Abul Kalam

ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT: WIDENING SECURITY FRONTIER AND THE QUEST FOR A NEW SECURITY FRAMEWORK IN SOUTH ASIA

Introduction

The subjects of environment and development have not been the primary concerns of the discipline of International Relations until recent years. Only in the last few decades as policies within and beyond nation-states tended to permit drastic dereliction of the planet earth and affect the future of the *homo sapiens* and other living beings of the habitat, analysts in international relations field could hardly distance themselves from the traditional areas of concern of the specialists of ecology and bionomics. Indeed, environment and development are special sort of linking issues that concern security and, therefore, have drawn attention of the global policy makers and need to be addressed by analysts in international relations and foreign policy practitioners as well.

There have been two contrasting developments in the area in the last quarter of a century: one is an accelerated rate of environmental degradation and developmental challenges that highlighted a fragmented system of sovereign states, normatively built around the mutual recognition of sovereignty, and the other is an improved scientific knowledge and

Abul Kalam, Ph.D., is Professor in the Department of International Relations, University of Dhaka.

heightened popular consciousness of the seriousness of the ecological challenges facing humanity[1]. The task confronting analysts in international relations is to seek a wider conceptualization of the linking areas and to insist on acceptable normative conceptions so as to tackle the environmental challenges that are to be firmly anchored in a realistic appreciation of the possibilities of effective political action at national and regional levels[2].

However, the current environment problems and development challenges seem "so tangled and at the same time so diffused that they cannot be effectively dealt with by their linear methods of the prestigious hard sciences."[3] Perhaps a tenderly analytical perspective and a flexible treatment by the normative approaches of the social science discipline may provide wider perspective and vision needed for adoption of appropriate policy by the decision makers, nationally, regionally and internationally.

The new analytical perspectives followed the withering of the Cold War in the international system and an appearance of a new set of global environmental issues such as desertification, depletion of ozone layer, global warming, greenhouse effect, sea-level rise--causal links now scientifically established that have seized the attention of the media, transnational actors and popular opinion[4]. All these have also cast a shadow on the existing national priorities and challenged the prevailing notions of security.

1.   Andrew Hurrell, "International Political Theory and the Global Environment," in Ken Booth and Steve Smith (eds.), *International Relations Theory Today* (University Park, Pa: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), pp. 130, 132.

2.   John Dunn quoted, in *Ibid.*, p. 127.

3.   Rene Dubos quoted, Donald R. Kelly, Kenneth R. Stunkel and Richard R. Wescott, *The Economic Superpowers and the Environment: The United States, The Soviet Union and Japan* (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1976), p. 6.

4.   Gareth Porter and Janet Welsh Brown, *Global Environmental Politics* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1991), pp. 1-2.

In the backdrop of the foregoing developments, the paper addresses the analytical dimensions offered under both environment and development, and suggests that the issues and perspectives they both advance cover substantial areas of security. Therefore, consistent with the more recent conceptual shift in the international system, it is viewed that analysts concerned with security and strategic studies can hardly afford to distance themselves from the emerging fields; indeed they both should be integrated in formulating and executing regional-national security policies. The paper views, in this context, that the recent analytical shift involving security and the emerging fields of environment and development should provide the necessary guide-post in readjustment and framing of policies at national and regional levels such as in Bangladesh and South Asia.

In support of the above arguments, the paper begins by identifying the broad linkage components of international relations, security and the emerging fields of environment and development (section I). It then appraises the concept of security, keeping in view its changing meanings and contexts (section II). The paper also surveys the multidimensional aspects of the concept of security, focusing on environment and sustainable development, including the paradigm shift that occurred in recent years (section III), and suggests on the basis of the linking nature of environment, development and security an eclectic framework that may harmonize national and regional interests (section IV). Finally, it reflects on the concrete South Asian reality and posits that an eclectic framework along the line may contribute to a better appraisal of the South Asian predicament in the area and may, as well, reinforce the effort towards better policy precision than what the region has so far witnessed (section V).

The paper is not being projected as a "think piece" on the conceptual aspects of security or on its widening frontiers, but it does attempt to synthesize the evolving pattern of the long-term concept, taking into

account the multilevel context of the debate, especially focusing on the broadened territory of the concept that seems to encompass the newer fields such as environment and development. It appears that the above issues have made inroad into the arena of politics, consequentially becoming matters of major security concern, and hence have also become major preoccupation of the policy makers. Therefore, the paper seeks to integrate the analytical views on both the issues for suggesting a security framework that may harmonize the national and regional interests. Perhaps the issues need to be addressed, keeping in perspective the developments in international relations as well as in the field of security.

I. International Relations, Security and the Emerging Fields

Contemporary international system is being buffeted by a number of "tectonic shifts" or powerful trends, with a consequent increase in certain types of conflicts at different levels, including environmental degradation, population pressures, scarcity of water and such other resources, an intensification of ethnic and religious identities resulting from conflicts over sharing of scarce natural resources, and so on[5]. It seems apparent that there has been a qualitative shift in the nature and the pattern of behavior of the constituting elements of the international system, and that the conceptual perspectives that were in currency in the previous decades may neither offer sufficient explanation for the emergent realities nor may have enough relevance for policy-oriented analysis in the current context of international relations.

Since its emergence as a discipline, International Relations has been predominantly occupied with what is going on between and within the system of nation-states. Issues such as environment and its sustainability

---

5.   Carolyn M. Stephenson, "New Approaches to International Peacemaking in the Post-Cold War World," in M. Klare and D. Thomas (eds.), *World Security: Trends and Challenges at Century's End* (New York: St Martin Press, 1994), p. 100.

and other related problems featured as "low politics" in the discipline[6]. In recent years relations between and among nations have increasingly become fragile with the foregoing complexities of international life, resulting, in particular, to the failure to manage the relationship between developmental aspirations of people within nation-states and the natural environment on a lasting and sustainable basis.

Environmental politics and development concerns at any level do not focus on a single issue but encompass complex set of issues, each of which has its own structure and dynamics. The issues in their very scope often focus on two dimensions: one is the issue of developmental sustainability or the scope of environmental consequences of the economic activity in question, and the other is the spatial view or the geographical scope of the states and non-state actors involved. If the consequences are global and regional or subregional, or if the interests of the actors concerned transcend those of one single nation-state and envelop other actors in a subregion or a region, the issues may no longer be seen as simply bilateral or national. Obviously, both environment and development currently may be seen as issue areas where the international players at different levels do interact and have vital and overlapping security interests.

There is little doubt that the contemporary environmental crisis is indeed global in scope; its causes are complex and the solutions needed may equally be complex. As a perceptive analyst wrote,

> Human beings have built dams, drained wetlands, diverted rivers, cleared bush and scrublands, and permitted overgrazing of grasslands since the ancient times.... But the environmental crisis we now confront is quantitatively and qualitatively different from anything before, simply because so many people have been

---

6. Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

inflicting damage on the world's ecosystem during the present
century that the system as a whole--not simply its various parts--
may be in danger[7].

Indeed, there has been a slow but steady realization that
environmental threats may have serious socio-economic and human costs--
hence causing insecurity--and that they cannot be solved by the unilateral
decisions of states. This has given impetus in recent years to increased
international co-operation to halt or reverse environmental degradation.
That realization has also unleashed a new political force--a global
environmental movement, viewed sometimes as environmentalism,
that pleads and undertakes increasingly effective transnational action
on various issues. As global negotiations multiply on issues affecting
a wide range of interests around the globe, the stakes for all the
participants in the struggle will continue to grow[8]. This is particularly so
because of the ramifications of the negotiations on the developmental
thrust of each nation-state and how that may affect both the security of
environment as well as that of the people in each of the nation-state
entities.

Notionally, environmentalism takes relationship beyond politics,
closer to the nature, emphasising an *a priori* relationship between man and
nature, irrespective of political divide and contentions. But both man and
nature currently face a common threat, the threat of a misperceived policy
of development. Hence both have currently emerged as inherently
transboundary, and increasingly global issues, intruding into the realms of
international relations.

There are, in addition, reciprocal influences from environmental
politics, with related concerns of national and international security,

7.   Paul Kennedy, *Preparing for the Twenty-first Century* (New York: Random House,
     1993), p. 96.

8.   Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

developed and Third World[9] or North-South relations, and inter-state, regional cooperation and international trade. There are also other issue areas of concern: environmental concerns are increasingly accepted as legitimate national security issues, and they constitute the basis for a critique of conventional military-security policies[10]. Yet environmental issues may constitute serious concerns in future military confrontation between and among nations.

Naturally, given the multifaceted nature of the linkage issues, it is critical to lay down the conceptual frontiers of the two organizing pillars, environment and development, which provides analytical blueprint for the salience of arguments that may serve as conceptual basis for co-operative ventures in a region like South Asia as well as in the eastern Himalayan subregion[11]. For better appreciation of the linkage module, it may begin with a notional view of security itself.

II. Notional View of Security: Meanings and Contexts

The term security has multiple meanings and the concept has undergone major transformation in recent years. It is one of the few concepts which is perpetually related to the situations of threats or perceptions of insecurity. Discourse on security immediately raises question on what

9.   Third World is often characterized as "a group of very different countries held together by a few common elements--hot weather, colonial history, and dashed hopes" (Richard Barnet quoted in "Preface," Sheryl J. Brown, Kimber M. Schraub eds.), *Resolving Third World Conflict: Challenges for New Era*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1992, p. x). Being part of Third World, Bangladesh and the rest of South Asia do indeed demonstrate the same kind of characteristics.

10. Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

11. A preliminary study has already been made by the author on the potentials for a subregional water community in the eastern Himalayas. See his "Environmentalism in South Asia: Building a Shared Water Community in the Eastern Himalayan Region," *BIISS Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (1996), pp. 477-535.

contributes to a sense of insecurity, and conversely, what makes one secure? As the international system within which it operates itself has witnessed major transformation, it is rightly suggested that security study has to be brought from generality to the contextual level of "a temporal framework."[12] To this end, analysis has been concentrated on ensuring that a "decoupling" in the military sphere goes hand in hand with multiplying and intensifying positive relations in other spheres.[13]

In its generic and literal meaning, security conveys the state or feeling of being free from fear, care, worry threat, danger etc., ensuring a sense of safety. In its most elementary form, security is seen as the well-being and prosperity of the individual at the bottom moving through the societal ladder to encompass the top collective echelon of state and the abode of the living beings. Conceptually, security witnessed a radical shift over time. Since the ending of the Cold War, there has been substantial change in threat perceptions. The changes affected international society, regional structures, nation-states and the individuals who constituted them. The traditional security concerns, however, had been state-centric, but these concerns have now changed in terms of dimensions and levels[14].

Since the 1950s, with a great proliferation of literature on national security, the field of security already has acquired the status of a sub-discipline of international relations[15]. In a divided humanity and a divided world, with a growing aspirations for unity of humanity and interdependence, there has been striving toward a new plane of organic interactions

---

12. C. Uday Bhaskar, "Post-Cold War Security," *Strategic Analysis* (November 1997), p. 1135.

13. Mikhail Bezrukov and Andrei Kortunov, "Interdependence: A Perspective on Mutual Security," in Richard Smoke and Andrei Kortunov (eds.), *Mutual Security: An Approach to Soviet-American Relations* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1991), p. 18.

14. Stephenson,*op. cit.*, pp. 16-18.

15. Morton Berkwitz and P. G. Bock, *American National Security: A Reader in Theory and Policy* (New York: The Free Press, 1965), p. viii.

and qualitative change in existing aspiration to pursue interests. Consequently, there has been efforts to widen conceptual frontiers of security, with a concurrent effort to modify substantially the existing "rules of the game" in security relations, both regionally and nationally. National security is often seen in many developing countries like those in South Asia as "the end result of a total process of development" and security needs of small states like Bangladesh seem more complex and challenging in terms of qualitative excellence than those of the bigger powers. National security also closely interacts with regional security, which seems equally relevant in South Asia.

Realist School of Security and Balance of Power

Until recently the notion of security was exclusively oriented to power and emphasized the military security as its main component. Under the definition, state was the primary actor and the dominant interpretation was that if state security can be ensured individual security was of little consequence.[16] Two aspects of security gets merged, security as a physical condition or protection of national boundaries and guaranteed access to natural resources, and security as a psychological state or free from fear-- fear to the extent that one lacks a feeling of fear. Both these aspects then represented the bedrock of security[17].

Indeed, security is identified by the "realist" school of scholars with both power and some kind of threat perception or security concerns of state as unit actors, being the centerpiece of the international system. Primary concern was the long-term survival capabilities of the states[18]. In the tradition of realism, security was equated with order and international boundary maintenance, with the goal of preservation of the hierarchical structure of the international system. The emphasize was upon the military

---

16. Bhaskar, *op. cit.*, p. 1136.

17. Donald M. Snow, *National Security: Defense Policy for a New International Order.* Third Edition (New York: St Martin Press, 1995), pp. 21-22.

threats, as perceived at the policy or decision making level. Security studies also tended to be primarily concerned with various constituents of power, focused on war as well as on ways of preventing war[19].

The classical balance-of-power system was the primary mode of maintaining security in the 19th century Europe, and was retained well into the 20th century, whereas the notion of collective security was inherent in both the covenant of the League of Nations and the Charter of the United Nations. Collective defence was a step back in the direction of the balance-of-power system and became the dominant international security system by the late 1940s when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and other regional military-security groupings came into existence[20].

Neo-realism and the Extended View of Security

Contemporary analysts and thinkers, therefore, stress the frequent incompatibility of national with international or regional security and felt the need for a broader concept of security. There has also been an emphasis on the need to harness through arms control, internationalization, and other mechanisms the enormous destructive capabilities humankind has devised. Moreover, security is being extended beyond a narrow compass on the military element to include areas such as economic security, the environment, and other non-traditional areas[21].

Such an analytical change has coincided with the transformation of theoretical perspective from realism to neo-realism: while realism emphasized on fashioning national interest in terms of power, war or threat

18. Chetan Kumar, "Environmental Degradation and Security in South Asia," in Marvin G. Weinbaum and Chetan Kumar (eds.), *South Asia Approaches the Millennium: Re-examining National Security* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995), p. 147.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 148.

20. Stephenson, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-18.

21. Snow, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.

perception[22], neo-realism begins by proposing a problem-solving approach, seeking to help develop "the concept of system's structure which at once bounds the domain," making theory relevant to policy makers, enabling "them to see how the structure of the system, and variations in it, affect the interacting units and the outcomes they produce.[23]"

Post-Cold War Security Context

The end of the Cold War, marked by a sudden collapse and disintegration of a superpower, raised questions about the utility and relevance of traditional security, based on military preparedness or power. Multiple threats that defy military solutions have caused many neo-realists and others in the field of peace studies and conflict resolution to search for a broader definition of security encompassing both freedom from physical violence and ensuring material well-being of people and the environmental health of the planet. The emphasis on order and concomitant increase of military capabilities has been perceived to contribute to an increasing economic and ecological insecurities by draining resources away from civilian needs and from efforts to create a cleaner environment. Thus modern military technology is not only perceived to be expensive but also carries huge environmental costs due to its high resource use and large-scale environmental pollution[24].

The Gulf War of 1991 especially demonstrated how serious the modern warfare may pose as a threat to the ecosystem. Thus, there has been a strong plea for constructing a new vision of security that can

22. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 5th edition (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972).

23. Kenneth N. Waltz, "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory", in Robert L. Rothstein (ed.), *The Evolution of Theory in International Relations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), p. 29.

24. J. Ann Tickner, "Re-visioning Security", in Ken Booth and Steve Smith (eds.), *International Relations Theory Today* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1995), pp. 184-85.

promote a viable ecosystem while at the same time working towards the elimination of both physical and structural violence. The idea is to move away from the zero-sum, dichotomous thinking of traditional national security discourse toward a more comprehensive, less state-centric orientation[25].

Naturally, experts in the new era developed theories both to explain and chart the future course of security, with an emphasis being placed on economic motivation and on the science of economics, de-emphasizing military aspects, ideological motivation or competition. Prestige in international affairs is now derived from national wealth, financial power and industrial capability[26].

There is also an increasing concern about threats emanating from domestic sources and the failure of the government to cope with them, precisely because the government is often seen as "both an important symbol, and major manifestation of the state."[27]

Thus security has come to be viewed as more inclusive, encompassing the non-military strands, with a great deal of emphasis placed on the economic performance of the nation-state in an increasingly interdependent, free-market, export-oriented international community. This means that primacy of state as an actor has become diluted and the state *per se* has become less effective and relevant with the emergence of a variety of transnational forces and multinational entities.[28]

---

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 187, 194.

26. Ambalavanar Sivaraja, "International Security at the End of the Cold War," in George A. Cooray (ed.), *New Dimensions of Security after the Cold War* (Colombo: Institute for International Studies, 1997), pp. 18-19.

27. Barry Buzan, "People, States, and Fear: The National Security Problem in the Third World in Edward E. Azar and Chung-in Moon (eds.), *National Security in the Third World: The Management of Internal and External Threats* (Hants: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 1988), pp. 24-25.

28. Bhaskar, *op. cit.*, p. 1136.

A three tier post-Cold War security has thus been posited: traditional, macro and micro security. While traditional security continues to be statist, the armed forces retaining the strength of major punctuation, the macro-security debate focusses more on control of trans-boundary military capabilities in terms of both fire-power and surveillance, covering arms control mechanisms and regulation of the weapons of mass destruction. The third tier or micro-security notion involves a complex mix of transnational forces, the prevailing focus being on economic gain/fiscal profiteering, environmental and gender concerns. There has been an increasing assumption of state's traditional role by non-state actors such as the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the multinational corporations (MNCs). There is, thus, a clear shift towards economic issues and developmental problems.

Such a level-of-security analysis does not preclude conceptual reappraisal that has been going on, as the nations will continue to focus on both power and prosperity[29]. It seems apparent that the concept of security is extended along the lines of "levels-of-analysis" to an understanding of security at all different levels which cause insecurity of states as well as of the planet earth and its surroundings. In the changed context of international relations in the post-Cold War era, priority has changed from security of unit actors to the perception of insecurity of not only of state as unit actors but also of its constituting components, i. e., of land and nature, life and living beings, ecology and environment[30]. The notion of security currently, thus, constitutes an extended frontier than what was traditionally contemplated.

III. Multilevel Security: Environment and Sustainable Development

Indeed, both economics and environment have become integrated with the security debate as part of the new multi-dimensional approach to

---

29. *Ibid.* , pp. 1139-1148; Sivaraja, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.
30. Kumar, *op. cit.*, pp. 148-49

security, though traditionally both have been regarded as separate elements of national security, dealt with on parallel tracks[31]. Both environmental and economic security are now viewed as non-traditional security areas, because of their characteristics of being non-life-threatening (the physical aspect of security) and, hence, remain within the psychological realm of security. Both these notions imply taking security beyond the traditional realm of national boundaries, even requiring closely bound international economic activity, often meaning a *de facto* assault on national sovereignty[32].

Peace, in this sense, becomes inseparable from economics and environmental security, as there cannot be any peace or stability without development and without an assured environmental security development cannot be sustained. Hence analysts stress both economics and environmental security and the interrelationship between environmental security, national and regional security, and international peace.

For an increased demand for development in one nation-state may exacerbate the development cum environmental problem of another, with an overuse and depletion of a finite resource base. Hence the maintaining the balance of nature across nation-state boundaries has become a major concern. Hence emerged the notion of "sustainable development" that seeks to ensure the lasting use of resources beneficial to all nation-states, to improve "the total quality of life, both now and in the future, in a way that maintains the ecological processes" across nation-state boundaries on which life depends[33].

The environment-development combine also emphasizes both environmental management and environmental conservation while pursuing

31. Gregory F. Treverton and Barbara Bicksler, "Conclusion: Getting From Here to There?" in Graham Allison and Gregory F. Treverton (eds.), *Rethinking American Security: Beyond Cold War to New World War* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1991), p. 412.

32. Snow, *op. cit.*, pp. 245-46.

33. Flood, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

developmental goals, assuming the need for greater equity between wealthy and poor nations, within societies and between generations, recognizing that developing countries must meet the basic needs of the poor in ways that do not replete the nature's resources.[34]

This recognizes the cycle of poverty-environmental degradation-poverty, seemingly vicious, that offers little prospect for stable national government or peaceful regional order. Among too many of the global population, there is a growing sense of despair which may indeed breed indifference and gloom, where only the strong few can settle key issues through muscle-flexing[35]. Worldwide instability, thus, contributes to the worsening of environmental problems because (a) governments have done so little about them, and (b) a failure to take action hastening further environmental deterioration[36]. This demands from all of humanity increased sensitivity to the long-term effects of state behavior on the habitat[37]. The logic of environmental security concept, therefore, is that environmental co-operation at the inter-state, subregional and international levels should be of major concern to the concerned actors[38]. The chain of causation is "marked by a transition from human activity to environmental changes, from environmental changes to social disruptions, and from social disruptions to conflict.[39]"

Extensive deforestation, desertification, salination, denudation, water scarcity etc. are no longer seen as local, state or even regional problems, but have broader international ramifications; for they undermine the

---

34. Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31.
35. Barbara Jancar, "The Environment, Population Growth, and Resource Scarcity," in Michael T. Klare (ed.), *Peace and World Security Studies: A Curriculum Guide.* Sixth Edition (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994), p. 306.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 307.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.
38. Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 127.
39. Kumar, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

economic base and social fabric of weak and poor states by generating or exacerbating intra-or inter-state tensions and conflicts. Many of the problems may be localized in their effects, but their causes often lie far beyond national borders, as local ecosystems are tied into structures of production and exchange beyond nation-state borders which cast an "ecological shadow" over life and living of all in the international system[40].

Degradation of the environment may, thus, constitute the gravest danger to national security in contemporary times[41]. The ecosphere is bigger and more important than any nation. The factors viewed in the context of environment include topsoil, forests, genetic reservoirs, hydrological systems, climate, watersheds and such other resources which serve as prime components of a country's natural resource base[42]. The destruction of animal species, the poisoning of air and water on a sizeable scale, and the obliteration of unique ecosystems are dangerous acts which transcend the mere internal affairs of a state[43]. There is a mounting concern about human interference with the earth's atmospheric heat balance, and associated predictions of climatic change, about "ozone hole" etc. [44].

Security is also seen from a multi-dimensional perspective[45], with denomination such as gender perspective, mutual/cooperative security, individual/ population security, "common security"[46], "global" or

40. Hurrell, *op. cit.*, p. 131.
41. Kelley et al, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
42. Norman Myers, "Environmental Security: The Case of South Asia", *International Environmental Affairs*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (1989), p. 138.
43. Kelly et al, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
44. Michael Grubb, Mathias Koch, Abby Munson, Francis Sullivan, Koy Thomson, *Earth Summit Agreements: A Guide and Assessment* (London: The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1993), p. 8.
45. D. Dunn, "Peace Research versus Strategic Studies", in K. Booth (ed.), *New Thinking About Strategy and International Security* (London: Harper Collins, 1991).
46. The contemporary definition of "common security" was first given political prominence in the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues (1982), which pointed to the basic nuclear paradox, i.e. the security of states depended on the insecurity of their citizens, and viewed that such a paradox had stretched the traditional concept of security to its limit. Tickner, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

"neighborhood security," "comprehensive security"[47], interdependence, a "world order" vision[48]-- all look at security from different non-traditional angles but, in essence, conveying somewhat closer meanings. They include freedom not only from military or political threats but also from societal, demographic or gender concerns and prevention of natural disasters, ensuring quality of life and fulfilling basic human needs on an equitable basis[49]. The foregoing multiple approaches, in essence, seek to secure life, living beings and nature from looming economic insecurities and environmental dangers.

Re-conceptualization of security along the lines also includes both positive (the ability to maintain relationships that are viewed as essential to survival, such as access to food, oil, water and credit etc.) and negative security (the ability to defend against threats viewed as harmful)[50]. They stand together on one basic point, namely, their rejection of hegemonic or military-centered notions of security as the sole criteria of security, which, it is felt, "are fundamentally flawed in a highly interdependent world

---

47. The concept of "comprehensive security" , as defined first in Japan in 1980 and later on also pleaded by Gorbachev in the mid-1980s. *Ibid.* p. 182.

48. The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) and the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues (1982) proposed re-definition of security of state, as no state could find security by itself, and underscored the interdependence between economic and ecological dimensions of security under a scheme what it had called "sustainable development."

49. Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991); Jessica Mathews, "The Environment and International Security", in M. Klare and D. Thomas (eds.), *World Security: Trends and Challenges at Century's End.* New York: St Martin Press, 1991); Richard K. Herrmann, "Conclusions: The End of the Cold War - What Have We Learned ?" in Richard Ned Lebow and Thomas Risse-Kappen (eds.), *International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1995).

50. Stephenson, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.

facing multiple security threats that are not amenable to traditional statist solutions."[51]

Thus, analysis and research have gone beyond the exploratory stage and currently touches on non-traditional areas, the most salient being global environmental and economic problems. On the regional and subregional levels, these include deforestation, desertification, air and water pollution, radiation pollution, and shortages of fresh water. Equally important are the problems of the commons, such as pollution of the marine environment, air pollution, global warming, and the resulting greenhouse effect and sea-level rise etc. Again, all these security problems may be seen as the outcome of misperceived policy of development.

Proponents of these security problems argue that the dramatic events of the past few years have diminished the threat of nuclear war between the superpowers but have unleashed a host of economic and ethnic conflicts as well as a growing awareness of potential environmental disasters. Insecurity in the comprehensive sense may result in various types of violence: direct (or physical), structural (or social), and more recently, violence against nature, endangering ecological or environmental security.

Whereas direct violence, such as overt attack or acts of aggression, focuses on the state and its international conflicts, structural violence (built-in violence within social systems, such as against feminine gender) emphasizes the insecurity of individuals and social groups, taking the argument at the negative-positive levels. There is, then, ecological threats drawing attention to the insecurity of the entire planet[52]. Some like Galtung felt for a long time that structural violence may also arise when socio-economic conditions are such that people die or suffer due to

---

51. Tickner, *op. cit.*, p. 181.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

unequal distribution of resources, not as a result of physical violence[53]. A little elucidation of each of the above approaches is in order.

Content-wise, an emphasis has been placed on gender security, as against "masculine" dominance, because of a perception of multiple sense of insecurity of women, their economic and environmental vulnerabilities. The old stereo-types involving the women, who are disproportionate victims of structural violence, and gender inequalities found focus under the gender perspective, as it seeks to incorporate women's experiences, and hence, it has emerged as an important category in security analysis.[54]

There are two other related security concerns. One is "common security" which posits a multidimensional definition of security, emphasizing a security interdependence[55]. Common security, as is suggested by the Palme Commission, assumes that there are global dangers which threaten the community of nations and which cannot be solved by mere boundary protection. By emphasizing common dangers, it bases its appeal for co-operative behavior, not altruism, but on a larger sense of collective self-interest[56]. Here common security become entwined with the logic of environmental security.

The notion of mutual security or "co-operative security," has also been advanced between two nations or alliances; it means that each of them would seek to gain security along with the other[57] and they must

53. See Johan Galtung, "Violence, Peace and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research* (1968), pp. 217-231; also his *Peace Research: Education, Action, Essays in Peace Research* (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers Forlag, 1976), pp. 80-150.

54. *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49.

55. Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

56. Tickner, *op. cit.*, p. 181-82.

57. Cyrus Vance, "Preface," in Richard Smoke and Andrei Kortunov (eds.), *Mutual Security: A New Approach to Soviet-American Relations* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), p. vii.

accommodate their common concerns[58], with both sides to *gain* more real security, by approaching the problems of security together and co-operatively for mutual threat reduction[59]. This means that increased security for one side should not be sought--and in fact, cannot be achieved--at the price of diminished security for the other[60]. Hence both sides should work toward co-operative security for common well-being i. e., fulfill their mutual development concerns, without upsetting the environmental concerns.

There is, then, the extended security concern at the individual or grassroots level, conveying the sense that people must be regarded as equally important as the security of states[61]. This means that the concept of security must be broadened to include the protection of people as well as the security of neighborhood.

Similarly, with a growing sense of global insecurity, greater emphasis has been placed on "global security," with a greater stress laid on the linkages between environmental remediation and national, subregional, regional and/or global security. The primary goals of global security policy has to be to prevent conflict and war, and maintain the integrity of the environment and life-support systems of the planet by eliminating those "conditions that generate threats to the security of people and the planet, and by anticipating and managing crises before they escalate into armed conflicts."[62]

---

58. Treverton and Bicksler, *op. cit.*, p. 412.
59. Victor Remenyuk and Richard Smoke, "Joint Introduction to Mutual Security," in Smoke and Kortunov (eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 6-8.
60. Sergei Plekhavov and Howard Swearer, "Conclusion: Mutual Security and the Future,", in Smoke and Kortunov (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 372.
61. The World Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighborhood: The Basic Vision* (Geneva 1995), p. 21.
62. The World Commission on Global Governance, *A Call to Action: Summary of Our Global Neighborhood, the report of the Commission on Global Governance* (Geneva, 1995), p. 11.

One security concept that has especially arisen in recent years in the context of Japanese security thinking (used first in 1980 in Japan's Defense White paper), is that of "comprehensive security." Notionally, it is an expanded concept of traditional security by means of self-defence but also includes ensuring access to food, energy, and other resources, and recognizes the utility of development aid and other economic methods in the pursuit of security.[63] As an all-inclusive concept, it has since spread to rest of the world and is so ordered as to to maintain environmental balance as well as to protect people's lives from various forms of threat both internal and external, including economic vulnerability, ecological threats etc.

The "world order" model envisions a new international system free from new threats to security, which defy boundary protection and which cannot be solved by one state alone. Such a model demands new framework that analyze security from a more comprehensive perspective, touching on issues of individual well-being and human rights to maintenance of environmental balance. It emphasizes association and involvement of democratic transnational social forces which are intensifying the interplay between domestic and international factors[64].

In a world that is becoming increasingly interdependent and in which old notions of territoriality, independence, and intervention have lost some of their meaning, these traditional principles need to be adapted with the current developmental and environmental requisites. Nations are having to accept that in certain fields, sovereignty has to be exercised collectively, particularly in relations to the global and natural commons[65]. More specifically, the principle of sovereignty must be adapted in such a way as

---

63. Stephenson, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
64. Richard Falk, *Economic Aspects of Global Civilization: The Unmet Challenges of World Poverty* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Center of International Studies, 1992).
65. The Commission on Global Governance, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

to balance the rights of states with the health of life and living beings i. e., fulfilling the rights of people or their developmental aspirations within states, and the interests of nations with the environmental health of the planet or interests of the global neighborhood.

Paradigm Shift

A paradigm shift in the security arena has already begun. The twenty years since the Stockholm Conference in 1972 and the founding of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), there has been a major shift in emphasis in both environment and development. The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), convened since the early 1970s by the states of the NATO and Warsaw Pacts and the Helsinki Final Act (1975), including its "baskets" of accords guaranteeing East-West border security, trade, and human rights and the subsequent initiation of "confidence-and security-building measures" (CSBMs) aimed at reducing East-West tensions--all served as useful references and provide framework for similar co-operation in other regions of the world for common well-being as well as for symmetrical development of all segments of people.

There is also the widely recognized linkage between poverty, population pressure and environmental degradation, a linkage which was given prominence by the Brundtland Commission in 1987 and emerged also as a central theme in the Earth Summit (held in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992)[66]. The Rio process (including the three Conventions involving Biodiversity, Climate and Desertification) followed by Earth summit II in 1997) and the World Conference on Climate Change (Kyoto 1997, in which a Protocol to the Framework Convention on Climate Change has been agreed)[67] in essence projected the emergence of a paradigm of global environmental change and a sense of global crisis. The frequency and

---

66. Hurrell, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

67. See for details United Nations, "Framework Convention on Climate Change," FCCC/CP/1997/L.Add.1 (1o December 1997).

seriousness with which the environmental issues are currently addressed in the seminars and symposia, workshops and conferences seeking remedial measures such as environmental management, agreement on targets and time-table of gas emission etc. at national, regional, international and transnational levels are indicative of the commitments to face the challenges squarely in terms of funding, mechanisms and technologies. The quest is for a symmetrical order, based on comprehensive, interdependence and common well-being, and *not* for continued dominance or hegemony. New journals and periodicals, not to speak of scores of new titles, which are being published on environmental issues, demonstrate the academic commitments to offer new scientific findings and develop new conceptual models[68].

The sustainable development paradigm also has begun to displace the exclusionist paradigm in some multilateral financial institutions, in state bureaucracies and in some intergovernmental organizations, such as the Asian Development Bank, The Inter-American Development Bank and the Environmental Committee of the Organization of American States etc[69]. Indeed, global environmental politics involves interactions among states and non-state actors transcending any single region regarding international decisions that affect the environment and natural resources[70]. In 1982, a special session of the UNEP's Governing Council was held to review progress since Stockholm, a decade earlier. The Council concluded that much greater long-term and integrated environmental planning was needed. In 1983, the UN General Assembly called for two major reports to be convened to examine the general issues in environment and development and their interlinkages[71].

---

68. *Clime Asia*, for instance, a new "clime action network-south asia (CANSA) newsletter," produced by Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies (BCAS) is being published from Dhaka.
69. Grubb et al., *op. cit.*, p. 6.
70. Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-32.
71. Grubb et al. *op. cit.*, p. 6.

Indeed both have been incorporated in the report of World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), the so-called Brundtland Report of 1987[72], prepared by a Commission under Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland. It served as an independent body to re-examine both the critical issues "to formulate innovative, concrete and realistic proposals to deal with them" and to "strengthen international cooperation on environment and development"[73]. It analyzed the socio-economic and environmental situations of the world and interaction between them. The Commission's report, *Our Common Future*, added the concept of environmental security to that of common security, strengthening the idea that sustainable development required protecting the environment that supported development. Environmental security encompasses both the protection of the environment for its own sake and the protection of the environment for the sake of humankind[74]. The Brundtland report posited that economic growth cannot take place at the expense of the earth's natural capital—its stock of renewable and non-renewable resources[75].

A parallel report prepared by governments through UNEP's Governing Council, *Environmental Perspectives to the Year 2000 and Beyond*, provided a framework for national and international action to translate the Brundtland report into practical action. In addition, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) published, in association with the UNEF, their broad-ranging World Conservation Strategy, which added further impetus to the growing concern and clamour for action. With UN Resolution 44/228 in December 1989, the UN General Assembly decided to convene the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in 1992[76].

72. World Commission on Environment and Development (WECD), *Our Common Future* (Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. 356-357.
73. Quoted from World Commission on Environment and Development, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
74. Stephenson, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
75. Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
76. Grubb et al, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8.

Different sectors organized themselves around UNCED themes. Industries gathered for the 2nd World Industry Conference on Environmental Management (WICEM), which agreed a Business Charter for Sustainable Development. A smaller and more focussed business group, the Business Council for Sustainable Development, was established with the direct support of the UNCED Secretary General Maurice Strong[77].

Against this background, the UNCED in Rio of 1992 formally recognized the importance of environmental concerns at the national level and transformed environmental affairs into an international political issue, stressing the urgent need for global commitment for ensuring environmentally sound and sustainable development (ESSD). The Action Plan, as agreed, offered a three-part package: (i) a global assessment programme; (ii) environmental management activities; and (iii) supporting measures, such as education and training. Similarly, the interaction of environment and development was formally recognized in the final documents, notably in several principles of the Stockholm Declaration[78].

The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (Chapter 8) presents 27 principles of environment and development, intended to build upon the Stockholm Declaration of 1972: "in order to achieve sustainable development, environmental protection shall form an integral part of the development process" (principle 4). Many of the principles address development concerns; they state a "right to development" and highlight the special needs and circumstances of the developing countries, especially the poorest, and stress the need for development and poverty alleviation, and access to financial and technological resources[79]. Agenda 21 is intended as the action plan for achieving sustainable development, and stands "as a grand testimony and guide to collected national insights and interests pertaining to sustainable development."

77. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
78. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.
79. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

Sustainability, however, remains an essentially contested concept in both philosophical and political senses and it is impossible to examine the debate in any depth here. The issue is raised to underline the very close linkages that exist between the various structures and systems that together comprise the international system[80].

Apart from the Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD), which is at work meeting once a year for a period of 2-3 weeks, there are other structures such as: a *High-Level Advisory Board*, consisting of "eminent persons broadly representative of all regions of the world, with recognized expertise in different relevant fields, established to report directly to the UN Secretary General; an Inter-Agency Committee and a secretariat support structure.

The other UN General Assembly resolutions enacted to cover specific institutional recommendations of Agenda 21 include: a global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island states and an official "World Day of Water," observed annually on 22 March, which shall be a focus for promoting the recommendations in Chapter 18 of Agenda 21[81].

The World Summit Meeting on Social Development (Copenhagen, March 1995) emphasized the global need to achieve alleviation of poverty, generation of productive employment and social integration by determined worldwide efforts to mainstream the disadvantaged segments of society. Sustainable development has, thus, come to denote something immensely greater and more important than mere economic and technological advancement of societies; it recognizes the human dimension of development and seeks to ensure a future for the posterity[82].

---

80. Hurrell, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

81. Grubb et al, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

82. Mizanur Rahman Shelley, "Equitable International Sharing of the Water of International Rivers: A New People-Centric Approach for Sustainable Development," in Hasna J. Moudud (ed.), *Women for Water Sharing* (Dhaka: Academic Publishers, 1995), pp. 132-33.

Similarly, on gender issues there has been the question of enhancing development performance of women through the efficient use of resources, as emphasized by the Cairo Conference on Population and Development, seen as a major step forward for women. It adopted a programme of action directed at the empowerment of women and calling for major increases in global resources[83]. The Fourth World Conference on Women (FWCW) held in Beijing in 1995 also injected new vitality into the worldwide movement towards an achievement of women's cause and sanctioned "the Platform of Action" so as to advance the feminine cause[84].

In order to ensure the new order of sustainable development the Regional Strategy for ESSD, fashioned by the Asia-Pacific region in the UN-ESCAP (1991) calls for "a set of measures, of development that *inter alia* reflect natural resource depletion, the environmental and health impact of pollution and the dissipation of human capital through poverty, ignorance and disease."[85] Central to this new approach is "to rethink of people: people not as problem but people as solution. It means valuing diversity, sustainability, community and livelihood, security whether or not these can be valued through the market place.[86]"

In this broader security context, compliance by the nation-states with their international environmental obligations has become a more critical issue in international affairs in recent years than ever before, though several thousand bilateral and multilateral treaties concerning the environment have been adopted since the late eighteenth century[87]. This

---

83. Philip Flood, "Sustainable Development: The Way Ahead", *BIISS Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (1995), pp. 40-41.
84. *The Bangladesh Observer* (17 September 1995); *The Daily Star* (16 September 1995).
85. Quoted in Shelley, *op. cit.*, p. 133.
86. Douglas V. Smith quoted in *Ibid.*, pp. 133-34.
87. The United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), (1991) , *Selected Multilateral Treaties in the Field of the Environment*, 1 (1983; 2).

is evident from the attention the subject received during the 1992 UNCED as well as the negotiation of recent landmark environmental treaties, including the 1987 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (1987 Montreal Protocol), the 1992 Conventions on Climate Change and Biological Diversity,[88] the Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (December 1997)[89].

Since the Rio summit, countries across the world have also been busy setting up new institutions, commissions, agencies and regulations to deal with the environment. Environmental officials's stature and clout have risen, and many countries are moving ahead to ratify the conventions signed in Rio as well as other international treaties on environmental issues. Regional bodies such as the Asian Development Bank have moved toward funding environmental-oriented project[90]. Non-governmental organiza-tions (NGOs) and environmental associations have mushroomed worldwide, as well as analysts and researchers have thronged into the environmental field with dual aim of staking a claim to funds under activities implemented jointly (AIJ), but more importantly of promoting the global environmental movement[91].

Moreover, since 1972 Stockholm Conference on Human Environ-ment, which was the precursor of today's environmental movement, the

---

88. Philippe Sands, "Enforcing Environmental Security: The Challenges of Compliance with International Obligations," *Journal of International Affairs* (Columbia, 1993), p. 371.
89. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, *op. cit.*
90. Adam Schwarz, "Looking Back to Rio: `Give us trade, not aid': Environmental Values vs Economic Growth," *Far Eastern Economic Review* (28 October 1994), pp. 48-49.
91. For a glimpse of some of the on-going and planned AIJ projects globally as well as of potential AIJ projects in Bangladesh see, Mizanur R. Khan and Abdur Rob Khan, "Policy Instruments to Combat Global Warming," Paper Presented at the Roundtable on *Kyoto and Beyond: Economic and Strategic Implications for Bangladesh,"* jointly organized by Bangladesh Institute of International and Strategic Studies and Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies, Dhaka (12 March 1998).

international community has created a large body of international environ-
mental law to establish standards and procedures on handling disputes[92].
The UN Security Council itself emphasized the emerging importance of
environmental concerns to international security and declared in January
1992 that "non-military sources of instability in the economic, social,
humanitarian and ecological fields have become threats to peace and
security."[93] Similarly, the UN General Assembly of 20 December 1989
[Resolution 44/228] recognized that the members of the international
community must act together to address global environmental challenges
and to prevent the occurrence and escalation of international
environmental conflicts.

At the root of international environmental conflict lies the actual or
perceived failure of a state to fulfill its international environmental
obligations under customary law, as codified for example in Principle 21
of the 1972 Stockholm Declaration or international treaty obligations. The
controversial issues include transboundary air pollution, denudation of
forests, siltation, the diversion or withdrawal of water of international
rivers, salinity, and conservation of farmlands and fisheries etc.[94]--all seem
to be causally linked. The failure to comply with minimum standards of
good neighborliness--carrying out transboundary environmental impact
assessments, exchanging information or consulting on projects likely to
have transnational effects--often cause significant tension[95].

Hand in hand with economic and social development and
environmental sustainability, today's development paradigm highlights the
essential role of good governance. For instance, bringing government
closer to the people ensures accountability as well as promotes efficiency

---

92. Sands, *op. cit.,*, pp. 368-369

93. Agenda 21, *U.N. Doc. A/CONF. 151/26, 1, II, III, [12 August,* (New York: United
     Nations, *Doc.* 1992), Chapter 1, Preamble, paragraph 1.1.

94. Sands, *op. cit.*, pp. 368-71.

95. *Ibid.*, pp. 369-70.

and effectiveness. It also helps to create the conditions for economic and social development. A strong civil society facilitates people's participation and good governance[96].

The issue of human rights, inextricably linked to aspirations for a civil society, that ensures economic, political and social development as well as good governance. All these are mutually reinforcing. Human rights cover economic, social and cultural rights as well as civil and political rights as reflected in the two international covenants, which sought to strike a balance between freedom and responsibility, enshrining universal values and declarations to which the entire global community subscribes. Moreover, the United Nations Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna in 1993 clearly affirmed that all human rights are equal and indivisible[97].

Poorer countries, like those in South Asia, are especially vulnerable to environmental change than rich countries of the North. Therefore, environmentally induced conflicts are likely to arise first in the developing countries; for a range of atmospheric, terrestrial, and aquatic environmental pressures will in time produce, either singly or in combination, four main causally interrelated social effects: reduced agricultural production, economic decline, population displacement, and disruption of regular and legitimized social relations. These, in turn, may cause specific types of acute conflict, including scarcity disputes and violence both at intra-state and inter-state levels, each with potentially serious repercussions for the security interests of the human and other living beings[98].

---

96. Barry Buzan, "People, States and Fear: The National Security problem in the Third World," in Azar and Moon (eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17.

97. Flood, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40

98. Thomas F. Homer-Dixon, "Environmental Changes as Causes of Acute Conflict," in Richard K. Betts (ed.), *Conflict After the Cold War: Arguments on causes of war and Peace* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1994), p. 426.

Widening frontier of security: levels and contents

All the foregoing changes in security thinking and the paradigmatic shift coincided with the collapse of the bipolar world of the Cold War era and the emergence of a more polycentric multipolar world, based on the greater concert of the powers both at the subregional-regional level as well as at the global canvass. The evolution of security, thus, has occurred in two directions, both level and content-wise. Level-wise, there has been development in the direction of broadening the subject of security (individual-social groups-nation-bloc-mankind), whereas content-wise, an effort has been to enrich its content (survival-functioning-development)[99]. Such a content-wise and level-of-analysis of security does not of course preclude unstated conceptual reappraisal that has been going on, as the nations will continue to focus both on power and prosperity.[100]

However, the old order of compartmentalisation involving peace and security, development and human rights in which these issues were treated as being in completely different conceptual and institutional boxes and settings, can no longer pass in the changed context of international relations[101]. The new vision of security for sustainable development gives development a *human face* by insisting on adoption of measures whereby *people* at large are to be fully involved in formulating and implementing development plans and programmes, in finding solutions to the problems of national-regional developmental effort[102]. It also contemplates a strategy of transnational and human-centric attempts to resolve problems created by governments unaware of, or unwilling to take, the interests of the people at large across political frontiers.

In other words, currently the international community cannot simply turn away from being involved in security situations which might

---

99. Cyrus Vance, *op. cit.*, p. xvi.
100. Bhaskar, *op. cit.*, pp. 1139-1148; Sivaraja, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.
101. Flood, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-43.
102. Shelley, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

previously have been viewed as domestic or internal in nature. For security is no longer defined exclusively in military terms or domestic frame; security can now be threatened economic and environmental problems, touching on issues such human rights abuses, social inequalities and deprivation on ethnic grounds. Addressing these issues at the national, regional and supranational levels is of high priority for the international community[103].

IV. Multi-dimensional Security and National-Regional Security

"National security" was once virtually the only security concept that was familiar at the policy and decision making levels. That concept also found prominence in its analytical dimensions. Both analysts and policy makers in recent years have acknowledged the relationship between national security and both international-regional, nation-state and individual security, moving from reliance on a balance-of-power system, to common, neighborhood or global security and other security components, with the present international security system representing some mixture of all these, a common link provided by environment and development.

Like the notion of security, national security no longer means only a strong military, it also depends on a strong economy, on the resilience or strength of the political system, and a healthy environment among others.[104] However, national security concerns the way of life of a self-governing people, including the right to develop their political and economic modes.[105]

---

103. Flood, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-43.
104. S.J. Deitchman, *Beyond the Thaw: A New National Strategy* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1991), p. 11.
105. Buzan, "People, States and Fear: The National Security Problem in the Third World," in Azar and Moon (eds.),*op. cit.*, pp. 16-17.

Therefore, a national security is often merged with national strategy, but the latter is often framed in the context of geo-strategic and political environment of the country in a regional frame, with an incorporation of its national values, objectives and interests. There is, then, the interactive concerns of relationships between external and internal security, foreign policy and defence matters, with particular importance attached to regional patterns of security relations[106]. Thus, evolution of national security in all its all-encompassing reach covers all aspects of national existence and development[107]

From this point of view, both common and comprehensive security have relevance to national security concerns, as they may convey the sense of possession of elements other than weapons of physical destruction, entailing the use of domestic remedial measures and economic instruments of foreign policy. Proper application of these means may help improve the nation's security position[108].

National Security and Core Values

In the more limited sense in which states speak of international security as a policy objective, it refers to the protection of values the states hold vital. As such, it is indeed an overall concept, with economic, military, political, and even cultural aspects. For analysis as well as for security planning one may consider them as distinct realms of state activity, but they are interlinked and do actually interact[109].

---

106. Col. Ravi Nanda, *National Security Perspective, Policy and Planning* (New Delhi: Lancer Books, 1991), p. ix; Buzan, "People, States, and Fear..." in Azar and Moon, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

107. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

108. Morton Berkwitz and P. G. Bock, *American National Security: A Reader in Theory and Policy* (New York: The Free Press, 1965), p. 52.

109. For a different view, see, James W. Morley, "The Structure of Regional Security," in James W. Morley (ed.), *Security Interdependence in the Asia Pacific Region* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1986), p. 8.

The central or fundamental value of a state may be related to its overall goals, with historic expressions. In security terms, the primary goal is to uphold its dignity, and this includes asserting a symmetrical status or the conduct of its affairs free of external dictation, to protect national independence and sovereignty[110]. Security is, thus, defined as "the protection and preservation of the minimum core values of any nation: political independence and territorial integrity." A nation may be "secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values, if it wishes to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war."[111] In this context, one can not be insensible to the discrepancies between the ideal goals of the nation and the prevailing practice, as there may be a "stress toward consistency" between the ideal and the actual.[112]

Towards a Linking Security Framework

The first step in the direction of a national security framework is to bring order out of seeming chaos, to get back to the fundamentals and to suggest strategic means in some kind of orderly progression.[113] National power is an amalgam of two principal elements: the inventory of a nation's resources and the national strategy which gives those resources direction. A nation's strategy is restricted to what is logically feasible rather than to what is strategically desired.[114]

---

110. Arnold Wolfers, *Discord and Collaboration. On International Politics* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1962), pp. 74-75.

111. Walter Lippmann quoted in Arnold Wolfers, *Discord and Collaboration. On International Politics* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1962), p. 152.

112. Harold D. Lasswell, *National Security and Individual Freedom* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), p. 50

113. Gordon B. Turner, "Classic and Modern Strategic Concepts" in Gordon B. Turner and Richard D. Challener (eds.), *National Security in the Nuclear Age: Basic facts and Theories* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1960), pp. 3-5.

114. Gordon B. Turner, "Air and Sea Power in Relation to National Power," in Turner and Challener (eds), *op. cit.*, pp. 227-28.

Security policy implies a set of decisions and actions taken by a government to preserve or create an internal and external order congenial to the interest and values the nation considers vital. The dimensions of security or security policy making as stipulated include elite assumptions and threat perceptions, force levels, weapons systems and doctrinal response to perceived threats, strategies to communicate or exploit opportunities, resource allocation and public opinion mobilization.[115]

The proliferation of strategic ideas in the decades since the ending of the Second World War has tended to create uncertainty and confusion in its wake. Strategy traditionally was concerned with the preparation for wars and with the waging of such wars. Wars are concerned with strategy, battles with tactics, though they get merged. Both the concepts may thus be defined in relative terms. Tactics is concerned with the theory of the use of military forces in combat; strategy represents the theory of the use of combats for the object of war. In other words, tactics deal with the means of war, and strategy deals with its ends. However, strategy has to be framed in accordance with policy i.e with national objectives during war as well as in peace time, lest wars become an end in themselves and national suicide should result.[116]

Strategy, thus, is no longer seen as a science of destruction; rather it is viewed as the art of control. With strategy a nation seeks to maintain its security in a world that is prone to conflict. By means of its strategy, a nation attempts to exercise three kinds of control: (i) it tries to regulate or control its resources, weapons, and power; (ii) it seeks to control or restrict the use of enemy resources by destroying them or making it unprofitable to use them; and (iii) it attempts to control the conflict situation--to

115. Edward A. Kolodziej and Robert E. Harkavy, "Introduction," in Edward A. Kolodziej and Robert E. Harkavy (eds.), *Security Policies of Developing Countries* (Toronto: Lexington Books, D. C. Heath and Company, 1982), p. 13.

116. Gordon B. Turner, "Classic and Modern Strategic Concepts," in Turner and Challener, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

channel it into lines most profitable to itself.[117] In all this tactics, naturally, thse must be matching functions during war as well as in peace time. In other words, national security policy must determine strategic formulations and chart the course of both strategy and tactics.

National security is also inseparable from regional-subregional security concerns. One country's security may well be its neighbor's insecurity, and thus in the long run be de-stabilizing. Certainly, building stable regional and international regimes requires the integration of security, economic, environmental and political factors, not an approach that presumes the independence of these factors in shaping the exterior behavior of other states. Security policy planners at the nation-state level have to keep that in perspective.

While the old pattern of security relations still frame international transactions, they must be understood in wider and subtler terms than the crude employment of violence. Thus, the subject of national security continues to immediately involve both strategy and tactics as well as the traditional military instruments of security. Preservation of the nation's vital values continues to be their primary responsibility, but the notion what is vital or non-vital is also changing and hence, the role perception of the traditional security forces would have to change.

The emerging notions of global neighbourhood and common security, individual/population security, mutual or co-operative security, "comprehensive security" etc. with serious economic and environmental ramifications convey the principle that no country can increase its security without at the same time increasing the security of other countries or nations.[118] There is a strong element of mutuality in all these concepts, and

117. Gordon B. Turner, "The Influence of Modern Weapons on Strategy," in Gordon B. Turner and Richard D. Challener (eds.), *National Security in the Nuclear Age: Basic facts and Theories* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1960), pp. 68-69.
118. Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

the concerned nation-state actors naturally have to recognize the mutuality of their interests so as to ensure a convergence of their security policies and strategic means.

Undoubtedly, the new dimensions of security system, and the dynamics of contemporary global, national and intra-state security relations pose new problems for scholars and practitioners alike[119]. Security calls for procedures for arriving at comprehensive and well-balanced program of action.

Ironically, measures sometimes proposed in the name of national security do not necessarily contribute to the avowed end. In particular, caution is needed against conceiving of national security policy divorced from domestic policy; and so far as foreign policy is concerned, against confounding defence policy with armament or friendship that may emerge as deceptive. A nation's greatest security lies in the best balance of all instruments of foreign policy, and hence in the coordinated handling of arms, diplomacy, information, and economics; and in the proper correlation of all measures of foreign and domestic policy.

In a continuing crisis of national security in the context of multidimensional security requirements, it seems inevitable that an eclectic or symbiotic framework of security, combining a nation's traditional security policy and strategic formulations with the new multilevel perspectives, especially touching upon the dual needs of environment and development would be essential so that both can be ensured, without which security would be unsustainable or could be vulnerable. To ensure both would require special vigilance on the part of everyone engaged in the review of security policies or strategic formulations. Whatever the procedure, the guiding principles are of vital importance. The principles that deserve special care in a country with a relatively new democratic

---

119. Edward A. Kolodziej and Robert E. Harkavy, "Developing States and Global Security," in Kolodzeij and Harkavy (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 384.

setting such as in Bangladesh, include: a patriotic but enlightened consciousness about nation-state building, good governance ensuring civilian rights and civilian supremacy, freedoms of assembly and of information, guaranteeing also accountability and transparency, a free but regulated economy--all geared to augment multidimensional security needs of healthy environment and sustainable development.

V. The New Security Frontier and South Asian Reality

Some reflective thoughts are now in order projecting the usefulness or relevance of the emerging security frontier for analyzing the South Asian predicament in the areas of environment and development. For a long time international relations as a discipline as well as policy makers worldwide were overly concerned about state, territoriality and national sovereignty. That now seems changing with a concurrent conceptual and paradigmatic shift, as both developed and developing economies face challenges of sustained economic development without environmental damage.

Throughout the developed world, environment is no longer perceived as merely a scientific and technical issue but as one intertwined with other central issues in world politics, such as economy and international security. The high level of economic activity in the developed world has often been blamed for the degradation of environment, but of late, as the developing world has been trying to catch up, it is suggested that "economic activities in the developing world ... are adding to the damage to the world's ecosystem.... The environmental issue, like the threat of mass migration, means that--perhaps for the first time--what the South does can hurt the North.[120]" Even within the South itself the more developed or fortunate ones can get equally hurt due to surge of economic refugees from their less fortunate neighbors who may fail to sustain their

120. Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

developmental effort or possible mass migration from low-lying countries as a result of sea-level rise caused by greenhouse effect.

While there have been sweeping changes across the globe, South Asia continues to suffer from crisis of development and environmental hazards, which are coupled with contentions over dominance and hegemony. A matter of deep concern in the region is the persistent effort to develop the ultimate weaponry i. e. nuclear weapons and the delivery system by the two main South Asian protagonists and their possible use against each other. This appears to represent a mortal threat to both development and environment as much as to life and living beings in the entire region, with serious ramifications for both regional and international security.

The irony is that while the rest of the world seems increasingly concerned about an inclusive approach towards nuclear safeguard following the signing of the comprehensive test ban treaty (CTBT) and finding a permanent and safe way to dispose tens of thousands of tons of irradiated fuel and of other radioactive waste accumulated by the commercial generation of electricity from nuclear power[121], South Asia is haunted by the prospect of a nuclear arms race and an inevitable environmental disaster that may follow the on-going power contentions between the two longstanding regional partisans. Therefore, strategic analysts and international relations specialists can no longer afford to remain indifferent to what predicament may await the future generations of the South Asian people.

Indeed, in South Asia there has been a proliferation of interest both at the state-to-state level cooperative relationships as well as in terms of research and studies on the possibility of cooperative arrangements in the areas of environment and development. Analysts and scholars drawn from different fields of research, even some from the guarded frontier of policy

---

121. Nicholas Lenssen, "Nuclear Waste: The Problem That Won't Go Away," *Worldwatch Paper* #106 (December 1991).

making, have joined the rank of those seeking to avoid the vicious cycle of conflict or exploring the possibility of cooperative arrangements for harnessing the ecological and water resources of the Himalayan subregion as well as for promoting sustainable development. The plethora of literature focuses on the need for collective arrangements for realization of the full potential offered by the nature-given resources towards meeting the common needs of the countries of the subregion. Apart from the mechanisms made functional under the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), some conceptual blueprints for environmental as well as economic cooperation have been developed at the analytical and NGO levels[122] and a framework agreement has also been signed to promote what is projected as the South Asian Growth Quadrangle (SAGQ) involving the four countries of the subregion: Bangladesh, Bhutan, India and Nepal. But it is not clear yet what concrete measures they are to pursue in promoting co-operative relationships among them[123]. A tripartite Business Summit held in Dhaka (January 1998) at the initiative of the Bangladesh Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina was also intended to offer a business track to a renewal of cooperative links.

What seems apparent is that South Asia in recent decades saw conflicts and wars, but the battle for the mind and heart of the South Asian people is far from over. Relations in the region have always reflected the mix of fear and hope--that is the legacy of 1947. The nations and subnations of the region are linked not only by history, religion, language and culture, but also by swiftly shifting economic determinants and bonds of environment which flow through political frontiers like rivers and streams, the control of whose waters have been a constant source of

122. For a review of scholarly analysis and blueprints in the area see, Abul kalam, "Environmentalism in South Asia: Building a Shared Water Community in the Eastern Himalayan Region," *op. cit.*.

123. See for a critical appraisal of the recent subregional cooperative endeavors in South Asia, Abul Kalam, "SAARC, Subregionalism and bangladesh Foreign Policy," *Regional Studies* (November 1997); also *Spotlight on Regional Affairs* (Islamabad).

friction and irritation[124]. All have their respective self-images and perception of strengths, weaknesses and vulnerabilities.

In South Asia already competition for land and natural resources is driving more and more people to live in disaster-prone areas and marginal lands, leaving them still more vulnerable to natural forces. Thus, millions of Bangladeshis live on *chars*--bars of silt and sand in the middle of the Bengal delta--some of which are washed away each year by ocean tides and monsoon floods. Similarly, millions of Nepalis live in the areas most likely to be hit by earthquakes and seismically identified as dangerous zones[125]. Frequent natural disasters and desertification may make people in both countries desperate to seek shelter in more secure areas within and beyond their own countries.

Problems of environment and development in the region can only be overcome by an increased sensitivity to disasters that occur every year by fully taking advantage of the so-called "window of opportunity" only when a recurrent problem is perceived as an opportunity. Time and again the blueprints or framework offered by social science or scientific researchers get nowhere nearer to their implementation due to misperceived policies of the concerned states[126].

No environment and development related problem in South Asia can be addressed adequately unless efforts are integrated into a programme for cooperation. Water policy, for instance, closely relates to land, population,

---

124. M. J. Akbar, *The Siege Within, Challenges to a Nation's Unity* (Harmondsworth, Midx.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1985), pp. 98-99.

125. Jodi L. Jacobson, "Environmental Refugees: A Yardstick of Hability," *Worldwatch Paper*, No. 86 (November 1988), p. 17.

126. David E. Alexander, "Flood and Drought Perception: A Review and Comparative Cultural Perspective", in Joint U.S.-Bangladesh Seminar on "Comparative Evaluation of Flood Control Approaches for Bangladesh and Mississippi River Basin", Dhaka, (*mimeo*) (1995), p. 21; L. Douglas James, "Flood Action: An Opportunity for Bangladesh", *Water International*, (1994), p. 61.

and trade policies. The countries of the basin have never been able to develop an ethos that places their common good above their particular interests. Some way must be found to travel beyond rhetoric and to stimulate interaction and build up co-operative momentum. In the technical area, data on land and weather from satellites now offer a way to overcome longstanding institutional barriers against exchanging maps and water information[127]. What seems critical is political commitment and will power to pursue common interests through properly constituted institutional mechanisms. As the governments often remain locked into positions that keep the nations apart, new approach may be needed to bring the people together. Analysts and researchers may focus attention on how the region's newly evolved democratic systems may be mobilized to serve both national and regional security needs.

International effort in the encompassing areas started in the early 1970s, though it found true momentum in the 1990s. The analytical debate is not very old but the mass of current literature already available certainly speaks of the abiding need for both greater scholarly perspectives and co-operative understanding. As in the rest of the world, in South Asia also there has been efforts at both government as well as non-governmental levels to address the issue areas; yet there is still a lacunae in the region of adequately feasible or substantial co-operative perspectives at both the conceptual and spatial levels. To rephrase what a Malaysian dignitary stated at the UNCED, "problems of environment and development exist at national, regional and international levels. Therefore the resolution of these issues requires action at these three levels..."[128]. South Asia does indeed require to pursue action at all these three levels if it is to overcome the problems of environment and sustainable development.

---

127. James, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-68.

128. Statement by the Honorable Dato Abdullah Haji Ahmad Badawi to UNCED, Rio, 10 June 1992, quoted in Grubb et al, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-36.

At the conceptual level also, the issue of "interdependence" needs to be placed in its proper perspective, as the process inherent in the notions described above involve a growing closeness of interdependence which would improve the chances of co-operation and peace. But interdependence may mean closeness of contact and raises also the prospect of occasional conflict, even though as part of an adjustment in an integrative process. There is also important foreign policy implications requiring, to quote Waltz, "concentration on the politics of international economics, not on the economics of international politics." Moreover, to quote Waltz again, "the common conception of interdependence omits inequalities, whether economic or political. And yet inequality is what much of politics is about."[129] This means that politics would have to make adjustment in its structure and capability or power projection for the sake of promoting interdependence. As Waltz reminds us, "Nations are composed of differentiated parts that become integrated as they interact," but they "pull apart as each of them tries to take care of itself and to avoid becoming dependent on others."[130] Given the cleavages of history, asymmetry and geopolitics, South Asia has to work out the necessary consensus and compromise towards a workable formula of interdependence in their common pursuit of a healthier environment and sustainable development.

Then the state's role perception has to change. It is known that at the international actors level, the nation-states are not the only players that play important roles in reshaping the affairs on environment and development; international organizations help to set the agenda, initiate and mediate the process of regime formation, and cooperate with developing countries such as those in South Asia on projects directly

129. Kenneth N. Waltz, "Structural Causes and Economic Effects," in Richard K. Betts (ed.), *Conflict After the Cold War: Arguments on Causes of War and Peace* (New York: Macmillan Publishing House, 1994), pp. 221-223.
130. *Ibid.*, p. 223.

affecting both environment and development. Donor nations contributing bilateral aid and multilateral fund may enter into the bargaining that produces the international legal instruments creating an environmental regime and can also deliberate on issues that are crucial to ensure both the global and regional environment and sustainable development. The NGOs may also participate in setting the agenda, influencing negotiations on regime formation, and shaping the environmental policies of the donor agencies toward developing countries such as ours. There are also multinational corporations and private investors both can participate in the bargaining over regime/project creation and carry out actions that may directly contribute to both healthier environment and sustainable development in the region.[131]

VI. Conclusion

The discusson in the paper shows that the encompassing issues, objectives as well as specific policy matters of the concerned state-actors in the region need to be re-apprised from the perspectives of national, subregional and/or regional, and international interests. Similarly, at the conceptual level, the issues of environment and development have to be brought under an action plan, considering their urgency for mutual interdependence, followed up with an appraisal of the concept of security in its compre-hensive or multi-dimensional sense, touching on eco-security or eco-philosophy, economic security, gender security, neighborhood security, common security, etc., and accordingly a blueprint for co-operative undertakings be developed[132]. Last but not least, the hierarchical security approach of the past order based on territoriality and power must give way to a symmetrical approach of security, with a concurrent change

---

131. For ideas along the line see Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
132. The author has made a tentative study on the subject with a particular focus on security concerns of Bangladesh and the methods that can be useful for the country. See his "Multilevel Security Debate and the National Security of Bangladesh in a Regional Frame" (forthcoming).

in enemy perception, so that the momentum toward a sustainable development and a healthier environment can be ensured. Here the state may have to compromise its traditional functions, giving way to a greater role playing by transnational actors as well as regional bodies and international institutions.

However, to bring about all these encompassing changes, pattern of politics and systems of governance in South Asia have to change; changes are also needed in national priorities and in the perception of the national leadership and vice versa. In all these areas, there is an aura of pessimism. Asymmetric rigidity and geopolitical dictates still seem to reign, the garb of good-neighbourliness nothwithstanding. Flexibility must replace rigidity and rhetoric must give way to concrete policy if optimism is to return in the region.

In an age of multilevel security, Bangladesh's quest for security regionally, subregionally and bilaterally is in the right direction; yet it should concentrate its focus more on secured environment and sustainable development than yielding to geopolitical dicatates while keeping also in perspective that the newly emerged country is no more than one of a "swing state," swing to whichever side for positional advantage so as to bargain for concessions that would guarantee her a future. As for the South Asian countries now and in the foreseeable future, they all need a model of "common" and "comprehensive" security that would help reduce their mutual vulnerabilities in the areas of environment and development. To this end, each of the South Asian states needs a change of self-image as well as of others in the neighborhood, with a "paradigm shift" of their own. In this projected shift of relations, it has to be ensured that India is perceived *not* as "hegemonic power," a "blocking state" or a "unit veto actor," but as the "lead state,"[133] a status that is compatible with its standing as the region's asymmetrical power.

---

133. For an elaboration of the terms see Porter and Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 189-91.

This would require India to change its current self-image as the sort of a regional hegemon concerned only about its traditional security, while treating others as its subservient. That image proved dysfunctional in promoting positive security in South Asia and as the region's lead state, that was India's greatest undoing. Security relationship in South Asia has to be one of symmetrical order i. e. partnership based on mutual self-respect and equality. This means that New Delhi has to be accommodative of the interests of the neighbors so that a true momentum may be built toward a sustainable development and a healthier environment, both of which presently constitute the bedrock of South Asian security. To these ends all the regional states may have to compromise their traditional role model, giving way to a greater role assumption by transnational actors as well as regional bodies and international institutions so that all could work in a co-ordinated fashion and in harmony with the donor nations and international funding agencies for a greater share of world's development and environmental programmes.