Anusandhanvallari
Vol 2022, No.1
October 2022
ISSN 2229-3388

Science Against Region: Understanding the Silent Valley Differently

Rohith P,

Associate Professor, School of Letters, MG University, Kottayam, Kerala.

p.rohith@gmail.com

Abstract: This article examines the Silent Valley Hydroelectric Project controversy in Kerala as a clash between regional developmental aspirations and ecological science. It explores how the rhetoric of regional upliftment, rooted in the historical underdevelopment of Malabar, conflicted with the emerging environmental consciousness of the late 1970s and 1980s. Drawing on frameworks from political ecology, Science and Technology Studies, and environmental ethics, the essay situates the debate within larger postcolonial tensions between knowledge, governance, and local identity. By tracing how scientific reports, public activism, and symbolic representations shaped the Silent Valley Movement, this article argues that the conflict ultimately redefined notions of progress and conservation in India. The episode highlights the complex negotiation between economic modernity and ecological responsibility, revealing how both region and science struggled to claim moral and political legitimacy.

Keywords: Political Ecology, Regional Development, Environmental Ethics, Science and Technology Studies, Silent Valley Movement

Introduction

This article argues that the campaign to resist the Silent Valley Hydro-electric Project in Kerala can be perceived as a conflict between the developmental aspirations of a region and the ecological urge to protect an invaluable tract of evergreen forest. The developmental ambitions of the local population were deftly directed against arguments for conservation and preservation by politicians and bureaucrats. This essay attempts to comprehend the campaign against the Silent Valley Hydropower Project, one of the most fiercely contested environmental disputes in India during the late 1970s and early 1980s, as a rupture between the regional desire for development and the scientific or ecological awareness. Unlike other environmental movements that arose locally, the Silent Valley Movement developed as a major resistance effort from locations distant from the project site in the Palghat and Malappuram districts of the Malabar region.

The Silent Valley Project had been a long-cherished dream of the people of Malabar, particularly in Palghat and Malappuram. The project's origins can be traced back to British colonial rule. In the 1920s, the colonial administration conducted a preliminary survey and found the region where the Kunthipuzha River flows between steep hills to be an ideal site for a dam (Nair 2). For various reasons, the British did not pursue it. In 1958, the Kerala Government, motivated by the need for economic upliftment in Malabar, revived the idea of a hydro-electric project at the fringes of the Silent Valley reserve forest. Construction began under the Kerala State Electricity Board (KSEB) in 1973 (Nair 3).

The first major opposition came from the Task Force of the National Commission for Environmental Planning and Coordination (NCEPC), which in 1976, under Zafar Futehally, warned the state government that the project would irreparably damage the region's ecosystem (Vijayachandran 2). In 1977, V. S. Vijayan of the Kerala Forest Research Institute (KFRI) and M. Balakrishnan from the University of Kerala submitted a report advising against the Silent Valley Project. Yet it was M. K. Prasad, a botany lecturer, who popularized the importance of preserving the Silent Valley forest through writings in Sasthragathi and Mathrubhumi (Aatmaraman XXIV-XXXII).

Due to pressure from Prasad and others, the issue was raised at the annual camp of Kerala Sasthra Sahithya Parishat (KSSP), a science-for-the-people organization, in 1977. After internal debate, KSSP adopted a resolution on October 15, 1978, to oppose the project. The year also saw intervention from national and international organizations, including the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and the Bombay Natural History Society (BNHS).

In 1979, the Central Government appointed agricultural scientist M. S. Swaminathan to study the project's feasibility. His committee also recommended abandoning it and developing the area as a rainforest reserve. When controversy persisted, another committee under M. G. K. Menon was appointed in 1980; it too advised against the project. The Silent Valley Project was ultimately shelved (D'Monte 2).

However, support for the project remained strong among political parties, the KSEB, and a group of scientists organized as the Parisara Asoothrana Samrakshana Samithi (PASS). These groups employed the rhetoric of regional development to justify the project. The region of Malabar was repeatedly contrasted with Cochin and Travancore; divisions that had persisted since colonial times and had evolved into disparities in industrial and educational growth.

This emphasis on "regional development" can be understood through the lens of political ecology, which examines how environmental issues intersect with social inequalities and power structures (Robbins 23; Peluso and Watts 12). Proponents framed the Silent Valley Project as a corrective to historical neglect of Malabar, arguing that the proposed 522 million units of electricity would energize industrial growth, provide employment for over three thousand workers for at least five years, improve local infrastructure, and expand irrigation for ten thousand hectares of paddy fields. In this sense, their rhetoric mirrored the development discourse that equates resource exploitation with progress, as observed in Amartya Sen's conception of development as the expansion of human capabilities.

Environmental groups countered these claims systematically. They argued that the KSEB's estimates were inflated and that most of the generated power would be sold rather than benefiting the local population. They maintained that energy efficiency improvements and transmission loss reduction could yield similar capacity without destroying the forest. Furthermore, they rejected the idea of sustained employment for locals, emphasizing that post-construction maintenance would require only a few skilled workers (KSSP 51-52). They warned of adverse climatic effects on Malappuram and Palghat districts.

From a Science and Technology Studies (STS) perspective, this conflict illustrates how scientific knowledge becomes a site of contestation between political and ecological rationalities (Latour 88; Jasanoff 15). The Silent Valley Movement used ecological reports to challenge the legitimacy of state-sponsored "developmental science." Those who joined the Silent Valley Movement valued ecological preservation over promises of industrial progress. For them, the Silent Valley forest was a living laboratory essential for genetic, medical, and agricultural research. Destroying such a biodiverse ecosystem would, they argued, create an irretrievable loss to scientific understanding.

This position resonates with Aldo Leopold's "land ethic," which calls for valuing ecosystems for their intrinsic worth rather than instrumental utility (Leopold 224). Similarly, Arne Naess's Deep Ecology advocates respect for the inherent value of all forms of life (Naess 97). For the Silent Valley activists, protecting the forest was both a scientific and ethical imperative, aligning with Rachel Carson's vision of environmental awareness influencing public morality (Carson 67).

The movement did not reject development entirely; rather, it proposed alternative models. The KSSP, echoing principles of decentralized governance, suggested small, run-of-the-river power and irrigation projects that would empower local communities. They also recommended a thermal power plant for Malabar to address energy needs without ecological devastation. The contrast they drew between the continued backwardness of Idukki—despite

hosting Kerala's largest hydropower project—and the projected prosperity from the Silent Valley Project illustrated their skepticism toward large-scale, centralized schemes.

The region-versus-science aspect becomes even more evident when we note that most anti-project activities originated far from Palghat and Malappuram. Organizations like KSSP and the Society for the Protection of Silent Valley operated from Kozhikode, Friends of Trees from Kottayam, and KNHS and BNHS from Thiruvananthapuram and Bombay respectively. To local supporters of the project, this geographic distance symbolized a lack of empathy for regional aspirations. The environmentalists' concern appeared abstract to local populations, whose immediate focus was economic upliftment.

The absence of displacement and resettlement issues further weakened the movement's local base. From the viewpoint of political ecology, this disconnect demonstrates how environmental campaigns can be perceived as external interventions that threaten local autonomy (Peluso and Watts 25). Thus, the Silent Valley Movement came to represent not merely an ecological struggle but a clash between regional developmental aspirations and a broader, often elite, ecological consciousness.

Those who supported the project exploited this sentiment effectively, portraying the movement as an elitist endeavor detached from local realities. Central government involvement and support from international conservation groups such as the IUCN and WWF were framed as examples of outside interference and even "imperialist" control (Balanandan 4). The regional narrative thus became one of resistance against perceived external domination—a discourse that can be analyzed through postcolonial frameworks. As Gyan Prakash observes, the postcolonial Indian state often positioned science and technology as tools of modernity and sovereignty, yet these same instruments could reproduce colonial hierarchies when local voices were marginalized (Prakash 41). Similarly, Ranajit Guha's subaltern critique helps us understand how the voices of the people of Malabar were largely absent in the decision-making process, overshadowed by bureaucratic and scientific elites (Guha 22).

One of the most striking examples of this was the publication by PASS titled Silent Valley: Myth and Reality, which accused the NCEPC Taskforce of regional bias (Vijayachandran 55). The author, Vijayachandran, alleged that the same committee that denied Kerala's project had sanctioned the Kudremukh Iron Ore Project in Karnataka, suggesting discrimination and the influence of foreign conservation agencies (10). This claim, which drew upon Cold War–era anxieties about Western interference, sought to stir nationalist and regional emotions (Habeeb 3). The invocation of imperial motives and "unbalanced representation" in the taskforce reflects what Bruno Latour would describe as the politicization of scientific knowledge, where facts are mobilized to serve competing narratives (Latour 92).

In this sense, the Silent Valley controversy exemplifies what Sheila Jasanoff calls the "co-production" of knowledge and governance—the way scientific facts and political authority mutually shape each other (Jasanoff 14). The battle was not only about a dam but about whose knowledge counted as legitimate and whose interests defined development.

The environmentalists' perception of the "region" diverged sharply from that of their opponents. Whereas the pro-project groups viewed Malabar as a socio-economic and administrative unit, the ecologists saw it as an ecological entity—an integral part of the Western Ghats with global significance. The anti-project stance was thus grounded not in anthropocentric reasoning but in biocentric and ethical perspectives consistent with Deep Ecology. They argued that the destruction of the Silent Valley would endanger the biodiversity of the entire Western Ghats, a loss that would outweigh any temporary economic benefit.

Aldo Leopold's "land ethic" (225) provides a moral framework for understanding this position: the idea that humans are part of a larger ecological community, and their actions should preserve the integrity, stability, and

beauty of the biotic system. In this light, the Silent Valley Movement's call for conservation transcended the local—it became symbolic of humanity's responsibility to nature itself.

The movement also drew strength from the artistic and literary communities, who interpreted Silent Valley as a metaphor for the fragility of the natural world. This alliance between science and art reflects the interdisciplinary nature of environmental activism, where rational arguments meet emotional and ethical appeals. Although critics dismissed the movement as romantic or utopian (Narayanapilla 11-12), its supporters bridged the gap between scientific rationality and humanistic concern. This collaboration between scientists and artists aligns with Thomas Kuhn's idea of paradigm shifts: the movement represented a shift in public understanding from viewing nature as a resource to seeing it as an interconnected system requiring stewardship (Kuhn 127).

The rhetoric of the pro-project camp, emphasizing jobs and energy, drew on the logic of utilitarian development, while the anti-project movement promoted an ecological worldview that questioned the very foundations of industrial modernity. The clash thus extended beyond the local, symbolizing a broader global tension between economic development and environmental preservation—a theme that Rachel Carson articulated powerfully in Silent Spring (Carson 98).

In conclusion, the Silent Valley controversy was not merely an environmental dispute but a complex negotiation between regional aspirations, scientific authority, and ethical imperatives. The pro-project groups employed the rhetoric of regional justice and development to assert political identity, while the anti-project movement, grounded in scientific and ecological ethics, sought to redefine the meaning of progress itself. This tension reveals how regional politics, postcolonial anxieties, and ecological thought intersect in shaping environmental debates in India.

Viewed through the combined lenses of political ecology, Science and Technology Studies, and environmental ethics, the Silent Valley Movement becomes a paradigm case of what happens when developmental modernity encounters ecological consciousness. The episode demonstrates that science and region need not stand opposed, but their reconciliation demands an inclusive framework that values both human welfare and ecological balance. In that sense, the Silent Valley stands not only as a preserved forest but as a symbol of India's ongoing struggle to harmonize development and conservation.

Works Cited

[1] Aatmaraman. "Harithavabodham Aadyannkurangal". *Harita Niroopanam Malayalattil*. (ed). G Madhusoodanan Current Books, 2002. pp XXIV-XXXII.
[2] Balanandan, E. *Silent Valiyum Parisara Paristhithi Samrakshanavum*. PASS, 1980.
[3] Carson, Rachel. *Silent Spring*. Houghton Mifflin, 1962.
[4] D'Monte, Darryl. *Silent Valley: An End to the Acrimony? Report No. 17*. Centre for Science and Environment, 1983.
[5] Guha, Ranajit. *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society*. Oxford University Press, 1982.
[6] Habeeb, K.O. "Silent Valiyum Samrajyatwa Rashtreeyavum." *Electricity worker*, Vol. 6, 1980, pp 2-4.
[7] Jasanoff, Sheila. *States of Knowledge: The Co-Production of Science and Social Order*. Routledge, 2004.
[8] KSSP. "Silent Valley Vivaadam." *Sasthragathi*. (May 1980): pp. 51-52
[9] Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, 1962.
[10] Latour, Bruno. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Harvard University Press, 1987.
[11] Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac*. Oxford University Press, 1949.
[12] Naess, Arne. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary." *Inquiry*, vol. 16, 1973, pp. 95–100.

[13] Nair, B. K. *An Ecological Hyperbole*. PASS, 1980.
[14] Narayanapilla, M. P. "Prakrthi Ammayano" *Kalakaumudi* 258 (1981): 11-12.
[15] Peluso, Nancy Lee, and Michael Watts, editors. *Violent Environments*. Cornell University Press, 2001.
[16] Prakash, Gyan. *Another Reason: Science and the Imagination of Modern India*. Princeton University Press, 1995.
[17] Robbins, Paul. *Political Ecology: A Critical Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
[18] Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford University Press, 1999.
[19] Vijayachandran, K. *Silent Valley: 'Myth and Reality'*. PASS, 1980.
[20] Vijayan, V. S and M. Balakrishnan. *Impact of hydroelectric project on wildlife. Report of the first phase of study*. Kerala Forest Research Institute, 1977.