

## The Mass Movement of Environmental Problems in Thailand

Manabu Ando\*

### Abstract

There are two different forms of environment movement in the Thailand.

1. It is the environment movement carried out by the power (state or bureaucracy), and it is the environment movement carried out by the capital (large enterprise).
2. It is the environment movement carried out by the general public.

The environment movement carried out by this general public was organized to keep their life. Because, their life suffered damage by the air pollution, the noise, the industrial waste throwing away, the chemical waste throwing away, the deforestation, and so on in Thai land in the 1970' s. This environment movement was supported by the student movement and the knowledge class, and NGO was founded. And this environment movement in Thailand became this rank. But, the power and capital carried out an environment movement such as Bismarck' s "candy and whip" to repress the environment movement carried out by the general public.

**Key words :** Environment, Pollution, movement, Protest, NGO

### Introduction

It was sent to Prime Minister of Thailand from the environmental NGO (International River Network).

October, 1999

The Hon. Mr. Chuan Leekpai  
Prime Minister of Thailand

Dear Mr. Chuan

We write to express our support for the 1850 people currently facing submergence at the Rasi Salai dam on the Mun River in North-Eastern Thai land. These people intend to stay in their village, Mae Mun Man Yuen Village #2, and face

the rising waters, until their demands are met.

The Department of Energy Development and Promotion is currently filling the reservoir and the water level is at 116.8 meters above sea level. Already four houses and 80per cent of the village' s rice fields and vegetable gardens have been flooded. If the level reaches 117.5 meters, the village will be entirely submerged and people will drown.

We are writing to urge you to direct the DEPD to immediately stop filling the reservoir, and to give due consideration to the people' s demands. The villagers are demanding that the government reexamine the impacts of the project, drain the reservoir, determine the exact number of people

---

\* Kyushu University of Nursing and Social Welfare

affected by the dam, pay compensation to all affected peoples, and correct the environmental problems caused by the dam. If the government refuses to pay compensation, the villagers demand that the dam be removed.

These people have been demonstrating for over six years, yet the government has refused to listen. On April 20 of this year, more than 1000 villagers affected by Rasi Salai dam occupied the dam site. Still the government did not listen. Now 1850 people are prepared to die in order to get the attention of the government. They have lost everything and they feel they have nothing more to lose.

Rasi Salai has been plagued by problems and deceit ever since it was first conceived. DEPD failed to release any information to the public prior to construction, and stated that they would only build a small rubber weir 4.5 meters high, not a concrete dam 9 meters high. More than 100 square kilometers were inundated, yet no

Environmental Impact Assessment was conducted, contrary to the Environment Act. Even though the dam was completed in 1994, and DEPD is currently filling the reservoir, the irrigation system is not operational, so the dam is effectively useless.

The dam destroyed the fresh water swamp forest along the banks of the Mun River and blocked the migration of fish. The reservoir has been plagued by salination problems because it is located on top of a big salt dome. More than 3000 families have lost their farmland to the reservoir, and compensation was paid for private property only, not for lost customary land rights. After a long struggle General Chawalit's government paid compensation to 1154 families, yet more than 1800 families remain uncompensated.

Please act now to protect the lives of these people and respect their demands. Thank you for your consideration of these important matters.

Yours sincerely

This letter is sent to support the inhabitants of the Rasi Salai valley who have been fighting for their livelihood and their lives. These people have been demonstrating for over six years, yet the government has refused to listen. More than 1000 villagers affected by the Rasi Salai dam occupied the dam site, but still the government did not listen. Now 1850 people are prepared to die in order to get the government's attention. They have lost everything and feel they have nothing to lose. Even though the dam was completed in 1994, and DEPD (Department of Energy Development and Promotion) is currently filling the reservoir, the irrigation system is not operational, so the dam is effectively useless. It is a very similar situation to the crisis of the Kawabe-gawa dam in Japan. Why has the well-being of local people been ignored by the government and their blinkered focus on the economy especially when this focus has been so utterly misguided? Because there are problems of the economic structure in the capitalist society itself. The birth and growth of this new environmental protest movement in Thailand is discussed in this paper. I have used the "Environmental Problem in the North of Thailand -Role and Function of the Royal Project-", the official view of the Thai Government and contrasted it with extensive research I carried out in Thailand in 2000-2002

### Environmental problems

The rapid economic growth in Thailand was mainly due to the explosive development of manufacturing industries, tourism, and direct foreign investment over the past few decades. However, the haphazard and opportunistic industrialization not only has produced many adverse social and economic effects, but also has had dramatic environmental costs, many of which are unfortunately irreversible. According to ERTC, Thailand's environmental problems are very serious, including all sorts of pollution from industrial wastes, widespread deforestation, depletion of mineral resources, and encroachment on national parks and wildlife.

In Bangkok, air, noise, and water pollution have far exceeded standard acceptable levels. There are at least two million vehicles moving around Bangkok, 800,000 of which are motorcycles. They emit dangerous gases as well as smoke and dust that contain lead and carbon. In 1989, some 900,000 people suffered from respiratory illnesses. Doctors have also found lead in the umbilical cords of newborn babies.

The major source of dangerous environmental problems stems from Thailand's estimated 100,000 factories. Wastes discharged from these factories in the form of air pollutants, waste water, and chemical waste directly invade the bodies of the people, taking their toll in both short-term and long-term effects. Thailand's rivers are contaminated with all kinds of filth and garbage, industrial wastes, chemicals, plastics, human waste, and disease-contaminated garbage from hospitals. The Bangkok Post <sup>1)</sup>, for example, reported that two hundred farmers and residents living near a dye factory marched to the

provincial hall in Nakhon Pathom Province, where they called on government officials to stop the factory from discharging untreated water into the river, which was polluting the water needed for their farms and household use. Contaminated water had flooded the whole area, killing fruit trees and causing people to become ill. When the situation remained unchanged, 400 farmers rallied in front of the factory seven months later, resulting in a confrontation.

Despite Thailand's rapid economic development, the majority of Thais live in rural areas and their livelihood depends on the rural resource economy. Over the past two decades, they have been drawn into political conflict over the environment by the mounting pressure that so-called "resource-intensive" development exerts on the sources of their sustenance. For example, since the late 1970s, Thailand has suffered considerable loss of fertile crop land and forest as industrialists and developers have turned such land into industrial sites, resorts, golf courses, and condominiums. Thailand's forest areas have shrunk by almost half since 1961, from 53 percent of the total land area in 1961 to only 28 percent in 1988 <sup>2)</sup>.

In the North, logging and encroachment into upland forests have motivated farmers to take action to protect the watersheds that feed their fields. Farmers' protests against timber-cutting in more than ten provinces in the North were important components of the rising environmentalist pressure that resulted in the banning of all logging nationwide in 1989 <sup>3)</sup>.

In the South, the level of degradation as a result of deforestation was brought to public attention by the tragic November 1 1988 mudslide and flood in which a heavy rain brought down thousands of

legal and illegal logs from the forest, killing 300 villagers and destroying a number of villages overnight in several provinces<sup>4)</sup>. The situation in the East has been aggravated since 1981 by the promotion of the Eastern Seaboard industrial zone. The Gulf of Siam is heavily contaminated with industrial waste from 1,647 plants located at the Laem Chabang and Mab Taphud areas in the eastern province of Rayong. Among them, 494 are chemical-producing plants, 40 are large chemical users, and 21 are in the petrochemical industry<sup>5)</sup>.

In the Northeast, illegal rocksalt mining has polluted one of the region's major rivers, the Nam Siew (Siew River). Rocksalt is used in the export-oriented soda ash and glass-making industries. Extensive mining in the 1970s and the 1980s has resulted in rapid land erosion and destruction of the Nam Siew and its aquatic life. The river is now twice as salty as sea water. The livelihood of 300,000 people in 500 villages along the banks of the river is badly affected<sup>6)</sup>. Finally, many foreign companies see Thailand as a polluter's haven because of a lack of enforcement of anti-pollution regulations. A good illustration is provided by the practice of dumping tons of toxic chemical wastes from foreign countries at the Port Authority area; this went on for years, until the waste exploded accidentally in 1990<sup>7)</sup>.

Similar to other developing countries, environmental degradation in Thailand has led to the emergence of environmental movements over the past three decades. In the 1970s and the 1980s, there was a fairly robust environmental movement from below organized by the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to protect the livelihood and welfare of the local populations. However, by the 1990s, the thrust of Thailand's

environmental movement has shifted to a form that can be called an "environmental movement from above" organized by big businesses and state bureaucrats to address life-style and "cosmetic" issues.

### Origins

As Quigley (1996) points out, prior to the 1970s there were virtually no environmental organizations in Thailand. However, by the early 1970s there was a loose network of student-organized ecological clubs. These clubs had some influence in expressing students' anger regarding the environmental policies of the military government of Thanom.

Thailand has been under military rule since 1932. In Thai's military-dominated system, coups d'etat (eleven between 1962 and 1973) became an institutionalized means for military generals to alternate in power while at the same time suppress the emergence of civil society<sup>8)</sup>. In this respect, the ecological club made history in 1973 when they exposed a hunting scandal of the military government. Following a helicopter crash on May 1, 1973, it became clear that government officials had been hunting in a restricted reserve at Thung Yai Naresuan Wildlife Sanctuary in western Thailand. Students at Ramkhamhaeng University published a satirical account of this incident, for which nine of them were expelled. The scandal led to demands for a government investigation, increased interest in conservation among youth and the general public, and to the establishment of the Royal Forestry Department's Wildlife Conservation Division<sup>9)</sup>.

In addition, this scandal is cited as one of the catalysts for the student-led rebellion in 1973. In October 1973, a march of 30,000 students against

the military government snarled Bangkok traffic for two days. Oppositional forces to the military government then used this opportunity to press for a new constitution, leading to an "open politics" period between 1973 and 1976 <sup>10)</sup>.

The most sustained environmentally oriented political battle during this period was the so-called TEMCO movement of 1974~75. The surging student movement at this time succeeded on March 14, 1975 in forcing the government to withdraw extremely profitable (and illegal) mining concessions in southern Thailand that had been granted

by a few shareholding high government officials to the Union Carbide-dominated Thailand Exploration and Mining Corporation (TEMCO). This campaign epitomized the use of environmental issue by students to highlight abuses of power by government officials and build popular support <sup>11)</sup>.

As a result of the success of the TEMCO movement, environmental groups proliferated during this open politics period. However, they were the focus of the crackdown following the 1976 coup that returned Thailand to authoritarianism under Prime Minister Thanin. Student leaders fled to the forest, as it came to be associated with refuge for the disaffected and a source of opposition to the authoritarian regime. Other than the forest, there was little space for open opposition to the military government, and students were barred from activism in rural areas (Hirsch and Lohmann 1989). Although the period of "open politics" was brief, it signaled the end of the unchallengeable supremacy of the military's right to rule Thailand.

### Development

Just a few years after the 1976 coup, environmental movements rose up in Thailand again. Quigley<sup>12)</sup>

has identified the following factors for the growth of environmental movements in the 1980s. First, there was mounting evidence that unbridled development was degrading the environment. Particular concerns, including water pollution, deforestation, and dam building, began to emerge in the 1980s. The degradation of natural resources, previously protected by their inaccessibility, had accelerated rapidly during the late 1970s under strict military rule. Thus, Hirsch and Lohmann <sup>13)</sup> estimate that Thailand's forests are being destroyed at an amazing rate of approximately 2,500 square kilometers, or 1.6 percent of remaining forest area, per year.

Second, there was a rapid expansion of the middle class as a result of economic development in Thailand. Paribatra <sup>14)</sup> suggests that the size of the middle class in Thailand has grown from 178,000 in 1960 to 1,800,000 in 1986. The middle-class members were mostly young (ages 25-35), well educated (bachelor's degrees or the equivalent), exposed to Western culture, and employed in professional and managerial occupations. Members of the middle class, especially in Bangkok, did not have to look far to see ample evidence of environmental degradation. Their concerns about the deteriorating environment and their dissatisfaction with the state's failure to address these problems motivated middle-class professionals to form NGOs in order to change government policy toward the environment.

Third, the military government began to adopt a more tolerant policy toward dissent after the collapse of the communist insurgency in Thailand in the early 1980s. The military granted an amnesty policy that encouraged many radical students to return from the forests <sup>15)</sup>. Thus, civil society organizations that were interested in

influencing public policy on environmental issues found an opening. Political activists tended to focus on environmental issues because they had more room to maneuver these issues than with democracy issues. On the other hand, government officials who had previously been suspicious of environmental organizations began to pay them some credence. For example, the mass demonstrations protesting the proposed Nam Choan Dam in Kanchanaburi from 1982 to 1984 are considered to be the first events where political activists could publicly express themselves after the 1976 coup.

Finally, Thai environmental movements were helped by the global environmental movements in the 1980s. Global linkages provided both an umbrella and some financial resources for Thailand's new environmental organizations to harness growing dissatisfaction with the government's poor environmental record. For example, the Wildlife Fund in Thailand received significant backing from the World Wildlife Fund, and the Project for Ecological Recovery was established with funding from Germany.

The first major environmental issue that erupted in this period was the proposed Nam Choan Dam on the Khwae Yai River in Kanchanaburi. In Hirsch and Lohmann's <sup>16)</sup> account, as the cabinet was considering whether to go ahead with the dam in early 1982, a storm of protest arose following a campaign by students in thirteen university environmental clubs. The Nam Choan Dam project was then shelved for several years. When the Thai cabinet tried to revive the project in the spring of 1986, another wave of protest erupted. Students, NGOs, university scientists, and dozens of foreign environmental organizations joined hands to challenge the government's

ministers, technocrats, military leaders, and big corporations. Rallies, marches, and concerts were held, and posters were put up all over the province to denounce the project. The protests were energized by the participation of a leading popular singer (Ad Carabao), a revered abbot (Phra BuddnadhasaBhikku of Suan Moke Temple of Surat Thani), and the ascetic governor of Bangkok (Major General Chamlong Srimuang). Fearing that the anti-dam movement might topple the eight-year-old government of Prem Tinsulanonda, political parties in both the government coalition and the opposition began to come out against the dam in March 1988, finally leading to the shelving of the dam project.

Another major environmental protest activity in this period involved the politics of the planting of the fast-growing eucalyptus for the wood chips and paper-pulp industry. Growth in Japanese wood chips and paper pulp led to the eucalyptus boom in Thailand in the 1980s as a Japanese-Thai joint venture, called Thai Eucalyptus Resources, promoted the planting of 2,000 square kilometers of eucalyptus to produce chips for export. The Thai state enthusiastically supports the tree plantation companies because it can be seen as discharging its responsibility to "reforest the country" after years of logging. However, expansive eucalyptus plantations have few of the characteristics of natural forests and can reduce the water table and damage neighboring crops and village agro-systems. Villagers complain that eucalyptus allows little intercropping; it is useless for fodder, damages local soil and water regimes in ways villagers are sensitive to, and supplies little firewood to the community. Every five or six years, eucalyptus is harvested just like any other export crop, leaving the ground temporarily

exposed to soil erosion and mudslide. In addition, a eucalyptus plantation requires use of land currently under cultivation and owned by the villagers. Displacement from such land is increasingly common. Protesting against the eucalyptus companies small-scale farmers, are weathering the contempt of bureaucrats, standing up to assassination threats, and arranging meetings with villagers from other areas. They are holding rallies, speaking out at seminars, blocking roads, marching on government offices, singing songs composed for the occasion. Where other means fail and they are well enough organized, they are ripping out eucalyptus seedlings, chopping down eucalyptus trees, stopping bulldozers, and burning nurseries and equipment. Many villagers are planting fruit, rubber, and native forest trees to preempt or replace eucalyptus <sup>17),18),19),20)</sup>.

In February 1990, at the Environment 90 seminar attended by more than 950 participants, an alternative development plan to the government was proposed. It strongly suggested a fairer measure of economic distribution and sustainable growth instead of the trickledown approach that has been used throughout the previous six economic plans (1963-1990). It stressed that the goal of economic development must be reconsidered, taking into account the costs of natural resources and the cost to the environment, in order to provide for a balanced and humane social and economic development <sup>21)</sup>. The alternative development strategy was further spelled out in the People's Plan for the 21st Century (PP21) in the "1991 People's Forum." PP21 declares that "promoting alternative development is to share alternative development approaches, which is economically self-reliant,

politically just, and environmentally sustainable. To enhance people's control of the development direction and their natural resources is the agenda for the approaching century" <sup>22)</sup>.

In August 1990, Seub Nakhasathien, a leading conservationist, took his own life as an act of protest in order to safeguard Thailand's national parks and wildlife reserves. The budget allocated for the Huay Kha Khaeng National Wildlife Sanctuary, for instance, was one baht (US\$0.04) per 50 square kilometers. Clearly, the foot patrol of wildlife conservationists is simply no match in deterring those with more modern technology felling trees. Seub Nakhasathien's tragic death raised public awareness about the plight of the national forest reserve and spurred the conservation movement to step up its campaign <sup>23)</sup>.

By the 1990s, of the approximately 12,000 NGOs in Thailand, some 200 are environmentally related organizations. Of these environmental organizations, the great majority focus on improving the local environment, while some 15 to 20 of these address broad issues of national environmental policy. The NGOs are a highly diversified group, and differ greatly in terms of ideology, strategy, and organization. The Project for Ecological Recovery (PER) is one of the most successful grassroots-oriented NGOs in contesting government environmental decisions.

Quigley <sup>24)</sup> has provided a lucid account of the social origins, the mission and program, the strategy, and organization of PER. Founded in 1985 by Witoon Permpongascharoen, a community development activist from rural Kanchanaburi, PER grew out of an environmental coalition formed during the protests over the proposed construction of Nam Choan Dam. This coalition

involved a variety of social forces, including Buddhadasa Bhikkhu (one of Thailand's most revered monks), grassroots NGOs, students, rural residents, as well as sympathetic governmental officials.

The mission of PER is to mobilize people to address specific environmental problems that affect their livelihood. PER aims to give people a greater say in how the problems of the environment are addressed. Consequently, the principal activities of PER involve training of and advocacy for local groups. These activities aim to promote local solutions to environmental problems, such as empowering citizens to have a role in the selection of dam sites. Thus, PER advocates an anti-bureaucratic, egalitarian ideology born of opposition to the mainstream development path that has marginalized the less privileged sector of society and done so much to damage Thailand's natural resources <sup>25)</sup>.

In its advocacy work, PER will not hesitate to adopt a confrontational strategy if needed. Since its inception, it has been highly visible in contesting some of Thailand's most well-known environmental flash points, such as deforestation, logging, and dam controversies. For example, PER has called for the shelving of forest-affecting commercially oriented projects such as resorts; it suggests that unoccupied or unused forests, whether degraded or not, be protected from commercial plantations <sup>26)</sup>. Thus, PER has given voice to the concerns of local rural people who were not previously involved with the government's decisions on major hydroelectric dam projects and other vital environmental issues.

PER has a small permanent staff of ten and a modest annual budget of US\$100,000, consisting primarily of grants from international agencies

and overseas organizations. PER was founded with assistance from the German government and has received support from numerous over-seas foundations such as Ashoka Fellowship and the Ford Foundation.

#### **Problems of environmental movement (NGOs)**

Despite the success of PER and the proliferation of other environmental organizations, Quigley <sup>27)</sup> points out that Thailand's environmental NGOs face the following structural constraints. First, most of the local NGOs are not well financed, and they are dependent upon foreign financing. For many environmental organization, external support averages between 80 and 90 percent of their operating budgets. By the 1990s, a reduced level of funding from overseas donors has become a major constraint on their operations and led them to look for new funding sources, including those originating from both the government and the business sector <sup>28)</sup>. However, in order to apply for funding from the government and the business sector, the NGOs have to change their strategy from confrontation to cooperation. Thus, Decha Premrudeelert, chairperson of NGO-COD's Northeastern Chapter, remarks, "NGOs will have to experiment more in marketing, community business and fund-raising activities. Thus, they need to adapt their personality and attitudes toward people in other sectors, such as the middle class and various socially committed groups which include government officers, business people and consumers in general" <sup>29)</sup>.

Second, many local environmental organizations do not have long-term staffs who are professionally trained. They do not network well and tend to live and die with their leaders. Their leaders, for the most part, are young and do not have experience



in government offices. They focus on local issues and single events and generally lack a strategic view. As Srisawang Phuavongphaet, chairperson of NGO-COD, remarks, "We have to admit that NGOs are not good at management. Their way of working has not required them to be strictly organized" <sup>30)</sup>. When funding became a serious problem in the 1990s, it affected the quality of NGO staff as well. Phra (monk) Phasian Wisalo explains, NGOs "can't go on paying higher and higher salary to their staff whose expectations and family needs will increase all the time. But once the organizations reach their budget ceiling, disappointed workers would leave for other better-paying jobs. Disruption of work resulted" <sup>31)</sup>.

Third, the NGOs are highly diversified. There are many different kinds of NGOs, with their concerns ranging from environment, rural development, human rights, indigenous people, and so on. Karunan <sup>32)</sup> laments that while the mushrooming of numerous NGOs signifies the diversification of NGO approaches and methods of work, "it also resulted in increasing fragmentation of community work and the inevitable polarization of conflicting orientations in development work . . . It has often been difficult for NGOs to come together and present a viable and sustainable alternative to mainstream development programs and parliamentary politics in Thai society. Thus, while strong community linkages and organizational network continue to prevail at local and provincial levels, Thai NGOs still have a long way to go in terms of developing effective cross-sectional alliances and national network.

Fourth, although environmental organizations have had some success in attracting media

attention around specific projects, they still have underdeveloped media and public relations capacity. Thailand's electronic media are still under government control. For example, all of the more than 300 radio broadcast bands are controlled by the military or military-related organizations, and they are licensed on a one-year contract to private operators. Given these short leases, station operators are wary about having their leases renewed, so they are quite circumspect in what they say about the government. In fact, in the government-controlled mass media, environmental organizations have been criticized as being agents of foreign governments, as trouble makers who aroused the public to create problems for the government, and as agents impeding Thailand's developmental process. As Dej Phoomkhacha, director of Thai Volunteer Service, remarks, "Time and again, grassroots people and their allies have asked for justice, proposed alternatives, and even organized protest rallies. Instead of rendering sympathy and compassion, Thai society as a whole tends to treat these people as trouble-making rebels" <sup>33)</sup>.

Finally, environmental organizations are under close supervision by the government through licensing. Aside from the general bureaucratic obstacles to registration with government (such as time-consuming, cumbersome, and expensive registration procedures), environmental organizations have to go through checking by the police, the cultural ministry, and the tax authorities. Government registration is a political means to keep the environmental organizations in conformity with governmental policies, so they will not become too rebellious. Given the number of the environmental organizations and the broad scope of their activities, coupled with some international

support, it was difficult for the state to suppress the Thai environmental movements from below completely. Nevertheless, given the considerable constraints—such as weak financial base, lack of organization, fragmentation, poor mass media image, and close government supervision—faced by the NGOs, the Thai state and big businesses grasped a golden opportunity to appropriate the environmental movements from above.

### Conclusion

Thailand's environmental movements represent a very complicated phenomenon because two different forms of environmentalism have intersected with one another since the 1980s. On the one hand, there is a grassroots environmental movement from below waged by the rural poor, students, and NGOs against business and the state's deforestation, dam construction, mining, and high-growth policy. Rallies, demonstrations, and confrontations are some of the strategies used by the grassroots environmental movements to protect the livelihood and welfare of the poor and indigenous people. On the other hand, there is an environmental movement from above organized by big corporations and government officials in order to pacify the protest activities of the environmental groups.

Big business and state officials emphasize the importance of maintaining the harmony of different interests and the need for cooperation. They promote "a green life-style" and the use of ecologically friendly consumer products among the Thai citizens as well as the adoption of technical solutions to clean up Bangkok. In the 1990s, it seems that big business and the state have, so far, successfully contained the grassroots

environmental movements through funding, new environmental policy, and mass media support.

However, it is unlikely that the business sector and the Thai government will be able to contain the grassroots environmental movements from below for long. Despite the "cosmetic" initiatives of the business community to beautify the environment, and despite the government's new environmental initiatives, above indicate that Thailand's environmental problems will get worse in the next century.

### References

- 1) The Bangkok Post. Various issues
- 2) Manabu Ando "Environmental Disruption around Chiang Kham Amphorne" Together with Asia 2000: pp24-25 .2000.
- 3) Hirsch, Philip, and Lany Lohmann "The Contemporary Politics of Environment in Thailand" Asian Survey 29: pp439-451. 1989.
- 4) ERTC (Environmental Research and Training Centre) investigation materials 2000,2001,2002.
- 5) Siriyuvasak, Ubonrat "The Environment and Popular Culture in Thai-land." Thai Development Newsletter 26: pp64-69. 1994.
- 6) Siriyuvasak, Ubonrat "The Environment and Popular Culture in Thai-land." Thai Development Newsletter 26: pp64-69. 1994.
- 7) ERTC (Environmental Research and Training Centre) investigation materials 2000,2001,2002.
- 8) Paribatra, Snkhumbhand "State and Society in Thailand" Asian Survey 33: pp879-93. 1993.
- 9) Hirsch, Philip, and Lany Lohmann "The Contemporary Politics of Environment in Thailand" Asian Survey 29: pp439-451. 1989.
- 10) Heinze, Ruth-Inge "Ten Days in October—Students versus the Military: An Account of the Student Uprisings in Thailand"

Asian Survey 14: pp491-508. 1974

11) Hirsch, Philip, and Lany Lohmann "The Contemporary Politics of Environment in Thailand" Asian Survey 29: pp439-451. 1989.

12) Quigley, Kevin "Environmental Organizations and Democratic Consolidation in Thailand" Crossroads 9 (2): pp1-29. 1996.

13) Hirsch, Philip, and Lany Lohmann "The Contemporary Politics of Environment in Thailand" Asian Survey 29: pp439-451. 1989.

14) Paribatra, Snkhumbhand "State and Society in Thailand" Asian Survey 33: pp879-93. 1993.

15) Maisrikrod, Surin "The Making of Thai Democracy" In Democratization in Southeast and East Asia, edited by Anek Laothamatas : pp141-166. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies. 1997.

16) Hirsch, Philip, and Lany Lohmann "The Contemporary Politics of Environment in Thailand" Asian Survey 29: pp439-451. 1989.

17) Manabu Ando "Environmental Disruption around Chiang Kham Ampharne" Together with Asia2000:pp24-25.2000.

18) Manabu Ando "Environmental Problem in the North of Thailand" The Journal of Kyushu University of Nursing and Social Welfare.3-1: pp199-204. 2001.

19) Manabu Ando "Health Promotion Project and Environmental Countermeasure in Phayao City" Together with Asia 2001: pp19-20.2001.

20) Manabu Ando "Establish Environmental Organization in Thailand" Kyushu University of Nursing and Social Welfare 4-1: pp153-158. 2002.

21) Siriyuvasak, Ubonrat "The Environment and Popular Culture in Thailand." Thai Development Newsletter 26: pp64-69. 1994.

22) People's Plan (People's Plan for the 21st Century). Experiences of Hope: Reaching for the 21st Century. Bangkok: NGO-Coordinating Committee on Rural Development. 1992.

23) Siriyuvasak, Ubonrat "The Environment and Popular Culture in Thailand." Thai Development Newsletter 26: pp64-69. 1994.

24) Quigley, Kevin "Environmental Organizations and Democratic Consolidation in Thailand" Crossroads 9 (2): pp1-29. 1996.

25) Hirsch, Philip "Where Are the Roots of Thai Environmentalism?" TEI Quarterly Environment Journal 2 (2): pp5-15. 1994.

26) Lohmann, Larry "Land, Power, and Forest Colonization in Thailand" Global Ecology and Biogeography Letters 3: pp180-191. 1993.

27) Quigley, Kevin "Environmental Organizations and Democratic Consolidation in People's Plan (People's Plan for the 21st Century). Experiences of Hope: Reaching for the 21st Century. Bangkok: NGO-Coordinating Committee on Rural Development. 1992.Thailand" Crossroads 9 (2): pp1-29. 1996. University of Hong Kong, February.

28) Thai Development Newsletter.NO.29.1995.

29) Thai Development Newsletter.NO.29.1995.

30) Thai Development Newsletter.NO.29.1995.

31) Thai Development Newsletter.NO.29.1995.

32) Karunan, Victor P "Introduction" In Thai NGOs, edited by Jaturong Boonyarattanasoontom and Gawin Chutima, p. 408. Bangkok: NGO Support Project. 1995.

33) Thai Development Newsletter.NO.29.1995.

## タイの環境問題における大衆運動

安 藤 学

### 要 旨

タイ国における環境運動には、2つの異なる形態がある。1. 権力（国家または官僚）によって実施される環境運動と資本（大企業）によって実施される環境運動。2. 一般大衆によって実施される環境運動である。この一般大衆によって実施される環境運動は、彼らの生活を守るために組織された。なぜならば、彼らの生活は、1970年代のタイにおいて、大気汚染、騒音、産業廃棄物投棄、化学廃棄物投棄、森林伐採などによって被害を受けたのである。この環境運動は、学生運動と知識階層によって支援されNGOが誕生したのである。そしてタイにおける環境運動は本格化していったのである。しかし権力と資本は、一般大衆によって実施される環境運動を抑止するために、ビスマルクの「飴と鞭」的環境運動を実施したのである。

キーワード：環境 汚染 運動 反対 NGO