liberalisation was a form of neo-colonialism, neo-imperialism and the farmer would lose his freedom and be transformed into a wage labourer. However, while the ideological battle between two leaders was ongoing, farmers themselves voted for technology in many parts of India.

Till late 1980s, for KRRS, the state was conceptualised as a function of the government, which at all levels, national and local has been perceived as an instrument of the capitalist class which necessarily exploits farmers. But post liberalisation the critiques of the state by KRRS also shifted such that it now asked for a 'strong but autonomous state' that would be strong enough to impose a 'Khadi Curtain' (Assadi 1999) that would keep out western hegemony and MNCs. '"Khadi curtain" means autonomy to peasantry, developing indigenous capitalism, development without foreign aid, non-exploitative relations, non-appropriation of surplus and homogeneity at the grassroots level…[and] opposing international dictates, hegemony and advocating equal relations and egalitarianism between the countries' (1999: 132). The state was considered to be *Mridu Rajya* or soft state and 'it demanded the replacement of one government by another, mainly by farmers vis-s-vis the industrial class' (Assadi 2002: 49). The solution to ensure a 'strong state' was to break the nexus between the capitalist class, the state, the World Bank, WTO/IMF and the MNCs by retrieving the place of farmers in the state as a ruling class. This trend, in a way was similar to the 'old' movements and contrary to the new social movements of the 1970s, which aimed at attaining state power to fight against exploitation of the ruling class. The concept of a 'strong state' also envisaged a state

that would prioritise agriculture over industry and prevent encroachment on agriculture by industry and the urban sector.

Sharad Joshi viewed the state as an instrument of the capitalist class; however, for him, the elimination of state interference would give more power in the hands of the farmers. Liberalisation not only split the farmer's movements in the country but also gave birth to two opposing movements from within the farmer's movements, a movement and a counter-movement. The interplay between a movement and a counter-movement 'influence each other both directly and by altering the environment in which each side operates. The opposing movement is a critical component in the structure of political opportunity the other side faces' (Meyer and Staggenbourg 1996: 1633). For Nanjundaswamy and Tikait, they had lost an ally to the 'other side' which weakened their position nationally and also in their own regions as such opposing views were evident even at the local levels - farmers trying to decide whether or not to support liberalisation. The counter-movement added to the change in the political opportunity structure.

Liberalisation and loss of an ally (Shetkari Sangathana) along with the changed perception of the state made Nanjundaswamy expand networks of KRRS transnationally. It was argued that as the state was a 'soft state' in the clutches of the western capitalist class, it was required to build stronger allies and fight on the global scale. According to Keck and Sikkink (1998), engaging in transnational advocacy networks is to create more pressure on the national governments, which they call the

'boomerang effect'[7]. KRRS expanded its networks with LVC and PGA not only to address new issues but also to strengthen its position locally and nationally. Simultaneously it asked for a replacement of the weak state led by capitalist class to a strong state led by farmers.

Engaging with the State and Electoral Politics

There has been a change in the perception of mainstream politics and state within the movement, ranging from complete contempt for politics to contesting elections over the last three decades. Earlier, politicians were seen to be corrupt but by the end of 1980s KRRS decided to contest Assembly and Parliament elections, joining hands with the Dalit movement and the language movement in the state. Though KRRS decided to participate in elections, two opposing views, some supporting and some against, were present within the movement giving rise to an ambiguous position of the movement as a whole and factions within the movement. It is thus important to historically understand the journey of the movement from being 'non-political' to engaging in electoral politics.

When KRRS was formed it had submitted 19 demands to the Karnataka government in October 1980 and the government had accepted certain demands, thus legitimising the movement as a representative of the interests of the farmers. These demands included withdrawal of cases against farmers, grant of loans, evolving a scientific price policy, wages of agricultural labourers at par with industrial workers, crop

[7] The boomerang effect implies putting pressure on actors on the global scale such that the state is pressurized indirectly.

insurance without payment of premium, pension for farm workers and labourers, abolition of purchase and levy tax and lower cost of electricity among others (Assadi 1997). Relationship with the state for KRRS varied from bargaining and demanding, to distrust and hostility and rarely cooperation and dialogue. KRRS would put up green boards specifying the time period for meeting all officials and bureaucrats. This was done to prevent officials from coming into the houses of farmers and attaching property by force. Chukki Nanjundaswamy recalls that "We wrote, before entering the village all the bureaucrats and bank officers are requested to take permission and enter". She went on to describe how the senior leaders in the 1980s had contempt and disgust for politicians and the government. "If they would meet politicians, they would come back and wash their hands". In the initial period, till 1984-85 there was complete disenchantment with politics and the government and there was a clear demarcating line between the 'political' and the 'non-political'. However, KRRS engaged in a 'balance of power' strategy (Assadi 1997: 235) by extending support to the opposition parties, but had no intention to engage in politics.

Since the early years diverse opinions regarding engaging in politics have created divisions within the movement. Assadi (1997: 237) gives an account of the different views present in the movement during 1983-84. Some preferred broad coalition with opposition parties, some chose electoral neutrality, some demanded freedom of contesting and "freedom of conscience" to support political parties. However KRRS chose to have a 'balance of power' strategy during 1983-84 by extending support to opposition parties, Janata-Ranga though some of its members supported the ruling party, Congress. KRRS first directly engaged in electoral politics in 1984 by forming

Mathadharara Vedike or Voters' Forum. This was first of a kind political strategy of selecting 'people's candidates' for Lok Sabha elections in 1984 and it contested elections from seven Karnataka constituencies, Shimoga, Bidar, Hassan, Chickmagalur, Kanakpura, Karwar and Belgaum. The candidates were all 'intellectuals, mostly lawyers from an urban, middle class background, much against the wishes of the local leadership in these areas' (Assadi 1997: 245). The outcome of the polls proved the failure of the experiment as none of the candidates were able to get even 5% of the votes polled. Till 1987, KRRS vacillated between 'balance of power strategy' and electoral neutrality, sometimes extending support and sometimes taking a neutral stance. This indicates the ambiguity and confusion within the movement regarding participation in electoral politics.

In 1987 KRRS decided to form a party of its own and contest elections and this marked the shift in the strategy from being an 'outsider' to mainstream politics to being an 'insider' and also indicating dual identities of being a movement and a political party. This decision was taken because of pressures from within and outside the movement. According to DSK, KRRS member and lawyer from Raichur, "Initially KRRS practiced only agitation and did not think of joining politics. When there was a protest against price of tobacco, some 30,000 farmers were arrested and released in scattered fashion all over the state. They had no money, no food, no phone number with them to go back to their homes. They were put in different buses and put in different districts. This created a lot of suffering. In the next committee meeting there was a lot of discussion and we decided to enter into politics because if

something like this happens we will have one of us in the government and they will not be able to do this to us".

Lok Dal[8] had attempted a broad coalition with KRRS in 1984, and in 1987 KRRS had almost agreed to accept political domination of Lok Dal and establish Lok Dal in Karnataka. However this coalition did not materialise for fear of losing exclusive identity in Karnataka (Assadi 1997: 250). Another reason was to form a third force in politics of Karnataka by bringing in the Dalit movement and language movement and it was named *Kannada Desha*. However, KRRS decided to contest under the banner of KRRS as "Kannada Desha might sound communal" says, KCB, a professor of economics and a member of KRRS. KRRS contested in 111 Assembly and 10 Parliament constituencies in 1989 and won two seats in Assembly. Baba Gowda Patil from North Karnataka won from two constituencies and hence Nanjundaswamy was chosen to be MLA from Dharwad and Baba Gowda Patil from Ki ttur. Similarly, KTG, who was associated with the socialist movement in Karnataka in Shimoga and is with KRRS since its beginnings, recalls, "In 1983 we decided not to give vote to Gundu Rao and we brought Ramkrishna Hegde of JDS to power". In 1994, KRRS contested election and Puttanaiah won one seat from Mandya. Since then Puttanaiah has been contesting Assembly polls and under the banner Sarvodaya Karnataka (a coalition between KRRS and Dalit Sangharsh Samiti) since 2005 but did not win until the recent polls in 2013.

[8] Bharatiya Lok Dal was formed in 1974 under the l eadership of Charan Singh

Though KRRS has been contesting elections since 1989, there is dilemma of whether to remain 'outside' or whether to 'go inside' mainstream politics. BN and VJ from Mysore fully support the idea of joining politics as they think a representative is required in the assembly to talk about farmer's issues. They think that "When Puttanaiah was MLA it did help in fixing rural budget, price, and irrigation schemes etc. It is because Puttanaiah stands for election people know how many supporters he has and that is why he has a good relation with all the ministers. They know how powerful he is". This indicates that, it is not only the need to have a representative in the government, but also to prove the power of KRRS as a strong political force in Karnataka. The idea that recognition in institutional politics is a sign of success for a movement is evident here.

However, other leaders like KTG and Suresh Babu Patil did not support the idea of participating in mainstream elections. KTG says, "I never supported contesting elections, I have seen 13 chief ministers from the time of Gundu Rao, it doesn't help. When we are outside politics, we can be a greater threat and we can protect ourselves more through movement politics". Chukki Nanjundaswamy says, "According to Suresh Babu Patil, the movement is not ready to contest elections as of now. He wants to rebuild the organisation, the way it was in the beginning". However Chukki is supportive of the idea of contesting elections. She says that "these leaders want to bring a change in the way elections are done in the country, want to make it more democratic, an alternative way of doing politics. In other cases voters are paid some sort of bribe or cash so that they vote for the leader, here, the voters are asked to pay and contribute for the money required for contesting elections. They want to be a part

of the system and change the way it runs". KS, farmer from Tamil Nadu and closely associated with KRRS, argues otherwise that:

> *"When you are leading a farmer's movement, if you contest elections, it disintegrates the movement. This is because people, irrespective of their political affiliations are part of the movement. When a farmer's movement takes a stand, those who are affiliated to other parties break away. Actually political parties and farmer's movements have a different role. Political parties failed to address the issues of farmers the way farmer's movements do. Look at BKU, TVS, they all lost the spirit when they decided to participate in electoral politics. Electoral politics has its own pros and cons, seat adjustment, alliance etc. In Tamil Nadu the political parties were waiting to split the movement, and now there are many, many, many splits (laughs)".*

These diverse ideas about participation in politics have created divisions within the movement in the past. Suresh Babu Patil, KTG and with their followers functioned separately as a faction of KRRS. These factions not only remain at the leadership level but percolate down to the district level and thus there are even at the village level owing allegiance to different leaders.

The analytical boundaries of the government, movement and political party become blurred when KRRS members contest elections and become MLAs. This is because it becomes difficult to demarcate between KRRS leadership and political party leadership. According to Chukki Nanjundaswamy, "KRRS is not an active party, it is more of a movement organisation. Only before elections they all wake up and decide that they want to contest elections and KRRS takes the character of a political party". Negotiating in the 'fuzzy boundaries' between a movement and a political party gives rise to ambiguities and contradictions within the movement. Thus Chukki says, "Challenge is to keep a movement as a movement. KRRS does play a big role but Sarvodaya Karnataka is separate". The 2013 Karnataka assembly polls have been

positive for the movement for two reasons. Puttanaiah, who had last won in 1994, after losing elections in the subsequent years, became MLA in 2013. While some KRRS members like BR, from North Karnataka, consider it to be a victory of the movement, some are skeptical about it. Chukki Nanjudaswamy says:

> *"We are planning to hold a public gathering of intellectuals and all parties on the 29th before the oath taking ceremony to greet Puttanaiah as the real opposition leader, to send him as our representative, not as an independent but as a face of our movement and all other progressive groups. We are definitely happy that Puttanaiah won. It was bec ause in his constituency his opposition had made many mistakes. When he filed his nomination people were already breaking coconuts and celebrating as if he had already won. But we are also skeptical as people can change when they become ministers. I was happy when he said that it is the victory for the movement not just his. At least he remembered KRRS. Having a minister in the parliament is definitely useful to get some policies made".*

Simultaneously, Siddaramaiah, who was Nanjundaswamy's student and was with the socialist movement in the initial years, became the Chief Minister in 2013. Though he started off as a KRRS member, he joined JDS (Janata Dal (Secular)) and then shifted to Congress. Being from a socialist background, and in contact with some KRRS leadership and Dalit leader like Devnu r Mahadeva, there is hope that the new government, although Congress, will be helpful for farmers. Thus Chukki Nanjudaswamy says "He has clear ideas, he reads, he is approachable and I feel like talking to him unlike other ministers. He has the aroma of my father". In fact Siddaramaiah has also sanctioned some funds to build Amritbhoomi, project started by Nanjundaswamy and now being continued by Chukki Nanjudaswamy (a training centre and school for natural farming, se ed conservation). Every year the birth anniversary of Nanjundaswamy is celebrated, and in 2012 the then Chief Minister, Sadananda Gowda was invited as the Chief Guest. This was not accepted by some

members of the movement as politicians and ministers are v iewed with contempt, considered to be corrupt. Though such sentiments exist within some members of the movement, some have started engaging in dialogue with certain 'good' ministers for pro-farmer policies. Siddaramaiah, being Nanjudaswamy's student is con sidered to be a 'good' minister and pro-farmer, though he is from Congress Party.

Thus there has been a change in the way KRRS engages with the state - first, while some members still view ministers and politicians with contempt, some have become 'softer' in their relationship with the state, engaging in dialogue and also invited for some functions. Second, there are two opposing views within the movement, one which thinks achieving some power in the government is necessary, while the other view considers it more powerful to engage in movement politics alone. A third view is that: KRRS is engaging in an 'alternative' form of politics which is clean and democratic. The different views have created factions and groups within the movement and thus the movement has an ambiguous position regarding participation in politics. However, one group contests elections under the banner of Sarvodaya Karnataka. The challenge is to demarcate and draw boundaries between political party and movement identity as leaders are oft en overlapping. In the alliance between DSS and KRRS, new kinds of complexities emerge as they are two different kinds of movements. Here it is important to historically trace the relationship between the two movements.

KRRS, Dalit Movement and Language Mo vement

KRRS, the Dalit movement (DSS) and language movement (also called Gokak [9] Movement) emerged around the same time in Karnataka and since then have been in dialogue or alliance with each other, primarily because of the close personal and ideological relations of its leaders, rooted in Lohiaite ideology. It is important here to look at the relationship of the three movements in Karnataka historically to understand how a rich farmer's movement, a Dalit movement and a language movement could come together on a common platform. The roots of the relationship between the three movements go back five decades to one figure, Ram Manohar Lohia and his ideas of Indian socialism including caste equality, decentralised administration, equal irrelevance of capitalism and communism, and support for regional languages as against English (Gowda 2010). These ideas have influenced intellectuals, artists, poets, academics and social movements in the state and 'some of the most vibrant political and intellectual work in Karnataka unfolded within the compass of Lohia's legacy' (Gowda 2010: 83).

Chandan Gowda gives an account of the beginning of the relationship between the movements in the state. 'In the mid-1960s, the Samajvadi Yuvajana Sabha (SYS), a forum of socialist youth activists that grew out of the activities of the Kannada Yuvajana Sabha in Mysore under the leadership of M. D. Nanjundaswamy (1936-2004) and K. P. Poornachandra Tejaswi (1938-2007), attempted to rescue Lohiaite ideals, which, it was felt, were being abused by the SP [socialist party]. Important dalit intellectuals such as Devanur Mahadeva and Govindaiah were also active in SYS

[9] The language movement was also called Gokak movement, as V. K. Gokak led the committee which recommended giving primacy to Kannada in government schools in 1980s.

activities in Mysore' (2010: 79). The Dalit Sangharsh Samiti was founded by B. Krishnappa, Devnur Mahadeva, both being socialists and Siddalingaiah in 1974. For Devanur Mahadeva, a writer and receiver of Padmashri award, his Lohiaite roots made him appreciate Gandhian ideals as also a way for liberation for Dalits (Mahadeva 1999, cited in Gowda 2010). Siddalingaiah, who had worked with Nanjundaswamy in SYS, was also well versed in, if not leaning towards Marxism. The broad ideological canvas of the movement owing to the Lohiaite and Marxist backgrounds of DSS founders allowed DSS to work with other progressive groups in Karnataka, not only against caste oppression but also policies of the state.

Lohia was an inspiration for Nanjundaswamy and also other leaders of KRRS, who considered KRRS to be part of the socialist movement and many of the leaders of KRRS, were part of SYS during the 1960s and hence KRRS practiced a mixture of Lohiaite and Gandhian ideology. Also, the farmer's organisation in Shimoga, which had a strong socialist culture, was one of the backbones of KRRS in the initial years. Though KRRS and DSS allied during 1989, DSS was skeptical of caste equality being a concern of KRRS as majority members of KRRS were from the two dominant castes, Lingayats and Vokkaligas. Though Nanjundaswamy and other leaders had ideological roots in Lohia's socialism, the dominant caste composition of KRRS, made the movement less sensitive towards Dalits. However in 2005, Sarvodaya Karnataka was formed as an unusual alliance between KRRS and DSS and since then they have been contesting elections in the state.

Lohia's influence was also immense in the modernist movement in Karnataka primarily because of three writers, U. Ananthamurthy, P. Lankesh and Poornachandra

Tejaswi, all coming from Shimoga. The pro-Kannada language movement borrowed the Lohiate ideals of support of regional languages. Tejaswi's father, Kuvempu (1904-1994) was the great Kannada writer and a supporter of Kannada as the medium of instruction in educational institutions. Nanjundaswamy and Tejaswi published a short book on Lohia popularly known as *The Red Book.* In fact, the *sarala vivahas* (simple marriages) organised by KRRS reflect its Lohiaite roots, and the wedding vows in these weddings were translated from Sanskrit to Kannada by Kuvempu. P. Lankesh went on to start the *Lankesh Patrike* which became a hugely successful political and literary weekly.

Nanjundaswamy, Poornachandra Tejaswi, P. Lankesh, Devnur Mahadeva, Govindaiah among several other intellectuals formed the intellectual force, rooted in Lohiaite ideals, and the reason behind the relationship of the three movements in the state. Also, during the last three decades the three movements have not only supported each other but have also been critical of each other, especially *Lankesh Patrike* which played a major role in analysing KRRS within the state. Chukki Nanjundaswamy says that "North Karnataka had Chenbasappa Bettadoor, Shankar Gowda (artist), Shantarasa (poet/ghazal writer) and the south Karnataka had Nanjundaswamy, P. Lankesh (journalist) and Poornachandra Tejaswi (writer) as intellectuals of that time and it was the connection and friendship between these intellectuals that formed the backbone of the movements that emerged in Karnataka at that time, especially KRRS". Thus, even though KRRS and DSS represent two fundamentally antagonistic communities, rich dominant caste farmers and poor dalits, the common historical

origin of the two movements rooted in Lohiaite ideology is an important factor behind the formation of Sarvodaya Karnataka.

Naya Netas (New Leaders): Power of the Green Shawl?

Identities of caste, regional belonging, political affiliation, membership in a social movement, interpersonal networks and faith in charismatic leaders are all inextricably linked to each other making it a challenge to decipher complex political behaviour of people. Thus it cannot be said that all KRRS members vote for KRRS and DSS alliance, Sarvodaya Karnataka, or they vote based on caste sentiments, or they follow the decision of state committee to extend support to a political party. However, some generalisations can be made that North Karnataka (henceforth will use North) is dominated by Lingayats who tend to support BJP and South Karnataka (South) is dominated by Vokkaligas who tend to support Congress or JDS. Although caste identities become more important than membership in KRRS when it comes to voting or supporting a political party, it is not always true. This is primarily because of presence of patron-client relationships in villages, and also the dynamics of political parties, local leaders and caste communities are specific in local contexts.

Caste and patron-client links have been considered to be building blocks of political organisation in rural areas in India (Midgal 1988; Weiner 1989; Karanth 1997; Kothari 1997; Manor 1997), though the old patronage-based political networks have changed in the last few decades (Krishna 2007). Patronage-based party-voter linkages or clientelism 'represents a transaction, the direct exchange of a citizen's vote in return for direct payments or continuing access to employment, goods, and services' (Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007: 2). According to Krishna, based on his study in

Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh, old patron-based politics has given way to emergence of *naya netas:*

> 'Non-caste-based political entrepreneurs-popularly known as *naya netas* (new leaders)- have emerged… [who] provide other villagers with their most effective means of making contact with politicians, with the government bureaucracy, and with market operations of different kinds. Their authority and respect in the village derives not from any ritual or economic status but from the information and connections that they make available to other villagers' (Krishna 2007: 143).

What has led to the emergence of the new leaders? According to James Manor (2010: xix), availability of funds to government has allowed for poverty programmes of the government which though may not replace old patronage politics, these programmes supplement it making old patronage politics insufficient to win re-election. Caste[10], mainly meaning *jatis* denotes not only hierarchy but also segmentation and difference. While the relevance and importance of hierarchy has decreased, *jatis* (which segment villages along horizontal lines) have remained strong and have become more important. Scholars like G. K. Karanth (1996) argue that spread of education and penetration of capitalism in agriculture are factors that have led to the declining power of caste hierarchies in rural areas. The decline of caste hierarchies in villages implies that lower castes or disadvantaged sections are no longer dependent on or they resist the domination of upper castes. However, they require some services which traditionally the upper or dominant castes or village patrons would do, primarily 'getting things done'. What has emerged is an 'army of local-level political

[10] A single word 'caste' refers to three different things - *varna* (broad four groups within the traditional Hindu hierarchy namely the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras), *jati* (endogamous caste groups), *jati-clusters* (multiple jatis which pursue similar occupation who describe themselves as castes).

entrepreneurs- small time political 'fixers' or *naya netas* (new leaders)- who lead up to sub-district and sometimes even district levels, to contact politicians and bureaucrats who can provide assistance to 'get things done', in response to the great proliferation of government programmes in recent years' (Manor 2010: xxvii). Reddy and Haragopal call them *pyraveekars* who are middleman possessing skills in exerting pressure on the administrative system through what is known as *pyravee*- that is, the art of approaching officials for favours' (1985: 1149).

Besides being dominant caste, rich and middle class farmers, KRRS members in villages emerged as leaders in villages because they have 'political power'. KRRS members who are *naya netas, may or may not be* economically well-off, or *may or may not be* from upper caste. For example, AP, from Sindhanur, is a young, Muslim farmer, with 2 acres of land, belonging to a particular faction of KRRS, and has emerged as a leader in his village. Though the patron-client relationship exists, the nature of patrons has changed in villages- the patrons (leaders) *may or may not be* from the dominant caste or rich i.e. caste hierarchy and clientelist politics is not always linked. Several villagers comment on the 'power of the green shawl' which KRRS members wear. These leaders in villages derive the 'political power' from being members of KRRS, for having more information and contact with the district and state level bureaucracy and politicians. But the crucial difference between *naya netas* and KRRS leaders is that KRRS leaders derive the power by using threat of collective organisation, and not by pleading with officials.

Thus, CP of Raichur, a state level KRRS leader says, "Many joined KRRS 5-7 years back because they were having a lot of problem in getting power and they needed

some support of farmer leaders to attend to their local problems. KRRS leaders have a lot of power in the village because of their organisation. So if someone's son has been put in jail, KRRS leaders will go and get them released on bail or with a lower fine. Similarly when they weigh the amount of produce, KRRS leaders see to it that the right amount has been weighed and farmers are not cheated". In a village near Tumbernhalli in Ramnagar district, I attended an oath taking ceremony of new members of KRRS. Some other villagers had come to see. "We also want to be a part of KRRS as we have a lot of problems in our village. If we join KRRS, our problems might lessen", said two of the spectators. Similarly in Nalwar village of Gulbarga, villagers from lower castes, belonging to SC and OBC categories have also joined KRRS because being in KRRS has helped them to get loans, in getting land, in getting their loans waived off, or getting a cow etc. The key patron in this village is a senior KRRS leader, and he says jokingly, "They wear green shawl when they need something that they are not getting". Thus several members have joined KRRS when there was some problem in their village and KRRS organised protests which helped them. For example, HA from Devanhalli, who joined during the protest against electric power meters which the government wanted to install to charge electricity. KRRS members came and took off all the power meters and threw them as a sign of protest in Devanhalli. Similarly, Girish, a young member (part of Green Brigade, the youth wing of KRRS) joined when there was a protest against lack of supply of ration in his village, DSK joined when there was an agitation regarding supply of water in Sindhanur. Thus KRRS leaders have the influence to get the day-to-day work done and these are the people who matter in the villages today, rather than higher economic

and social position. The role that KRRS leaders play in villages is th at of *naya netas*. According to Krishna (2007),

> 'The interactions which new village leaders have with politicians at higher levels are hardly those of a client locked into a hierarchical relation with a patron. *Naya netas* are not bound to any particular political party. Rather, they look around for whichever politician can provide them credibly with most resources to finance development works in their village, and they switch allegiance easily from, one set of politicians to another. Parties chase after *naya netas* as much as or more than *naya netas* chase after parties; consequently, the top half of the clientelist pyramid is inverted to some extent' (Krishna 2007:148).

The emergence of new leaders, who may or may not be from dominant caste, is also associated with the inability of political parties to attend to the needs of the people. Disillusionment with political parties is a factor that made villagers accept leadership from KRRS, a new kind of political formation. Thus some members of KRRS, like MS of Chamrajnagara, AP of Sindhanur, KN of Mandya, all old members of KRRS, either vote for independent candidates or do not vote at all rather than voting for BJP, Congress or JDS.

However it does not imply that these new leaders do not engage in interaction w ith political parties, rather most KRRS leaders form the middle layer maintaining the vertical political linkages that exist between political leaders and villagers, between state level KRRS leadership and ordinary KRRS members in villages. Whether it is voting for a party or an agitation organised by KRRS, they provide the numbers. Thus, the nature of leaders in villages may have changed, but vertical linkages between political party leaders, KRRS leaders and people are maintained. Also, as Krishna (2007) comments, parties chase after the new leaders making the top half of the pyramid inverted to some extent.

KRRS, Caste and Politics

Does change in old patronage politics and emergence of new leaders change the way caste is related to voting behaviour? Thou gh caste is not the only factor, it remains an important factor, along with other factors like faithfulness to a specific leader and regional identities (whether from the North or the South). With liberalisation, there has also been a change in rural areas as greater economic opportunities are available to lower status groups to climb up the social ladder. Class also becomes a factor, as KRRS being primarily a rich and middle class farmer's movement, tends to support the political party and government which has policies that help their class interests. The kind of solidarity and collectivities formed are more hybrid, where 'incongruous elements exist alongside one another' (Karanth 1996) which are not neat, tidy systems. Thus Karanth (1996) says, no 'caste s ystem exists'. According to D. L. Sheth, 'de-ritualisation' and 'politicisation' of caste has made it possible for 'individual members of different castes to acquire new economic interest and social - political identification and (to) own class-like as well as ethnic type identities' which he called *classisation* (1999: 2504). Thus members of different castes may form a group or an alliance for political convenience. During elections there are differences in opinion about which party the movement should suppor t, or which leader's party to support. These differences are there because KRRS members have multiple identities - caste (Lingayat or Vokkaliga or lower caste), regional (north or south), class and of course as KRRS members.

The Lingayats and Vokkaligas ha ve not only owned the best land in th e state but they have also had numerical strength, which made them dominant castes in the state

(Manor 2010: xxxv). The Vokkaligas (non-vegetarian) are a cluster of six *jatis*, their primary occupation being agriculture, whereas the Lingayats (vegetarian) are a religious sect and have a greater number and variety of *jatis.* Historically, the Lingayats and Vokkaligas were antagonistic to each other for almost twenty-five years after independence till Devaraj Urs became chief minister in the state in 1972. He became chief minister by 'mobilising support from groups of lesser status, which comprised a sizeable majority of the population, and which had awakened sufficiently to challenge the locally dominant *jati* clusters' (ibid.: xxxv). He broke the dominance of Lingayats and Vokkaligas in the state by implementing land reforms [11] and several welfare programmes for the poor and backward castes. In this situation, the two groups came together to cooperate with each other to hold on to their dominance at local and state level. Interestingly, KRRS was formed in 1980, a few years after the two groups merged back. Since then the Lingayats and Vokkaligas, unite with the common identity of being a 'farmer caste', but divisions between the two groups become visible during elections.

AK, associated with KRRS as technical coordinator of LVC, says that "No movement supports anyone *openly*, but every movement supports someone depending on the situation. If they say openly that they support someone, that means they are sold out". In the early 1980s, KRRS had voted Congress out of power in favour of JDS. This is a case where a movement as a whole supported a political party as they considered that

[11] Land Reforms Act was passed in 1973 and came into force on 1974. Under this act, the only persons eligible to hold land are those engaged in personal cultivation, with the sole exception of soldiers and sailors. The use of hired labour remains legal but only through payment of wages and not in a share in the crop (Manor 2002).

particular party to be pro-farmer. Here the class identity, rather than caste sentiments achieved primacy in supporting a party which would help the 'farmer', in this case rich or middle class farmers. This also implies domination of leadership and the 'movement's choice' of a particular party over personal, political choice. This was the dilemma and issue of discontent among many members who preferred to vote and support according to their personal choices. Of course, the voting behaviour of these members was based on caste identities and relationship with local level political party leaders. It is because of this reason that "farmers are united as 'kisans' but before any election these farmers fight with each other. Caste becomes more important then" says DSK. According to KTG, "Caste still exists because politicians, *mathas*, moneylenders still support the caste system, and for the people it is a protection, an identity which they use when they are in trouble, there is a community feeling within a caste". Similarly, HA says, "During elections you must see the leaders. Entire KRRS is divided, they start fighting with each other because each leader supports a different political party. Even villages support different parties. All are separate then and after the elections, everything is okay again (laughs)".

BR of Gulbarga is a rich farmer, Lingayat and in the state level leadership of KRRS. He owns 80 acres of land and gives his land for lease. He thinks that supporting a political party to come to power is required and says that "Singly we cannot win the elections and come to power, so why should we not support someone then?" He recalls that when Baba Gowda Patil, a very powerful leader of North Karnataka and MLA (1989) left KRRS and joined BJP:

> *"We supported BJP because we knew him. Instead of supporting some one unknown, why should we not support someone who we knew would be good? He did a lot of reforms but did not get along well with BJP. So when he came out of BJP, we also stopped supporting BJP. Now we are supporting Congress as he is in Congress now. Also many of ex-KRRS members have left JDS and come to Congress now. We help mainly during elections, but if they are wrong we will not support them".*

BR proudly proclaims that "without KRRS, BJP is zero in North Karnataka". He says that the benefits of allying with political party are that they get cows and subsidised seeds, and he oversees that. This is a case where BR acts as a broker between the political party and villagers in his region; he extends support to a political party because it is easier to get certain benefits from the party in power and he provides those benefits and services to villagers, who in turn vote for the party which BR advises them to vote for. However a direct relationship between caste and political party cannot be always drawn. BR supported BJP not only because BJP is dominated by Lingayats but also because of charismatic leaders like Baba Gowda Patil. Thus when Baba Gowda Patil left BJP and joined Congress, his followers also shifted. In fact, in the North, Baba Gowda was worshiped to such an extent that when he left KRRS to join a political party, many KRRS members also left, making the organisation weak in north Karnataka.

In a small village in Gulbarga district of North Karnataka, in a (OBC) family of five, the younger son is an active KRRS member and a supporter of BJP. The men of the family vote for BJP (two sons and the father) and women vote for Congress (mother and one daughter). This is a trend in some families in the village, where usually the KRRS members and office bearers vote for the party which the district level committee has decided to support, while the other family members vote for the other

party. In fact if there are three brothers, they vote for all three parties. Here, neither caste affiliation nor KRRS membership is important, but it is a 'getting the best of both' strategy.

In KRRS office in Manvi, the five KRRS leaders there gave an explanation why KRRS could never become a strong political force and win elections in the state. They think that though KRRS has the support of farmers, they cannot win elections because their ideology and anti-caste ideas do not capture votes. Though they attribute the reason to caste identities, the class difference along with caste plays out here – agricultural labourers prefer to vote for the party that will give them benefits rather than voting for their employers. The district secretary comments:

> *"The major vote bank is the agricultural labourers who are generally lower caste and they are bribed by political leaders so that the concerned political party wins. These agricultural labourers will never vote for farmers who are higher caste and more importantly their employers".*

Though caste and politics are closely linked they can also work in an unusual way, as seen in the election of Puttanaiah from Sarvodaya Karnataka (SK) from Mandya. In Karnataka, as James Manor (2010) describes, princely state of Mysore had most equitable land distribution and even Dalits owned some amount of land. Thus compared to other regions, Dalits in Southern region of Karnataka became educated and felt less alienated from the upper or dominant castes. This is important here because though the political alliance between DSS and KRRS is unusual, it was possible only in southern region of Karnataka where, comparatively, Dalits are less oppressed. Mandya is the heart of the sugarcane lobby in the southern region of the state, is primarily dominated by Vokkaligas and has always been a strong hold of

KRRS. Puttanaiah is a Vokkaliga, owning about 80 acres and allied with DSS (Dalit Sangharsh Samiti) in 2005, won for the first time in 1994, has been contesting elections since 1999 but won only in 2013. His followers and also KRRS leaders proclaim, "He got votes without giving bribes, he is an example of how politics can be made clean". BN and VR explain why he has been losing for so many years is that "he has to fight against his own community i.e. Vokkaligas. The Vokkaligas support JDS in his constituency and thus it is a direct fight between JDS and SK in Mandya. Puttanaiah gets votes from other castes rather than Vokkaligas i.e. Nayaks, Muslims, SC, Lingayats. Every time he lost by a small margin". Here, interestingly, though he is a Vokkaliga, his identity as the ex-President of KRRS and an ally of DSS, being sensitive to lower castes attains more importance than his caste identity.

Thus voting behaviour of people are not only based on caste and patron-client relationships, but also other factors. KRRS leaders have emerged as new leaders, not only because they are middle and rich farmers from a dominant caste, but also because of a vacuum created by political party leaders, and because of the 'power' that they have in villages. The old-patronage politics still exists, where the patron, a KRRS leader BR for example (above) supports a political party. However, besides caste and patronage politics, the worship for a leader was a major factor here. The case of Puttanaiah (above) exemplifies the complexity of caste and politics, as he won not from the votes of his caste members but from Dalits and lower castes, because he allied with DSS. It is not only caste, but also class (which is often intertwined with caste), that plays a role in politics, where lower castes, poor agricultural labourers tend to vote based on an economic decision, says some leaders. The relationship between

caste, class and politics is complex on its own but attains further complexity when movement actors play a role in this relationship. This is because a movement resembles a pyramidal structure, where village, district and state level leaders are linked vertically not only within the movement but also horizontally at each level with political party leaders based on caste, class and regional identities.

Drain of movement activists to political parties

Another trend in KRRS is that several members of KRRS have left the movement and joined political parties for better opportunities. Some charismatic and popular leaders, having a large following, considered joining a political party to give them more power, which they did not get within the movement because of domination or personal ego clashes with other leaders. This also indicates the tendency of top level leaders to strive for achieving utmost power within the movement, to question the domination of the leader. In such cases it has been seen that popular leaders leave the movement to join political parties, as was the case with Baba Gowda Patil.

People in North Karnataka worshipped Baba Gowda Patil and called him the second Basavanna[12]. Invoking the name of the great social reformer and leader of 12 th century, he strengthened the Lingayat ideology and culture in northern region, rather than the ideology of KRRS. In fact, this cultural superimposition was possible because both Basavanna and KRRS preached caste equality. This shows how culture and politics are closely associated with each other. However, the movement did not

[12] Basavanna, also known as Basaveshwara, was the philosopher and social reformer of 12 th Century in Karnataka. He fought against caste system, untouchability and rejected many Hindu rituals and ideas of *karma* and reincarnation. He practiced monotheism through worship centered on Lord Shiva in the form of Linga or *Ishtalinga.* Lingayatism or Veerashaivism is a distinct Shaivite tradition in India, established much before 12 th century but attained a new height because of Basavanna.

invoke Basavanna in its ideology because the South is dominated by Vokkaligas. Thus ideologically the movement has been weak in the North and hence when Baba Gowda left, even other members followed him, says KTG, a leader from Shimoga and a part of KRRS since its beginnings. According to KCB, an economics professor and one of the core members in the initial years of the movement:

> *"Baba Gowda was a great leader, people would run to listen to him. Once I had gone to the North to give a lecture and I saw people running on the roads. I asked the people why they were running. They said, to listen to Baba Gowda. Baba Gowda did not want to be in the movement anymore. So I was the only one who said that let Baba Gowda be President and Puttanaiah be General Secretary keeping in mind that Baba Gowda was a Lingayat and Puttanaiah a Vokkaliga. I thought it was not good to lose a leader like Baba Gowda. But Nanjundaswamy did not want to give up his post, so Baba Gowda left and joined BJP the next day".*

He left the movement in late 1990s and joined BJP which weakened the movement in the North. He had become such a popular leader within the movement that some members considered him to be the 'rightful' leader of the movement causing factions and ego problems within the movement. However, when he switched from BJP to Congress, "People lost faith in him and he is nowhere now", says a leader, CP, state level leader from Raichur.

In fact there is a thin line between institutional and non-institutional methods of practicing politics i.e between a movement and a political party at the local level. Alongside, 'we-feeling' of a caste community makes the boundary between a movement and a political party even more permeable. Also, the 'power' that one derives from engagement in movement politics is different from the 'power' of being a political party leader. Ultimately it is a matter of individual perception of which kind of power is considered to be more potent and lasting. Political parties also wooed

many KRRS leaders as these leaders have a large following in their regions. This has weakened the movement in some regions as some members followed their leader to join political parties, while other members lost faith in leaders.

DSK, an old member form Dharwad, says that "Many KRRS leaders were taken away by political parties because they were strong and trained activists. They got sold to some party or the other. People usually join Raitha Sangha when there are problems and leave when they get better political opportunities". Similarly BR from North Karnataka argues that "Farmer's movement in Karnataka has weakened now because lots of KRRS members have joined politics". People of Sindhanur, primarily populated by refugees from Bangladesh, comment that "Earlier there would be lakhs of people from KRRS on the roads at the drop of a hat. Hanuman Gowda betrayed the trust of the people and joined BJP first and then Congress. Now people no longer trust KRRS leaders and consider them to be the same as other political leaders". PS from Ramnagar district says, "In Ramnagar districts there are four taluks, Ramnagar, Chenpatna, Kanakpur and Magadi. There are branches of KRRS in all the taluks. Earlier 70% of the villages had KRRS members but now it is about 50% or less. This is because people have left and gone to political parties. Different taluks are divided depending on their alliance with different political parties. In principle KRRS is still strong but in numbers it has decreased. There is also a lot of jumping from one party to another during elections". This has been a major challenge of the movement, to prevent leaders from leaving the movement and joining political parties. As several leaders have left, the movement has weakened in some regions.

Split and Factions

Factions and splits happen in movements for personal ego problems between leaders, or for ideological differences, or for opinions regarding which political party to support etc. In KRRS too, there are divisions and it suffered a major split in 1999 and merged back in 2008. However, after the major split the movement never got back to its earlier form, also because Nanjundaswamy passed away in 2004. Interestingly these factions, splits and divisions are never long lasting and people keep changing allegiance from one group to another, thus making factions very fluid in nature. Here I will attempt to sketch out the multiple groups that were present at the time of my fieldwork. The situation and group dynamics changed post-fieldwork when I visited the field briefly, after a few months.

There is a division based on views regarding participation in politics. The group which believes in participation in politics is again divided based on who to support during elections, where the caste, regional identities and several other factors become important. There are other divisions based on trust or lack of it for a leader within KRRS. This heightened after the split in the movement into two factions: Nanjundaswamy and Puttanaiah faction. In the Nanjundaswamy faction, Kodihalli C. emerged as a leader after his death. After the merge, Puttanaiah became the President, and after two years Kodihalli the Working President. The bone of contention between these two, Puttanaiah and Kodihalli, had boiled down to who would be the President. Even after the merge, undercurrent of factional rivalry continued between Puttanaiah and Kodihalli but interestingly the followers of Nanjundaswamy faction abandoned Kodihalli and sided with Puttanaiah, even Chukki Nanjundaswamy. To resolve the problems between Puttanaiah and Kodihalli even a special committee was formed in

the movement. In 2012 February a new board was selected, where Puttanaiah became honorary president, Chamrasa Patil the President and Kodihalli was out of the picture.

What is interesting in these ego clashes and faction rivalries are the issues and how these affect the district and village levels of the movement. One major issue behind the split in 1999 was that some members questioned financial credibility of Nanjundaswamy as he was travelling abroad extensively attending conferences. KS, who joined the movement after 2005 says "I heard a lot of rumours, lot of mud throw on Professor because of his international presence". The other view is that Nanjundaswamy had dismissed Basavarajappa (for secretly allying with a political party) without the opinion of others and his autocratic ways had caused discontent among some members.

In fact there are several ways in which members attempt to interpret why the split happened. These opinions percolate down to the village level and factions based on allegiance to a specific leader emerge in the village level. There are some districts like Davangere and Shimoga which are split into three or four factions based on allegiance to different leaders like Nanjundaswamy, Kodihalli and Puttanaiah etc. and the movement is fragmented. Some districts like, Dharwad, Raichur, Shimoga, Tumkur which used to be strong holds of KRRS earlier have become fragmented and some others like Mandya, Haveri, Kollar, Bagalkot, Raibag Taluk in Belgaum are still strong holds of KRRS. CP of Raichur, Lingayat and a state level leader says that, "When the split happened the numbers went down. Even before that when Hanuman Gowda and Baba Gowda Patil left, numbers had gone down. I was the only one left here and I tried to rebuild the organisation here slowly". BR of Gulbarga, a state level

leader says, “KRRS is not so strong here; it used to be. Now even the local markets have stopped bringing green shawls as there is hardly any demand”. There are also some members like MS from Chamrajnagara, (who was a district level office bearer but gave up his post during the split) who were disillusioned with the movement and when the split happened they took off their green shawl. He says:

> *“There are many people who have removed the shawl but the spirit is still alive in us; but there are some leaders who wear the green shawl although they do not have any ideology. In fact after the split many people moved back, we were always with Prof., but the split was a big blow to the movement and the numbers went down. I had lost faith in leaders. I gave up my post as a convener of Mysore District. Things have changed within KRRS now - there used to be no garlanding before, but now leaders are garlanded. Leaders would sit at the back in a meeting, but now leaders sit in the front.”*

There is also a gap between old and new generation activists. While the older generation thinks that they have been part of the real, lively farmer’s movement, the younger people feel that, that kind of activism is not enough today. The older generation feels that though there are a lot of new people in the movement today, they do not have any strong ideology. Thus DSK, an old member, says, “I do not feel like attending meetings anymore. There is no discipline, no ideology”. KRRS also has a youth wing called Green Brigade, consisting of members less than the age of 35.

Conclusion

One distinct shift within the movement post globalisation has been in the perception of the state where the state is considered to a weak state. It was considered that it is not sufficient to address only the state and it is required to engage in transnational networks. Now, whether and how transnational networks enable a movement will be analysed in the next chapter. The changes in the political environment also led to a division in the alliance of farmer’s movement in the country. This not only weakened

the position of farmer's movements in the country but also made movement leaders explore other alliances based on opinions about globalisation, for example building contacts with intellectuals like Vandana Shiva, Medha Patkar among others. This elevation of politics from the national level and also exploring other possible alliances indicates a marked shift in the trajectory of the movement.

At the local level, the impact of globalisation was also felt differently by different farmers leading to a reshuffling in the local hierarchies and power dynamics in villages and there has also been a shift from agriculture to non-agricultural occupations. And thus, '*the fragmentation of farmer's movements during the last decade or so cannot be understood without referring to the growing internal differentiation within the landowning classes/castes and the changing political and class balance at the local and regional level'* (Jodhka 2006: 1536). Simultaneously, the movement also contested elections in 1989 and that marked a shift in its stance on electoral politics. Practice of politics, on one hand, elevated from the national level to transnational level, and on the other hand, there was a shift from being an 'outsider' engaging in non-institutional politics, to being an 'insider' and contesting elections, creating several factions within the movement.

However, the movement was also in its peak during the early 1990s, when for the first time, KRRS won two seats in the assembly elections and also held several protests against globalisation. Engaging in mainstream politics also entailed several tensions within the movement and it was also during this period that several leaders left the movement to join political parties followed by a split in the movement. All these factors together weakened the movement considerably and the movement has not

really revived to its older form. Today there are several factions in the villages and the movement is very fragmented.

Chapter 4
Process and Politics of Networking

Introduction

Since the 1990s KRRS has engaged in anti-globalisation movement and is a member of People's Global Action (PGA) and La Via Campesina (LVC). While there is a growing literature on transnational networks, one also needs to explore how a movement simultaneously engages in not only transnational networks, but also in local and national ones, building coalitions, alliances with diverse group of actors. This chapter explores the process of networking of a movement, KRRS, how it engages with transnational networks, international and national NGOs, other similar and dissimilar movements at the local, national and transnational level and the consequent implications for the movement itself. By networks I mean 'social movement networks' and not transnational networks only.

Since the 1980s and 1990s transnational movements, networks and coalitions have proliferated. On one hand, movements have expanded their networks transnationally and have 'internationalised', and on the other hand, there are several international NGOs, funders and civil society organisations, which have become important actors in the field. Though movements have always built alliances and networks, post-globalisation networking has taken a new shape and character, with new modes of communication, agendas, actors and methods. Participation in networks has become an essential component of collective identities of the activists involved, networking

forming part of their common repertoire of action and recruitment (Melucci 1996; Castells 1997).

Though transnational links have existed even before globalisation, since globalisation one can see a proliferation of different groups and movements linked thr ough networks and coalitions. della Porta and Tarrow (2004) argue that since the late 1980s, three kinds of major changes in the international scenario have facilitated the growth of networks. First, the collapse of the Soviet Bloc led to the development o f different forms of non-state action that had previously been blocked by Cold War divisions. This increased the support for NGO activity from Western countries. Second, the advancement in technologies of communication and cheap international travel made it possible for the formerly isolated movement actors to communicate and coordinate actions with each other. Finally, there has been a growing power of transnational corporations and international institutions in the era of globalisation that have led to common discontent among people of different countries. Thus, 'globalisation has consistently transformed the conditions for collective action, and, along with limits, has brought occasions and resources for protest. In economic, political and cultural systems, the growth of interconnections has generated new conflicts as well as opportunities for expressing these conflicts at multiple territorial levels' (della Porta et. al. 2006: 16).

The nature of alliances and networks of a movement vary depending on the i ssue, the actors and the context. There can be strong ties, loose contacts, coalitions and forums for exchange of information, networks that last for years or for only a brief period of time, and networks of a movement that keep changing constantly. The crucial aspect

of process and politics of networking is who allies with whom, why, how , and in what context. It is by looking at the processes of networking at different levels that one can delineate the challenges of networking and examine whether and how networks enable social movements. Thus, I have looked at networks of KRRS at multiple levels with diverse actors: the transnational level with LVC and PGA, at the national and local level with other movements like Narmada Bachao Andolan (NBA), National Alliance for People's Movements (NAPM), Adivasi Gothram Mahasabha of Kerala (AGMK) and Bharatiya Kisan Union (BKU), with NGO leaders like Vandana Shiva of RFSTE, Suman Sahai of Gene Campaign, Kavitha Kuruganti of Kheti Virasat Mission, and Shalmali Guttal, Afsar Jafri of Focus on Global South among others.

I have looked at the need for networking to understand why movements engage in networks at multiple levels. The role of leaders or representatives of a movement is crucial in this process of networking as they become the main link between the local and the global. By looking at the multiple levels and the diverse actors it is seen that the primary challenges are negotiating the differences in identities and ideologies and the question of representation. It is argued here that though networking is crucial for social movements during globalisation, the emphasis on difference in identity, and the diversity and heterogeneity in networks often becomes an impediment for any well - integrated collective struggle, resulting in a loosely connected network. Closely related to the issue of negotiating identities is that of representation: who should represent whom and what are the implications for that on the collective struggle.

Along with the emergence of transnational movements there has also been a proliferation of NGOs since the 1980s. The relationship of social movements with the

NGOs is interesting as they have a love-hate relationship and closely related to it is the politics of funding and the implications it has for the autonomy and dependence of a movement on the NGOs. It has been seen that linkage at different levels are dependent on leaders who negotiates between local and global issues and in the case of KRRS this had led to multiple cleavages within the movement. The local and the global exist simultaneously but disconnected from each other in terms of issues, actors and programmes. Finally, I have explored whether and how engaging in networks enable or empower movements in any way.

Understanding Process and Politics of Networking: Social Movement 'Webs'

There has been a growing literature on transnational networks, global civil society (see for example, Wapner 1996; Beck 2003; Florini 2001; Gaventa 2001; Naughton 2001; Said and Desai 2003; Sassen 2002) and 'globalisation from below' to understand the nature of networks (Ayers 2001; Edwards and Gaventa 2001; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Smith 2001; Smith and Johnston 2002; Tarrow 2002). According to Edelman (1998) several studies have been done on transnational networks and social movements focusing on indigenous groups (Brysk 1996), human rights (Sikkink 1993), women (Elshtain 1995; Palley 1991), labour (Kidder and McGinn 1995), and environmentalist groups (Keck 1995). However, transnational agrarian movements have received relatively less attention barring a few scholars like Edelman (1998, 2003, 2005), Mazoyer and Roudart (2002), Borras (2004), Holt-Gimenez (2006) and Desmarais (2007). Though several studies have looked at transnational social movements and civil society organisations which have expanded our understanding of social movements, according to Borras et. al. (2008) there are some

silences in the literature. Few studies have systematically examined the internal dynamics of movements and how movements around each theme ally or compete with each other (2008: 11). They also argue that there is a lack of analysis on the dynamics of interconnectivity, the local-national-global linkages and questions of 'partial representation' (ibid.: 11). I have attempted to examine these issues in this chapter.

Networks of movements are multi-scalar, dynamic processes of interaction and relationship, with overlapping networks in the local, regional, national and transnational levels, where material places are linked to virtual spaces (Routledge 2003). Movements today have not only 'globalised' their struggles, they are also rooted in their national and local places. This chapter explores how do the local and the global interact, negotiate, contest each other and exist simultaneously. It is here in the context of forging, building and negotiating collective identities across spaces and places, the local and the global become important. Further how does networking, allying at different levels help a movement, if at all? Does it enable the movement in any way?

Theoretically, there are broadly two ways of understanding networks of a social movement – one, in which the concept of network becomes the axle to understand different dimensions of a social movement, and the other, in which networking or building alliances and contacts is considered to be one of the aspects of social movements. A network perspective is often used to understand social movements: how individuals negotiate between structure, or networks of relations and agency, or the ways in which they draw meanings and act accordingly. This perspective attempts

to map, measure and empirically understand how networks play a role in social movement dynamics, where social networks become a way of mapping social structure and 'provides a clue to assess the social location of specific actors as well as to identify general structural patterns from a relational perspective' (Diani and McAdam 2003). Latour's (1997) actor-network theory, self-organisation, assemblage theory, autopoeisis and meshworks (de Landa 1997), rhizomes (Deleuze and Guattari 1987) have become new ways of thinking about networks and social movements. In these set of theories, the primary objective is to examine networks in society, social movements being one of the fields in which networks are studied. In fact there is a long history of using the concept of networks, empirically and metaphorically (see Knox et. al. 2006), where the concept of networks is used to understand several aspects of social life. As the focus of this study is to understand networking or alliance building as one aspect of social movement dynamics, I will be drawing from the theories of social movements primarily, which focus on the aspect of networking.

Most of the theories of social movements and networks aim to understand how networks emerge, operate and how effective they are, how they work as advocacy networks, how information is shared and 'frames' are aligned (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Diani and McAdam 2003). Scholars have looked at coalition building (Rucht 1989; Diani 1990, 1995; Hathaway and Meyer 1994; Ansell 1997, 2001), overlapping memberships (Caroll and Ratner 1996), on networking activities whether real or 'virtual' (Melucci 1984; Taylor and Whittier 1992; Hampton and Wellman 2001). There has been a renewed interest in social movement dynamics, tactical adaptation of action repertoires, recruitment, aligning frames, and networking. Networks have

been seen as forms of convergence spaces Routledge (2003), or 'broad umbrella spaces' (Juris 2005) within 'which movements from many parts of the world and diverging place-based experiences strive to craft collective visions and strategies of mobilisation which actively negotiate differences' (Escobar 2008: 266). Some scholars (Alvarez et. al. 1998) use the term 'social movement webs' as against a more common term 'networks' as it 'conveys the intricacy and precariousness of the manifold imbrications of and ties established among movement organisations, individual participants and other actors in civil and political society and the state. The "web" metaphor also enables us more vividly imagine the multilayered entanglements of movement actors with the natural-environmental, political-institutional and cultural-discursive terrains in which they are embedded (1998: 16).

The metaphor of a social movement 'web' is useful to understand the multilayered, knotted, messy and transient politics of networking, which is an everyday practice of social movement actors. Movement participants ally or coordinate actions or get support from a variety of groups – other movements, NGOs, intellectuals, transnational networks, and political parties. Also, these networks function at multiple levels – transnational, national and local. When movement participants engage in networks, *negotiation, contestation and tensions begin in the politics of exclusion and inclusion involved in the process of networking*, which gives birth to new kinds of dynamics within the movement. In the process of networking, the role of individual actors becomes important as they 'represent' the movement in different platforms. Thus, caste, class, gender and racial identities of actors have implications on the strength of the network. Actors forge links often based on personal relations and

emotional aspects making networks fluid and ephemeral in nature. I will base my analysis not only on the *current* networks that participants of KRRS engage in but also on the alliances of the movement during the 1980s and 1990s.

Need for International Networking: Information and Solidarity

Networking is a strategy of social movements to increase bargaining power and build pressure on the local governments and supra-national institutions to affect policy changes. Keck and Sikkink (1998) argue that transnational advocacy networks are political spaces through which they seek international connections to amplify their demands and pressurise the local governments. Appadurai (2006) argues that global links, networks, exchanges and perspectives are the key assets that strengthen movements and morale of local federations. Networks are also helpful to access resources, funds, information and build solidarity.

During the mid-1990s, KRRS became famous internationally for ransacking Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC). Chukki Nanjundaswamy recalls, "That was the time when the Zapatistas had called for a global conference of people's movements all over the world. We had gone there. We became part of the PGA process ; in fact we were one of the founder members. There were a lot of student groups in Europe at that time fighting against GATT, MAI[13]. It was Play Fair Europe that became PGA. We were called for the Third World Farmer's convention. KRRS became a member of Via Campesina (LVC) in 1996, in the second global conference of LVC". She continues, "It was at that time that farmer's movements all over the world, specially

[13] Multiple Agreement of Investment (MAI) that was proposed by the industrialized nations accelerating economic globalization by restricting the ability of local and national governments to regulated corporate investment.

the Southern movements, realised that it was time to get globalised". During the 1990s, the formation of many coalitions, networks and alliances indicate that a common need was felt by movements and other groups to 'get globalised', to network with each other.

AK, technical coordinator of LVC of South Asia region feels that networks not only enable but are necessary because of exchange of information and learning common strategies. She says:

> *"It is only because we are internationalized that we can fight with MNCs. Earlier Monsanto would be 'Oh, these people do not like us in Europe, so we will shift to Argentina, Oh, in Argentina they do not like us, so we can shift to India'. But that can't happen now, as we are internationally organised, it is not easy for them to move from here to there, because they know that resistance is internationalised as well. That is why Via says 'globalise struggle'. We know what is happening all over the world, we are educating each other, forming common strategies, and the movement is everywhere, and it is a struggle, both are going parallel".*

There are several instances of exchange of strategies and methods of protest through these networks. As Jose Bove of Confederacion Paysanne (CP) in France and M.D. Nanjundaswamy of KRRS were in contact with each other during this period, common strategies were applied both in India and France. KRRS had ransacked KFC in India, and McDonald's outlet was similarly ransacked in France. The Cremate Monsanto Campaign was carried out both in India and France where farmers uprooted GM field trials. Laughing satyagraha was a demonstration organised by KRRS where KRRS members surrounded Karnataka assembly (Vidhan Soudha) in Bangalore and laughed at Vidhan Soudha. Chukki Nanjudaswamy says, "The European activists were so impressed by this that we repeated this in front of Cargill, and in front of WTO in Geneva too". According to Henry Saragih, head of LVC based in Indonesia, "when KRRS burnt GMOs, it was big news to the world, and then we in Indonesia

also burnt GMOs. They gave us inspiration". He also says that there is also diffusion of ideas that takes place through networks. For example, the concept of food sovereignty which LVC now projects as the alternative was inspired by the *Beeja Satyagraha* campaign of KRRS led by M.D. Nanjundaswamy. Similarly, the idea of agrarian reform was inspired from movements in Latin America and later taken up by Indonesia.

Transnational networking is not only about exchange of information, learning strategies and ideas, but it is also about a feeling of 'solidarity'. Different activists from different parts of the world emphasise the need for networking, the mutual benefit from exchange of ideas and information, and the feeling of solidarity which gives strength to movements. Jaime Tadeo, a farmer's leader of Philippines, during a conversation, says, "Platforms like LVC help create solidarity. You feel that you are not alone, you are organised on a global level". JR, a farmer's leader from France says, "It is like a motor, a push-pull that happens at different levels. Activism at the international level acts like a motor that drives a movement to struggle more". A women's leader from KRRS, who has travelled to Bangladesh, Korea and South Africa, says that it creates awareness, gives a broader vision, and "we get to know that there are other farmers like us in other parts of the world".

Though involvement in a network may be necessary for information and exchange of ideas, the *effectiveness* of it is dependent on leaders, or those transnational activists who participate in these networks. Lucas, who was associated with the Yabasta Movement in Italy and now lives in Bangalore, explained, "A network is definitely empowering, but whether the network empowers or not depends not on the network

but on the organisational strength and structure". It is thus required to examine the role of the transnational activists in the process of networking a s they represent and speak for the movement. They form the crucial link between the local, grassroots and the transnational and national.

Role of Transnational Activists (Leaders): Rooted or Alienated Cosmopolitans?

The exchange of information, ideas, and feelings of solidarity take place between the leaders of different movements. A few leaders from different movements form the intellectual driving force behind a transnational network, who coordinate, strategise, exchange information and ideas and emerge as transnational actors. In the case of LVC, besides other driving forces, the intellectual core in the initial years consisted of Nettie Wiebe from Canada, Paul Nicholsan from Spain, Raphael from Honduras and M. D. Nanjundaswamy from India, among others. Such activists are 'rooted cosmopolitans' (Tarrow 2006 : 35) who are 'domestic based activists, citizens and others' (ibid.), who engage in the transnational plane of collective action. According to Tarrow, 'the fundamental socio-cultural change that has increased transnational activism is the growth of a stratum of individuals who travel regularly, read foreign books and journals and become involved in networks of transactions abroad' (ibid.).

M. D. Nanjundaswamy had emerged as one such transnational act ivist, representing KRRS. He had studied abroad, was a Professor of law, was well -versed in English and well read and had become the spokesperson of the movement.

> 'Perhaps no one typified this move to the global arena more than the late Prof. M. D. Nanjundaswamy of the KRRS in India. Through his engagement in the anti-GM campaign – and his links to global farmer's and anti-globalisation movements, notably Via Campesina – he moved from being a local politician and state level farmer leader to an internation al figure. He increasingly moved

> in international activist circles, and was revered as a 'southern' farmer leader, a voice from the poor and the marginalised' . (Scoones 2008: 158)

During the early 1990s, opposition to Dunkel proposal among the farmer's movements came from Nanjundaswamy, who came in contact with other intellectuals like Vandana Shiva of Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Ecology (RFSTE), and Third World Network, Suman Sahai of Gene Campaign, Vanaja Ramprasad of Green Foundation and other movement leaders in the country, like Medha Patkar of Narmada Bachao, C. K. Janu of Kerala. Since the 1980s Nanjundaswamy was in contact with leaders of other farmer's movements like Sharad Joshi of Shetkari Sangathana, Narayanswamy Naidu of TVS, Mahendra Singh Tikait of BKU; and a coordination committee of farmer's movement became functioning. In this period, KRRS became a member of LVC and PGA, because Nanjundaswamy felt the need for international networking, and as a representative of KRRS, he initiated the process. He not only became a member but also emerged as a core intellectual force behind LVC and PGA. Thus, Nettie Wiebe from Canada and a LVC leader says, "His position on trade agreements was very useful at the heart of Via leadership".

Not only did Nanjundaswamy lead KRRS, but he also initiated the process through which other farmer's movements, like TVS and Kerala Coconut farmer's association came in contact with LVC. The South Asia region of LVC consists of India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. According to Borras, 'KRRS had become a critical actor in Via Campesina's global anti-GM crops and anti-TNC campaigns. It had become extremely influential within the global movement, and in turn, had earned the role of being the 'gatekeeper' in South Asia' (2008: 107). It was Nanjundaswamy who had come to play a critical role at all levels of networking, at the local level within the

movement in Karnataka, in the national level with other movements and NGOs, at the south Asia level with movements from Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, and at the transnational level with LVC, PGA, and leaders of other movements.

It was Nanjundaswamy who actively engaged at the transnational level during the 1990s because that was the time when a wave of protests against globali sation had caught the world, where leaders from different movements across the world were coming together. KRRS became a member of LVC in 1996 and was a founder member of PGA in 1999. People's Global Action (PGA) started in 1999 when people's movements comprising KRRS, KMP from Philippines, KAP from Indonesia, MST from Brazil, CCP from Peru, FCB from Bolivia and indigenous groups from Nigeria, Chiapas from Mexico, met in Geneva and launched a worldwide coordinated struggle against globalisation. PGA was a loose network of leaders of different movements, and Nanjundaswamy played a major role in drafting its manifesto.

One landmark event celebrating and establishing transnational solidarity was the Inter-Continental Caravan as a part of PGA. KRRS had establis hed itself as a powerful movement protesting against globalisation and consequently came in contact with several other movements through such programmes. The ICC project emerged from the meeting of movements in Chiapas in 1996 and was influenced by the Zapatistas (Featherstone 2003). In May 1999 more than 400 activists comprising farmer's movement of India and other social movements, went on a one -month caravan, by buses and on foot in different parts of Europe, mainly Germany, Belgium, France, Italy, Spain, the Czech Republic, Poland, Switzerland, Netherlands and UK.

Numerous groups, associations, intellectuals, parties, ethnic groups, feminist organisations supported the caravan (see Assadi 2001: 227). One of the key slogans were 'our resistance is as transnational as capital' (see Featherstone 2003: 405). Of several actions taken, they demonstrated before the headquarters of multinationals (Nestle, Cargill, Monsanto etc.), and also before institutions such as WTO, FAO, the European Central Bank, and destroyed genetically modified crops, all aimed at rejecting the western paradigm mediating through globalisation (Assadi 2002: 52).

After Nanjundaswamy's death in 2004, his daughter Chukki Nanjundaswamy was given the responsibility of international and national networking even though she was only 23 years of age. She became the youngest ICC (representing South Asia region in the International Coordination committee of LVC) member. Currently, she along with a few others has formed the 'networking core' within the movement. Thus, when I asked one of the leaders, who has held posts at the state level in KRRS and is an influential figure in the movement, he said, "I do not know about international networking. Ask Chukki. I have gone abroad once, but I do not know what happens in the international level". This 'networking core' functions independently and most of the other leaders are not aware. Though Chukki has continued with some of the alliances and contacts, after Nanjundaswamy's death and split within the movement, the fervour and initial euphoria of the 1990s is not visible today. It could be a reason also that the surge of the coming together of diverse movements, the formation of networks and coalitions, that happened earlier in the 1990s was specific to that era.

Question of Representation

The question of representation becomes crucial in the process of networking at every level: who should be a leader and represent the movement in different platforms . Even at the transnational level, the question is which movement is the 'authentic' voice of farmers. Nanjundaswamy and now Chukki Nanjundaswamy along with a few others are engaged in transnational and national networks, and they represent the movement in different forums. It has been seen that only leaders , who can speak English or Hindi and accustomed to urban environment and culture, and are either well-off or can arrange to pay for their travel, represent a movement. This is problematic because we find that often non-farmers represent farmers, rich landowners represent peasants, and urban upper middle class activists represent the rural poor. Th ose relatively richer, more well-educated within a movement, because of their class position , tend to become the leaders and represent the movement, especially at the n ational and international levels, and this has significant implications for framing the movement issues at different levels.

When KRRS became famous internationally after ransacking of KFC, it was Nanjundaswamy who started representing KRRS in several int ernational conferences and meetings. Though some leaders , like Baba Gowda Patil (an important KRRS leader in North Karnataka), Puttanaiah (who had emerged as a KRRS leader in South Karnataka), K.T. Gangadhar (also another important figure in the movement) , had attended some meetings abroad, it was mostly Nanjundaswamy who represented KRRS. BN, an activist, who is also a lawyer by profession, from Mysore says , "Professor never took us into confidence while doing this networking ; it was a one man show". It was indeed a 'one man show' of Nanjundaswamy, who led the

movement to 'get globalised'. It was only he who came in contact with the other leaders in the world, only he who attended several conferences and meetings, and only he who decided whether any other member would get the opportunity to attend international conferences.

Given the trend that only relatively richer and well-educated individuals become leaders and representing the movement, some members argue that if they were paid an honorarium, they also would have the ability to represent the movement in different forums. However, Chukki Nanjundaswamy argues otherwise and says, "Volunteerism keeps the movement alive, the moment you start paying them, that's the end of a movement". However, KS argues, "movement which is voluntary does not sustain the activist. Otherwise only well-off people, who can take care of their travel expenditure, can assume leadership role in the movement. Then will only rich people represent masses, the grass roots?" Similarly, a young member says, "It is not practically possible to work for a movement only, because we also have families". CP, a leader from Raichur, who is rich farmer, says, "I raised money from the district and bought this vehicle, so that we from Raichur can easily travel to Bangalore and Mysore. I still have to repay the loan. I went to Delhi by flight as all the trains got cancelled because of Telengana issue. In all these meetings, in Bangalore and Delhi, only people who can afford it can go". Not only the financial ability but also linguistic skills often become important in deciding the representative. While many leaders have represented KRRS in international meetings by taking interpreters along, mostly it was Nanjundaswamy who would go. This caused some discontent among members

who thought who could go with an interpreter, but Nanjundaswamy chose an English-speaking well educated person to represent.

As Nanjundaswamy was a Professor and not a farmer though he led a farmer's movement, the question of who should be leader and represent a movement was also raised within the movement: whether an intellectual like Nanjundaswamy or a farmer? KCB, talks about the split in the movement and argues that he supported another leader because he was from the grassroots, not an intellectual. He says, "We do not need an intellectual, we need a worker who has tilled the land. But see he has become a great leader now". The other opinion is that it is only an intellectual who can give ideological direction to a movement. But another old member from Mysore argues, "The problem in leadership in KRRS now is that there is no ideology, the grass roots still have the spirit alive in them, but there is no strength of ideology to give direction". In fact, these are questions that even activists from other movements engage with, that who is or should be a leader, "who should represent us, one among us or one who can lead us", says HB of Brazil. This also indicates a hegemonic role that leaders often play in a movement and also the simultaneous reaction to question the leader.

At the international level the rivalry between LVC and IFAP points to the question of representation – who is the 'authentic voice' of peasants and small farmers? International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) was formed in the post-World War II period when efforts were taken for global co-operation and to prevent agricultural depression like that of the 1930s with the objective of supporting the newly formed UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). IFAP has been

dominated by northern European groups who have backed centre right parties, and who also have considerable influence on FAO policies. IFAP and LVC have been rivals at the international level, as both have presence in many countries, but have different ideologies, where IFAP is in league with the corporate sector. Nettie Wiebe of National Farmer's Union of Canada, in an interview, recalls how she, Nanjundaswamy, and Paul Nicholsan had gone to an UN meeting after the first Rio conference:

> *"There was a funny moment there, IFAP had brought, a whole delegation of Africans and Asians as part of the IFAP delegation. In the morning meeting, when I was talking, suddenly all of those African and Asian delegates said "we are with her". In the afternoon coffee break we had to go over to them and tell them that, no actually you are with IFAP. What we were saying resonated with the people they had brought, which reinforced our position that we are the authentic voice of peasants and small scale farmers".*

Thus, process of networking entails politics of representation at every level, the local and the transnational, and this is related directly to the question of identities: how the 'us' is defined and understood by people. The class question becomes crucial here – the well-educated ideologue vs. the farmer who tills the land, the ability to speak English or Hindi vs. a farmer who can speak only his native language, the voice of the small farmers vs. the voice of the rich farmers.

Negotiating Identities and Ideologies

The process of networking at the international level entails negotiating the differences in identity and ideologies. The purpose here is to highlight the politics of representation, politics of inclusion and exclusion, the ways in which differences are negotiated to understand the process of networking of social movements, whether at the transnational, national or at local levels.

During the 1990s Nanjundaswamy was in contact with Medha Patkar of Narmada Bachao Andolan (NBA) and National Alliance of People's Movement (NAPM). Medha Patkar had walked in a *Padayatra* in Bangalore demanding the release of Nanjundaswamy when he was arrested after KFC was ransacked. Recently with the problem of land acquisition and the impending Land Bill in the Parliament, efforts were taken to rebuild connection and collaborate with NAPM and Medha Patkar to expand the network. When *Raithotsava* (farmer's festival) was organised in Amritbhoomi in Chamrajnagar in February 2013, Medha Patkar was invited and she came for the programme. In March 2013 a massive joint protest was organised at Jantar Mantar in Delhi against the Land Bill, BRAI[14] bill and several other issues, where NAPM had joined with other farmer's movements. The presence of NAPM and other figures like Swami Agnivesh in the protest increased the 'weight' or bargaining power of the farmer's movements with the state. In fact, this protest in Delhi particularly turned out to be significant as the state agreed to form three committees to look into the price issue, FDI in retail and free trade agreements. These committees consist of farmer's representatives, experts, bureaucrats and NGOs. This is an instance of how networking and bringing together other groups often increases the bargaining power of a movement.

Joint activities of KRRS with NAPM were organised after a gap of several years; it was not possible earlier because of ideological problems of NAPM with other allies of KRRS. An activist working with NAPM says, "NAPM is not with KRRS as KRRS is allied to movements of big farmers/landlords like BKU. We have small farmers, dalit

[14] BRAI or Biodiversity Regulatory Authority of India 2013, to regulate organisms and products of modern biotechnology

organisations. We too have farmer's organisations in our alliance like Kisan Sangharsh Samiti from MP but not big landlords". In fact the distance between KRRS and NBA was because KRRS was considered to be a big farmer's organisation for its links with BKU. In terms of class composition, both BKU and KRRS have middle and rich farmers as their primary base, and both the movements emerged after the Green Revolution. What was different about KRRS was its leadership, its ideological trajectory, framing of demands, which allowed for alliances with diverse groups indicating the crucial role of leaders in the process of networking. It was Nanjundaswamy who focused more on the larger cause of fighting against globalisation rather than differences in composition of NAPM and movements like KRRS and BKU. However, such alliances remain only at the level of leadership as the differences between two groups at the lower level such as between the poor peasants and the rich farmers remain and make an alliance difficult to sustain.

A similar challenge is evident in the relationship between KRRS and Adivasi Gothram Mahasabha of Kerala (AGMK). Nanjundaswamy had gone to Kerala during the early 1990s to establish contact with C. K. Janu of AGMK and since then C. K. Janu was in contact with Nanjundaswamy and now with Chukki Nanjundaswamy. Recently AGMK has become a member of LVC and is a part of ICCFM (Indian Coordination Committee of Farmer's Movements, which is a chapter of LVC). Though C. K. Janu as a leader of AGMK was in contact with movements in southern India, being an adivasi movement its position in the national network is problematic. AGMK has been fighting for land rights of the tribal community in the region, who lost their land to tenants during land reforms and has historically been opposed to

farmers and big landlords. Though C. K. Janu, Chukki Nanjundaswamy and KS, coordinator of South Indian Coordination Committee of Farmer's Movements (SICCFM) share a personal rapport, C. K. Janu's membership in ICCFM and LVC was opposed by BKU initially. Hence, a south Indian level network was formed in the name of SICCFM in October 2010 where C. K. Janu was included to work more effectively on GMOs, land issues and FTAs.

In this case the alliance and subsequent membership in LVC was formed based on personal friendship and a common position against globalisation even though the composition and character of a farmer and an adivasi movement are fundamentally different and contradictory. It is this common position against globalisation that leaders emphasise to overlook the dynamics at the local level, and attempt to translate local issues into a global one primarily to expand the network. Assadi rightfully argues, "that issues of Zapatistas and Dalits etc. becomes one and the same at the global level", even though "farmer's movements cannot speak the language of Dalits" (Assadi 2001: 236). Similarly farmer's movements like KRRS and BKU cannot speak the language of any adivasi community in Kerala who lost land to tenants (who became landowners) during land reforms.

It is also interesting to note the relationship between Zapatistas and LVC, which indicates a situation in which there is ideological commonality but a difference in identity. Zapatistas and LVC, are 'friends' but they do not work together, as indigenous groups and farmers have a historically antagonistic relationship based on the question of ownership of land in Mexico. Also, Zapatistas, according to JR, a LVC leader, believe in armed struggle, unlike LVC. In fact the local level problems

between farmer's groups and indigenous groups in Mexico, makes it difficult for Zapatista leaders and LVC leaders to work together, even though both oppose globalisation. This indicates the crisis of the anti-globalisation movement: in negotiating differences in identity even when there is a common ideological stance against globalisation.

BKU and KRRS work closely together now on the national level and organise a rally biannually in Delhi. BKU and KRRS leaders have ideological differences based on land issues, where some BKU leaders often argue for the advantages of getting compensation by selling land and some KRRS leaders are against land acquisition. There are also differences based on ideas about caste, where BKU does not have an anti-caste stance like that of KRRS. However, as Assadi (1994: 216) points out that though KRRS has had an anti-caste stance, differences based on caste exist within the movement, and there are numerous instances of oppression against Dalits by KRRS members. Also, though leaders may be against land acquisition as such, with or without compensation, there are several members of KRRS who are willing to sell their land and rather fight for a higher compensation. The differences between BKU and KRRS are only at the level of leadership whereas by practice and class composition they are quite similar. According to Chukki Nanjundaswamy,

> "*BKU has a different orientation and it focuses on minimum support prices mainly and it also has a different history, whereas KRRS has its roots in the Lohia Movement and the leaders were from a socialist background. KRRS always fought against alcoholism, mining, extraction of natural resources and various social issues. In the 1990s KRRS started focusing on globalisation as it was directly linked to issues of land and farming. But BKU has been different because majority of its members are Jats led by the Khap"*.

Interestingly, as the two movements, BKU and KRRS are similar with respect to class composition, initially their demands were also similar. During the 1980s the majority

members of KRRS are also, like BKU, concerned about minimum support prices, electricity and water, loans and subsidies. It is only the *leadership* in KRRS which went beyond these issues and made alliances with different groups, creating ambiguities, contradictions and divisions in the movement. This also indicates that even in an alliance between similar movements there could be differences between the leaderships as well as ideological differences which might affect a network.

Inability to speak or understand Hindi or English by the farmer's leaders of both KRRS and BKU also hinders the process of working together. In fact people who engage in national or international networking are people who can speak Hindi and/or English. Thus, an ex-President of KRRS says, "the major problem of farmer's movements in the country is that there are different languages and it becomes difficult to communicate and come together". He also points out that farmer's movements are not well-integrated. He continues, "Where are the farmer's movements now? Shetkari Sangathana is almost over, Sharad Joshi went on their side. Tamil Nadu farmer's association is split into so many groups that most of them are just letterhead organisations". Similarly an old leader VJ from Shetkari Sangathana (who is in contact with KRRS after Shetkari Sangathana got split), echoes that it is because of the language and communication problem, ego problems between leaders and the lack of leadership that farmer's movements are not able to come together today. DSK, a lawyer by profession and also an old member of KRRS, says, "Farmer's movements have multiple divisions within itself because of caste; every caste will have its own leader. Many KRRS leaders were taken away by political parties". This highlights the crisis of farmer's movements in the country: inability to come together truly on a

common platform. The strength of any alliance or collective depends on the way differences are negotiated and how a common ground is emphasized. This is crucial in the process of networking because, if an alliance cannot overcome or resolve its inner or subterranean conflicts to sustain itself then it is almost ineffective. One activist from North Karnataka, who is a rich landowner, says that farmer's movements do not have the strength of trade unions because of different classes within the movement. He says,

> *"We have a larger community here, we are land owners and we also work with landless labourers. We spoke for landless people many times, supported their movement, gave patta land to those who were cultivators of forest land or waste land, but not on a large scale. Chiefly farmer's movements are landholders' movement, though some districts have landless people associations in our organisation. Maybe because we have landowners, small farmers, agricultural labourers in the farming community, we are not as strong".*

KRRS leaders in charge of networking constantly negotiate between different alliances and networks that they engage in. One distinct feature of networks is that it is dependent on leaders, initiated and maintained by leaders and not by ordinary members of a movement. Thus, while leaders ally with each other as representatives of movements, it is possible that the movements concerned may be antagonistic to each other. For KRRS engaging in networks with other kinds of movements like NAPM, or adivasi movement, indicates a contradiction or mismatch between the ideology, aims and strategies of the 'networking core' of the movement and the support bases. The local level dynamics based on caste, class, ideological differences are often overlooked as the primary aim in such networks is to bring like-minded people together, to integrate all kinds of struggles, movements under one umbrella of anti-globalisation. Thus, Chukki Nanjundaswamy says, "Even in Latin America for

example in Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, they are split into so many groups. Maybe at the global level we are able to create an impression that we are very strong". In fact not at the global but at the national and local levels the complexities of negotiating class and caste identities, linguistic differences and ideological differences between leaders or between two different movements become more prominent.

This is seen in the case of LVC and Zapatistas where there is a clash between the indigenous groups and farmers as two categories. Similarly, in the national level such a tension is evident in the alliance between KRRS and Adivasi Gothram Mahasabha (AGMK). Also, the political alliance between KRRS and Dalit Sangharsh Samiti is problematic because of the composition of the two movements. Further, KRRS and NAPM share a common ideological stance regarding globalisation but as NAPM includes movements of small farmers and peasants and KRRS comprises mainly rich and middle farmers, the alliance is problematic. While all these movements oppose globalisation, the differences in identity pose a challenge for the 'networking core' to negotiate the differences. It becomes a challenge to keep aside the tensions between the two categories, small farmers vs. rich farmers, or indigenous groups vs. Farmers, or landowners vs. Landless, and form a collective struggle. The primary difference here is in fact based on class; difference in class composition entails different experiences, ideologies and interests. This is a feature of the anti-globalisation movement: diverse groups under one umbrella of anti-globalisation movement but loosely connected.

As the character and composition of KRRS and BKU are similar, with similar support bases, the ideological differences with BKU also imply a certain distance of KRRS

leaders from its support bases. In their effort to bring together all the streams of movements to a common goal of opposing globalisation, it is ironical how the leaders become distant from their support bases, speaking a different language and resulting in a fragmented movement. KRRS still works with BKU as BKU has streng th in terms of numbers which KRRS lacks now. Ideological differences are more complex, as the opinion of leaders become crucial along with the broader ideological lineage of a movement. Though KRRS calls itself Gandhian, Nanjundaswamy's personal ideology had heavy influence of dependency theory. Ideological differences are not only between two dissimilar movements, but also between two leaders who represent the same kind of movement. One such instance is of Sharad Joshi of Shetkari Sangathana who supported neoliberal policies and other farmer leaders like Nanjundaswamy, Tikait and Narayanswamy Naidu who were against globalisation. This had split the unity of farmer's movements in the country in the early 1990s.

However, ideological differences are often kept aside in alliances and networks as the effort is to integrate all 'progressive' groups together. Thus, in different contexts, different collective identities are constructed, ranging from 'farmers and peasants of the world', 'poor peasants', 'adivasis and farmers-people who are losing their land', 'Lingayats', 'Vokkaligas', 'non-violent Gandhians' and so on. While there are efforts to overcome such differences and frame notions of collective identities and emphasise commonality, these very differences oft en make integrated struggle difficult. In fact, it is the diversity in networks and coalitions against globalisation that is the strength as well as the weakness.

Relationship with NGOs

Since globalisation, there has not only been an emergence of transnational social movements but also the proliferation of NGOs and funders. Social movements have a love-hate relationship with NGOs: some movements feel the need to work together with NGOs on some issues as NGOs can coordinate, have resources, lobby in the government but at the same time they are sceptical about the possible corruption and fear the domination and subversive appropriation of the movement by the NGOs. NGOs often dominate or appropriate movements by providing funds which is crucial for any movement to survive. So a movement designs strategies to prevent such domination while working with NGOs. This is evident at the transnational, national and local level, where movements are constantly negotiating with NGOs – either strategically allying with them, or questioning and rejecting them. Here I have explored the various perceptions of social movements about NGOs and related politics of funding at different levels.

At the transnational level, LVC has a clear cut strategy about how to interact with NGOs, with which NGOs and why. With regard to the relationship of LVC with NGOs, Nettie Wiebe of the National Farmer's Union of Canada says, "there were many NGOs that were interested and hoping to fund us. But we were adamant from the beginning that they can send representatives to meetings, but cannot participate, they can be observers. So they felt excluded from the beginning, though they did fund some of the travel and accommodation of delegates". Peter Rosset, who is the coordinator of LRAN and closely associated with LVC, explains, "Initially LVC was not friends with any NGOs or support groups. After creating a space for itself, it was decided that LVC will need allies and it is not possible to work alone. There are two

kinds of allies – strategic and tactical. Strategic ones are long term allies working together on same issues like Food First (FIAN), Focus on the Global South, GRAIN, and tactical ones are allies in particular points of time, for example Action Aid, OXFAM". Alliances are based on issues, "we have some friends but we also have our own strategy of taking funds. We do not take so much money that any NGO will dominate us, we usually ask for the tickets. When people donate, we take the same amount roughly from all sources so that no one really dominates. We also get support from national governments at times, like the Basque country", says JR, a farmer's leader from Confederation Paysanne of France. These strategies are designed to prevent domination of any NGO on the movement by providing financial support.

Financial strategy of a movement is crucial to understand its autonomy and dependence on external (NGO) support. Social movements either have their own funding strategies or get donations. KRRS started a project in the late 1990s called *Namdu* (ours) as a strategy to build funds for the movement by making rice and selling it instead of selling paddy, and by selling *neera* (coconut sap). But it was not continued. Chukki Nanjundaswamy says, "We have big economic problems, we have been thinking of starting our own market, where producers can sell directly to the consumers. We have to travel all over, especially the leaders, which is costly even if we stay in local farmer's house". Usually members would contribute and even today in every meeting a bag is passed around where members put in some money. A member, KTG, recalls, "Earlier there would be a line to contribute whatever people could and we would also get donations from our friends and supporters. But now that has decreased, that sentiment is not there anymore. So we face a financial crisis".

Another young member AP from Raichur says, " We usually contribute, which is why KRRS has no money. The rule is that every district should contribute, but it does not happen like that. I usually spend my money in fighting court cases in our villages, because I don't drink or smoke I spend that money on KRRS". Thus, at the local level a few leaders often contribute to fight court cases, hold press meet, travel somewhere together for a meeting as and when required.

The question of external funding comes when a state or national level programme is organised, for example protest against the global agribusiness meet in Bangalore, where around 2000 people demonstrated in front of the meet. When KRRS works jointly with LVC or any NGO, it is easier to get funds for a particular programme. There are NGOs which provide logistical support, or pay for travel at the transnational and the national level. Thus AK, LVC technical coordinator, says, " Yes, funding is an issue, but now all social movements in the country are foreign funded. It is not possible to survive without funds. Only in India this funding issue is a hush-hush affair though they are all funded. But then the question of legitimacy comes of course. If social movements are funded, how are they different from NGOs or political parties?" Legitimacy of a social movement is dependent on the crucial aspect of funding: 'who' is funding and 'how', whether an international NGO, or a granter, or a friend of KRRS, or the state. Networks at all levels, with diverse actors, are also ways in which different groups help or compete with each other to get funds. Local movements are often funded by some NGOs or support groups who have FCRA [15]. These need not necessarily mean that the movement is over as they are externally

[15] Foreign Contribution Regulation Act

funded, as there are groups which support movements without any intention of dominating them.

Amritbhoomi, a KRRS project, initially got its funds from a Spanish organisation, then from an Italian organisation, and now it has got some funds from the state government. KRRS members took some time to accept it, and most of them still haven't accepted it as a part of KRRS. Amritbhoomi is considered to be primarily Nanjundaswamy's project. This is because funding from any international NGO is not accepted by other leaders and members within the movement, as they consider that it will end the movement. Thus, in any programme it is required for the leaders and organisers of the programme to explain and establish that 'these NGOs or funders are like us, they will support us'.

Scepticism towards funding is justified as, "there are times when funders start dominating the project. But that happens when the objectives of funders and receivers do not match", says AJ, who is working in an NGO and active in the national and international networks. He continues that, "only those funders which have similar goals are approached. Based on ideologies and objectives, for example, Ford Foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation are of one kind. There are parallel networks of funders and big international NGOs (which get a lot of funds from their governments and then they 're-grant') and local or national level NGOs (which receive these funds and implement programmes)". However this fear of domination by funders is more relevant for NGOs rather than social movements, as social movements do not have long term projects or programmes. But the dependence on funds makes the movement 'pick up' issues for which they will get funding at times.

"Funding is usually based on what is hot. For example, if the funding proposal is on land issues now, it will be easier to get funds as that is the most debated and the most important crisis now. Fund raising is considered to be an expertise and most groups and NGOs have fund raisers" says AJ.

Besides the issue of funding, NGOs provide intellectual resources for a movement, help in coordinating programmes. At the national level, during the 1990s Nanjundaswamy established contact with some NGOs and intellectuals to expand the scope of protest against globalisation. According to KCB, a professor of economics and an old member of KRRS, there was a need to interact with intellectuals and NGOs after globalisation:

> *"After GATT new issues had come up and not even the government was conversant on such issues like IPR. We organised a seminar on GATT where people like Vandana Shiva, S. P. Shukla, Pushpa Bhargava had come as resource persons. These national and international contacts were required to train leaders and farmers about IMF, Bretton Woods, Trade regime and so on. It is through these networks that we realised that third world agriculture is same all over. We were the first to form an inter-state coordination committee to fight against GATT. Vandana Shiva was the main player".*

Chukki Nanjudaswamy argues that though there are various problems of working with NGOs, they do play an important role. Both movements and NGOs need each other in different ways, and hence the love-hate relationship between NGOs and movements persists. She says:

> *"NGOs are playing some kind of a role in bringing movements together because it is not easy for movements to focus on one issue like NGOs do. NGOs work based on projects. For example Kavitha Kuruganti works on GM, Afsar Jafri on free trade. For us it is not possible as we have to deal with daily questions and daily challenges of a farmer. We are not enough-skilled or equipped with technology. NGOs follow up and coordinate with movements. However, they cannot reach the level of pushing the government, only movements can do that".*

However, KS, coordinator of SICCFM, argues that NGOs can also push the government in their own ways, and says that, “NGOs have lobbies and clout in the government. Even though they are corrupt, and there is a lot of swindling of funds, one cannot ignore them today”. CSR, who heads an NGO on agriculture says, “Farmers cannot resist on their own. If they could, they would not have committed suicide. Pesticides would not have been so rampantly used”. NGOs have become important actors in the field of activism where they provide information, funds, coordinate activities, produce documents and press releases, organise seminars, and lobby with government officials.

At the national level, NGOs are important actors on the issue of GMOs. These NGOs are primarily headed by two or three individuals, who write in journals, speak in different forums, do short-term and long term projects and research, conserve and exchange seeds, publish documents, and encourage organic, chemical-free agriculture in different ways. They are not only well-educated, urban individuals, with a middle or upper middle class profile, they also have the necessary ‘contacts’ with which they engage in lobbying in the government. Organisations like RFSTE and Gene Campaign have filed petitions and public interest litigations, fought for the right to information disclosure on trial results on several occasions since Bt material was imported in the country. These NGOs, or rather individuals, are a part of loose coalitions like Coalition for GM-free India, GM-free Karnataka, Kisan Swaraj Forum, ASHA (Association for Sustainable and Holistic Agriculture). These are networks at the national level “mainly for exchange of information and coming together to protest

against the same issue, and it mainly functions through information exchange over internet", says AJ, who works with an NGO and is also a researcher.

Some of these individuals are 'rooted cosmopolitans', moving in the international circuit of anti-GM lobby making links with international organisations like Third World Network, GRAIN (Genetic Resources Action International, based in Spain), RAFI (Rural Advancement Foundation International, based in Canada), Action Aid, among several others. Through exposure to wider networks, links through internet and email, several workshops, conferences, meetings held at the national and international levels, some of these activists have emerged as anti-GM 'stars' (Scoones 2008:158) such as Nanjundaswamy and Vandana Shiva from India, Jose Bove of France, Peter Rosset from USA.

At the local level, Sahaja Samruddha, headed by Krishna Prasad, (who was a member of KRRS) is in contact with KRRS leaders, (though they do not work together) and it primarily conserves seeds. At the national level, Suman Sahai of Gene Campaign, Kavitha Kuruganti of Kheti Virasat Mission, Afsar Jafri of Focus on the Global South, Rajesh Krishnan of Greenpeace are individuals with whom primarily Chukki Nanjundaswamy and the 'networking core' of the KRRS movement is in contact. While there are other NGOs like DDS in Hyderabad, Centre for Sustainable agriculture (CSA) in Hyderabad, Green Foundation in Bangalore, Environment Support Group in Bangalore, Navdanya of Vandana Shiva among several others who all work on the issue of agriculture, it appears that networks with NGOs are primarily based on personal relations between NGO leaders and movement leaders. Thus, Chukki Nanjundaswamy says, "There are some NGO leaders who are radical, I think,

with whom KRRS would like to work, like Krishna Prasad, Kavitha Kuruganti, Devinder Sharma". Nannjundaswamy used to work very closely with Vandana Shiva in the 1990s and organised several demonstrations and programmes together. But due to personal clashes between Nanjudaswamy and Vandana Shiva, KRRS no longer works with Vandana Shiva. KRRS, through Nanjundaswamy, is also in contact with an international NGO, Focus on the Global South, which was founded by Walden Bello, based in Bangkok, and works to counteract corporate-led globalisation, neoliberalism and militarisation. Focus on Global South also has an office in Delhi and is closely associated with Via Campesina. Earlier Nanjundaswamy and now Chukki Nanjudaswamy is in contact with Focus through individuals like Shalmali Guttal and Afsar Jafri among others. Thus, networks of KRRS leaders with NGOs are primarily at the national level, besides a few like Sahaja Samruddha at the local level, and Focus on the Global South at the international level.

Though KRRS leaders are in contact with these individuals or rather NGO activists, there are inherent tensions in working with or jointly organizing an activity with an NGO. "We don't have a good experience of working with NGOs. We do the mobilising and they take the credit. You tend to depend on them as they have greater infrastructure, they work with the media, take out reports, things which we farmers can't do easily, so they try to take advantage of this weakness of ours. There's always a tension", says Chukki Nanjundaswamy. When some high-profile NGO activist is invited as a speaker in any seminar organised by KRRS, it becomes difficult for the movement to pay for travel and accommodation in a good hotel. Farmer's movements, which have an anti-urban bias, view the high-profile urban NGO activist

as someone who is far away from their reality. KS says, "Though we are a part of GM-free coalition, they are urban based and they are taking up a more *consumers' point of view*, most of the debates are centred on consumers, not on farmers. It is mainly taken care of by NGOs". A local level member of KRRS says, " What do they know about farming?" Similarly, the clash between Nanjundaswamy and Vandana Shiva was also on the issue of representation – who should represent the farmers in the international circuit? Though the 'networking core' of the movement is in contact with certain activists, they do not have any joint activity or work together on any project with any particular NGO.

Several members are also sceptical about credibility of NGOs – "most NGOs are swallowing money from government funds and other funding agencies. In fact there are two kinds of NGOs, ones which are radical, and others which simply swallow money", says DSK, a lawyer and an old member of KRRS. A member from BKU says, "NGOs are like shops, whenever they get some money, they write up a report by compiling some material and that too according to the funding agency. NGOs have all the funds by showing pictures of agitations of movements, and we movements have nothing". Foreign funded NGOs are considered to be dishonest, corrupt and not 'radical' but which do want to change things.

According to Scoones (2008: 171), though "with their global connections and elite, educated, urban leaderships, they can be seen as often very detached from rural realities and agrarian struggles, [but the] resonances and connections are definitely there". It is the noise that such groups make in different levels, in different ways that creates a 'discursive space' (ibid.:171) that is required for a democracy to function. In

the case of resistance to GMOs, the networks at the national level, often expanding to the transnational level, created that political space in which movement representatives, scientists, lawyers and NGO activists, came together, though with internal tensions and rivalry. But it is also dependent on political climate and the need of the time. Such a wave was created against globalisation in the 1990s, and resistance to GMOs became a symbol of the wider struggle at that time. Though such protests are still happening, currently it is the issue of land acquisition, conservation of forests and water that has become important. Thus, these networks, coalitions and loose contacts are usually temporary and fluid, which emerge in a certain context and time, and also subside down when the context changes.

Local-Global Linkage

The purpose of networking is to create greater pressure on authorities, gather greater support and networks should be a means to an end rather than an end in itself. As seen earlier, leaders play a crucial role in negotiating differences in the process of networking and networking is often restricted at the level of leadership. It has also been seen that leaders often become distant from the support bases resulting in a fragmented movement, some leaders being more concerned about the international level, while the majority of the members of the movement are more engaged in local issues. This is the challenge of networking: how to maintain the local-global linkage such that it is a consolidated struggle, such that the struggles at the local level are in tune with the global level and such that the movement does not get fragmented as a result of its engagement at the global level. Do the transnational activists or 'rooted cosmopolitans' represent the local concerns in global platforms and impart their

global experience at the local level? Are they 'rooted' in their local settings? Such concerns have been raised by activists themselves, in different ways.

It is argued that too much energy, time and money is spent on just meetings, building solidarity and establishing networks rather than on concrete programmes and direct action at the local and global level. According to MK, an activist from NAPM, "Resistance needs to be at the global level, with global projects. We are failing in actual mobilisation. Regarding FTAs (free trade agreements), we have not been able to pose challenge nationally. There is information sharing and solidarity but collective resistance is missing. Indian organisations have to mobilise and they have not been able to do so. Direct action is required". Some activists also raise concerns about local-global linkage. According to RO, a forest rights activist in India, " The local, regional, international needs to be collated, it cannot be just at the global level ; it has to be through local processes". Similarly, a leader from Senegal said, " Struggle needs to start from the local, then regional, then national, and then international. If we are starting from the international level then we are missing something. Information exchange is okay, but the struggle needs to start from daily life".

Henry Saragih, the head of LVC, says in this regard, that it is a continuous process of integrating the local and the global and it is dependent on the leader and organisation. Also, "the companies are strong and they not only push at the global level but also at the local level. To combat this we need to have strong social movements and need to work at policy level". It is the responsibility of the leader to maintain that link. But leaders often have to negotiate between global and local issues and such that they are

'rooted' in their local settings. But what are the challenges in maintaining the local - global linkage?

It is possible that the local and the global issues are different and are interpreted in different ways in different contexts and hence attain different levels of importance. There is a clash regarding which issue is more important and whether to perceive the 'local' as an extension of the global or as distinct from the global? It is important to understand which issues are considered to be 'global' issues, and which are 'local', 'national' issues, even though all of them may be linked. For example, the proble m of farmer suicides in India does not get the required attention at the global level as it is considered to be a national level issue. Assadi says, 'one criticism that has been levelled against the movement is that while it is becoming or claiming global, KRRS was neglecting or forgetting the basic local issues which had sustained the movement for the last twenty years'. But Nanjudaswamy argued that the 'days of analysing local issues separately have gone. Every local issue has a global reason' (quoted in Assadi 2001: 235). Assadi comments 'neither could they develop a strong anti -globalisation movement nor a strong farmer's movement in Karnataka. This is the tragedy or paradox of a social movement in India' (Assadi 2001: 237). Attention to global issues made Nanjudaswamy distant from KRRS members and other leaders, who were more concerned with their everyday, local, specific problems. In his attempt to negotiate between the global and the local, he was no longer 'rooted' in his local settings, which created divisions, ego problems, tensions within the movement. It was these tensions that were one of the contributing factors for the split in the movement in 1998.

For instance, while leaders at the global level maybe concerned about elections in Brazil, or climate change conference, local level leaders and activists are more concerned about drought in a specific region or price of turmeric in a particular district. Thus, certain issues attain importance and are more relevant at certain platforms depending on the context. Also, a particular issue at the global level is often linked to other questions, whereas the same issue at the local level is interpreted, understood in a more specific way. It is this difference in perception and interpretation that often creates gap between the two levels. For example, the agro-ecology project of LVC is related to the notion of food sovereignty, an alternative to fight against transnational corporations, to encourage self-reliance. At the local level both organic, natural and indigenous methods are used, not as a way of fighting against MNCs and attain food sovereignty, but simply because it may be cheaper for the farmer.

KRRS being a member of LVC organises programmes at the local level often as a part of the several global campaigns of LVC. In such programmes, it is a challenge to make the global campaign relevant at the local level. One such programme was Asian Farmer's visit to Karnataka's natural farms, organised by KRRS, LVC and SICCFM (South Indian Coordination Committee of Farmer's Movements) in November 2011. LVC's committee on sustainable agriculture has been encouraging agro-ecological practices of farming by documenting, organising seminars, farmer-to-farmer exchange programmes. Farmers from Indonesia, Thailand, Cambodia, South Korea, Sri Lanka and Nepal visited the natural farms in and around Mysore, Mandya and Chamrajnagar in Karnataka, followed by a seminar to learn about methods and benefits of Zero budget natural farming (ZBNF). Experts like Peter Rosset from

Mexico, Subhash Palekar and Partap Agarwal spoke on agro-ecology and natural farming. The committee on sustainable agriculture has also documented agro-ecological practices in Cuba, and a second book is forthcoming on natural farming practices in Karnataka. The motive is to document and analyse some agro-ecological practices in different parts of the world, and publish as a book for use of LVC's member organisations, movements, and schools and libraries. Though such a programme was an initiative to encourage agro-ecological practices, the question is how effective was the farmer-to-farmer exchange programme? The major impediment in the process was language and the different contexts of the participant farmers.

Thus, from the above two examples it is evident how food sovereignty as a global campaign does not resonate at the local level and similarly how the problem of farmer suicides are considered to be a local problem as a result of the global crisis in agriculture and hence does not receive that attention at the global level. This disconnection at the local and the global levels can be attributed to different ways of perception in different contexts. But there is also a possibility that there is a lack of information sharing, of what is happening at the global level and how that has an implication on the local level and vice-versa. It is here that leaders play a crucial role in spreading information and exchanging experiences.

For example, land grab by MNCs is not only a national but a global issue and to address this global problem LVC has the Global Campaign for Agrarian Reform (GCAR). Besides a handful of leaders, and the 'networking core', no member of KRRS knows about GCAR. But KRRS leaders are engaging in struggles in specific districts against land acquisition, either fighting for more compensation or refusing to

give land. In fact, even the state level leaders are not aware of the numerous struggles that happen at the village level. Though resistance to land grab is happening in different ways at different levels, there is a lack of information sharing across the levels. But there are also the cases in which the global and the local are in tune with each other, for example, the struggle against GMOs was such that simultaneous resistance was visible in different countries like India, France, Brazil among others.

Conclusion: Effectiveness of Networks

Several committees of LVC work on different issues and represent 'peasants and farmers of the world' in international meetings, like Rio+20, World Wat er Forum, Nyeleni Europe Conference, UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) meetings, climate conferences, among several others. To challenge World Bank assisted land reform, an activist research network LRAN, (Land Research Action Network) was formed in 2000 in Chiapas, Mexico, with Food First Information and Action Network (FIAN), and Board Members of Focus on the Global South and MST. Since 2004, LVC and LRAN work together on the Global Campaign for Agrarian Reform (GCAR). In 1997 the GCAR was launch ed by LVC together with FIAN, as a right to food.

One significant step has been the formulation of Declaration of Rights of Peasants that has recently been adopted in the Human Rights Council (HRC) of UN, as a resolution to promote human rights of peasant s and rural poor. The working committee of human rights of LVC, along with allies like CETIM (Centre Europe Tiers Monde), FIAN, Indonesian human rights committee for social justice, has been working to create an international instrument to protect peasants ' rights – the

International Convention on the Rights of Peasants (ICRP). "The violations of peasants' rights are on the rise because of the implementation of neoliberal policies" , and to protect peasants' rights, the ICRP will "have to be respected, prote cted and fulfilled by governments and international institutions" (Declaration of Rights of Peasants – Women and Men, LVC: 3). Such steps indicate the importance of getting organised at the transnational level. LVC today has established itself as a very important voice of farmers and peasants, and is in dialogue with several international institutions, governments and engaged in building alliances with NGOs.

LVC interacts with national governments and attempts to push for policies through them. LVC has made some progress in the Bolivia, Venezuala, Cuba, Nepal, Nicaragua, Mali with regard to food sovereignty policies. According to some LVC leaders, Henry Saragih (who has been interacting with governments on the issue of declaration of rights of peasants and GCAR), Peter Rosset (who has been working on the issue of agro-ecology), it is easier to pressurise left governments, especially in Latin America. LVC also works to build relations with UN on some issues, like food sovereignty and they lobby with some gove rnments who will support their claim. The process of building alliances with NGOs, national governments, UN officials involves strategies which are extremely complex, explains Henry Saragih. He says :

> *"It is not easy, it is actually based on the history of the world, different nations, their ideologies, interests. If we approach through ideology, say left governments, then we will face opposition from the governments which are not left. Like the Peasants Rights concept, we received support from Africa, Egypt, Luxembourg, Indonesia. You think that Brazil will support us, but it is not like that because they support agribusiness now. We must know the context, situation now. Most right wing countries are working closely within the global financial capital, libe ral governments are untrustworthy. The left is better than the rest, but they too work within the same framework. But yes, we*

think that Cuba, Venezuala, Bolivia, Brazil are 'better' governments than the rest".

Thus, at the international level the process of networking attains a different complexity as actors have to negotiate differences of ideology and identity, and also the history of the particular nations. It also entails building personal relationships with persons of influence and complex strategies of alliance building. The Declaration of Peasants Rights is definitely a step forward as a result of networking and lobbying at the global level.

I have looked at the complexities involved in the process of networking to understand whether and how engaging in transnational networks empower, enable or disable a movement. Networking is considered to be required for information, solidarity and funds, but does it create a political space for actors to discuss, debate, understand and question? Coming together of different groups at different levels through networks brings certain issues into the limelight. It is the 'noise' that several demonstrations make against globalisation that is considered to be a victory, rather than any material impact. Olivier, who has been associated with PGA, says, "There is tremendous effect but on a material level, nothing really. These protests have created an ideological wave where people in all countries are opposing the same thing. This is quite a victory. We assemble in front of G8, G20 or WTO where people shout slogans. So now there are 5000 police or army that is required to do these meetings. The victory is more symbolic than material". The 1990s saw a wave of protests against globalisation. Though the wave has subsided, pro tests at different levels continue.

Networking helps in increasing bargaining power, the 'weight' of a movement, by including diverse groups. Thus, at the international level LVC has been successful in

creating an international instrument to protect rights of peasants. At the national level, the government agreed to form three committees to look into the issue of free trade, FDI in retail and price issue. These are instances which indicate that networking helps in pushing for policies at international and national levels. But in the process of integrating diverse groups, there are several challenges. Networks are like social movement 'webs', where there are multiple levels, issues and actors, criss-crossing with each other, and fluid in nature. For an alliance or network to survive, identities of different groups and actors and ideological differences are constantly negotiated. For a movement engaging in such networks, the ability and role of the leader to maintain local-global linkages, and address questions of representation becomes important. For KRRS, though national and international networks may provide information and solidarity, only the networking core is involved in the processes of networking now, and earlier it was a one man show of Nanjundaswamy.

Multiple divisions and cleavages were formed within KRRS since Nanjundaswamy got involved in the international level. Though Nanjundaswamy perceived every local issue to be linked to global problems, there is a clear distinction between the local and the global with respect to issues, actors and programmes. The local and the global exist simultaneously within the movement often disconnected with each other. Thus, at the local level, networks have not enabled the movement, but have rather created tensions within the movement that are more locally rooted.

Chapter 5

Framing and Ideology: Exploring Post-Globalisation Shifts

Introduction

With globalisation KRRS elevated its politics from the local and national level to the transnational level and some leaders through networks got exposed to new ideas, frames and perspectives. The economic reforms of globalisation not only entailed new challenges and opportunities for the movement but also a reshuffling of caste, class and power dynamics within the movement. The exposure to new ideas entailed linking with the transnational frame of the larger anti-globalisation movement and also incorporating new issues in the ambit of movement activity. Different members experienced and perceived globalisation differently related to their caste and class positions. This chapter, drawing from the framing perspective, explores the shifts in framing activity and construction of ideology, the negotiations and contestations within the movement in the process of linking with the transnational frame.

This chapter will first review the framing perspective in social movements. Next, based on the accounts of the respondents, I will explore the collective action frames of the movement during the 1980s, that is, before globalisation. Post-globalisation, the perception of the state changed, some leaders got involved in transnational networks and the movement had to confront new problems like introduction of biotechnology in agriculture, free trade agreements and land acquisition. Simultaneously in the national level, the farmer's movements split, one group supporting globalisation and the other fighting against it and at the transnational level the burgeoning anti-

globalisation protests presented a transnational frame of anti-globalisation. KRRS, led by Nanjundaswamy opposed globalisation by linking with the transnational frame. This process entailed contestations in the framing activity and a consequent shift in ideology and trajectory of the movement. I will explore this process of transformation within the movement with respect to, first framing activity, and then, shifts in the ideological trajectory.

KRRS, in the 1990s and even today is protesting against GMOs, free trade agreements, land acquisition and encouraging agro-ecological methods of farming. The crucial question here is: how are these issues framed and linked with the larger anti-globalisation struggle within the movement? A major challenge of networking in the transnational level has been maintaining the local-global linkage and it is dependent on the way the local and the global are perceived. While these issues are perceived to be a part of the globalisation project by leaders in the transnational level, how do the local and the grassroots perceive these issues and relate it with globalisation? Are the differences in perception related to the different class and caste positions? Finally, I will look into three cases to understand the varied perceptions and contestations within the movement – resistance against GMOs, a search for alternative in encouraging agro-ecological methods, and resistance against land acquisition.

Framing Perspective

Framing denotes an 'active, processual phenomenon that implies agency and contention at the level of reality construction. It is active in the sense that something is being done, and processual in the sense of a dynamic, evolving process' (Benford and

Snow 2000: 614). It is also contentious as frames are formed which may challenge or differ from existing frames. This process of framing activity results in what is referred to as 'collective action frames' which are '*action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organisation*' (Benford and Snow 2000: 614). Framing refers to this 'signifying work, that is to the process associated with assigning meaning to or interpreting' (Benford 1997: 416).

Collective action frames are not mere summation of different beliefs but it also entails negotiation of the shared meaning. They constitute 'core framing tasks' and a discursive, interactive process through which these frames are formed (ibid.: 615). These core framing tasks have three component parts – 'diagnostic framing' (problem identification and attribution), 'prognostic framing', and 'motivational framing'. Prognostic framing involves articulation of a proposed solution to the problem and strategies of protest. Motivational framing involves a rationale for engaging in collective action and refers to the agency component of collective action frames. It is by pursuing the core framing tasks that consensus is built among different actors such that they are motivated to act.

There has been considerable research on identifying and understanding the different kinds of diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing in different movements (Benford 1993b; Gerhards and Rucht 1992; Johnson 1997; McCarthy 1994; Meyer 1995). To understand diagnostic framing scholars like Gamson (1992) have focused on the development of 'injustice frames' which are the ways in which movements identify the 'victims' of a given injustice and amplify their 'victimisation' (Benford

and Hunt 1992; Hunt et al 1994; Jasper and Poulsen 1995; White 1999). Benford and Snow (2000) however disagree with Gamson's (1992) assumption that all collective action frames are injustice frames or that all collective action frames contain an injustice component (ibid.: 615). However, the 'injustice frame is the seedling for the development of a collective action frame' (Benford 1997: 416). Closely linked to construction of injustice frames are 'adverserial framing' and 'boundary framing' (Gamson 1995) which constructs who the enemies or opponents are, who is 'good' and who is 'evil'.

Frames are developed, generated and elaborated not only through the core framing tasks but also through three sets of processes which can be conceptualised as discursive, strategic and contested (Benford and Snow 2000: 623). In fact, for the framing perspective meaning is pivotal; 'meanings are derived (and transformed) via social interaction and are subject to differential interpretations. Hence meaning is problematic…meaning is negotiated, contested, modified, articulated, and rearticulated. In short, meaning is socially constructed, deconstructed, and reconstructed' (Benford 1997: 410). Benford's critique of framing perspective points out the descriptive bias and the tendency to focus on 'frames as things rather than on the dynamic processes associated with their social construction, negotiation, contestation and transformation' (ibid.: 415). Hence it is important to focus on frame disputes, counter-framing and reframing processes and the role of human agency in framing processes. He also suggests that it is required to examine 'continuities and changes in framing strategies, their forms and the content of frames over a life of a movement, throughout a cycle of protest, or across a historical epoch' (ibid.: 417). He

also points out that studies on framing should examine diffusion processes across cultural and geopolitical barriers, and how they vary from one movement context to another (ibid.: 416). There is also an elite bias in studies on framing and hence it is imperative to understand how the ordinary members think, perceive and interpret rather than only the perspective of the leaders. Keeping in mind these suggestions, I have attempted to look at shifts in framing activity over a period of time since globalisation – how transnational frame of anti-globalisation diffused to existing social movements in different contexts, and the processes of framing by different participants of the movement. Here, I have also tried to incorporate how class and caste positions entail different experiences and consequently meanings are constructed differently. This is an attempt to integrate human agency and structure as 'each [participant] brings his/her own biographical and experiential background to the movement encounter which she/he seeks to fit with the movement group's already constructed versions of reality' (ibid.: 422). This entails contradictions, tensions and conflict in a movement.

Collective Action Frame of KRRS

According to Johnston and Noakes, the role of social movement entrepreneurs is crucial in the construction of collective action frames as they must produce 'interpretive packages that explain a range of problems in relatively narrow terms, highlight some issues and ignore others' (2005: 7). In the case of KRRS, Nanjundaswamy and other leaders like N. D. Sundaresh, H. S. Rudrappa, who were the founder members, played a crucial role in the construction of the collective action frame, in *amplifying* and *articulating* the frame so as to mobilise masses and gather

support. The first major agitation was the no-tax movement which was organised against the recovery drive of the state where bank officials would take away the property of farmers from their houses if they failed to repay the loan. KRRS claimed that due to unscientific prices there was a 'false' or 'artificial loan' that the farmers had and hence the recovery drive of bank officials was not justified. Since then it is not only the state, but also the bureaucracy, the bank officials, and the factories who are considered to be the primary cause for the distress of farmers. In the initial years the collective action frame of the movement was based on the 'injustice frame'; that farmers were victims of injustice, neglect, exploitation and corruption of not only the state but also politicians and bureaucrats who were considered to be corrupt. Such an idea continues to be strong among the members of the movement and they point out the numerous problems they face ranging from getting loans from money lenders, fluctuating prices, uncertain environmental conditions, lack of water and irrigation in dry regions, high charges for electricity and lack of labourers. This is because the state neglects agriculture sector and is concerned only with the urban industrial sector. This frame has been common to all the farmer's movements that emerged in the 1980s: *Bharat vs. India* or the rural India vs. the urban India dichotomy where the rural is neglected and exploited because of the urban. This was in fact a *master frame* (Snow and Benford 1992) of the farmer's movements: sharing aspects of their collective action frames during the 1980s *cycle of protest* where several movements had emerged post-Emergency questioning the state and its policies. Thus, an ex-President of KRRS says:

> "*Lakhs of farmers have committed suicide in the country, has anyone thought about them in the country? We are the majority in the country, we are the*

> *major producers and the consumers, but the state and everyone thinks about the 30% of the consumers but not about us. Koi andolan bhi nahi, koi dukh bhi nahi, koi socha bhi nahi (There was neither any protest, nor any sadness, nor did anyone think about us). There are wage laws for government employees, but not for us, why? No one knows about agriculture but everyone knows about IT, why? This is a sector which has always been neglected"*.

KRRS leaders claim that it is a village movement and not merely a farmer's movement and recognise imperialism and modernisation as the cause of rural poverty and agrarian crisis. This functioned as a collective action frame for the movement and the anti-granite movement, anti-liquor campaign, against eucalyptus planting, encouraging simple marriages (*sarala vivahs)* and discouraging dowry were organised. During 1982 and 1983 the anti-liquor movement under the leadership of women led to prohibition of alcohol in many villages in Dharwad, Belgaum, Hassan and Mandya districts. It was argued that alcoholism was a design of the capitalist class to destroy rural life and also to make huge profits, hence villagers should be allowed to make alcohol at home. From 1982 to 1986 KRRS agitated against eucalyptus plantation on the grounds that eucalyptus converts lands into dry areas by reducing the water level of the soil, toxic roots affect both the grass and the land and it is unsuitable as fodder. The idea was: profits derived from the sale of minerals, water and forest products falling within the vicinity of the village panchayats ultimately belonged to the concerned panchayats who were at a liberty to use the amount for overall development of the villages. It was this idea that led to one of the major agitations against illegal granite mining in Kanakpur, Karnataka in 1982. According to Puttaswamy, who joined KRRS during the movement, granite mining was destroying the natural resources and agriculture was getting affected. Chukki Nanjundaswamy says that KRRS, in some regions was successful in initiating simple

marriages discouraging the practice of priests presiding over marriages and also luxurious weddings as it is unfair that all your life's savings will go in your daughter's marriage.

The collective action frame was constructed in such a way as to evade the caste, class differences within a village and include the entire village in the movement. Also, the system of getting membership in the movement was that the unit of KRRS would be set up in the village displaying a green board, indicating that the village is the member and not just individuals. Extending the frame from the primary issues of prices, loans, water and electricity charges of farmers and engaging with social and en vironmental issues was the mobilisation strategy. The extension of frame and inclusion of these issues in the movement helped KRRS to expand its support base to villages. According to KCB, an old member, KRRS was primarily a village movement. The residents of the villages were considered to be the owners of the natural resources in and around that village. He says:

> *"We defined a farmer as someone who lives in a village, who may or may not own land, which is why a village would be a member of KRRS not just individuals. And we had asked for 19 demands from the state including scientific prices, just system of loans, taxes, electricity and that 80 percent of the national revenue should be resourced back to the villages as percent of the people lived in villages"*.

Collective action frames entail some strategic processes by which collective identity is built within a movement. The collective action frame of KRRS was based on ideas of self-respect and pride of being a farmer; a farmer should be proud as he produc es food for the nation and food is integral to life, a farmer should first learn to respect his profession and himself. All KRRS members wear a green shawl as a sign of their

membership in the movement. The green shawl also signifies self-respect, and is a way of asserting the identity of being a farmer. The green shawl as a symbol was adopted from TVS, Tamil Nadu farmer's association. Similarly BKU members wear white and green caps.

Even though the movement extended its frame, the primary diagnostic framing for the last three decades has been against the state, fighting for prices, loans, electricity and water, just like other farmer's movements in the country. As middle and rich farmers constitute a smaller section of agrarian population the extension of frame to include social issues, and instil self-respect among farmers was a way of finding legitimacy and mobilising masses. It is evident that the idea behind this collective action frame was to avoid differences of class, caste within the rural population. However, today the majority of members are from dominant castes of Lingayats and Vokkaligas, and are primarily rich and middle farmers and definitely landowners. Though anti-liquor campaign was led by women, women are hardly involved in the activities of the movement now and so a women leader Anasuyiamma, says "they are concerned only about prices, loans, water and electricity; they do not care about women's issues". Though the effort in the initial years was to establish KRRS as a village movement with a broader scope and some campaigns were also organised, the majority of the members being middle and rich farmers from dominant castes, the primary interest of the movement remained to be prices, loans, water and electricity.

Globalisation and Exposure to the Transnational Anti-Globalisation Frame

Under the leadership of Nanjundaswamy, KRRS became a member of LVC in 1996 and was also a founder member of the PGA (People's Global Action) process.

Nanjundaswamy as a representative of KRRS engaged in not only transnational networks but also national ones with NGOs and intellectuals during the 1990s and with other movements in the country, as seen in the earlier chapter. Through these alliances KRRS was exposed to the 'master frame' of the anti-globalisation protests. 'The movement against globalisation links different protest campaigns and provides a shared master frame which actors use to convince people to engage in collective action' (della Porta et al. 2006: 61). The master frame is associated with cycles of protest, provides a bridge between different frames, linking social justice with solidarity and environment concerns, also with women's rights, peace, democracy, human rights, anti-racism. Social justice, solidarity and environmental justice serve as broker frames providing links between social movements of different kinds (ibid.: 81-82). In this frame the root cause of all problems is attributed to capitalism, imperialism and neoliberal globalisation. It has been seen that the anti-globalisation protests have a tremendous capacity of bridging different frames which brings together people from diverse backgrounds. The final document of the second World Social Forum (WSF) in Porto Alegre proclaimed, "We are diverse-women and men, adults and youth, indigenous peoples, rural and urban, workers and the unemployed, homeless, the elderly, students, migrants, professionals, peoples of every creed, colour and sexual orientation" (quoted in della Porta et al. 2006: 68). It is this diversity that the anti-globalisation movement claims to be their strength and intrinsic to the collective identity. Though the 'we' is diverse, the notion of 'us' and 'them', the self and the other, the friend and foe are unified here. These movements claim that there is a 'common' enemy to all their different problems. This is referred to as 'frame

condensation' by Tarrow (2002) through which different targets, perceived as causes of the problems, are "condensed" in one "super target". The super target has been neoliberal globalisation represented by the international institutions like WTO, WB, IMF, NATO, hegemonic superpower (United States) and dominant social actors (MNCs) (della Porta et al. 2006: 71).

The anti-globalisation movement is the umbrella term and phenomenon but simultaneously there are issue specific struggles also against globalisation, as exemplified in transnational agrarian movements like LVC. The agrarian population of the world and agrarian movements are also very diverse – socially, politically and ideologically. Even though there is a lot of diversity according to Nettie Wiebe of National Farmer's Union of Canada and an ICC member of LVC, "there is one common demand, one common problem, whoever we are or wherever we come from. The alternative to this problem is 'food sovereignty' which preserves ecology, culture, livelihood of farmers and food that is locally grown". In this frame the common enemy is the same as that of the anti-globalisation protest, and the common solution or alternative is 'food sovereignty'.

The notion of food sovereignty is an alternative that was developed by LVC in the 1990s and has since then spread to the agendas of many other transnational agrarian movements and environmental movements. This concept was developed as 'a strategic challenge to the hegemonic, neoliberal concept of food security' (McMichael 2010: 168) developed by FAO, which is a 'situation that exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life'

(quoted in Wittman et al. 2010: 3). The food sovereignty concept takes into account where and how and by whom food is produced, addresses the food, energy and climate crisis simultaneously. It is a critique of the idea that food security is primarily a result of lack of supply and monopolisation of the concept of food security by agri-business corporations which promote agricultural trade liberalisation for maximisation of food supply. 'It emerged as an expression of, and potential solution to, the contradictions of agro-industrialisation (food distribution inequity, monoculture, population redundancy, environmental degradation, fossil fuel dependence)' (McMichael 2010: 173). This framework presents an alternative model of agriculture which addresses many issues simultaneously; right to food, right of farmers to decide what to produce and how, the macro questions of food supply and distribution, trade in agriculture, biotechnology in agriculture as a solution to food crisis, global warming and energy crisis. Hence the concept can be understood and adapted in different ways by different movements.

Involvement of KRRS in LVC

The key link between KRRS and the anti-globalisation protests was Nanjundaswamy. Nanjundaswamy, along with other leaders of movements and NGOs and intellectuals, perceived globalisation as a threat; opening up of agriculture would affect prices of products and progressive reductions in the agricultural support by the state would increase cost of production, IPRs, biotechnology in agriculture and MNCs would uproot the farming community from a position of autonomous producers, denying them their right over land, seeds and production, to a position of labourers (Assadi 2002). Globalisation was constructed as capitalist and the political domination of the

western world and this domination 'was through culture industries, fast food companies, new seed technology that would increase unemployment, lead to elimination of indigenous knowledge, displacement from land, loss of lifestyles, superimposition of culture and subsequently cultural alienation, violation of basic human rights, loss of dignity and would ultimately transform India into a neo -colony'. (Assadi 2002: 50).

Nanjundaswamy considered engaging in transnational networks crucial and hence in 1996 made KRRS a member of LVC. This entailed tensions and contradictions between the position of KRRS and LVC in the global level, and also between different classes of members of KRRS at the local level. As it was through Nanjundaswamy that KRRS members learned about globalisation and it was under his leadership that KRRS emerged as a voice against globalisation, and like many other transnational activists, he was 'divided between the global framing of transnational movement campaigns and the local needs of those whose claims they want to represent' (Tarrow 2006). The role and responsibility of leaders to establish and maintain the link becomes important in protests against globalisation (Keck and Sikkink 1998).

In the transnational level, framing processes involve contradictions between leaders of different movements, with differing class composition, primarily because globalisation affects different classes differently. LVC claims that it is a movement for 'small farmers and peasants' and which represents 'people of the land'. This idea of 'people of the land' is all inclusive, irrespective of difference of classes, castes and race and emphasizes the commonality of the farming community as producers of food

who till the land. However the class character of movements in LVC is extremely heterogeneous – its members include '(i) landless peasants, tenant farmers, sharecroppers and rural workers in Latin America and Asia, (ii) small and part-time farmers located in Western Europe, North America, Japan and South Korea, (iii) family farms in global South, including those in Africa as well as those created through successful land reforms, such as those in Brazil and Mexico; (iv) middle to rich farmers, mainly but not solely, in India; and (v) semi-proletariat located in urban and peri-urban communities in a few countries such as Brazil and South Africa' (Borras 2008). The presence of various classes in the movement tends to create contradictions in formulation of strategies of collective action.

One such instance is KRRS, representing mostly the middle and rich farmers, opposing land reform. Land reform is one of the major campaigns of LVC but it was decisively overruled by KRRS. This is primarily because land reforms would redistribute surplus land from rich farmers to the landless and impose ceilings which would adversely affect the rich farmers. 'KRRS consciously evades issues that could bring sharper class issues' (Borras 2008: 107) and in this regard Nanjundaswamy said, "we cannot divide ourselves into landlords and landless farmers and agitate separately, for the agitation will have no strength, nor will it carry any weight" (quoted in Assadi 1994: 215). Thus, classes and the main support base of the movement and the effort to avoid contradictions based on class differences have profound implications on the way issues are framed. Also, the presence of KRRS and BKU in LVC makes it difficult for other small farmer's groups to participate in LVC process. 'A significant proportion of the organised section of the rural based exploited

social classes not only in India but in South Asia more generally were excluded from the Via Campesina process, either because KRRS blocked their entry into Via Campesina or they refused to participate in the process where the 'gatekeeper' was KRRS' (Borras 2008: 108). However, even within the LVC process there are clashes between differing class perspectives of middle and rich farmers of BKU and KRRS as against landless peasant organizations from Latin America.

At the local level, Nanjundaswamy and only a few leaders were well versed on the process of globalisation, while for most of the members it was very distant and they were more concerned with local problems. Hence, Nanjundaswamy and in effect KRRS's involvement in LVC was not supported whole-heartedly by all members. CP from north Karnataka is sceptical about the involvement in LVC. He says, "how will it help? Will it give us MSP (minimum support price)?" Another member, MS from south Karnataka laughed and said:

> *"How many people know about LVC?! How will it help us directly?! There is no unity among farmers. That is required. What will foreign contact do in that? But it creates awareness about what is happening in the world, like we get to know that there are farmers like us too in other parts of the world. Professor (Nanjundaswamy) taught us about globalisation, Dunkel Draft, WTO and what it all means".*

Initially, LVC was considered to be something foreign and possibly a NGO which is funding KRRS and this idea was one of the factors for the split in KRRS in 1998. The collective action frame in KRRS was anti-west and anti-foreign, and was opposed to NGOs and funding from foreign countries. LVC was associated with 'foreign contact' and 'international fame'. While they were uncomfortable with idea of 'working with' a foreign organisation, they were also proud to have had that 'foreign contact'. One member very proudly says that "we were the first in the world to attack KFC and

Cargill after which we became famous internationally and Nanjundaswamy went all over the world and made contact with LVC".

Linking with the Transnational Frame: Perceiving and Resisting Globalisation

Globalisation was a phenomenon that was unheard of by the ordinary members of the movement. While the role of Nanjundaswamy in framing globalisation is crucial, it is also important to examine how other leaders and members perceived globalisation and what were the contestations involved. Globalisation was framed as a 'western' project of capitalist and political domination, invoking Gandhian ideas of freedom and satyagraha resonated with the members of the movement. The right to save seeds became a symbol of freedom for the farmers. This frame was a successful frame as several protests against globalisation was organised under the leadership of Nanjundaswamy in the 1990s. This also marked a shift in the framing processes within the movement.

BR, a farmer from North Karnataka, says that, "It is the nexus between the bureaucrats of the state, the multinationals, the WTO and other such supranational institutions that is the core of the globalisation process". Through Nanjundaswamy the KRRS members learned about how globalisation entails international policies which affect policies of the state and which in turn affect them. "We know the conspiracy of MNCs and it is the nexus between the state, bureaucracy and MNCs that needs to be broken, the core problem", said one member. According to another member, the problems of farmers have increased during globalisation because of market economy and free trade, "There is this false statement from agriculture ministers that we have a

lack of production in wheat, so they are importing wheat from Australia. Now, they will say there is no rice, and they will import rice".

The change in the perception of the state, where the state was considered to be weak was linked to the way globalisation was perceived. BR said, "The state, the agricultural universities are all agents of the MNCs and the west". The idea that globalisation was a 'western' project of capitalist and political domination, aligned with the anti-urban frame of the movement. Rural India was glorified as the real India whereas urban India was 'western', echoing the *Bharat vs. India* idea of other farmer's movements in the country. This idea was amplified and globalisation came to be perceived as a 'western' process which the 'weak' state facilitated and encouraged. Thus, since the 1990s the movement started opposing not only the state but also the capitalist globalisation, supranational institutions like WTO, World Bank, and IMF.

KRRS, under the leadership of Nanjundaswamy, first confronted the issue of globalisation in its protests against the Dunkel Draft in 1991 when activists of KRRS resorted to eight hour Rasta Roko agitation opposing the central government's liberalisation policy. In February 1992 KRRS also organised a seminar along with Third World Network on the implications of the Dunkel Draft. An activist recalled, "In 1987-1988 when the Dunkel Draft was prepared, Professor (M. D. Nanjundasamy) did his own study of the draft and planned a protest in Delhi. In 1992 there was a massive rally in Delhi. We even protested with the slogan of 'Go Back Sutherland' at the airport". In 1992 other farmer's movements of the country joined the protest. KRRS along with BKU organised a massive rally at Boat Club in Delhi

rejecting the Dunkel Draft where 200,000 (approximately, as said by some members) farmers made it to Delhi despite efforts by the government to prevent any protests.

The first direct action against liberalisation was when activists of KRRS attacked Cargill Company's office in Bangalore in 1992. To commemorate the birth anniversary of N. D. Sundaresh, one of the founding leaders of KRRS, there was a second attack on the warehouse of Cargill Company in Bellary in 1993. An activist, also a lawyer by profession, remembered, "We attacked the Cargill administrative building in Bellary then. I did not go in then. I stood outside and my job was to get the activists out on bail. I had to take 80 people out on bail from Bellary court". The Cargill action gave a notice to multinational seed companies to 'Quit India', echoing Gandhi's Quit India Movement of the Indian Independence struggle. KRRS had then threatened a blitzkrieg to oust multinational companies, in all sectors of the Indian economy. Hundreds of farmers voluntarily courted arrest as part of their 'satyagraha'. It was at the Cargill action that KRRS officially launched the Beeja (seed) Satyagraha recalling the Indian independence struggle of Gandhi's Salt Satyagraha and using peasant's seeds as a symbol of peasant resistance against MNC patented seeds. Bringing in Gandhi and the symbolism of satyagraha in the process of framing resonated with the participants of the movement.

In 1998, KRRS launched a global call to action to cremate Monsanto under its 'Operation Cremate Monsanto'. It also called on social movements around the world to engage in direct actions against companies like Pioneer, Novartis and especially Monsanto by burning their GM fields and squatting or destroying their offices. They warned not just the companies but also people that had invested in these companies.

In Karnataka and other states of India farmers burned many illegal GM field trials in front of the media as a direct action. This call was taken up by movements around the world where farmers also destroyed GM crops such as by Conferation Paysanne in France and peasant organizations in Indonesia.

According to Nanjundaswamy, losing the right to save seeds was equivalent to losing a country's independence, recalled Chukki Nanjundaswamy. The concept of frame articulation is useful here to understand how Nanjundaswamy articulated the idea of independence and freedom to save seeds by using the slogans and ideas of the Indian National Movement. The slogan of 'Quit India' and idea of Satyagraha not only echoed Gandhi's struggle against independence but it also linked the struggle against capitalist domination of the west and MNCs with the idea of freedom and 'master frame' of independence. It was also a form of motivational framing as the notion of independence motivated farmers and instilled a spirit to fight for their land, seeds and freedom. Even a decade later the Bandi Yatra or the Cart March was organised in 2000 where BKU marched to Mumbai from Kashmir and KRRS along with TVS and Kerala Coconut Farmer's Association marched from Kanyakumari to Mumbai , which took more than a month and threw imported goods into the sea as a protest against Free Trade agreements, resembling also the Dandi Yatra of Gandhi.

On October 2nd 1993, commemorating Gandhi Jayanti, KRRS organised a convention of the 'Third World Peasantry' at Bangalore where peasant leaders from Indonesia, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Philippines and Zimbabwe attended and an eight point resolution was adopted to oppose the GATT negotiations. By organising seminars and protest rally with other peasant leaders and Third World Network KRRS

established itself as a dissenting voice against globalisation and attracted international attention. It was also a turning point for farmer's movements in the country as Shetkari Sangathana in its support to globalisation was no longer a part of the alliance of farmer's movements. KRRS and BKU emerged as two farmer's movements opposing globalisation.

In 1999, in solidarity with movements of Europe and as a part of the PGA process, KRRS organised a month long Intercontinental Caravan of Resistance and Solidarity where 400 farmers from India were accompanied by 50 members of movements such as the MST of Brazil, Landless people of Bangladesh, Zapatista support groups of Mexico, Mapuches of Chile, Afro Colombian movement and others. In Geneva activists of different movements marched at the WTO office shouting, "Kill the WTO". In Rome they protested at the FAO headquarters and at the G8 Summit in Germany they engaged in a laughing protest as part of a global day of action.

Members of KRRS have protested against free trade, GMOs even after Nanjundaswamy's death in 2004, though not with the earlier fervour and frequency. The Mangalore port was blocked on the coast of Karnataka in 2010, as a symbolic protest against the Indian government's free trade policy allowing duty free dumping of cheap palm oil. In 2011, KRRS farmers uprooted Dupont's illegal GM rice field trials that were being held without any prior intimation to the farmers or the state government in Dodballapur, Karnataka. In November 2011 farmers in Ramnagar district protested against the price of silk that had fallen down from Rs. 160 to Rs. 30

because China was dumping its excess silk in India. This protest went on for around two weeks where farmers did sit-ins.

In December 2012 KRRS organised agri-livelihood summit opposing the global agri-business and food processing summit where about 1000 farmers held a rally and parallel summit outside the Bangalore International Exhibition Centre and several farmers also got arrested. The Global Agri-Investment and Food Processing Summit was organised by Government of Karnataka to attract investment for Karnataka's agricultural sector including marketing and distribution. "The Government of Karnataka is planning, with the help of its new investors, to modernise and liberalise the following targeted sectors- agriculture, apiculture, animal husbandry, floriculture, horticulture, fisheries and food processing"[16]. It is feared that corporatisation of agriculture in the state would take away land of farmers, would encourage contract farming and bonded labour for poor farmers in the state, said one activist. " Karnataka lapped up as many as 31 projects worth Rs 93,724 crore on day one of the country's first-ever Global Agribusiness and Food Processing Summit 2011, held on Thursday"[17].

The transnational master frame of anti-globalisation was a successful frame and it diffused into the movement's framing processes. This diffusion linked the anti-globalisation frame with ideas of freedom for the nation against western capitalist domination. While this resonated well with the ordinary members, they did not

[16] Briefing paper "Farmer's Response to Bounteous Karnataka: Sustainable agribusiness and food processing summit", prepared by SICCFM, KRRS and LVC secretariat, December 2011

[17] http://www.deccanchronicle.com, 2 December 2012

perceive their local problems to be a reflection of the global issues. A clear distinction remained between the local and the global and both existed simultaneously within the movement. It existed simultaneously with the frame of the movement restricted only to a level, usually to some educated leaders who could understand how the transnational was linked to the local problems of farmers, which most of the other members could not. In fact the simultaneous existence of two frames within the movement reflected different groups within the movement – a group had the educational and social ability to not only understand but also engage with the issue of globalisation actively, another group understood but considered engaging with immediate local problems of prices, water, electricity, drought more important and 'real' than talking about international politics, and a third group which was completely disconnected. Also, Nanjundaswamy being involved at the international level became distant from the grassroots which created discontent among middle level leaders and grass roots, adding to the gap between the local and the global.

Though all the different issues of GMOs, free trade, FDI in retail, land acquisition, natural farming, are related to struggle against globalisation, they were interpreted differently by ordinary members. So the transnational anti-globalisation frame was present within the movement, but the different issues related to globalisation were experienced differently. Just like Nanjundaswamy being the representative of KRRS, a middle and rich farmers group, opposed land reforms as a campaign in LVC, similarly other KRRS members also perceive and took different political stands with regard to different issues and aspects of globalisation. It is here that the social

positions of members, and the class-analytic lens is useful to examine how different issues, all being different facets of globalisation process, are perceived differently.

Framing and Resisting GMOs

KRRS, under the leadership of Nanjundaswamy, had emerged as a strong voice opposing biotechnology in agriculture and this resistance became a symbol of resistance against globalisation. The possible introduction of GM in agriculture during the early 1990s set off a debate in the country, whether GM will be beneficial or harmful for the country and several intellectuals and activists got involved in the debate like, Vandana Shiva, Suman Sahai among others. Resistance to GM emerged not only at the national level but also at the international level and through these networks an anti-GM frame emerged.

For opponents of GM, introduction of GM was directly related to processes of globalisation and concerns were raised against patenting, bio-piracy, corporate control and consequences of globalised trade relations. It was argued that GM would eventually lead to erosion of traditional knowledge and would affect traditional medicinal systems of a community. Besides the arguments about disadvantages of using GM for economic, ecological and health reasons, introduction of GM was seen as a conspiracy of the capitalist nations to gain access to the bio-resources of the third world. According to Suman Sahai, 'The harmonised IPR regime was an attempt of these nations to create instruments to gain access to the biodiversity and the genetic wealth of developing countries without which their technology could not get off the laboratory shelf and come into the marketplace' (Gene Campaign 1998). Similarly Vandana Shiva echoes, 'IPRs have been used for plain 'political coercion' by

industrial countries, particularly the US' (Shiva 2001: 4) and thus 'company's commercial laboratories, universities, researchers and more particularly governments – all seem to be in a 'high-stakes scavenger hunt' to collect 'patents' which can be sold for billions of dollars' (ibid.: 3).

Kavita Kuruganti in this regard says, 'there is no independent research worth its name, despite the presence of such huge research establishment in the country and expertise in a variety of fields' (Kuruganti 2006). According to G.V. Ramanjaneyulu of Centre for Sustainable Agriculture, Hyderabad, "whatever research is being done is being copied verbatim from other reports of the companies, no one looks into raw data". Similarly C. S. P. Patil of Green Foundation argues, "agricultural universities have a big role to play in this and they do the research. They convince the farmers about GM and farmers do it for temporary profit". It is also argued, 'scientific research is rigged, alarming evidence of health dangers are covered up, and intense political pressure silences the sane voice of dissidents' (Herring 2006: 477).

Even though the opponents of GM including intellectuals, activists, scientists and NGOs created a 'noise', the anti-GM frame was not well-defined as many issues were clubbed together under one umbrella. There has not been a consensus within the anti-GM lobby itself. Chukki Nanjundaswamy said, "We need to have concrete points to say why we are against GMOs, and by reading this document the grassroots will also be aware". Suman Sahai in a meeting said, "farmer's movements get involved in strategy but there is lack of direction and clarity on what we are actually asking for". Thus, even after more than two decades of protesting against GM, the articulation of the frame has been problematic and lacked clarity. While some argue that technology

is required to tackle the problem of malnutrition, others question the very u se of technology. Others suggest that they are not against technology but question the control and use of it, and emphasise the need to have democratic regulatory body with representatives of all stakeholders. Some focus on the health impact of eating GM, which according to Chukki Nanjundaswamy is from the perspective of the 'urban' consumer and not from the perspective of the farmer. Though civil society groups, NGOs, farmer's movements and transnational networks all oppose GM, the frames differ with respect to degrees of emphasis on different impacts of GM. However, all these actors agree on the ideas of 'domination' by the 'west', 'capitalism', 'imperialism', 'nexus between state, MNCs and agricultural universities', 'corporate control' etc.

Though several protests were held against GM by activists of KRRS, it did not resonate at the grass root level. This is primarily because the experiences of farmers differed from the activists and intellectuals. According to Chukki Nanjundaswamy, "the first thing a farmer sees is his livelihood, and only then does the question of environment and health come in. They do understand but they want their livelihood first". The anti-GM frame had focused on environment and health aspects, which the farmer could not relate to. It is here that the differences in class relates to the experiences and consequently interpretation of a particular issue. A leader coming from north Karnataka where Bt cotton is cultivated extensively, explains why farmers choose Bt, "People do Bt because it decreases labour and no pesticides are required. But fertilisers are required. Yield is good but it kills the soil and they can realise it only after 6-7 years". A farmer from North Karnataka, Gulbarga district cultivates Bt

cotton because he gets good yield, and that Bt cotton seeds are mostly available in the market. He argues, "It may be bad for the soil, but as long as it gives me and my family food to eat, I'm happy". This indicates that though farmers are aware, they often end up cultivating Bt for various reasons, it may give good yield, it may be easily available, it may be cheaper.

Though several protests were held, the fact remains that many areas in the country cultivate Bt. Some leaders and activists say that it is because the farmers are un aware and innocent victims of corporate control. BR, leader from the North Karnataka, says , "Many farmers cultivate Bt as they have to survive and are innocent and ignorant of the hazards." KS, coordinator of SICCFM, says that they are trying to educate th e farmers about hazards of GM because farmers need to know the problems of doing GM. Thus, one activist says, "Regarding GM, many farmers are being lost due to the temporary profit temptation and hence the strength is lacking with regard to opposition to GMOs". Here, farmers are considered to be 'hapless victims' (Herring 2006: 473) who do not understand and hence are fooled by MNCs and the scientists of agricultural universities.

The fundamental problem here is the contradiction that while farmer leaders have opposed globalisation, farmers have cultivated GM in certain areas. It is evident that while the members of the movement participated actively in anti-globalisation protests, they did (at least some) end up cultivating GM seeds because of profit and hope of better yield. One possible reason is that the anti-GM frame constructed by intellectuals and NGO activists emphasised the health and environment hazards of GM which did not resonate with the farmer's objectives. Also, the anti-GM frame

lacked clarity and consensus. Another possible reason is the missing link between the larger transnational frame and the local concerns. Herring (2006) argues that anti -GM frame activists take the 'discursive leap that if you oppose globalisation you also oppose GM'. Introduction of GM has been constructed as a 'part', as an aspect of globalisation, as a method of domination and it is this linkage that is problematic. Thus, consensus on the larger frame of globalisation does not often translate to consensus on the 'sub-frames' of globalisation among different groups from different classes and with diverse experiences and objectives. KRRS members, who are middle and rich farmers, were naturally concerned more about the profit and yield rather than environmental issues.

Search for Alternatives: Food Sovereignty and Natural Farming

Since the 1990s Nanjundaswamy has been suggesting that alternatives need to be created along with agitation to resist corporate control over agriculture. KRRS has been encouraging alternative farming practices like zero-budget natural farming (ZBNF). ZBNF is one of the alternative farming practices that have emerged not only in India but also worldwide as an alternative to conventional chemical agriculture. Chemical agriculture implies use of chemicals as fertilisers, pesticides with hybrid seeds for higher yield. Alternative farming practices which include organic farming, natural farming and other sustainable agriculture methods like NPM (non -pesticide management) and SRI (systemic rice intensification) are all efforts to make agriculture more ecologically sustainable, to decrease the cost of cultivation and increase yield while preserving the soil quality, to prevent the farmer from getting into debt trap, and thereby to prevent food crisis. Different names are used to distinguish

different techniques developed by different people, but in general alternative farming practices use traditional knowledge, believe in living in harmony with nature rather than controlling nature and eating healthy food that is locally grown. All of these practices emphasise the adverse ecological, health and livelihood impacts of 'modern' agriculture and support 'ancient' agricultural methods.

LVC has a working committee on agro-ecology which focuses on understanding, and encouraging agro-ecological farming practices in different regions. LVC's working committee on agro-ecology is closely linked to the idea of 'food sovereignty' as an alternative, where using agro-ecological methods are a way in which food sovereignty may be achieved. KRRS has been encouraging natural farming also because of the support it gets from LVC. According to Peter Rosset who is the technical coordinator of LVC of North America region and is coordinating the sustainable agriculture commission of LVC, the trend within LVC is that many countries are moving towards agro-ecology principles. He says:

> *"A huge change has been seen in the last five to ten years where agro-ecology has become a big thing. This is because price of chemical inputs have increased 200-500 percent making chemical agriculture unaffordable by farmers. Governments have cut back subsidies and credits and this increasing cost has led to several farmer suicides. Besides the cost factor, LVC has politicised many organisations to support alternative farming practices to resist agribusiness. This has led to the framing of the discourse on agro-ecology. There has also been an encounter with indigenous people and LVC which has brought ideas of living in harmony with nature and sustainable agriculture and notions of 'mother earth'. There was also a convergence of many researches looking at alternative farming methods and an urge to preserve traditional knowledge felt worldwide. All these factors have led to*

the growing interest and urge to look at agro-ecology as an alternative and a way to resist chemical agriculture and fight agribusiness multinationals".

Two most popular methods practiced in Karnataka are Fukouka's 'do nothing' method and Palekar's ZBNF. The main idea of natural farming is that farming should be left to nature itself and it should be simple and low cost. Natural farming is not just a farming method but also a philosophy. The origin of 'modern' natural farming is generally associated with Masanobu Fukouka from Japan who started his experiments in 1938. In India the first documented experiment of natural farming was made in Rasulia, Madhya Pradesh in 1979 by The Friends Rural Centre (FRC) under the guidance of Partap Aggarwal who gave the name 'Rishi Kheti'. In 1984 FRC published the Indian edition of Masanobu Fukouka's *The One Straw Revolution*, bringing national and international attention to Rishi Kheti. Many farmers who visited Rasulia started switching to natural farming. Since then different methods of natural farming has developed in India, the most popular being Subhash Palekar's *Zero Budget Natural Farming* (ZBNF). Kailash Murthy is another successful example who follows the Fukouka method. Fukouka's principle is that one should not try to control nature but farmers should cooperate with nature by observing and facilitating the natural cycle. Fukouka's method is also called 'do-nothing' farming as there is minimal effort and input from the farmer. Both these methods claim that yield is higher than conventional chemical farming and cheaper. Similarly Subhash Palekar's ZBNF also claims[18] that the yield will be same as chemical farming but without any cost, and hence the name 'zero-budget'. In the initial years of transition from chemical

[18] See http://palekarzerobudgetnaturalfarming.com

to natural farming the yield will be less but after a couple of years the yield will be same as chemical farming.

KRRS started encouraging natural farming since 2005 when one of its members, Krishnappa visited a camp of Subhash Palekar. Subhash Palekar was organising camps in North Karnataka with the help of Basavaraj Tambake, who was a senior leader of KRRS. Krishnappa practiced ZBNF which was successful and his experience of ZBNF came out in the Krishi magazine. A journalist, Swamianand, also a member of KRRS noticed it and did a lot of research on ZBNF and wrote many articles on Krishanappa's experiment. Thereafter, with the effort of this journalist and others, several camps were organised in Karnataka where Palekar was invited. Swamianand also wrote a book based on the lectures of Palekar in Kannada which sold more than 70,000 copies and had 16 prints and he also got an award for the book from the state. Since then Palekar was treated as the famer's hero in Karnataka and people started doing ZBNF. Palekar was also given the Basawashree awa rd by Murugaraj Matha in Chitradurga. In fact, the spread of ZBNF in Karnataka was also supported by the *mathas* (religious monasteries) as Palekar presented ZBNF as 'spiritual' farming and hence, some of these camps are held in *mathas*. *Mathas* provide the logistical support by giving free food to participants of these camps and give cow dung for members to use.

Alternative farming practices like natural farming have been framed as an alternative to the problems in agriculture, to tackle problems of farmer s uicides and as a method of achieving food sovereignty by LVC and KRRS leaders. A natural farmer says:

> *"The movement has not taken it forward as much as it could have, because of leaders who support natural farming do not practice it. They are only busy agitating, and they are only leaders not farmers. Though KRRS supports natural farming there has not been any active effort from the leaders to encourage natural farming. There is a natural farmer's wing but it is inactive. However alternative farming is practiced and is prevalent in Karnataka. In some villages especially in Bidar and Bijapur, farmers form cooperatives of their own and the membership in these cooperatives cuts across KRRS and non-KRRS farmers. These cooperatives are prevalent in Bidar and Bijapur districts where farmers meet regularly to discuss new techniques and exchange ideas and are formed by initiative of farmers themselves rather than KRRS leaders.*

This indicates that agro-ecology as a way of achieving food sovereignty is a frame that exists among the leaders in the transnational and national level. Simultaneously at the local level farmers practice their form of natural farming by forming cooperatives of their own without the support of KRRS using their traditional knowledge as it is cheaper. Again, there is a missing link between the way the issue is framed at the level of leadership and the way grassroots take it, though both support the same idea. Rather than the food sovereignty concept it is the monetary calculation that affects a farmer.

There is no single method of alternative farming that is being practiced and there are contestations regarding the most appropriate method. Thus, one KRRS member says, "I have been doing natural farming for 20 years. Palekar came much later. In his method yield is less and there is a lot of financial and mental pressure on the farmer. It is easy to say all that, but doing is difficult. We have been using our

traditional methods for years". KTG, who has been practicing his own method of alternative farming says , "Palekar's method is not zero -budget. What about the cost of keeping a cow, a cow shed, fodder for the cow or buying cow dung? It is not so easy". In fact, the major problem in practice of any alternative farming is in the transition cost, because in the initial years of transition from chemical to alternative method involves low yield. This makes it difficult for any small farmer to shift to natural farming. One activist from Mysore says that the alternative methods, be it natural or organic usually "do not get popularised among small farmers not only because of the transition cost but also because it is the same person who lends money, sells seeds and fertilisers and there is a strong petroleum and fertiliser lobby". Jaime Tadeo of Philippines also says, "farmers are trapped as they cannot get out of the addiction of chemical fertilisers".

Though food sovereignty has been constructed as an alternative to corporate control of agriculture and struggle against globalisation, the idea has not reached the grass roots, as seen in the case of KRRS. It is because some classes have benefitted from globalisation, some have faced greater problems and small farmers are not in a position to shift to alternative farming and others have practiced their own methods because of monetary reasons. Though alternative farming practices were constructed as a way of resisting globalisation, it did not spread sufficiently because of the presence of multiple classes, experiences , and perceptions within the movement.

Resisting Land Acquisition

Neoliberal discourse on economic growth promotes acquisition of land by governments to set up SEZs and this has become an issue of debate in the country in the recent years. Land acquisition is intrinsically linked to the proc ess of capital expansion and accumulation during globalisation. The role of the state has changed in recent years where the state has become a facilitator in process of land acquisition from farmers by offering meagre compensation and encouraging establish ment of SEZs. Struggles against land acquisition are taking place at the local, national and transnational levels by diverse groups. In India several movements have emerged to resist land grab by corporate bodies and government, like in Jagatsinghpur in Od isha against POSCO steel project (India's largest foreign direct investment), against JINDAL, Vedanta and the like in the mining belts, in Bhatta Parsaul in UP against infrastructure company Jai Prakash associates, in Koodankulam against thermal power plant, in Nandigram against Salem, in Jaitapur, Maharashtra against nuclear plant (which is to be the biggest in the world and is being built by French company AREVA). These several struggles of different scales by diverse groups including farmers, fisherfolk, adivasis with support of NGOs and intellectuals have led to the formation of the Land Acquisition Act in 2013.

Farmer's movements like KRRS and BKU have also opposed land acquisition but no t much of consolidated opposition has come from these movements. T his is because, though land grab is associated with globalisation and corporate control, there are multiple views within the movement and between KRRS and its different allies. Land acquisition has been framed as a part of the process of globalisation, as a conspiracy of the state, where the state is the agent allowing corporate foreign and national

companies to acquire land in the name of development and infrastructure. An activist says, “The state is acting like a real estate agent”. He continues, “We are not saying that do not take land for public purpose, but here mis-utilisation of land is taking place”. Similarly another activist argues, “How will the state decide which is fertile land and ultimately land will be acquired on the ground that it is unfertile. Hence we should say ‘no’ to land acquisition”. The state and corporate bodies are considered to be the enemies and so he says, “Why should we give land to the state, has the state ever thought about us?” Leaders of KRRS cite several examples of where and how land has been acquired in the state and point out how nothing has been done on those lands.

While the members are critical of the role of the state since globalisation, there are multiple views regarding compensation. A farmer from North Karnataka says, “We do not know any other skill. If our land is taken away we can only become labourers in our own lands. Compensation is of no use. Usually people first buy a TV, and if their wives are smart they buy some gold, then go to the cities and watch movies, drink and make merry till the money gets over and then they become labourers”. However the other view is that as agriculture has become unviable, it is better if farmers sell their land and get some compensation. In fact land acquisition is considered to be inevitable, evident in the words of AP from Sindhanur, “We can only fight for higher compensation, we cannot stop land acquisition”. When I was in Raichur, I saw a KRRS board in front of a construction site where a thermal power plant was under construction. CP, who is a KRRS office bearer in that district said, “The state government acquired 94 acres and offered 12 lakhs. Out of 30 farmers

some have already sold their land and bought land in interior villages, while others are still protesting and demanding higher compensation. This was fertile land, beside the highway. We have been supporting the farmers here for the last one year but nothing has happened as there are a small number of farmers." It is because of lack of consensus on the issue of land acquisition that protests launched by KRRS have not been strong enough.

KRRS has been organising meetings and seminars to discuss about land acquisition. In one such meeting all district representatives were present along with other groups like Dalit Sangharsh Samiti (DSS), socialist leaders, and it was evident the land grab is happening in most districts in different magnitudes and some local units are protesting against it. These protests, either to stop land acquisition or to get higher compensation, have been small in scale and have not received state and national level attention unlike other movements against land grab. In Bagalkot 3500 acres of land has been acquired by state government. In Chikmagalur 250 acres of land has been suggested for acquisition, and KRRS unit has been agitating against it. 12,000 acres of land was allotted near Nandi Hills and KRRS members along with others filed an objection as 20 percent of the drinking water that comes from the river will be polluted and used for construction. It was felt by speakers in the meeting that struggle against land grab needs to be addressed at the state and national levels. They also feel the need of experts, lawyers who can fight battles in court for them, as just protesting is not enough. DSK, who is a lawyer by profession said, "We should also have a legal cell of our own to fight cases in court. Government will crush us if we do not substantiate our street protests with legal backing". Thus, it is evident that even

though small struggles are happening in different districts, they are all fragmented and often without support of the state level KRRS.

At the national level a wide range of people's movements are fighting against land grab in different ways, and the views regarding land acquisition are equally diverse. BKU, an ally of KRRS has not had a clear position on land acquisition because of diverse opinions within the movement. Rakesh Tikait from BKU explained that the trend within BKU is that farmers themselves are willing to sell their land as agriculture is unviable hence it is difficult for farmer leaders to launch any struggle against land acquisition. C. K. Janu, leader of Adivasi Gothram Mahasabha in Wayanad, Kerala says that the situation is reverse in adivasi regions as the land reform laws benefitted tenants but tribals lost their land in the process, as redistribution did not happen in their favour and they became bonded labourers. She says, "It is no longer an issue of a particular community but it is part of a growing global crisis, we must work together to address these issues". This is the challenge of movements of diverse class composition to reach a consensus on the issue of land grab, as there are some within the movement who are willing to sell land for compensation.

Though the Indian Coordination Committee of Farmer's Movements (ICCFM), a wing of LVC, which includes KRRS, BKU, TVS, Kerala Coconut Farmer's Association, a faction of Shetkari Sangathana, and Adivasi Gothram Mahasabha of Kerala, state their position regarding land acquisition in letters written to the government, at the local level no such collective action frame has emerged, primarily because of multiple class positions within these movements. They state in a letter:

> *"We outright reject giving land to corporations and PPP under the guise of people's development. We especially reject the inclusion of acquisition for the vague term 'infrastructure projects' in the current form of the bill which allows the government to define any project as if it is for public purpose… There is an urgent need to take up a review of all land allotted so far after land acquisition for stated purposes to see if the land is being put to use against the stated purpose and if not, return the land to the original landowners or to the lowest administrative unit, to be further used for food and livelihood security purposes, including providing land for landless. This, then, is our question on the very development model/paradigm that the State follows, in the pursuit of which 'public good' often means essential resources of the poorest going into the hands of the rich and powerful."*

Also, for the people opposing land acquisition, there are multiple views regarding the methods and policies of land acquisition. However, these debates usually take place at the leadership level among a select few. Though land acquisition is framed as yet another method of the state and corporate bodies, as another way in which capitalism and globalisation impoverishes farmers and peasants, the frame has not been contested by some farmers who are willing to sell land for higher compensation. In fact, in case of land grab, there are two opposing views at every level, local, state and national levels: whether it is better to sell land as agriculture is unviable or whether to fight against it. This has resulted in an ambiguous position of the movement, resulting in contestations which were evident in state level meetings. While some leaders argued that agriculture is unviable and hence it is better to support land acquisition for betterment of the farmer, others argued that what will a farmer do after he has sold his land?

Ideology and Role of Intellectuals

'Ideology is generally portrayed as a fairly broad, coherent and relatively durable set of beliefs that affects one's orientation not only to politics but to everyday life more generally…it is a pervasive and integrated set of beliefs and values that have considerable staying power' (Benford and Snow 2000: 613). According to Michael Freeden, 'ideologies [are] those systems of political thinking, loose or rigid, deliberate or unintended, through which individuals and groups construct an understanding of the political world they, or those who preoccupy their thoughts, inhabit, and then act on that understanding' (1996: 3). Ideology and collective action frames often overlap as they are closely linked and so a distinction between the two needs to be made. Ideology and framing are related concepts and 'very roughly, framing points to process, while ideology points to content' (Oliver and Johnston 2005: 193). 'Ideology focuses attention on the content of whole systems of beliefs, on their multiple dimensions, and on how ideas are related to each other' (Benford and Snow 2000: 194). Unlike frames, ideologies do not 'resonate' with the people, rather it is developed by a core group of thinkers/intellectuals and the people are socialised into it. 'Framing processes involves, among other things, the articulation and accenting or amplification of elements of existing beliefs and values, most of which are associated with existing ideologies' (Oliver and Johnston 2005: 209). One also needs to delineate between a master frame and ideology, as both function as broad set of ideas. However, the difference lies in two respects – one, master frames are usually associated with cycles of protest and two, master frames lack the inherent normative and value systems, social and political theory that underlies ideology (Oliver and Johnston 2005: 198).

KRRS has its roots in the Lohia movement as during the 1970s the socialist movement was strong in Karnataka and many leaders who came to join KRRS were Lohiaites. The ideology of KRRS was based on Gandhian ideology and Lohia's socialism. Influences of Gandhi are evident in its ideas of self-reliance of villages and rural reconstruction, wearing khadi, in its Bandi Yatra and Beeja Satyagraha echoing Gandhi's Dandi Yatra and Salt Satyagraha. Framing processes of globalisation were drawn from and based upon the Gandhian ideology, by organising campaigns which invoked Gandhian concepts of Satyagraha. Snow and Benford view 'ideology as a cultural resource for framing activity' (2005: 209), and in the case of KRRS, Gandhian and Lohiaite principles became the 'cultural resource' on which collective action frame was built.

Gramsci considers that an 'ideology is not to be judged by its truth or falsity but by its efficacy in binding together a bloc of diverse social elements, and in acting as cement or as an agent of social unification' (Simon 2001:68). There must be 'a cultural-social unity through which a multiplicity of dispersed wills with heterogeneous aims, are welded together with a single aim, as the basis of an equal and common conception of the world' (Selections from Prison Notebooks cited in Simon 2001: 69). In this case, it was the collective identity of being 'producers of food', 'people of the land', 'the rural India', of being the victims of injustice of the state and MNCs, of capitalism, of globalisation. This bound together the different classes and castes together, and brushed aside the differences between various agrarian classes. Class, caste and other differences were secondary and the primary identity was that of being a 'producer' of food, one who lives in a village.

Here it is important to understand what role a leader, (Nanjundaswamy, in the case of KRRS), plays in constructing ideology and frames of a movement. Here I have drawn from Gramsci's idea of ideology and organic intellectual as Nanjundaswamy was one such organic intellectual. According to Gramsci, 'ideological practice possesses its own agents in the shape of intellectuals who specialise in the elaboration of organic ideologies and in the task of moral and intellectual reform', (Simon 2001:67) and that every fundamental class 'creates one or more strata of intellectuals who give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only in the economic but also in the political and social fields' (Selections from Prison Notebooks cited in Simon 2001: 67). Gramsci elucidates the task of leadership: 'a human mass does not 'distinguish' itself, does not become independent in its own right without, in the widest sense, organising itself; and there is no organisation without intellectuals, that is without organisers and leaders ... But the process of creating intellectuals is long, difficult, full of contradictions, advances and retreats, dispersals and regroupings, in which the loyalty of the masses is often sorely tried' (cited in Simon 2001:111). Ideology and/or collective action frames are formed by leaders or ideologues of a movement. In this case it was Nanjundaswamy who provided the movement an ideological identity; that this movement belongs to this ideological family, and trained members in that ideology.

'Less has been written about the processes that occur when a group of committed activists reconstructs their ideology' (Oliver and Johnston 2005: 196). When Nanjundaswamy started engaging in anti-globalisation protests, he leaned towards neo-Marxism, indicating a shift in ideology. This was problematic, as the support

bases of KRRS were socialized into Gandhian ideology. Drawing from Gandhi and neo-Marxism, and blending the two, he formed the frames where rural India, village life and farmers were being exploited and impoverished because of forces of capitalism, imperialism and globalisation. There was also some effort to stress on dependency theory and a departure from Gandhi but 'the movement could neither denounce or renounce the Gandhian model in favour of a more radical ideology, as this would have entailed further erosion of its support bases' (Assadi 1997: 125). With involvement in the transnational level of activism, Nanjundaswamy was leaning more towards a radical ideology, but that was not accepted by other leaders. He ultimately played a middle path by often slicing different ideological currents, blending and joining them to form a coherent frame. This would also be problematic as the other farmer's movements in the country were also based on Gandhian and Lohiaite ideology, quite distant from neo-Marxism.

Conclusion

It seems that farmers of not only KRRS but the world are resisting globalisation, burning GM field trials, struggling to protect land, at every level, in all possible ways. Like globalisation itself, struggles against globalisation are not confined to any region or any group of people, it is everywhere, all pervasive, taking different forms, shapes and sizes. It is the diversity of people, ideologies and strategies, and the heterogeneity that is the defining character of these struggles, and this diversity is considered to be the strength, the validation, that 'all' kinds, 'everywhere', are opposing globalisation. Looking closely in one such movement resisting globalisation, the diversity within, the multiple frames, the varied perceptions and

experiences become visible. There is no doubt about opposition to globalisation, farmers of 'all' kinds do oppose globalisation, the nexus between the state, MNCs and bureaucrats, and the forces of capitalism and imperialism. When the big phenomenon of globalisation is sliced into pieces of opposition to GM, land acquisition, farmer suicides, FDI, FTA, it is no longer 'one' voice against all aspects of globalisation. This is a character of movements opposing globalisation – lack of consensus, varied degrees of importance attached to different issues, scattered struggles. There is a missing link between the big frame of opposing globalisation and the sub-frames. Multiple contradictory ideas also exist simultaneously within like, 'we support alternative farming' and 'we want fertiliser subsidy', 'we do not support land acquisition' and 'it is okay if they give us higher compensation' and so on.

Such contradictory views point to the fact that a movement consists of people from similar social backgrounds with different views and people from different social backgrounds with even more different ways of perception. While the former is a more psychoanalytical question about why people in a group think differently, the latter indicates a possible association between class, caste, regional belonging, education, linguistic abilities, among other social differences in ways of perception. Thus, how Nanjundaswamy understood new issues, how he framed globalisation as an ideologue of the movement was not how others experienced globalisation. This created a gap between the leader and the grassroots. But it also points the role of the leader, in attempting to maintain links, in representing people whose needs may be different from the frame. It not only created gaps between the leader and the

grassroots but also led to formation of groups within the movement depending on different views – a group thinks networking with LVC and such is the need of the hour, another group thinks that it is more important to encourage alternative farming rather than agitating on the streets, yet another think that it is required to pressurise the state to fix higher MSPs and so on.

Chapter 6
Conclusion

This study has attempted to understand the processes of transformation within a movement post globalisation in terms of politics, networking and framing with a purpose to identify the prospects and challenges that have emerged for social movements since globalisation. Anti-globalisation movements have grown since the 1990s and have been marked by growing alliance building between different groups and emergence of new movements at all levels, local, national and transnational. This study has focused on how an already existing movement, which emerged in the 1980s, has engaged with globalisation by incorporating new issues, frames, methods of agitation and alliance building and by elevating its politics from the local and national level to the transnational level and consequently how the trajectory of the movement has been affected. I have looked at the dynamic interplay of simultaneous tendencies of disintegration, exemplified by tensions, contradictions and factions, and also of integration through the notions of a collective identity.

Here I have first given a summary of the major findings as discussed in the previous chapters and then have pointed out the key conclusions of the study. I have attempted to focus on some kinds of social movements engaged in transnational networks and in anti-globalisation protests to understand under which conditions, in which kind of movements, what kind of trends are visible in social movements.

Chapter Summary

In the first chapter, *Introduction*, I have introduced the subject of research locating its context and relevance as we find in contemporary research literature. Then I have

explained the selection of the field, the theoretical framework and the methodology of carrying out this research, followed by a chapter organisation.

In the second chapter, *Mapping the Field of Study*, I have attempted first, a review of literature, to identify the gaps in literature and arrive at the research problem of this study, and then to give a profile of the field of study, that is, the movement, KRRS. I have briefly examined the key concepts of the theories of social movements, i.e., resource mobilisation, political opportunity structure, framing, and also the notion of new social movements, to map the emergence of these theories in different contexts in different regions of the world, within the larger debate of structure versus agency in social movement studies. It has been recognised that all the three concepts of political opportunity structure, resource mobilisation and framing are required to understand different aspects of a social movement.

Next, I have addressed the emergence of transnational movements in the era of globalisation and the literature relating to understanding the new kind of transnational collective action. It has been seen that while several sch olars have looked at the emergent form of collective action in general, transnational agrarian movements, despite their vibrancy, have received relatively less attention. Thus, I have looked at the emergence and nature of transnational agrarian movements.

In India, several scholars have looked at new social movements that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s. I have looked at the new social movement literature in India and the debate whether farmer's movements which emerged during this period can be called new social movements. I have argued that though these farmer's movements share commonalities with the other movements, they are different because of their class

composition and engagement in with politics. However, the emphasis has been on how new social movements of the 1970s and 1980s have 'globalised' their struggle and also new kinds of movements have emerged since globalisation. Next, I have looked at the emergence and the state of farmer's movements in the era of globalisation and attempted to conceptualise caste, class and gender in farmer's movements.

Finally, in this chapter I have tried to give a brief profile of the field of study; locating the historical background, the emergence of the movement, major agitations, class, caste, and gender composition of KRRS. It is followed by a brief description of the structure and organisation of La Via Campesina, a transnational network to which KRRS joined after globalisation.

In the third chapter, *Engaging with State, Political Parties and Factions: Shifting Relations*, I have focused on how KRRS members engaged with mainstream politics and the different perceptions. It has been seen that there has been a shift in the idea about mainstream politics from complete contempt to participation in politics around the mid-1980s. Thereafter there was another shift in the 1990s. Post-globalisation the state was considered to be 'weak' and hence engagement in transnational networks was considered to be crucial. These two shifts within the movement, one in participating in local level politics and the other in engaging with transnational networks, created tension between conflicting ideas and stance that disintegrated the movement. This is primarily because there is a complex interaction between a movement, political parties and caste and class identities at the local level. There is indeed a fuzzy boundary between institutional and non-institutional politics and

KRRS leaders at the local level maintain the horizontal and vertical linkages. Thus, there have been several factions because of different perceptions regarding mainstream politics, some leaders have left the movement to join political parties, and further the ego clashes between different leaders have weakened the movement considerably in the last decade.

In the fourth chapter, *Process and Politics of Networking*, I have looked at the networks of KRRS at the local, national and transnational levels with diverse actors and examined what are the challenges and opportunities of networking. It has been seen that a need for networking was felt and this is related to the change in the perception of the state. But in the process of networking the leaders play a crucial and perhaps indispensible role and this brings forth the question of representation: who should represent a movement – one among us or one who can guide us? Engaging in networks with other kinds of movements indicates a contradiction between the ideology, aims and strategies of the leaders engaged in networking and that of the support bases. It becomes a challenge to negotiate different identities and ideologies and form notions of collective identities at different levels.

I have also looked at the love-hate relationship between social movements and NGOs where both need each other and also at the problems that the politics of funding brings at different levels. Another crucial challenge of the process of networking is maintaining the local-global linkage. It is argued by some activists that networks have become an end in itself rather than means to an end, because too much time is spent in establishing networks and meetings rather than solid resistance at different levels. There is a disconnect between two levels of local and global as different members

experienced and perceived globalization differently. There is a clash regarding whether the 'local' is just an extension of the global or has an identity of its own which is distinct from the global? It has been seen that attention to global issues made Nanjundaswamy distant from KRRS members and other leaders, who were more concerned with their everyday, local, specific problems. Finally, I have looked at whether and how networks enable a social movement. In the case of KRRS, though it brought the issues of the movement in the forefront and members are still proud about their involvement in protests against globalisation, it was seen that it created discontent within the movement with regard to questions of representation and in dealing with the local and the global.

In the fifth chapter, *Framing and Ideology: Exploring Post-Globalisation Shifts*, drawing from the framing perspective I have explored the shifts in framing activity and construction of ideology and the process of linking them with the transnational frame. I have looked into three cases to understand the varied perceptions, contestations within the movement – the resistance against GMOs, the search for alternative to neoliberal agricultural regime by encouraging agro-ecological farming methods, and the resistance against land acquisition.

In the initial years the collective action frame of the movement was based on the 'injustice frame'; that farmers have been victims of injustice and corruption of the state and such an idea continues to be strong within the movement. The collective action frame was also based on ideas of self-respect and pride of being a farmer and all KRRS members wear a green shawl asserting the identity of being a farmer. Later on, through transnational networks Nanjundaswamy got exposed to the transnational

frame of anti-globalisation and it was he who linked the collective action frame of the movement with the anti-globalisation transnational frame. Globalisation was framed as a 'western' project of capitalist and political domination, invoking Gandhian ideas of freedom and satyagraha, with slogans of 'Monsanto Quit India', which resonated with the members of the movement as it aligned with the anti-urban, 'anti-west' frame of the movement. This marked a shift in the framing processes within the movement. However, the ordinary members did not perceive their local problems to be a reflection of the global issues and generally failed to link the two. Though the transnational anti-globalisation frame was present in the movement, the different issues like GMOs, free trade, FDI in retail, land acquisition, natural farming, related to globalisation were experienced and interpreted differently by different members. Thus, consensus on the larger frame of globalisation does not often translate to consensus on the 'sub-frames' of globalisation by different groups from different classes with diverse experiences. Drawing from Gramsci's concept of organic intellectuals, I have looked at how Nanjundaswamy constructed the ideology of the movement such that the difficult questions of caste and class differences and of the ideological shifts since the involvement in anti-globalisation protests were brushed aside.

Concluding Observations

The primary shift discernible in the post-1990s has been increased alliance building with different groups including social movements of different kinds, NGOs, funders, intellectuals, across territorial borders. A need for networking, lobbying, gathering support at the international level is felt primarily because the perception of the state

has changed. Social movements have always had a direct relationship with the state; some movements reject the authority of the state, for example Maoist movements, while most are in a negotiating and bargaining relationship with the state subscribing to the constitutional framework. With the formation of supranational institutions, international laws, integration of the economy, states are perceived to have become 'weak' and hence networking, lobbying at the international level is considered to be imperative, along with pressurising and negotiating with the state. I have examined how networking post globalisation may enable a movement, and at the same time can create weaknesses and divide a movement and how does it affect the trajectory of the movement.

How networking and engaging with diverse actors at multiple levels affect a movement varies from case to case depending upon the nature of the movement. First, let us look at the cases in which networking enabled a movement. The way the Zapatista movement got international visibility through mobilising in cyberspace, gathering supporters from different parts of the world, that it restricted the possible course of coercive actions that the government, concerned about its international image, could have exercised otherwise. For example, 'The Zapatista cause drew an incredibly high level of support from Italy, where prominent politicians, trade unions and political parties collected money and participated in support actions' (Froehling 1997: 301). In case of Zapatistas, the movement and its cause was elevated to a different scale, adding a new dimension to the local struggle and reconfiguring the space of politics (ibid.: 304). Similarly, the recent Supreme Court verdict in January 2014 regarding the struggle by Dongria Kondhs of Niyamgiri Hills in Odisha against

mining in the hill by Vedanta, is also a case where the issue got international attention. Protests in support of the Dongria Kondhs were held in different parts of the world. In the case of Niyamgiri struggle, a number of environment and human rights organisations, like Survival International, Lokshakti Abhiyaan were involved in providing support and 'ballooning' the issue from a local struggle to an issue of international concern. This led to withdrawal of investments from Vedanta and the company incurred heavy losses. Simultaneously the Dongria Kondhs rejected the mining project in their gram sabhas and Vedanta had to withdraw. These are examples where international support from diverse actors create visibility, 'balloons' an issue and in effect pressurises the government.

Transnational and national networking by movement groups in India, in the context of globalisation intensified since the mid-1990s. According to D. L. Sheth, 'challenge of globalisation has politically revitalized the scene of social movements in India', where 'groups working separately on different issues such as gender, ecology, human rights or in the areas of health and education are now conceiving their activities in more generic terms – as a form of social and political action aimed at countering hegemonic power structures at all levels – locally, nationally and globally' (2004: 51). Trends of transnational activism were seen first in the 1970s and 1980s in the anti-dam struggles and this trend accelerated during the 1990s and more recently. According to Khagram, transnational alliances of anti-dam activists have 'dramatically altered the dynamics surrounding big dams from the local to the international levels' (2004: 3). Several movements like the Silent Valley movement in Kerala in the 1970s and 1980s, the Narmada Bachao Andolan and movements against Koel-Karo project and Tehri dams

emerged in India in the 1970s and 1980s which engaged in transnational networking with international NGOs and several coalitions were formed nationally and transnationally. According to Khagram (2004), local resistance would be ineffective without the support of international organizations that could pressurize World Bank and other funders against mega dam projects. He also asserts that the global set of norms regarding environment conservation, rights of indigenous people and human rights were essential factors in the success of anti-dam movements.

While in some cases networking at national and transnational levels has enabled the movement one cannot overlook the several challenges. One challenge of the process of networking is the question of representation: who should represent a movement, a middle class, well educated ideologue who provides the movement with frames for protest, becomes the spokesperson of the movement and formulates strategies and campaigns or, an individual or group of individuals with similar class, caste backgrounds. 'One like us or one who can guide us' is the question that has been a dilemma and a reason for discontent and splits in many movements. This question became prominent in KRRS after it started engaging in transnational networks. This is because ability to speak English as well as ability to travel was required to represent the movement in multiple fora. Nanjundaswamy had emerged as one such charismatic leader of the movement, an ideologue with a vision, who represented KRRS. Besides Nanjundaswamy, only those people who can at least manage to speak some English or Hindi were sometimes chosen to attend the networking meetings. Today, the 'networking core' consists of educated, urban middle class individuals who can afford to travel. Thus, it is only people coming from a certain background, with certain

linguistic abilities who become representatives and consequently leaders. What implications does this have for the movement – can the representative adequately understand the issues of the grassroots, as they belong to different classes? While this fear is always there, the importance of a 'vision' in a leader who can give 'ideological training' is equally stressed. The role of the leader in giving 'ideological training' or, in other words, constructing frames, designing the ideology of the movement, often by merging slices of different ideological undercurrents, plays a vital role in shaping the trajectory of the movement.

KRRS is not an exception; even other movements like Narmada Bachao Andolan, Shetkari Sangathana, Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan, Chattisgarh Mukti Morcha have all produced charismatic leaders like Medha Patkar, Sharad Joshi, Aruna Roy, Shankar Guha Niyogi among others. If there is a class difference between the leader and other members of the movement, there is a tendency for the movement to become top-down and hegemonic rather than being bottom up. Farmer's movements like KRRS, and also many other movements are often leader oriented, that is, dependent on the leader, top-down in character and it is the leader who becomes the face of the movement. If there is no leader, the movement does not survive. This is because within a movement there is a power structure, a sense of hierarchy and hence there could always be other equally powerful leaders vying for utmost power in the movement. It is ironic that a movement which questions power bears the same roots of hegemony and domination within it. Dependence on leaders or worshipping the leaders is not only at the top level, but it is a complex pyramidal structure that percolates down to the bottom-most layer. Pattenden argues that 'the hierarchical

nature of KRRS's organisational structure has concentrated processes of transnational solidarity…amongst a handful of state level leaders', and 'if transnational processes have reverberated in Karnataka's villages, it is among village elites rather than amongst marginalized groups' (2005: 1976).

Networking is primarily dependent on leaders-representatives of a movement who play a crucial role in lobbying with different actors, alliance building. In this process of alliance building and lobbying, only the representatives are involved, who happens to be a class of activists-intellectuals who remain busy to meet frequently in several meetings and conferences, travel frequently, and in this process may become disconnected from the grassroots. Nanjundaswamy had also emerged as one such transnational activist and had consequently grown distant from the support base of the movement. This is a challenge of the process of transnational networking and engaging with the anti-globalisation protests. Taking the example of a transnational peasant organisation in Central America, one can also see similar tendencies of professionalisation of networking at the global level. According to Edelman, lack of information flows between ASOCODE and the national and base level organizations created the perception that regional leaders constitute a distant elite (Edelman 1998). He continues, 'ASOCODE's concentration on high-level lobbying and organizational consolidation also meant that many ambitious alternative development plans hashed out in regional seminars have yet to be applied on the ground, yet "to land" or "come down to earth," as the frequent fliers in the leadership put it. Clearly, it is easier and cheaper to be effective in transnational lobbying and information politics than in the

protracted and frustrating work of domestic organizing or the formidable struggle t o raise rural living standards' (Edelman 1998: 77).

Lack of local-global linkage is also evident in KRRS primarily because different issues are perceived differently by different members of the movement primarily because of different class interests, as for example with regard to cultivation of GM, land acquisition and alternative agro-ecological methods of farming. This is because the transnational frame of anti-globalisation does not often match with the opinions at the grassroots. The local and the global issues exist simultaneously within the movement, as only a small group consisting of well educated middle class individuals is engaged in or support transnational networking, whereas the majority of the members, consisting of middle or rich farmers are more concerned about local issues and issues of immediate concern such as prices, loans, electricity charges etc. Though KRRS members are against the 'larger' phenomenon of globalisation, specific and 'smaller' issues are often interpreted differently. It is found that among the member farmers some use fertilisers and also cultivate Bt cotton; some are willing to sell land for a higher compensation; and some poor farmers are not able to practice natural farming methods. This is because there is a distinct difference in perceiving what constitutes the 'local' and the 'global'. The leaders and more specifically the 'networking core' tend to stress the importance of linking 'global' to 'local' and interpreting the local problems as a reflection of the 'larger' process of globalisation, while to the grassroots farmers the distinction between the 'local' and the 'global' is more real and hence they focus on the 'local' as their own or real problems. This

difference in perception is a reflection of different material conditions in the respective milieu and class positions of different members within the movement.

This disconnect between global discourses and local concerns in the case of KRRS, is also because in its transnational network of LVC the dominant ideology is pro-small farmers and peasants and landless. There is also a distinct clash between the composition and consequently ideologies of movements of different class composition. This is a challenge before the process of networking with diverse groups; negotiating identities and ideologies. As a result, the global discourses often do not comply with the demands and ideologies of movements which differ in class composition, and are located in specific contexts and have a different history. Though such differences and heterogeneity are recognised, global discourses are built around commonality of different struggles and notions of a 'global' collective identity. Such tendencies are also visible in the global indigenous movement. Kaushik Ghosh, on the transnational discourse on 'indigeneity', commented:

> '[It] is marked by an awkwardness of fit and a reconfiguration of the political process that ends up excluding vast numbers of the indigenous who are engaged in struggles against neoliberal projects that threaten them with displacement' and this transnational discourse has led to the 'production of a nucleus of new political leaders who no longer need to be involved with the everyday struggles of land and territory but are continually "encouraged" to perform and fit the paradigms of a transnational 'indigenous' subjectivity that has little resonance in the localities occupied by such populations in India' (2006: 502).

Examining the 30-year old Koel-Karo movement of adivasis in Jharkhand, Ghosh points out that as tribal populations are being recognized as 'indigenous', there has been a significant participation of elite adivasi leaders which has affected the

understanding of adivasi culture and indigeneity and there is an enormous divergence between the local identity and the transnational indigenous identity (ibid.).

This divergence between transnational and local identity and also between transnational and local framings is a characteristic feature of the global indigenous movement, the transnational agrarian movements, environment and women's movements. It is a tight rope walk; interpreting the local as an extension of the global, forming a global collective identity including different local identities and emphasizing the commonality *and* recognising the local specificities, the different contexts, histories and identities of movements of a similar kind. Thus, all adivasi movements cannot be necessarily read as indigenous movements, and more importantly, farmer's and peasants movements cannot be clubbed together just by forging a collective identity of 'people of the land'. Such divergence is reflected in the following example: 17th April is the International Peasant Day whereas 22 July is the day KRRS commemorates the killing of two peasants in 1980 which marked the beginning of the movement. Most KRRS members disagree to celebrate 17 th April and for them 22nd July is more meaningful and important.

Currently, struggles against mining and land acquisition have emerged in the last two decades in several corners of the country, for example, against Coca-Cola in Plachimada, Kerala, against POSCO in Jagatsinghpur in Odisha, against Vedanta in Niyamgiri, Odisha, against nuclear power plant in Koodankulam, Tamil Nadu, against TATA Nano factory in Singur, West Bengal, against SEZ by Indonesia based Salim group in Nandigram in West Bengal among several others. These are broadly anti-displacement struggles directed against the state and the larger process of

development and globalisation. In recent years displacement has become intensified due to conditions created by globalisation which favour the growth of mineral-based industries, SEZs, and dams, set up by MNCs and large Indian corporate houses. These struggles raise concerns about environment, human rights to livelihood, tribal rights, and rights to natural resources. All these movements have received outside support from various environment and human rights organizations, intellectuals and regional political parties in varying degrees. Some of these movements got that national level or international level attention, some achieved success and some subsided. Though KRRS and the above mentioned anti-displacement struggles are fighting against globalisation and also by engaging in transnational and national networks, with support from NGOs, funders and political parties, the crucial difference between these movements lie in three respects. One, they have emerged in different decades and contexts. Two, the anti-displacement struggles end once success is achieved, whereas a farmer's movement continues to engage with new issues. Three, the nature of hierarchies within the two are different. However, it is worth comparing these two kinds of movements because of their common stance against globalisation and presence of outside support and national and transnational networks.

The crucial difference is that of hierarchies within the movement. The anti-displacement struggles, though may or may not have a leader, function through committees formed at the local level, whereas KRRS has a hierarchical pyramidal organizational structure. Also, the differences of caste and class within KRRS, and in general within all farmer's movements, makes the composition heterogeneous. This in turn is related to the multiple experiences and perceptions of globalisation and related

issues within the movement, factions and power dynamics. Though KRRS consists of primarily landowners, the difference between a farmer with 2 acres land and one with 50 acres land is evident within the movement. Caste identities become evident during elections, forming divisions within the movement. The multiple perceptions of KRRS members regarding participation in politics, either contesting in elections, or supporting a political party, or leaving the movement to join a political party is a big factor behind the fragmentation of the movement. For such movements which are by nature relatively more heterogeneous with a system of hierarchy within the movement, engaging in transnational networks may create further divisions and factions.

It can be argued that the organisational structure, the presence of hierarchy and heterogeneity, especially with regard to class and caste identities, makes it difficult for a movement to sustain itself during processes of transformation. KRRS during the 1990s got simultaneously engaged in local level mainstream politics and also transnational level of networking. Two kinds of cleavages were formed within the movement during this period – a vertical rift based on differences of class, education and linguistic abilities (only certain leaders got involved in transnational networking) and a horizontal rift based on caste, for example, the segmentation and difference between Lingayats and Vokkaligas (different caste groups started allying, supporting, participating in mainstream politics), resulting in fragmentation within the movement.

To conclude, engagement in anti-globalisation protests and transnational networks like PGA and LVC, along with participation in mainstream politics, has led to fragmentation within the movement. Also, as the movement, like many other farmer's

movements is leader oriented and with the death of Nanjundaswamy, the movement disintegrated a great deal. It was because of Nanjundaswamy that the movement became visible in the 1990s with its protests against globalisation. Most KRRS members are still proud of their engagement in the anti-globalisation protests during the 1990s, and they share a common memory of the 'glorious past'. However, Nanjundaswamy's involvement in several transnational networks created discontent and consequently resulted in formation of small groups within the movement, questioning the leadership and issues of representation, hegemony within the movement and inability to link local and global issues. Today, though the movement is disintegrated with several factions, there is still a collective identity built on 'self-respect' and shared memories which act as forces of integration within the movement. Though engagement in LVC has created greater awareness among members regarding the global economy and processes of globalisation, such ideas usually do not resonate much at the grassroots.

Transnational and national networking with diverse groups, including NGOs has intensified since globalisation and it has enabled movements in certain cases, such as the Zapatistas, Narmada Bachao Andolan and Niyamgiri among several others. However, there are certain challenges a movement faces in the process of elevating its politics from the local and national to the transnational level. Leaders who represent the movement spend more time in attending seminars and lobbying at the international level, and may become disconnected from the support bases. Especially in leader oriented movements, where the leader is the face of the movement, discontent is created at the grassroots, as there is a gap between the local and the

global. This is also because the global discourses often do not match with a movement's specific history, context, organisation, composition and local concerns. Global discourses are built in a way to include different kinds of movements under one umbrella reflecting global concerns and targeting the supranational institutions. Local framings are 'specific' reflecting the local issues, based on specific histories, class composition and ideology of a movement, and primarily targeting the state. It is here that the charismatic leader plays a crucial role in attempting to link the global with the local and also negotiating identities and ideologies at multiple levels. Also, movements which have multiple hierarchies within, based on class, caste, gender tend to get more fragmented in the process of building alliances with NGOs, political parties and other movements at different levels. It can thus be argued that a movement that has relatively homogenous community and members' composition, less hierarchy and a more horizontal form of leadership emerging from the community, may be more able to cope with the challenges of networking especially with regard to representation. Without a strong sense of collective identity among the members of a movement, a movement may disintegrate and become a 'collective of networks' of small groups connected to each other through some common individuals.

References

Almeida, Paul D. and Mark Irving Lichbach 2003. 'To the Internet From the Internet: Comparative Media Coverage of Transnational Protests', *Mobilization: An International Journal*, 8(3): 249-72

Alvarez, Sonia, Evelina Dagnino and Arturo Escobar (eds.) 1998. *Cultures of Politics and Politics of Cultures*. Boulder: Westview Press

Amin S. 1998. *Capitalism in the Age of Globalization*. London and New York: Zed Books

Ansell, C. K. 1997. 'Symbolic networks: The realignment of the French working class, 1887-94', *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. 103: 359-90

_____ 2001. *Schism and Solidarity in Social Movements.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Appadurai A. 2000. 'Grassroots globalization and the research imagination', *Public Culture,* 12(1):1-19

_____ 2006. 'Grassroots Globalisation' in *Fear of Small Number: An Essay on the Geography of Anger,* Public Planet Books. Durham and London: Duke University Press

Armstrong, Elizabeth A. and Mary Bernstein 2008. 'Culture, Power and Institutions: A Multi-institutional approach', *Sociological Theory*, 26(1): 74-99

Arora, Vibha 2012. 'Politics of Class(ness) in the Farmer's Movement in India: Validity of the New Social Movement Paradigm', in D. R. Sahu (ed.), *Sociology of Social Movement (Studies in Indian Sociology Vol. 6)*. New Delhi: Sage Publications

Assadi, Muzaffar 1994. 'Dunkelism and Peasant Protest in Karnataka: A view from within' in *Teaching Politics,* Vol. 20(4): 71-89

_____ 1995. 'Khadi Curtain, Weak Capitalism and Operation Ryot: Some Ambiguities in Farmers' Discourse, Karnataka and Maharashtra 1980 -1995' in Tom Brass (ed.), *New Farmers' Movements in India*. London: Frank Cass

_____ 1997. *Peasant Movement in Karnataka.* New Delhi: Shipra Publications

_____ 1999. 'Third Attack on Multinationals: Badakalu Bandavala's re -enactment of Gandhian Violence' in Ashish Ghosh (ed.), *Dalits and Peasants: The Emergent Caste-Class Dynamics.* New Delhi: Gyan Sagar Publicatons

_____ 2001. 'Globalising the Anti-Globalisation Movement: Caravan, Collectives and Discourse of Authenticity– Notes from Karnataka', *New Quest,* (April-June): 224- 37

_____ 2002. 'Globalisation and the State: Interrogating Farmer's Movement in India', *Journal of Social and Economic Development,* Vol. 4: 42-55

Ayres, Jeffrey M. 2001. 'Transnational Political Processes and Contention Against the Global Economy', *Mobilization: An International Journal,* 6(1):55-68

Basu, A. 1987. 'Grassroots movements and the State: Reflections on Radical Change in India', *Theory and Society*, Vol. 16 (5): 647-674

Baviskar, Amita 1995. *In the belly of the River*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press

Beck, Ulrich 2003. 'The Analysis of Global Inequality: From National to Cosmopolitan Perspective' in M. Kaldor, H. Anheier, and M. Glasius (eds.), *Global Civil Society 2003.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Benford R. D. and S. A. Hunt 1992. 'Dramaturgy and Social Movements: the social construction and communication of power', *Social Inquiry,* Vol. 62:36-55

Benford, Robert 1993. ''You could be the hundreth Monkey': Collective Action Frames and Vocabularies of Motive within the nuclear disarmament movement', *Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 34: 195-216

_____ 1997. 'An Insider's Critique of the Social Movement Framing Perspective', *Sociological Inquiry,* 67(4): 409-30

Benford, Robert and Scott A. Hunt 1992. 'Dramaturgy and Social Movements: The Social Construction and Communicative Power', *Sociological Inquiry,* 62: 36-55

Benford, Robert D. and David Snow 2000. 'Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 26: 611-639

Bentall, Jim and Stuart Corbridge. 1996. 'Urban - Rural relations, demand Politics and the 'New Agrarianism' in Northwest India: The Bharatiya Kisan Union', *Transaction of the Institue of the British Geographers,* New Series, 21(1): 27-48

Bernstein, Henry 2010. *Class dynamics of Agrarian Change.* Canada: Fernwood Publishing

Beteille A. 1979. 'Homo Hierarchicus, Homo Equalis', in *Modern Asian Studies,* 13(4): 529-38

Borras, Saturnino M. Jr. 2004. *La Via Campesina: An Evolving Transnational Movement*. TNI Briefing, Series No. 2004/6. Amsterdam: Transnational Institute

_____ 2008. 'La Via Campesina and its Global Campaign for Agrarian Reform' in Saturnino M. Borras Jr., Marc Edelman and Cristobal Kay (eds.), *Transnational Agrarian Movements confronting globalization*. Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell

Borras, Saturnino M. Jr., Marc Edelman and Crist´obal Kay 2008. 'Transnational Agrarian Movements: Origins and Politics, Campaigns and Impact', in Saturnino M. Borras Jr., Marc Edelman and Cristobal Kay (eds.), *Transnational Agrarian Movements confronting globalization.* Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell

Borras, Saturnino M. Jr. 2010. 'The Politics of Transnational Agrarian Movements' in *Development and Change* 41(5): 771–803. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Bove, J. 2001. 'A farmers' international?' *New Left Review*, Vol. 12: 89-101

Brass, Tom (ed.) 1994. 'Introduction: New Farmers' Movements in India', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 21(3-4) special issue: 3-26

_____1997. 'Agrarian Myth, the 'new' populism and the 'new right'', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 32(3): PE27-42

Brysk, Alison 1996. 'Turning Weakness into Strength: The Internationalisation of Indian Rights', *Latin American Perspectives*, no. 23: 38-57

Buechler, Steven M. 1993. 'Beyond Resource Mobilisation? Emerging Trends in Social Movements Theory', *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34(2): 217-235

_____ 1995. 'New Social Movement Theories', *The Sociological Quarterly*, 36(3): 441-464

_____ 1997. 'Beyond Resource Mobilization?' in S. Buechler and F. Cylke (eds.), *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company

Butler, Judith 1992. 'Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of Post-Modernism' in J. Butler and John W. Scott (eds.), *Feminists Theorize the Political*, (3-21). New York: Routledge

Calderon F., Piscitelli A., Reyna JL. 1992. Social movements: actors, theories, expec- tations. See Alvarez et al 1998, pp. 19-36

Carroll, William, K. and R. S. Ratner. 1996. 'Master Framing and Cross Movement Networking in Contemporary Social Movements', *The Sociological Quarterly,* 37(4): 601- 625.

Castells 1997. *The Information age: Economy, Society and Culture, Vol.2, The Power of Identity.* Oxford: Blackwell

Chandrashekhar C. P. and Jayati Ghosh 2004. 'Agrarian Crisis in Andhra Pradesh' *Business Line*, October 5

Chatterjee, Partha 1989. 'The Nationalist Resolution of the Women's Question' in Kumkum Sanghari and Sudesh Vaid (eds.), *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History*. New Delhi: Kali for Women

Cohen, Robin. 1998. 'Transnational Social Movements: an assessment', Paper presented at the seminar held at the Transnational Communities Programme, School of Geography, University of Oxford on 19 June 19 98

Costain, Ann N. 1992. *Inviting Women's Rebellion: A Political Process Interpretation of the Women's Movement*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press

Cox, K. (ed.) 1997. *Spaces of Globalization: Reasserting the power of the Local.* New York: Guilford Press

Cox, R. W. 1997. 'A Perspective of Globalization' in J. H. Mittelman (ed.), *Globalization: Critical Reflections.* London: Lynne Reiner

De Landa, Manuel 1997. *Meshworks, Hierarchies and Interface.* (http://www.to.or. at/delanda/)

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Della Porta and M. Diani 1999. *Social Movements: An Introduction.* London: Blackwell

Della Porta, D., M. Andretta, L. Mosca and H. Reiter, 2006. *Globalisation from Below: Transnational Activists and Protests Networks*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press

Della Porta, Donatella Della and Lorenzo Mosca 2005. 'Global Net for Global Movements? A Network of Networks for Movement of Movements', *Journal of Public Policy,* 25(1): 165-190

Della Porta, Donatella and Sidney Tarrow 2001. 'The Antiglobal Movement, the Police, and Terrorism', *Items*, 2(3/4):9-11.

_____2005. 'Transnational Processes and Social Activism: An Introduction' in Donatella Della Porta and Sidney Tarrow (eds.), *Transnational Protest and Global Activism.* USA: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Desai, A. R. 1954. *The social background of Indian Nationalism*. Bombay: Popular Prakashan

Desmarais, Annette 2007. *La Via Campesina: Globalization and the Power of Peasants*. Michigan: Fernwood Publications

Dhanagare, D. N. 1983. *Peasant Movements in India 1920-1950*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press

Diani, Mario 1990. 'The Network Structure of the Italian Ecology Movement', *Social Science Information,* 29: 5-31

_____1992. 'Analysing social movement networks', in M. Diani and R. Eyerman (eds.), *Studying Collective Action.* Newbury Park/London: Sage

Diani, Mario and Doug McAdam 2003. *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Edelman, Marc 1998. 'Transnational Peasant Politics in Central America', *Latin American Research Review,* 33(3): 49–86

_____ 2001 'Social Movements: Changing Paradigms and Forms of Politics', *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 30: 285–317

_____ 2003. 'Transnational Peasant and Farmer Movements and Networks', in Helmut Anheier, Marlies Glasius and Mary Kaldor (eds.), *Global Civil Society 2003*, Oxford University Press, Pg 185-220

_____ 2005. 'Bringing the Moral Economy Back in to the Study of 21st Century Transnational Peasant Movements', *American Anthropologist,* 7(3): 331-45

_____ 2009. 'Peasant–Farmer Movements, Third World Peoples, and the Seattle Protests against the World Trade Organization, 1999', *Dialectical Anthropology,* 33(2): 109-28

Edwards, Michael and John Gaventa 2001. *Global Citizen Action. Boulder.* CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers

Eisinger P. K. 1973. 'The conditions of Protest behaviour in American cities', *American Political Science Review,* 67: 11-28

Elshtain, Jean B. 1995. 'Exporting Feminism', *Journal of International Affairs,* no. 48: 541-58

Escobar, Arturo and S. E. Alvarez (eds.) 1992. *The making of new social movements in Latin America*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press

Escobar, Arturo 2004. 'Other Worlds are (Already) Possible: Self-Organisation, Complexity and Post-Capitalist Cultures' in Jai Sen, Anita Anad, Arturo Escobar and Peter Waterman (eds.), *The World Social Forum: Challenging Empires.* New Delhi: Viveka

_____ 2008. *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes.* Durham: Duke University Press

Falk R. 1993. 'The making of global citizenship', in J. B. Childs, J. Brecher, and J. Cutler (eds.), *Global Visions: Beyond the New World Order.* Boston: South End

_____ 1999. *Predatory Globalisation: A Critique.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fals Borda O. 1992. 'Social Movements and Political Power in Latin America' in Arturo Escobar and Sonia Alvarez (eds.), *The Making of Social Movements in Latin America.* Boulder: Westview Press

Fischer, J. 1998. *Nongovernments: NGOs and Political Development of the Third World*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press

Florini , Ann M. 2001. 'Transnational Civil Society' in M. Edwards and J. Gaventa (eds.), *Global Citizen Action.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers

Frank, Andre Gunder and Marta Fuentes 1988. 'Nine Theses on Social Movements' *Economic and Political Weekly*, 32(35) : 1503-1510

Freeden, Michael 1996. *Ideology and Political Theory.* Oxford: Clarendon Press

Friedmann, H. 1987. 'International Regimes of Food and Agriculture since 1870', in T. Shanin (ed.), *Peasants and Peasant Societies*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Froehling, Oliver 1997. 'The Cyberspace "war of Ink and Internet" in Chiapas, Mexico', *Gepgraphical Review*, 87(2): 291-307

Gamson, William A. 1988. 'Political Discourse and Collective Action' in Aldon Morriss and C. Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

_____ 1990. *The Strategy of Social Protest* (2nd edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth

_____ 1992. *Talking Politics.* New York: Cambridge University Press

_____ 1995. 'Constructing social protest' see Benford and Snow 2000

Gamson William A. and David Meyer 1996. 'Framing Political Opportunity', in McAdam et. al. (eds.) *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Garner, Roberta Ash 1994. 'Transnational Movements in Postmodern Society', *Peace Review,* 6

Gaventa, John 2001. 'Global Citizen Action: Lessons and Challenges' in M. Edwards and J. Gaventa (eds.), *Global Citizen Action.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers

Gerhards J. and D. Rucht 1992. 'Mesomobilization: organizing and framing in two protest campaigns in West Germany', *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol.98: 555-95

Ghosh, Kaushik 2006. 'Between Global Flows and Local Dams: Indigenousness, Locality and Transnational Sphere in Jharkhand, India', *Cultural Anthropology,* Vol. 21(4): 501-534

Ghurye, G. S. 1950. Caste and Class in India. Bombay: Popular Book depot

Gill, Sucha Singh 1985. 'Genesis of Punjab Problem' in Abida Samiuddin (ed.), *The Punjab Crisis: Challenge and Response*. New Delhi: Mittal Publishers

_____ 2004. 'Farmer's Movement: Continuity and Change' *Economic and Political Weekly,* 39(27): 2964-2966

Giugni, Marco G. 1998. 'Was It Worth the Effort? The Outcomes and Consequences of Social Movements', *Annual Review of Sociology,* 24: 371- 393.

Goffman, Erving 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience* . Boston: North Eastern University Press

Goldstone, Jack A. (ed.) 2003. *States, Parties and Social Movements.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Goodwin, Jeff 1997. 'The Libidinal Constitution of a High Risk Social Movement: Affectual ties and Solidarity in the Huk Rebellion, 1946 -54', *American Sociological Review,* 62: 53-69

Goodwin, Jeff and James M. Jasper 1999. 'Caught in a Winding Snarling Vine: The structural bias of Political Process theory', in *Sociological Forum,* vol. 14: 27-53

Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper and Jaswinder Khattra 1999. 'Caught in a Winding, Squarling Vine: The Structural Bias of Political Process Theory', *Sociological Forum,* Vol. 14: 27-54

Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper and F. Polletta 2000. 'Return of the Repressed', *Mobilization,* 5: 65-84

Goodwin, Jeff and James M. Jasper (eds.) 2003. *The Social Movements Reader – Cases and Concepts.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers

Gore, M. S. 1989. *Non-Brahman Movement in Maharashtra.* New Delhi: Segment Distributors

Gough, E. K. 1960. 'Caste in a Tanjore Village' in E. R. Leach (ed.), *Aspects of Caste in Southern India, Ceylon, and North-west Pakistan* (11-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Gowda, Chandan 2010. 'Many Lohias? Appropriations of Lohia in Karnataka', *Economic and Political Weekly,* vol. XLV no. 40: 78-84

Gramsci, Antonio. 1976. *Selections from Prison Notebooks.* London: Lawrence and Wishart

_____ 1971. *Selections from Prison Notebooks.* Edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishart

Guha, Ramchandra (ed.) 1989. 'New Social Movements. T he Problem' *Seminar,* no. 355

Gupta, Dipankar 1980. 'From Varna to Jati: The Indian Caste System, from the Asiatic to the Feudal Mode of Production', *Journal of Contemporary Asia,* 10(3):249-71

_____ 1982. *Nativism in a metropolis: The Shiv Sena in Bombay*. New Delhi: Manohar Publications

_____ 1988. 'Country-Town Nexus and Agrarian Mobilisation: Bharatiya Kisan Union as an Instance', *Economic and Political weekly,* 23(51):2688-2696

_____ 2005. 'Caste and Politics: Identity over System' *Annual Review of Anthropology,* vol. 34: 409-427

Habermas, J. 1976. *Legitimation Crisis.* (trans. T. McCarthy) London: Heinemann

Harriss, John 1982. *Capitalism and Peasant Farming: A study of agricultural change and agrarian structure in northern Tamil Nadu.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press

Harvey, David 1989. *The Condition of Post-Modernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change.* Oxford: Blackwell

_____ 1996. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers

Held, David, A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt, and J. Perraton 1999. *Global Transformation: Politics, Economy and Culture.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Held, David and A. McGrew 2000. 'The great Globalisation debate' in David Held and A. McGrew (eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization debate.* Cambridge: Polity Press

Herring, Robert J. 2006. 'Why did Operation Creamate Monsanto Fail?', *Critical Asian Studies*, Vol. 38(4): 467-93

Hirst, P. and G. Thompson. 1996. *Globalisation in Question.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Holt-Gimenez, Eric 2006. *Campesino a Campesino: Voices from Latin America's Farmer to Farmer Movement for Sustainable Agriculture.* Oakland, CA: Food First Books

Hunt, S. A., Robert Benford and David Snow 1994. 'Identity fields: framing processes and the social construction of movement identities', in see Benford and Snow 2000

Ibrahim, S. E. 1995. 'Civil society and Prospects of Democratization in the Arab World', in A. R. Norton (ed.), *Civil Society in the Middle East,* Vol.1. New York: Leiden

Ikegame, Aye 2010. 'Why do backward castes need their own gurus? The social and political significance of new caste-based monasteries in Karnataka', *Contemporary South Asia*, 18(1): 57-70

Jaffrelot, C. 2003. *India's Silent Revolution: The Rise of the Low Castes in North Indian Politics.* New Delhi: Permanent Black

Jasper, J. M. and J. D. Poulsen 1995. 'Recruiting strangers and friends: moral shocks and social networks in animal rights and anti-nuclear protests', *Social Problems*, Vol. 42: 493-512

Jasper, J. M. 1998. 'Emotions of Protest: Reactive and Affective emotions in and around social movements', *Sociological Forum,* 13:397-424

Jenkins, Craig J. 1983. 'Resource Mobilisation Theory and the Study of Social Movement', *Annual Review of Sociology,* Vol.9: 527-553

Jodhka, Surinder S. 2006. 'Beyond Cirses: Rethinking Contemporary Punjab Agriculture', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41(16): 1530-1537

Johnston, Hank and John A. Noakes 2005. 'Frames of Protest: A Road Map to a Perspective' in Hank Johnston and John A. Noakes (eds .), *Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers

Jordan, Glenn, and Chris Weedon 1995. *Cultural Politics: Class, Gender, Race and the Post-modern World.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Juris, Jeffery S. 2005. 'The New Digital Media and Activist Networking within Anti - Corporate Globalisation Movements', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 597: 198- 208

Kamat, Sangeeta 2002. *Development Hegemony: NGOs and the State in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press

Kapadia K. 1995. *Siva and her sisters: Gender, Caste and Class in rural South India.* Boulder: Westview Press

Karanth, G. K. 1996. 'Caste in Contemporary Rural India' in M. N. Srinivas (ed.), *Caste: Its Twentieth Century Avatar*. New Delhi: Penguin

_____1997. 'Caste after Fifty Years of Independence', *Review of Development and Change* 2(2): 319-37

Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Khagram, Sanjeev 2004. *Dams and Development: Transnational Struggles for Water and Power.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven Wilkinson (eds.) 2007. *Patrons, Clients and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Knox, Hannah, Mike Savage and Penny Harvey 2006. 'Social Networks and the Study of relations: Networks as method, metaphor and form', *Economy and Society*, 35(1): 113-140

Kohli, Atul 1987. *The State and Poverty in India: The Politics of Reform*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Koopmans, Rudd 1993. 'The Dynamics of Protest Waves: West Germany, 1965 to 1989', *American Sociological Review,* 58: 637-58

Kothari, Rajni (ed.) 2010. *Caste in Indian Politics*, 2nd edition, revised by James Manor. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan

_____ 1984. 'The Non-Party Political Process', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 19 (5): 216-224

Kreisi, Hanspeter 1995. 'The Political Opportunity Structure of New Social Movements: Its Impact on their Mobilization', in Jenkins and Klandermans (eds.), *The Politics of Social Protest*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Kripa, A. P. 1995. 'Raitha Sangha's Political Dilemma', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 30(3): 140- 141.

Krishna, Anirudh 2007. 'Politics in the middle: mediating relationships between the citizens and the state in rural North India', in Herbert Kitschelt and Steven Wilkinson (eds.), *Patrons, Clients and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 141-158

Kuruganti, Kavitha 2006 'Biosafety and Beyond: GM crops in India', *Economic and Political Weekly***,** October 7: 4245-4247

Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Moufffe 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London: Verso

Langman, Lauren and Douglas Morris 2003. 'Globalization and Social Movements: The Impact of the WSF', Presentation at the American Sociological Association Meetings, August. Atlanta, GA: American Sociological Association

Latour, Bruno 1997. 'The trouble with Actor-network theory', (http://www.ensmp.fr/ffilatour/poparticles/poparticle/po67.html)

Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell

Levien, Michael 2007. 'India's Double-Movement: Polanyi and National Alliance for People's Movements', *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 51:119-149

Lindberg, Staffan 1994. 'The new farmer's movement in India as structural response and collective identity formation: The cases of Shetkari Sangathana and Bharatiya Kisan Union', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 21(3-4): 95-125

_____ 2005. 'Whom and What to Fight? Notes and Queries on Indian Farmers Collective Action under Liberalisation and Globalisation', unpublished seminar paper. Patiala: Punjabi University

Madsen, Stig Toft 2001. 'The View from Vevey', *Economic and Political Weekly*, September 29: 3733-42

Maney, Gregory M. 2001. 'Rival Transnational Networks and Indigenous Rights: The San Blas Kuna in Panama and the Yanomami in Brazil', *Research In Social Movements, Conflicts and Change,* Vol. 23: 103-144.

Manor, James 1977. 'Strcutural Changes in Karnataka Politics', *Economic and Political Weekly,* 12(44): 1865+1867-1869

_____ 1997. *The Political Economy of Decentralisation*. The World Bank, August.

_____ 2007. 'Change in Karnataka over the Last Generation: Villages and the Wider Context', *Economic and Political Weekly,* vol. 42(8): 653-660

_____ 2010. 'Prologue', in Rajni Kothari (ed.), *Caste in Indian Politics.* xii-lxi New Delhi: Orient Blackswan

Mayo, Marjorie 2005. *Global Citizens: Social Movements and Challenge of Globalisation.* Toronto: Zed Books

McAdam, D. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

McCarthy 1994. 'Activists, authorities and media framing of drunk driving', see Benford and Snow 2000

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald 1977. 'Resource Mobilisation and Social Movements: A Partial Theory', *American Journal of Sociology,* 82(6): 1212-41

McMichael, Phillip. 1994. 'Rethinking Globalisation: The Agrarian Question Revisited', *Review of International Political Economy,* 4(4): 630- 662.

_____ 2008. 'Peasants Make their Own History, But Not Just as They Please . . .', *Journal of Agrarian Change,* 8(2&3): 205–28

_____ 2009. 'A food regime geneology', *Journal of Peasant Studies,* 36(1): 139-69

_____ 2010. 'Food Sovereignty in Movement: Addressing the triple crisis' in Hannah Wittman, Annette Desmarais and Nettie Wiebe (eds.), *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature and Community.* Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing

Meillasoux C. 1973. 'Are there Castes in India?' in *Economy and Society,* 2(1): 85-111

Melucci, Alberto 1980. 'The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach', *Social Science Information,* Vol.19: 199-226

_____ 1988. 'Getting involved: Identity and Mobilisation in S ocial Movements', in B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi and S. Tarrow (eds.), *From Structure to Action: Comparing Movement Participation Across Cultures.* Greenwich, Conn: JAI

_____ 1989. *Nomads of the Present.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press

_____ 1996. *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Mencher, J. P. 1974. 'The Caste System Upside Down or the not -so Mysterious East', *Current Anthropology,* 15(4): 469-93

Meyer, David S. 1990. *A Winter of Discontent: The Nuclear Freeze and American Politics.* New York: Praeger

_____ 1993. 'Institutionalizing Dissent: The United States Structure of Political Opportunity and the End of the Nuclear Freeze', *Sociological Forum,* 8: 157-79

_____ 1995. 'Framing national security: elite public discourse on nuclear weapons during the Cold War', See Benford and Snow 2000

Meyer, David S. and Susanne Staggenbourg 1996. 'Movements, Counter -Movements and the Structure of Political Opportunity', *American Journal of Sociology,* 101(6): 1628-1660

Meyer, David S. and Sidney G. Tarrow. 1998. *The Social Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Meyer, David S. 1999. 'Tending the Vineyard: Cultivating Political Process Research', *Sociological Forum,* 14(1): 79-92

_____ 2003. 'Political Opportunity and nested Institutions', *Social Movement Studies,* Vol 2: 17-35

_____ 2004. 'Protest and Political Opportunities', *Annual Review of Sociology,* vol. 30: 125-145

Meyer, David S. and Debra C. Minkoff 2004. 'Conceptualizing Political Opportunity', *Social Forces,* 82(4): 1457-1492

Midgal J.S. 1988. *Strong Societies and Weak States: State -Society Relations and State capabilities in the Third World*, Princeton University Press, Princeton

Mohanty, B. B. 2011. 'Introduction' in B.B. Mohanty (ed.), *Agrarian Change and Mobilisation*. New Delhi: Sage Publications

Mohanty, Manoranjan 2004. 'Dimensions of Power and Social Transformation' in Manoranjan Monhanty (ed.), *Class, Caste and Gender: Readings on Indian Government and Politcs*, Sage Publications

Morrice, David 1996. *Philosophy, Science and Ideology in Political Thought,* Macmillan, Basingstoke

Morriss, A. 2000. 'Reflections on Social Movements Theory: Criticisms and Proposals' in *Contemporary Sociology* 29(3): 445-454

Mosse, David. 2005. *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice.* London: Pluto Press

Mukherji, Partha N. 1977. 'Social movements and social change' *Sociological Bulletin,* 26(1)

_____ 1987. 'Study of social conflicts: Case of Naxalbari peasant movement', *Economic and Political Weekly,* 19 September, 22(38): 1607-17

Mukherji, Partha N. and Bhupati B. Sahoo 1992. 'Agrarian Structure, Contradiction and Mobilisation: A Framework for the analysis of Emerging Rural Power', *Social Scientist,* Vol. 20 (9/10): 77-86

Myers, Daniel J. 2002. 'Social Activism through Computer Networks', in Orville Vernon Burton (ed.) *Renaissance in Social Science Computing.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press

Nadkarni, M. V. 1987. *Farmers' Movements in India*. Ahmedabad: Allied Publishers, Pvt. Ltd.

Nair, Janaki 1993. 'Badanavala Killings: Signs for the Dalit Movement in Karnataka', *Economic and Political Weekly,* vol. 28(19): 911-912

Nandy, Ashis 2000. 'The Political Culture of the Indian State', in Zoya Hasan (ed.), *Politics and the State in India; Readings in Indian Government and Politics* (vol. 3). New Delhi: Sage Publications

Narayanan, S. 2005. *Organic Farming in India: Relevance, Problems and Constraints*. Mumbai: Department of Economic Analysis and Research, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development

Natrajan, Balmurali 2005. 'Caste, Class and Community in India: An Ethnographic Approach', *Ethnology,* 44(3): 227-241

Naughton, John 2001. 'Contested Space: The Internet and Global Civil S ociety' in Helmut Anheier, Marlies Glasius, and Mary Kaldor (eds.), *Global Civil Society Yearbook 2001.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nilsen, Alf Gunvald 2007. 'On New Social Movements and the Reinvention of India', *Forum for Development Studies, NUPI* no. 2: 271- 293

Norval, Aletta J. 2000 'Things we do with words: Contemporary approaches to analysis of ideology', *British Journal of Political Science,* Vol. 30, no. 2: 313-46

Oliver, E., Pamela and Hank Johnston. 2000. 'What a Good Idea! Ideologies and Frames in Social Movement Research', *Mobilisation 4:* 37-54.

Oliver, Pamela E., Jorge Cadena Roa and Kelly D. Strawn 2003. 'Emerging Trends in the Study of Protest and Social Movements', *Political Sociology for the 21st Century, Research in Political Sociolo gy,* Vol. 12: 213-244

Omvedt, Gail 1984. 'Ecology and social movements', *Economic and Political Weekly,* XIX (44): 1865-67

_____ 1991. 'Shetkari Sangathana's new direction', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 26(40): 2287-91

_____ 1992. 'Capitalist Agriculture and Rural Classes in India' in B. Berberoglu (ed.), *Class, State and Development in India.* New Delhi: Sage Publications

_____ 1993. *Reinventing Revolution: New Social Movements and the socialist tradition in India.* New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

_____ 2006. 'Farmers' Movements and the Debate on Poverty and Economic Reforms in India', in Raka Ray and Mary Fainsod Katzenstein (eds.), *Social Movements in India: Poverty, Power and Politics.* USA: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers

Oomen, T. K. 1972. *Charisma, Stability and Change: An Analysis of Bhoodan - Gramdan Movement in India.* New Delhi: Thomson Press

_____ 1977. 'Sociological Issues in the analysis of social movements in independent India', *Sociological Bulletin,* 26(1): 14-37

Panini, M. N. 1999. 'Trends in Cultural Globalisation: Agriculture to Agribusiness in Karnataka', *Economic and Political Weekly,* 34(31): 2168-2173

Parajuli, P. 1991. 'Power and Knowledge in Development Discourse: New Social Movements and the State in India', *International Social Science Journal,* no. 127: 173-90

Patnaik, Utsa 1976. 'Class Differentiation within Peasantry: An approach to analysis of Indian Agriculture', *Economic and Political Weekly,* 11(39):82-101

_____ 2004. 'The Principal Task on the Agrarian Front', *Social Scientist* 32(7/8): 36-41

Pattenden, Jonathan 2005. 'Trickle-Down Solidarity, Globalisation and dynamics of Social Transformation in South Indian village', *Economic and Political Weekly,* 40(19): 1975+1977-1985

Piven, F. F. and R. A. Cloward 1977. *Poor People's Movements.* New York: Vintage

Polanyi, Karl 2001. *The Great Transformation: The Political Economic Origins of our Time.* Boston: Beacon Press

Polleta, F. 1999. '"Free spaces" in collective action', *Theory and Society*, Vol. 28: 1-38

Polletta, Francesca and James M. Jasper 2001. 'Collective Identity and Social Movements', *Annual Review of Sociology,* 27: 283-305

Pratt, Nicola 2004. 'Bringing Politics Back in: Examining the Link between Globalization and Democratization', *Review of International Political Economy,* 11(2): 311-336

Rao, M. S. A. 1978. 'Conceptual Problems in the Study of Social Movements', in M.S.A. Rao (ed.), *Social Movements in India.* Vol. 1. New Delhi: Manohar

Ray, Raka and Mary Fainsod Katzenstein (eds.) 2006. *Social Movements in India: Poverty, Power and Politics.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press

Reddy, Ram and G. Haragopal 1985. 'The Pyraveekar: The "Fixer" in Rural India', *Asian Survey* vol. 25(11): 1148-1162

Rheingold, Howard. 2002. *Smart Mobs: the Next Social Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing

Ribeiro G. L. 1998. Cybercultural politics: political activism at a distance in a transnational world. See Alvarez et al 1998, pp. 325-52

Riles, Annelise 2000. *The Network Inside Out.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press

Robinson, William. 1998. 'Beyond nation-State Paradigms: Globalisation, Sociology and the Challenge of Transnational Studies', *Sociological Forum*, 13(4): 561-594.

Robnett, B. 2004. 'Emotional resonance, social location and strategic framing', *Sociological Focus,* 37(3): 195-212

Rosen, Michael 1996. *On Voluntary Servitude: False Consciousness and the Theory of Ideology.* Cambridge: Polity Press

Routledge, Paul. 2003. 'Convergence Space: Process Geographies of Grassroots Globalisation Networks', Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, *New Series*, 28(3): 333-349.

Rubin, Jeffrey W. 2004. 'Meanings and Mobilizations: A Cultural Politics Approach to the study of social movements and state', *Latin American Research Review,* 39(3): 106-142

Rucht, D. 1989. 'Environmental movement organisations in West Germany and France', in B. Klandermans (ed.), *Organisations for Change.* Greenwich Conn.: JAI Press

_____ 2004. 'Movements, Allies, Adversaries and Third Parties', in D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kreisi (eds.), *Blackwell Companion to Social Movements.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Rudolph, L. I. and Rudolph, S. H. 1967. *The Modernity of Tradition.* Chicago: University of Chicago

_____ 1987. *In Pursuit of Laksmi. The Political Economy of Indian State.* Chicago: University of Chicago

Rudra, Ashok 1978. 'Loans as a part of Agrarian Relations: Some results of a preliminary survey in West Bengal', *Economic and Political Weekly,* 12(22, 23, 24): 916-23, 963-68, 998-1003

Sahai, Suman (ed.) 1998. *Microorganisms and Intellectual Property Rights.* Gene Campaign

Sahasrabudhey, Sunil 1989. *Peasant Movement in India.* Chicago: Chicago University Press

Said, Yahia and Meghnad Desai. 2003. 'Trade and Global Civil Society: the Anti - Capitalist Movement Revisited', in M. Kaldor, H. Anheier, and M. Glasius (eds.), *Global Civil Society 2003.* London: Oxford University Press

Sanghvai, Sanjay 2007. 'The New People's Movements in India', *Economic and Political Weekly,* Dec. 15:111-117

Sassen, Saskia 2002. 'Global Cities and Diasporic Networks: Microsites in Global Civil Society', in M. Glasius, M. Kaldor, and H. Anheier (eds.), *Global Civil Society 2002.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Schuurman, Jur 1995. 'La Via Campesina at the Crossroads', *Development in Practice,* 5(2): 149-154

Scoones, Ian 2008. 'Mobilizing against GM crops in India, South Africa and Brazil' in Saturnino M. Borras Jr., Marc Edelman and Cristobal Kay (eds.), *Transnational Agrarian Movements confronting Globalisation.* Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell

Sethi, Harsh. 1984. 'Groups in a New: Politics of Transformation', *Economic and Political Weekly,* 19 (7): 305-316

Shah, Ghanshyam 1990. *Social Movements in India: A Review of Literature*. New Delhi: Sage Publications

_____ (ed.) 2002. *Caste and Democratic Politics in India.* New Delhi: Permanent Black

_____ (ed.) 2002a. *Social Movements and the State.* New Delhi: Sage Publications

Sharma, K. L. 1986. *Caste, Class and Social Movements*. New Delhi: Rawat Publications

Sheth, D. L. 1999. 'Secularisation of Caste and Making of New Middle Class', *Economic and Political Weekly,* August 21-28: 2502-12

_____ 2004. Globalisation and New Politics of Micro-Movements, *Economic and Political Weekly,* 39 (1): 45-58

Shiva, Vandana 2001. *Patents: Myths and Reality.* New Delhi: Penguin Books

Shiva, Vandana, Ahsok Emani and Afsar Jafri 1999. 'Globalisation and Threat to Food Security: Case of Transgenic Cotton Trials in India', *Economic and Political Weekly,* 34(10): 601-13

Sikkink, Kathryn. 1993. 'Human Rights, Principled Issue, Networks, and Sovereignty in Latin America', *International Organisation,* 47(3): 411-441.

Simon, Roger 2001. *Gramsci's Political Thought: An Introduction.* London: The Electric Book Company

Singh, Rajendra 1988. *Land, power and people: Rural Elite in transition, 1801-1970*. New Delhi: Sage Publications

Singh, Y. 1986. *Indian Sociology, social conditioning and emerging concerns.* New Delhi: Vistaar Publications

Sklair, Leslie 2002. *Globalisation, Capitalism and its Alternatives* (3rd edn.). Oxford: Oxford University Press

Smith, Jackie. 2001. 'Globalizing Resistance: The Battle of Seattle and the Future of Social Movements', *Mobilization,* 6(1): 1-21

_____ 2008. *Social Movements for Global Democracy.* USA: The John Hopkins University Press

Smith, Jackie G. and Hank Johnston. 2002. 'Globalization and Resistance: an Introduction', in Jackie Smith and Hank Johnston (eds.), *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers

Snow, David A. and Pamela Oliver 1995. 'Social Movements and Collective Behaviour: Social Psychological Dimensions and Considerations', in Karen Cook, Gary Fine and James House (eds.), *Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Snow, David A. and Robert Benford 1988. 'Ideology, Frame Resonance and Participant Mobilisation', in B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi and S. Tarrow (eds.), *From Structure to Action: Comparing Movement Participation Across Cultures.* Greenwich, Conn: JAI

Snow, David A. and Robert Benford 2005. 'Clarifying the Relationship between Framing and Ideology' in Hank Johnston and John A. Noakes (eds.), *Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective.* Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield

Sood, A. D. 2006. *The matha state: Kinship, asceticism and institutionality in the public life of Karnataka*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago

Srinivas, M. N. 1955. 'The social structure of a Tanjore Village', in McKim Marriott (ed.), *Village India.* Chicago: Chicago University Press

Staggenborg, Suzanne 1988. 'The Consequences of Professionalization and Formalization in the Pro-Choice Movement', *American Sociological Review*, 53:585-606

Tarrow, Sidney 1988. 'National Politics and Collective Action: Recent Theory and Research in Western Europe and the US', *Annual Reviews of Sociology,* Vol. 14: 421-440

_____ 1989. *Democracy and Disorder: Protest and Politics in Italy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

_____ 1994. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Mass Politics in the Modern State.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

_____ 1996. 'States and Opportunitues', in McAdam, McCarthy and Zald (eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

_____ 1998. *Power in Movement – Social Movements and Contentious Politics* (2nd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

_____ 2002. 'The New Transnational Contention: Organisations, Coalitions and Mechanisms', see della Porta et.al. 2006

_____ 2006. *The New Transnational Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Taylor, V. and Whittier N. 1992. 'Collective identity in social movement communities: Lesbian feminist mobilisation' in A. Morris and C. Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory.* New Haven: Yale University Press

Thakur, Manish 2012. 'Global Discourses and Local Mobilisations: The case of 'Barh Mukti Abhiyan'', in D. R. Sahu (ed.), *Sociology of Social Movement in India*. New Delhi: Sage Publications

Thimmaiah G. and Abdul Aziz 1983. The Political Economy of Land Reforms in Karnataka, A South Indian State', *Asian Survey,* vol. 23(7): 810-829

Tilly, Charles 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*, Addison-Wesley

_____ 2004. 'Social Movements Enter the Twenty-first Century', in Charles Tilly, *Social Movements 1768-2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers

Touraine, A. 1981. *The Voice and the Eye*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

_____ 1985. An introduction to the study of social movements. *Soc. Res*. 52: 749-88

Wallerstein, Immanuel 2006. 'Anti-systemic movements: History and Dilemmas', in Samir Amin, Giovanni Arrighi, Andre Gunder Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein (eds.), *Transforming the Revolution: Social Movements and the World System*. New Delhi: Aakar Books (first published in 1990)

_____ 2000. 'Globalisation, or the Age of Transition? A Long term View of the Trajectory of the World System', *International Sociology,* 15(2): 249-65

Wapner, Paul 1996. *Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics.* New York: SUNY Press

Weiner, Myron 1989. *The Indian Paradox: Essays in Indian Politics.* Michigan: Sage Publications

White A. M. 1999. 'Talking Black: micro-mobilisation processes in collective protest against rape', see Benford and Snow 2000

White, Jenny B. 2002. *Islamist Mobilization in Turkey: A Study in Vernacular Politics.* Seattle and London: University of Washington Press

Wignaraja, Ponna (ed.) 1993. *New Social Movements in the South – Empowering the People.* New Delhi: Vistaar Publications

Wittman, Hannah, Annette Desmarais and Nettie Wiebe 2010. 'The origins and potential of foos sovereignty', in Hannah Wittman, Annette Desmarais and Nettie Wiebe (eds.), *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature and Community.* Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing

Yeung, Henry Wai-chung 1998. 'Capital, State and Space: Contesting th e Borderless World', in *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 23(3): 291-309

Zald, M. N. 1992. 'Looking backward to look forward: Reflections on the past and future of the resource mobilization research paradigm', in A. D. Morriss and C. M. Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers of Social Movement theory.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press