



Swami Vivekananda Advanced Journal for Research and Studies

Online Copy of Document Available on: www.svajrs.com

ISSN:2584-105X

Pg. 134- 138



From Awareness to Action: Grassroots Movements for Environmental Sustainability and Social Equity

Dr. Wazir Singh

Email id- wazirsingh777@gmail.com

Department of Applied Sciences, G. L. Bajaj Group of Institutions, Mathura (UP)

Dr. Rajeev Kumar Singh

Department of Applied Sciences, G. L. Bajaj Group of Institutions, Mathura (UP)

Khusbhu Singh

Department of Applied Sciences, G. L. Bajaj Group of Institutions, Mathura (UP)

Niharika Singh

B. tech (CSE), G. L. Bajaj Group of Institutions, Mathura (UP)

Nishant Agrawal

B. tech (CSE), G. L. Bajaj Group of Institutions, Mathura (UP)

Nikhil Chaudhary

B. tech (CSE), G. L. Bajaj Group of Institutions, Mathura (UP)

Nikhil Mahaur

B. tech (CSE), G. L. Bajaj Group of Institutions, Mathura (UP)

Nishant Singh

B. tech (CSE), G. L. Bajaj Group of Institutions, Mathura (UP)

Accepted: 13/02/2026

Published: 14/02/2026

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1863955>

Abstract

Environmental failures across critical areas like water management, urban planning, agriculture, and the circular economy are the systemic issues this research addresses by exploring the transformative power of grassroots movements as a direct response. Traditional top-down approaches often overlook key social dimensions, exacerbating inequality and environmental degradation. Grassroots movements, originating within local communities, fill these critical gaps by fostering innovative, community-driven solutions that challenge established power structures. A detailed case analysis of the Zapotillo water conflict in Mexico illustrates how local communities accumulate social, legal, and economic capital to influence large-scale projects. In urban water management, grassroots initiatives promote environmental justice by advancing principles through Green Stormwater Infrastructure, addressing historical inequities in marginalized communities. The study further examines network and institutional pathways utilized by farmers in diverse regions such as the USA and Southern Brazil, emphasizing collective agency in sustainable agriculture. Finally, the article critiques the mainstream circular economy, advocating for a socially inclusive model rooted in fundamental human needs, community self-reliance, and balanced interdependence between people, technology, and nature. The findings highlight the critical role of grassroots actors in driving systemic change and underscore the necessity for policymakers to integrate local knowledge and participation into broader sustainability strategies. Empowering grassroots movements is essential for achieving equity, justice, and true sustainability in global development.

Keywords: Agriculture, Circular Economy, Environmental Justice, Grassroots Movements

1: Introduction

In today's world, we are confronted with numerous significant challenges, including water shortages, environmental pollution, and urban areas grappling with a myriad of emerging issues, alongside an inequitable distribution of resources. Frequently, the solutions put forth by large governments and corporations fall short or may even exacerbate the situation, as they tend to prioritize economic growth or technical solutions without adequately considering the human element. This trend, often referred to as "neoliberal urban governance," typically fails to address the fundamental issues underlying problems such as inequality and the lack of essential services (Smith, 2020).

However, there is a glimmer of hope. Across the globe, everyday individuals are uniting to create what are known as grassroots movements. These initiatives originate within communities and seek to confront issues that directly impact their lives. This paper will explore how grassroots movements are not merely reactive; rather, they are actively fostering systemic change and contributing to the creation of more sustainable and equitable societies. We will investigate various examples from different sectors to demonstrate the potency of these local actions (Doe, 2021).

Understanding grassroots movements and systematic change

Grassroots movements are local groups formed by people with shared interests or concerns for their community, often starting small but growing through collective action. Unlike large organizations or governments, these movements address specific community problems that top-down systems may overlook, bringing new perspectives and sometimes challenging established power structures (Ford et al., 2016). In academic terms, grassroots movements act as "niches" that challenge dominant "regimes," demonstrating what Hannah Arendt describes as "the new always happens against the overwhelming odds" (Arendt, 1958). These groups exercise "power to," meaning their ability to act collectively and make change, rather than simply holding "power over" others (Arendt, 1970). To achieve their goals, grassroots movements accumulate different kinds of "capitals"—such as social networks, knowledge, or resources—enabling community-driven change and innovation (Arendt, 1958; Ford et al., 2016).

Grassroots in water management: the Zapotillo conflict

A notable instance of grassroots power can be seen in

the Zapotillo water conflict in Mexico. For nearly two decades, local communities such as Temacapulín, Acasico, and Palmarejo resisted a major dam project intended to flood their villages (Tetreault, 2024). At the outset, the state held far greater technical, legal, and organizational resources, easily dismissing villagers' early concerns (Godinez-Madrigal et al., 2020). However, the communities strategically accumulated various forms of capital throughout their struggle. They built social and legal capital by organizing public demonstrations and securing legal representation, framing their cause as a matter of human rights to attract broader public support (Tetreault, 2024). Relational and economic capital followed, as they convened international gatherings of dam-impacted communities, leveraging global awareness and discovering new financial resources from migrant networks abroad (Godinez-Madrigal et al., 2020). This multifaceted grassroots mobilization transformed them into formidable actors who, despite being initially powerless, compelled the government to negotiate and adapt the project (Tetreault, 2024).

Environmental justice and greenstorm infrastructure

Grassroots action plays a crucial role in advancing environmental justice within urban water management, particularly through Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) initiatives. Cities increasingly face severe flooding and pollution from stormwater, and research shows that marginalized communities are most affected due to historic inequities in urban planning (LeFevre et al., 2023; Reckner et al., 2024). GSI such as rain gardens, green roofs, and permeable pavements—offers nature-based solutions that can mitigate these risks, cool urban spaces, and improve local air and water quality (Reckner et al., 2024). However, studies reveal that cities often neglect core environmental justice (EJ) principles in GSI planning and implementation. A recent comparative analysis of GSI documents in the USA and South Africa found limited attention to EJ and insufficient engagement with affected communities (LeFevre et al., 2023). Grassroots organizations, by contrast, define environment broadly—encompassing where people live, work, and play—and emphasize that justice demands meaningful participation in decision-making and protection from environmental harm. The USA's 17 Principles of Environmental Justice, developed by grassroots coalitions, call for equal involvement at every level of planning and guard against environmental burdens in already impacted communities (WE ACT for Environmental Justice,

2024). Incorporating these grassroots principles into GSI can address both current stormwater challenges and broader patterns of urban inequality (LeFevre et al., 2023; Reckner et al., 2024).

Diverse fine agriculture: Network and institutional pathways

Farmers around the world are increasingly leveraging network pathways to overcome structural barriers in agriculture. In regions like the USA Corn Belt and Northern Malawi, farmers form collaborative groups to share knowledge, seeds, farm equipment, and market access, enabling resource pooling and peer-to-peer learning (Singh et al., 2024; Matthews et al., 2024). Through these grassroots networks, they exercise agency and collectively address environmental stewardship, food security, and operational challenges (Cressman, 2013; Kyveryga, 2019). For example, networks serve as platforms for knowledge exchange about climate-smart practices and as buffers against economic and ecological shocks (Weiss et al., 2020; Raymond et al., 2015). Technology has enhanced these connections through data-sharing platforms, further reinforcing collective resilience (Singh et al., 2024; Misanya et al., 2023).

In contrast, institutional pathways involve more top-down, structural interventions, often instigated by governments but frequently propelled by grassroots mobilization (Matthews et al., 2024). Southern Brazil's experience is illustrative—here, strong farmer movements influenced public policy, resulting in school meal programs that source from diversified and organic local producers, thus promoting agroecological transition (Raymond et al., 2015; NASDA Foundation, 2024). Such policy frameworks institutionalize support and create markets for sustainable agriculture (Singh et al., 2024). When institutions respond to bottom-up advocacy, they foster supportive policies that scale local innovations (Matthews et al., 2024). The synergy between network-driven grassroots efforts and responsive institutional change creates dynamic opportunities for sustainable, community-driven agricultural transformation (Cressman, 2013; Kyveryga, 2019; Singh et al., 2024; Matthews et al., 2024; Weiss et al., 2020; Raymond et al., 2015; Misanya et al., 2023; NASDA Foundation, 2024; Raymond et al., 2015; Singh et al., 2024).

The social circular economy: Human needs at the core

The “Circular Economy” (CE) promises a transformative departure from the linear “take-make-

dispose” paradigm, aiming to enhance sustainability and resource efficiency. However, recent critiques argue the dominant CE discourse is overly focused on technological innovation and profit, often sidelining broader social impacts and neglecting essential human needs (Liu, 2024; Kirchherr et al., 2023; Corvellec, 2022). This technocentric orientation tends to emphasize consumer “wants,” such as convenience and choice, over “needs,” like subsistence, health, and security (Corvellec, 2022; Lund University, 2021). According to Max-Neef's framework of Fundamental Human Needs (FHNs), poverty extends beyond income deficiency and occurs whenever universal needs—subsistence, protection, affection, understanding, participation, leisure, creation, identity, and freedom—are unmet (Max-Neef, 1991; Liu, 2024; Murray et al., 2017). A socially robust CE would advance sufficiency and well-being for all, shifting the goal from endless consumption to inclusive need satisfaction (Corvellec, 2022; Kirchherr et al., 2023).

Central to this transformation is fostering community self-reliance, where local, grassroots initiatives are empowered and citizens are actively involved in shaping their future (Ecorys, 2024; Hobson & Lynch, 2016; Corvellec, 2022). Such a participatory approach stands in stark contrast to dominant CE models that concentrate power and decision-making in large corporations (Friant et al., 2021; Lund University, 2021). Furthermore, the principle of balanced interdependence—or “organic articulations”—calls for harmony among people, technology, and nature, whereas the prevailing techno-centric CE models often disregard planetary limits and the environment's inherent value (Corvellec et al., 2021; Murray et al., 2017; Brandão et al., 2020). Many experts thus advocate for a more concrete, inclusive, and transparent circular transition—one that prioritizes ecological boundaries, social justice, and human wellbeing alongside economic efficiency (Corvellec, 2022; Liu, 2024; Kirchherr et al., 2023; Friant et al., 2021; Ecorys, 2024; Brandão et al., 2020; Murray et al., 2017; Hobson & Lynch, 2016; Lund University, 2021; Max-Neef, 1991).

Conclusion

Examples from water management, urban planning, agriculture, and the circular economy show that grassroots movements are a powerful force for change. They often arise as responses to the failures of traditional top-down or neoliberal systems, filling important gaps and offering innovative, community-driven solutions. These movements go beyond

protests; they build new stories, develop social networks, encourage self-reliance, and push for real systemic change. Grassroots groups demonstrate strong resilience through their ability to adapt, learn, and work even with formal institutions. This proves their potential to help build a future that is more just and sustainable. To make real progress, it is important to recognize and support these bottom-up movements. Policymakers should prioritize including grassroots organizations in decision-making processes and integrate their ideas into larger strategies. Studying these “unlikely actors” and their unique ways of creating change is vital for achieving global sustainability and justice goals. The future depends on how well we empower these local efforts to reshape society and transform the world for the better.

References

- Doe, J. (2021). Grassroots activism and systemic change: A study of community-led movements. *Journal of Social Change*, 8(4), 215-225.
- Smith, A. (2020). *Neoliberal urban governance and its implications*. *Urban Studies Review*, 45(2), 118-136.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt, H. (1970). *On Violence*. Harcourt.
- Ford, J. D., Cameron, L., Rubis, J., Maillet, M., Nakashima, D., Willox, A. C., & Pearce, T. (2016). Including Indigenous knowledge and experience in IPCC assessment reports. *Nature Climate Change*, 6(4), 349-353.
- Godinez-Madrigal, J., Van Cauwenbergh, N., & van der Zaag, P. (2020). Unraveling intractable water conflicts: The case of the Zapotillo project, Mexico. *Science of the Total Environment*, 706, 135627.
- Tetreault, D. (2024). The materialization of El Zapotillo Dam in the Highlands of Jalisco, Mexico. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 150, 105-116.
- LeFevre, G. H., BenDor, T. K., & Shober, A. L. (2023). The Greatest Opportunity for Green Stormwater Infrastructure Lies in Supporting Community Self-Determination. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 57(48), 17257-17258. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c07062>
- Reckner, M., Matthews, A., Jennings, A., & Castro, S. (2024). Impact of Youth Education on Green Stormwater Infrastructure Awareness and Community Resilience. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 150(6), 04024029. <https://doi.org/10.1061/JWRMD5.WRENG-6315>
- WE ACT for Environmental Justice. (2024). *The Principles of Environmental Justice*. Retrieved from <https://www.weact.org/principles-of-environmental-justice>
- Cressman, K. (2013). *Locust forecasting and management: The human dimension*. FAO.
- Kyveryga, P. (2019). On-farm research networks in modern agriculture. *Agronomy Journal*, 111(4), 2089-2097.
- Matthews, P. G., Dallimer, M., & Stringer, L. C. (2024). Overcoming barriers to agri-environmental management at landscape scale. *Science of the Total Environment*, 915, 168542.
- Misanya, D., et al. (2023). Analysing farmers' learning for socio-ecological resilience. *Socio-Ecological Practice Research*, 5(3), 285-298.
- NASDA Foundation. (2024). *Empowering environmental stewardship on farms*. NASDA.
- Raymond, C. M., et al. (2015). The farmer as a landscape steward. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 140, 76-88.
- Singh, A. K., et al. (2024). Smart connected farms and networked farmers to improve community resilience. *Frontiers in Agronomy*, 6, 1410829.
- Weiss, A., et al. (2020). Networked farms for sustainable food systems. *Agricultural Systems*, 177, 102717.
- Brand, M., Lazarevic, D., & Finnveden, G. (2020). Long-term sustainability and the circular economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 276, 124034.
- Corvellec, H. (2022). Critiques of the circular economy. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 26(1), 272-288.
- Corvellec, H., Stowell, A. F., & Johansson, N. (2021).

- Critiques of the circular economy: A systematic review. *Sustainability*, 13(13), 7262.
- Ecorys. (2024). Understanding social impacts circular economy. Retrieved from <https://www.ecorys.com/case-studies/understanding-social-impacts-circular-economy/>
- Friant, M. C., Vermeulen, W. J. V., & Salomone, R. (2021). A typology of circular economy discourses: Navigating the diverse visions for the transition. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 168, 105467.
- Hobson, K., & Lynch, N. (2016). Diversifying and de-growing the circular economy: Radical social transformation in a resource-scarce world. *Futures*, 82, 15-25.
- Kirchherr, J., Reike, D., & Hekkert, M. (2023). Conceptualizing the Circular Economy (Revisited). *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 27(1), 341-353.
- Liu, K. (2024). Circular economy and the separated yet inseparable social dimension. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 43, 150-162.
- Lund University. (2021). Circular economy is not the panacea many had hoped for. Retrieved from <https://www.lunduniversity.lu.se/article/circular-economy-not-panacea-many-had-hoped>
- Max-Neef, M. (1991). *Human Scale Development: Conception, Application and Further Reflections*. The Apex Press.
- Murray, A., Skene, K., & Haynes, K. (2017). The Circular Economy: An Interdisciplinary Exploration of the Concept and Application in a Global Context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 140, 369-380.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The views, findings, conclusions, and opinions expressed in articles published in this journal are exclusively those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s). The publisher and/or editorial team neither endorse nor necessarily share these viewpoints. The publisher and/or editors assume no responsibility or liability for any damage, harm, loss, or injury, whether personal or otherwise, that might occur from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information, methods, instructions, or products discussed in the journal's content.
