

**Dhiraj Kumar and Niharranjan Mishra**

## **PRODUCING SOCIAL NATURE: THE POLITICAL ECOLOGY OF STATE**

### **Introduction**

In a context of globalization and neoliberalization, the nation states of the global world are increasingly confronted with the new pace of commercialization. Various large scale actors including state itself, capitalist body and entrepreneurs are looking at nature to produce it again and again to generate quantitative growth and surplus. In this neoliberal postmodern era, it seems that nature became subordinate subjects of the state developmental agenda. The role of the state in shaping the nature is much greater than earlier. The paper would attempt to discuss the state role in producing a socio-political nature. It is a fact that the rapid changes in technological and social area problematize the idea of nature. Nature independence is at danger end and if it continue to decline in future at this pace then production of nature become a norm (Castree, 1995; Bryant& Bailey (1997); and Escobar (1996). In this vein Aidan Davison (2001:66) has mentioned the assertion of Bill McKibben who told that nature has ended. For greening the nature along with quantitative development, the Brundtland report reformulated the concept of growth as sustainable development but economic development serves top position in comparison to environment or ecology (Padel 2013). The conceptualization of nature as wilderness or as untouched, virgin, less machinery is losing their explanatory power. So there is needed to look at the social reality of development of contemporary era that has rooted in capitalism.

Capitalism was a gradually global economic system and political ecology insights seemed to have a vital applicability and relevance to explore a materialized nature whose root is in capitalism. In this vein, for capitalism, Amin (2006) has mentioned two kinds of discourses to understand the root of capitalism. Firstly he talked about the CMP; capitalist mode of production and his emphasizes on the class struggle, class formation etc. then he moved onward and argues about the vary dimension of capitalist reality that promotes unequal distribution. For Samir Amin (2010) it is "actually existing capitalism". Capitalism creates its own barriers to growth by destroying its

---

**DHIRAJ KUMAR**, Research Fellow, Department of HS, NIT Rourkela, *E-mail: dhirajsociology@gmail.com* and **NIHARRANJAN MISHRA**, Associate Professor, Department of HS, NIT Rourkela, *E-mail: niharhcu@gmail.com*

own ecological condition of production. Nature is a contested term and it means that different things to different people (Ginn & Demeritt 2008). Different scholar defines nature in their own ways and the different meaning of the nature is as essence, material place external to humanity and universal laws. But the present study will use political ecology lens to describe nature and it will be discussed later in other part of the study. Escobar (1999) argues that nature is socially constructed. There is no real nature and it is made up of the political economy and ecology. Ecology is the base of the condition of the nature production. In this process first the external physical condition and the natural elements entering into capital. Through the framework of political ecology, the paper will discuss the way state interacts with 'social nature' and in this vein the endeavour of this paper is to reappraise nature and state.

### **How State Produce Nature: Emerging Sites of Political Ecology**

The word nature is perhaps the most complex in the [English] language' (Williams 1985).

Nature is a complex concept because it differs from animals to human to non-human entities and it goes beyond. Nature has a multiple meaning and dimension. This section will demonstrate the meaning of social nature and my endeavor is to demarcate the discussion of nature into following question; How nature is constructed, produced and a subject of accumulation. Smith (1984: 18) observes, "Nature separate from society has no meaning. Defining nature is a complex, multiple and highly political process (Goldman & Turner 2011). It can be observed by looking at the knowledge, management of a nature. State impact on nature is a kind of decision making processes and politics of a sovereign state to legitimize the neoliberal economic agenda of capitalism. Appadurai (1986) argues that nature may exist outside the society, but as a resource it has a social life. The 'social life of the resource' is better understood as part of 'government' (Rose 1999) rules, technologies, rationalities and institutions. For example, Shiva (1986) has posited that 'rich forests and common land category were considered 'waste' in the pre-colonial time. Shiva (1986:613) refers wasteland as a land category that did not generate revenue, but new state legislature of the land made land as a revenue generator. Nature has a cultural value and in the broader sense it has assumed that its value resides in their material use value. Value and ethics of the resources determine the solidarity of the state economy. The waste land, forest land and revenue land all came in the reign of the capitalist economy to generate surplus. Gadgil and Guha (1992) argue that Modernity gave nature a social life by investing too much into its geography. Also, to Ludden (2003), nature may begin its social life in state territorial domains where several legislatures, policies mobilized the natural resources from hand to hand, place to place, and give the social and cultural identity to nature and its resources. The politics over accessing the natural resources treat identities, 'interest', which is a product

of the modern economy. Baviskar (2008:7) further added that culture determines the identity and interest of the individual or the community; 'itself as a site of political struggle. So, it is necessary to look into the social life of the nature. Political ecology as a theoretical framework able to explore the politics over nature because political ecology itself is rooted in production of nature that mainly have carried the issues of economic, social and cultural along with the political to understand the way nature is produced or reproduced by the state and capitalist bodies. It helps to understand the politics that produce the nature and after what produced by it (Neumann 2014:120). The state mainly the modern one, a capitalist one, is developed gradually from the 18 century onward. Controlling the nature and access to land and resources appears to a sustainable kind of state agendas. It is a fact that the national park, biodiversity conservation, dam construction and major ecological project are in the place where ecological natives lived from time immemorial but the resource and nature valuation affect the ways people lives. Pelusco in DuPuis *et al.* (1996: 136) mentions that

A state or state agency's capacity to enforce this construction of tamed and wild places, and of legitimate and illegitimate users, has both political and economic consequences, affecting the state's perceived legitimacy locally and internationally.

Cindi Katz in Braun and Castree (2005) observed that nature is for state is an accumulative strategy. He observed nature from the instrumentalist view and mention that nature is the source of value. State has a capital purview in the nature. Cindi Katz (2005) has mentioned three observations on accumulative strategy. Nature seems as an arena for investment in future, secondly he talked that to secure the interest of investment at all scales nature has been commodified and finally he talked about the restructuring of the traditional means and mode of access. To understand nature as a reserve, pristine, forest are always constructed, produced and historical. Nature became an event of resource commodities what Polanyi has told as fictitious commodities. Today socialized nature a kind of nature in itself is human created i.e. biodiversity reserves and park zone and forest ranges are the historically produced and socially constructed through knowledge power discourses. Neoliberal state relation with the nature is a kind of politics that serve the socio natural relation of the capitalist process. The process of politics can be seen as once nature and its resources are being territorialized and set aside in governable space in the name of development, public interest and public purposes or getting accumulated by other means to set up the industry. As a process it also normalizes the fictitious commodities. In this vein, Watts *et al.* (2010) call it as commodification of everything.

In the era of neoliberalism, conservation and privatization is mutually mixed up by the state. State make a park, ecological zone, bank of diversity and also work for preserving the natural resources at the same time state

allow extracting industry to generate more capital. Nature which is aside the local people became alien. State did it through several legislature and policy. State making of ecological zones, national park or preservation is an imperative kind of accumulative strategy of state. Preservation is the state politics and it show that nature can be located, fixed and produced outside the common societal culture. The undisturbed nature which nurtures the people and society are vanished by the state. State produced a politics of exclusion and inclusion in which ecological native who live in laps of nature from time immemorial are excluded and state along with capitalist bodies get included. Timothy Luke (1995) talked about the politics of preservation. He observed a case that the land preserved in the name of environment conservation will serve as memorials of environmental exploitation. The government policies on preservation and ecological restoration including ecological niche park is also for the administrative setup what Peluso and Vandergeest in Peet et.al (2011:264) observed a specific case from Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia and argued that "taking the jungle out of the forest." They show how state set a boundary between forests and agricultural land and how forest became a political forest in which preservation and ecological restoration is a kind of state action to push nature into governable territory. Restoration is a re-socialization of the nature (Kitz in Braun & Castree 2005) and both preservation and restoration of ecology is to serve the project of global neoliberalism. He mentions that preserves or national park were means of ennobling wasteland or landscapes that promised little in the way of potential resource extraction.... (2005:48) and the preservation of nature is a kind of state politics to give an environmental value to the nature. For Mahony (1992) the role of state to arrange a nature to produce more abstraction shows imperialism redux via nature. Arranging nature means that state fix or consolidates the nature of access through enclosure, territorialization and legislation. The mapping of the nature is not proceeding in linear forms. Many times it may be exercised through mechanism of public concern or by conflict. Rod Neumann (2014) explores the biodiversity conservation through political ecology lens and he mentions that it is a strategy that is anchored in the proprietary claims of the state. It is widely acknowledge that for centuries that a non-state people have enjoyed accessed and occupied the nature harmoniously but the rise of modern state and the need of defining territory produced a new kind of ecological citizenship. Neumann (2014) mentions the mechanism of state in utilization of natural resources. In this vein, he gave an example of Yellowstone the world first national park that was established in 1872. State territorial claim is a kind of political claim. It is because state wants to govern the nature which has a material and economic value in the neoliberal era. The contemporary developmental politics has root in neoliberalism and neoliberalism has a feature of accumulation that dispossesses the commons. So keeping in mind the politics of neoliberalism the succeeding section will try to emphasis on the strategy of neoliberalism.

**Neoliberalism as a Developmental Strategy for Nature Accumulation**

Neoliberal structuring aims to expand the capital accumulation. Accumulation and legitimization is the dual role of the political state to serve neoliberal interests. The neoliberal structuring is done through financialization of capital that facilitates dispossession. It has deepened the Marx concept of Primitive accumulation. Like Marx, for Harvey (2009) argues for process of accumulation through dispossession. The use of Harvey concept shows how the competitive mechanism of market regulated and imposed by state restructured the property relation. The institutionalization of the natural resource and nature is the new form of state logic for growth. For growth, the pressure of global capitalism forced state to commoditize the nature. Robert W. Mc Chesney (1999) defines neoliberalism as a kind of capitalism. He aptly argued that it as a political economic paradigm of contemporary time period. He goes further and mentions that Neoliberalism is indeed “capitalism with the gloves off.” Neoliberalism is a kind of developmentalism in this era in which capitalist forces are stronger and more aggressive, and face minimal organized opposition than ever before. Its only happens when state facilitates the vision of neoliberalism on common ground. Nothing exists when Neoliberalism operates in naturalized setting of society. As a result, the neoliberalism as developmental strategy is increasingly difficult to challenge, and therefore, public sphere, civil society (nonmarket, noncommercial, and subsistence nature) barely exists at all. Neoliberalism operates - not only as an economic system, but as a political and cultural system as well as ideological system. Neoliberal democracy, with its notion of the market interest is more than the interest of others (ueber alles). Neoliberalism wants citizen to be consumers. Neoliberalism became an ideological fuel for capitalism and it is also related to mode of production debates. Not going in depth of debate on mode of production. I am going to discuss briefly about the capitalist mode of the production (CMP) to give more emphasize on the way state interacts with nature interaction. CMP produced and reproduced the existing societal reality. CMP is the structural logic of the neoliberal state to deal with nature or society. The role of the state is to serve the bourgeoisie interest and produced a regulative mechanism that caused a particular class rule. The development of modern nation-states can be seen from the dialectical interaction between societal economy and the state (Liodakis 2010). The feature of the CMP is to so dominant. The exploitation of the capital, nature and the extensive reproduction, commodification and accumulation of man and capital is the feature of the CMP itself where problem lies State through vice and virtue and by using the technology as a mediating factor to exploit the labour and nature. This all is done for developing the capital. Traditional society with a neutral character of technology is accumulated by the productive forces of CMP (a feature of state economy). The rapid extraction of the natural resources led countless problem i.e. poverty, marginalization, destitution and unemployment etc.

The nature of neoliberalism has been redistributive rather than generative. Harvey (2007) argues neoliberalism serves for particular class and bourgeoisie state interest. The concept of accumulation by dispossession shows the political tactic of state. By this, he has deepened the Marxian notion of primitive accumulation as i have discussed earlier. His notion includes (1) the commodification and privatization of land and the forceful expulsion of peasant populations (as in Mexico and India in recent times); (2) conversion of various forms of property rights (common, collective, state, etc.) into exclusively private property rights (2007:34) the subsistence economy get transformed by the juggernaut<sup>1</sup> of neoliberalism. Instead of citizens, neoliberalism produces consumers. Instead of communities, it produces shopping malls. The net result is an atomized society of disengaged individuals who feel demoralized and socially powerless. In sum, neoliberalism is the immediate and foremost enemy of genuine participatory democracy. The neoliberal policy enables state to accumulate nature, where power relations clearly play to transform the nature. Barry Smart (2010) has mentions the work of weber and Veblen to discuss of modern capitalist system. He mentions the features of capitalism to consume natural resources. Smart mentions Weber who argued that material goods are given priority over human life in capitalism. State is in hurry to produce a productive future for the static nature. State claims are kind of environmental politics. Goldman & Turner (2011) termed it as politics of knowledge. The knowledge is produced, funded and advertised to serve the purpose of neoliberal state economy. Political ecology and state discourses particular on science and technology are new emerging field of academic inquiry. Political ecology has focused primarily on the politics that works for nature production, commodification, conservational and the economics related to nature and its products. The study argues state engage nature into many ways. To support the statement, we assume that nature is perceived or studied and valued by different social groups in different manner. It depends on the assumptions, vision, and management technique that have been imposed on nature by several actors. Among all actor state is sovereign one. To employ political ecology as a study discipline for my present study, we would like to mention the feature and the cross disciplinary nature of political ecology. It mainly focused on the politics behind the use and control of natural resources, environmental change, degradation and its representations. It favors to consider of the political over the ecological issue. It emerged from the inter alias of cultural ecology and political economy and also get insight from the neomarxism. Blaikie & Brookfield (1987) argue the origin of political ecology has economic and political roots. They observed it during the study of land degradation of the developing country. Political ecology as framework is fueled by its attraction to scholars of multidisciplinary backgrounds for drawing connections between social and ecological change. The paper employs political ecology because it mainly focuses on the power relation and political, economic process producing knowledge about nature and mediating knowledge, politics

of access, domination dispossession etc. The paper also chosen development context because Political ecology as a theoretical approach continues to be associated with the politics of development. Political ecology gets reflection of the range of academic work mainly from the geography, sociology, and anthropology. Blaikie (2012) defines political ecology as a critique involving gaps between the rhetoric reality and the less than reality, and between intention and outcome.

### **State and Socialized Nature: Putting Politics first in Political Ecology**

There has been an expansion of interest in state nature relation within sociology, anthropology and geography. It is spurred by the rich optimist analyses of ecology and development issues within the global state. The analyses of these issue emerged out of the intermarriage of cultural ecology and political economy of resource use that also be a reason of the birth of political ecology. Political ecology also designs from the political economy of development, Marxism and post-structuralism that encompasses a diversity of theoretical and methodological approaches. At the heart of the political ecology, the idea of politics, power and domination should be analytical superiority of place. Political ecology deals with the way in which production of knowledge about nature is mobilized and contested politically. This knowledge includes ecological processes of making a zone, park and reserve. Some time it often combine understandings of physical processes with social histories of the development that has been transformed the nature. Further, the primacy of politics shows that the research field of political ecology considers political over the natural. Indeed it is a fact that political ecology seeks to understand the politics of environmental change, production of nature, and developmental politics along with the politics of societal change. Yet, political ecology tries to give more focuses on politics as a part of attempt to understand the changes and environmental problems. In my study I also attempt to focus on politics because the ingredient of politics determine the eco social problem as Bryant and Bailey (1997:4) mention

All ecological projects and arguments are simultaneously political- economic projects and vice versa. Ecological arguments are never socially neutral any more than socio- political arguments are ecologically neutral. Looking more closely at the way ecology and politics interrelate than became imperative if we are to get a better handle on how to approach environmental/ ecological question.

[Harvey in Bryant and Bailey (1997:4)]

After discussing the role of politics in political ecology research, this paper is going to talk about nature and state from the perspective of political ecology. Political ecology share a perspective of political economy but adopt a varieties of approaches in describing or investigating the ecological process, issues, episodic events and the human state interaction what Blaikie and Brookfield

(1987) termed political ecology as a 'plurality of purpose and flexibility of explanations'. The preceding discussion talks about the role of politics in political ecology research. Now the succeeding discussion has attempted to discuss how nature lived in state boundary.

Nature lives in state territorial domain. It directs our attention to how state is able to hold on to land, forest and other natural resources. State is major neoliberal actors who produce a bundle of powers and mechanism to maintain the power relation and restricting access. In this vein this section discuss about the socialized nature (a social nature) that is produced in state domain. Social nature is made from two assumptions. The first is that nature itself is not natural – whether it's been in the form of resources, natural body or natural hazards. Second, nature in itself is changeable and social. We can see it in this world through saturated power and inequality. Eric Swyngedouw's (1999) the concept of 'socationature' is to explore the benefits as well as the challenges of a more relational, non-dualistic sociological analysis of society and nature (see also Goodman, 2001). From these perspectives, 'nature' is not a separate category that is acted upon and then revealed, especially in it's for Sociology of 'Socationature' that refers nature is in a commodified form. Rather, proposing that the nature is constituted by interconnected act who form networks and that act and include both humans and nonhumans, united in particular actor-networks, socationature offers a more multifaceted and open-ended understanding of the world. Neoliberal state has multiple interests and for serving its interests state work both inside and outside the economy. it can be seen through the ways state involve in contradictory process of intervention, regulation and deregulation. As Castree (2001) illustrates that neoliberalism is paradoxical in theory and practical. His observation is based on understanding of conflated process of commodification, privatization and commercialization. State organizes its subjects including people and things). State does it in the ways to make subjects easier to govern. Nature is a green capital (Scott, 2011). His study deals with development which is translated in privatization of the resource. Nature is a source of generating economic wealth and the exploitation of the nature by bourgeois is the main aim of capitalist society. The role of the state is to provide a necessary condition through natural wealth and nature can be abstracted. State as a social system that seeks to maintain the internal cohesion (2010:43) State has a bureaucratic rationality and capitalist state shared a neoliberal ideology to do the economic intercourse. State role in neoliberal era is to provide a material conditions under the market utilization of nature can be proceed. Class interest conflict power access and marginalization alienation is the subtheme of the Marxist analysis of the nature state relation. The nature of neoliberalism has been redistributive rather than generative. Harvey (2007) said it because neoliberalism serves the class and bourgeoisie state interest. His concept of accumulation by dispossession shows the politics strategy of state. By this, he adds in the Marxian notion of primitive accumulation. The notion includes (1) the commodification and privatization



of land and the forceful expulsion of peasant populations (as in Mexico and India in recent times); (2) conversion of various forms of property rights (common, collective, state, etc.) into exclusively private property rights (2007:34). For Foucault (2001) state action is a kind of governmentality. Applying the term 'governmentality', Arun Agarwal coined the term "environmentality". He used it to refer the knowledge, politics, institutions and subjectivities that come to be linked together to regulate environment and State power exists in multiple forms. Purdey (2010) mentions Gilpin definition of state and market. state is based on territoriality, loyalty, and exclusivity whereas market is based on functional integration and its work to locate economic activities which are more productive and profitable and state capture this processes and accumulate the capital to serve the interest. In capitalism, neo liberal market system is dynamic and expansionary.

Taking about the features of capitalism as an apparatus Purdey (2010) mentions that it works beyond the production system not only it includes labour, land and capital but also incorporates every aspect of society into itself. He mentions that it is a processual phenomenon. It can be said that capitalism creates its own path dependency. Through democratic politics, state calculates the economic interest and it is especially encouraged by the capitalist democracy. Cohen and Rogers posit that prior to the particular interests of all actors satisfaction of the capitalist state is necessary condition for the satisfaction of all other interests within the system.

Whitehead et.al (2007) mentions that in order to govern nature modern states have developed a range of specialist institutional division to manage and produce nature naturally. They mention that how state manage the nature through the bureaucratic administration and management. Managing nature and control over nature is the central subject of the state. Nature in state territory played a social life and the social life of nature is as in form of social cultural fabric. Whitehead et.al (2007:13) mention Foucault who refers Modern state as a governmental entity and it is characterized by the rational science of government, which is based upon the systematic collection of knowledge concerning that which is to be governed, and the use of that knowledge to ensure the ordered government of a particular person and territory through various techniques and tactics.

The preceding discussion has attempted to talk about state interaction with nature and study observes that state interaction with nature is a processual event. The study has attempted to look at the processes through modern neoliberal state produced and reformed the nature. Framing is a similar kind of attempt that state made to transform nature. Framing is for the bracketing off of the nature and its objects. After discussing state politics of framing and knowledge production I would like to discuss the ways state interacts with nature and manufacture the power relation. The lens of political ecology suggests that state interact in a politicized

environment. The dimension of politicized environment as Bryant & Bailey (1997: 29) discussed is as below.

<b>Dimension of politicized environment</b>					
Dimension	Physical Changes	Rate of Impact	Nature of Human Impact	Political responses	Key concept
Everyday	Soil erosion, deforestation, salinization	Gradual and may not even be perceived for a long time	Cumulative and typically highly unequal; the poor are the main loser	Livelihoods protests/ resistance	Marginality
Episodic	Flooding high winds/ storm drought	Often sudden but occasionally drawn out	May have general impact but unequal exposure means that the poor are the main loser	Disaster relief	Vulnerability
Systematic	Nuclear fallout, pesticide concentration, biologically modified species	Gradual and not necessarily perceived but also potentially unexpected	Tends to have a general impact	Popular distrust of official experts	Risk

The politics of modern state depend upon the two basic interrelated tendencies. Whitehead *et al.* (2007) calls it as centralization and territorialization. They mention that both are synonymous with the modern state apparatus. State, firstly, from the nature. The framing depends upon the state power and the production of Knowledge State through bureaucratic rationality, and knowledge bodies framed the nature. State became a central body of knowledge about nature. Centralization is a collection of knowledge to produce, manage and reproduce the reality. Knowledge legitimizes the power, in this vein, Scott (1988) has mentioned that state became a centre of calculation and the process of centralization is to make nature dynamic. Whitehead *et al.* (2007) refers Territorialization as the use of nature as a space to control and manage or to regulate. They told how territorialization of nature work through the authorized knowledge state construct and use knowledge politically. The politics of state is in question, however violence in name of resource access, control also help state to control people. The interaction of state nature is defined as what Mann (1984) called infrastructural power. In this vein, legal practice and management of nature is a kind of making a boundary objects (Forsyth 2003:141) and at the same time he argues that state administrative setup may be understood as boundary organization.

Political ecology became so important here because it questioning the state politicized role. Nature became an object of knowledge and state theologially determines nature. Determinism is a kind of political arrangement that serve a neoliberal interest of state. State intentionally arranges a territory and nature and hence the arrangement of nature can be understood as a political nature. I argue it as because state jurisdiction realizes territory as a state property. Nature became an object of knowledge and state theologially determined it. The boundary organisation is determined by the state. Giddens (1985) observed state as a reflectively monitored system of production. Reflective monitoring for Giddens is gathering of information, documentation and storage. it help state to advances its accumulative strategy. This kind of features of the state facilitates ordering of region, nature and time space. State reflective system manages control the social activity within its territory. Ron Johnston in Whitehead *et al.* (1996:37) argues that state act as a privileged institutional player to manage the nature. He explored that state features of accumulated administrative/ infrastructural capacity help to manage and regulate the nature. It is because state is only body which can reach into complexities and diversities of the nature. What state argued that through specialist knowledge producing bodies, laboratories and military able to deal with nature and in modern time state became an institutional manager of the nature. James Scott (1988) has provided an exploration about the role of state in the administrative management of the nature. The nature is politically manageable and state often undermined the local ecologies and local nature that had existed before. Weber's analysis shows that state is a complex system of administrative structures. The observation of weber on state is as a differentiated set of institutions and personnel embodying 2) centrality in the sense that political relations radiate outwards from a centre to cover 3) a territorially demarcated area, over which it exercises 4) a monopoly of authoritative rule making, backed up by a monopoly of means of physical violence (quoted in Mann 1984: 185) whereas Driver (1991) has defined state from Marxian viewpoint. He has proposed three interrelated prepositions. Firstly he mentions that state is a super structural institution and the force of production is related to capitalist mode of production, in last he talks about the role of state in accumulation of a capital.

Marxian assertion about state is nothing more than the apparatus that serves the capitalist interest. State role is to favour certain class interest and in neoliberalism state main focus is to favour certain class interest and at the same time state also reinforcing social alienation that can be observed in case of local social ecological scenario of ecology and ecological natives. Gramsci concept of political society is very nearer to the realist concept of State. Gill (1993) mentions that for Gramsci Political society is an institution which regulates society. At the same time Gramsci also make a distinction He refers state in an organic sense. The features of a state as society are the articulation of political and civil society. State hegemonies all keep them in governable

territory. State became a powerful actor amongst the all. State by making alliances, through power and knowledge capture the ideological structure of the society and at the same time giving assurance to subordinate community for their economic development. State domination on nature is based on what Stephen Gill (1993) has mentioned as a Fraudulent hegemony. State is hegemon and hegemonic state exercise domination over nature and society to serve their interests. Reinold (2012) mentions how hegemony actor exercises domination. He writes Hegemony might thus exert domination over marginalized segments of the society without ending the basis of their hegemony as long as the norms and the mores of the society at large legitimates such domination of pariah elements (Reinold 2012:29). He added in his statement and mentions how ruling class adjust its behaviour to maintain the consensual basis of the hegemony. Several legislatures or preservation policies and politics, inclusion, decentralization, participatory democracy is a kind of adjustment to facilitate the capitalist state interest. The ways state maintain its privileged position is as what Gramsci calls Fraudulent Hegemony. State to fulfil its capitalist interest develop a understanding about the societal requirement and at the same time try to capture the ideological realm by promising the assurance of economic development, right over natural resources or access of the nature. States as a dominated social group understand that hegemony need renewed regularly. So state produced a material concessions and at the very same time state also committed for the societal collective value.

### **Conclusion**

The link with nature and increased state intervention through framing, knowledge production, planning, territorialization and centralization resulted marginalization. Environmental problem, land degradation, resource wars and conflict over resources is so common in these days. It is due to political repression and private capital accumulation. The new liberal policies and its accumulating character and the extraction of the natural resources for the production of surplus value is a second cultural logic of the capitalism. Capitalism and neoliberal policies of the state shapes the discussion of the nature. Nature is conceptualized as second nature, social nature, and humanized nature (Biersack and Green Berg 2006). Foster (1999) used the term metabolic rift to describe the new human environment which differs from the natural environment. He adds further and argues that the capitalist mode of production separates the human from the natural environment from which capitalist derive their subsistence and in return leads to its exploitation. Development involves the use of resources and their commodification. The political economy of land dispossession in neo-liberal regime can be conceptually defined as 'accumulation by dispossession' (Harvey, 2003) and 'accumulation by encroachment' (Patnaik, 2005). These two terms refers to a process whereby land, resources, services or knowledge that were considered individual or community property is acquired or privatized.

Nature social property lives inside the geographies defines state ability to produce social forces that can make nature more productive, which can move in time and space has altered the preexisting social structure. Social nature in a capitalist state exists mainly for its investors and the common access to nature is strictly prohibited. The status of nature in capitalist society is in form of commodity fetishism or as an economic site. Ecological native peoples have been left in pervasive condition of marginality- their land, culture, resources and nature open to appropriation by others. It is because state and local people or group value resources for the different reason their interests and the ways of access are also likely to differ. State by valuation strategies often alienates the natives who have long histories of nature access. The state's interests in nature are emerging issues of political ecology. Resource access, resource control, allocation, conflict, legitimate use of violence, degradation, competition over arenas of legitimacy, alienation, and management are the theme of political ecology. One should know that power and politics is the heart of political ecology and state action and interest are for power and economics. The state developmental politics and discourse on nature in name of conservation, park and biodiversity become a kind of contemporary lingo. Nature is constructed and produced in relation to exercise of power and control and the state plays a micro politics in the production of nature which can be varied from time and space. Political ecologist should adopt varieties of explanations and strategies to deal with these issues. .

#### NOTE

1. Juggernaut (Giddens, 1990) refers it as fast moving and seemingly unstoppable force.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amin, S.  
2006 *Transforming the Revolution; Social Movements and the World-System.* AAKAR books.
- Amin, S.  
2010 *Eurocentrism.* NYU Press.
- Appadurai, A. (Ed.).  
1988 *The social life of things: commodities in cultural perspective.* Cambridge University Press.
- Blaikie, P.  
2012 Should some political ecology be useful? The Inaugural Lecture for the Cultural and Political Ecology Specialty Group, Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers, April 2010. *Geoforum*, 43(2), 231-239.
- Braun, B., & Castree, N. (Eds.).  
2005 *Remaking reality: nature at the millenium.* Routledge.

- Baviskar, A. (Ed.).  
 2008 *Contested grounds: Essays on nature, culture, and power*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Blomström, M., & Hettne, B.  
 1984 *Development theory in transition: the dependency debate and beyond: Third World responses* (pp. 81-91). London: Zed books.
- Bryant, R. L. & Bailey, R.  
 1997 *Third world political ecology*. Psychology Press.  
 2005 *Third world political ecology*. Routledge.
- Chakrabarti, A., & Dhar, A. K.  
 2009 *Dislocation and Resettlement in Development: From third world to the world of the third*. Routledge.
- Castree, N.  
 1995 The nature of produced nature: materiality and knowledge construction in Marxism. *Antipode*, 27(1), 12-48.
- Davison, A.  
 2001 *Technology and the contested meanings of sustainability*. SUNY Press.
- Driver, F.  
 1991 Political geography and state formation: disputed territory. *Progress in Human Geography*, 15(3), 268-280.
- Escobar, A.  
 1996 Construction nature: Elements for a post-structuralist political ecology. *Futures*, 28(4), 325-343.
- Escobar, A.  
 1999 After nature: steps to an antiessentialist political ecology 1. *Current anthropology*, 40(1), 1-30.
- Escobar, A.  
 2011 *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton University Press.
- Gadgil, M., & Guha, R.  
 1993 *This fissured land: an ecological history of India*. Univ of California Press.
- Giddens, A.  
 1985 *The nation-state and violence* (Vol. 2). Univ of California Press.
- Ginn, F., & Demeritt, D.  
 2008 Nature: a contested concept. *Key concepts in geography*, 300-311.
- Gill, S. (Ed.).  
 1993 *Gramsci, historical materialism and international relations* (Vol. 26). Cambridge University Press.

PRODUCING SOCIAL NATURE: THE POLITICAL ECOLOGY OF STATE  
333

Goldman, M. J., Nadasdy, P., & Turner, M. D. (Eds.).

2011 *Knowing nature: conversations at the intersection of political ecology and science studies*. University of Chicago Press.

Harvey, D.

2007 Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610(1), 21-44.

Harvey, D.

2009 The 'new' imperialism: accumulation by dispossession. *Socialist register*, 40(40).

Mann, M.

1984 The autonomous power of the state: its origins, mechanisms and results. *European journal of sociology*, 25(02), 185-213.

Ferguson, J.

1990 The anti-politics machine: "development," depoliticization, and bureaucratic power in Lesotho. CUP Archive.

McChesney, R. W.

1999 Noam Chomsky and the struggle against neoliberalism. *Monthly Review-New York-*, 50, 40-47.

Padel, F and Ajay Dandekar.

2013 *Ecology, economy: quest for a socially informed connection*. Orient Blackswan.

Peet, R., Robbins, P., & Watts, M. (Eds.).

2010 *Global political ecology*. Taylor & Francis.

Pieterse, J. N.

2010 *Development theory*. Sage.

Purdey, S. J.

2010 *Economic growth, the environment and international relations: The growth paradigm*. Routledge.

Lemke, T.

2001 'The birth of bio-politics': Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy and society*, 30(2), 190-207.

Luke, T. W.

1995 The nature conservancy or the nature cemetery: Buying and selling "perpetual care"; as environmental resistance. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 6(2), 1-20.

Ludden, D.

2003 Investing in Nature around Sylhet: An Excursion into Geographical History. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 5080-5088.

- Marx, K.  
1887 *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Progress Publisher.
- Neumann, R.  
2014 *Making Political Ecology*. Routledge.
- Williams, R.  
1985 *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*. Oxford University Press.
- Wolford, W., Borras, S. M., Hall, R., Scoones, I., & White, B.  
2013 Governing global land deals: the role of the state in the rush for land. *Development and Change*, 44(2), 189-210.
- Reinold, T.  
2012 *Sovereignty and the Responsibility to Protect: The Power of Norms and the Norms of the Powerful*. Routledge.
- Rose, C. M.  
1994 *Property and persuasion: Essays on the history, theory, and rhetoric of ownership* (p. 14). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rose, N.  
1999 *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge University Press. Scott, A.  
2011 *Managing natural resources in british columbia: markets, regulations, and sustainable development* (Vol. 1, p. 220). UBC Press.
- Scott, J. C.  
1998 *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press.
- Shiva, V.  
1986 Coming tragedy of the commons. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 613-614.
- Smart, B.  
2010 *Consumer Society: Critical Issues & Environmental Consequences*. Sage Publications.
- Smith, N.  
2008 *Uneven development: Nature, capital, and the production of space*. University of Georgia Press.