

*Narottam Gaan*

## **RELEVANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY: A CRITIQUE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORIES**

---

### **Abstract**

National security understood in realist and conventional wisdom needs to be redefined in view of the disastrous transformation and changes in the environment sector of the planet. The trend towards disassociating security and nation state now clearly visible in world politics has been strong enough to avoid the dangers of falling down the slippery slope toward a parochial statism. The debate over whether environmental security assumes the status of national security is primarily confined to the Westphalia logic and wisdom within hegemonic, homogenization and linearity logic typical of world power structure and arrangement presided over by the US. Environmental security refuting the very basis of realist framework of security and its logic does not acquiesce in statist frame of security based on duality, division between rich and poor, nature and the universe, and the present and future generations. At the confluence of the morally and ethically required nuances of sustainable development, economic rethinking, new planetary principles and new vision of and approach to life in place of the western profligate life style stands the environmental security.

---

**Narottam Gaan**, Ph.D., D.Litt, is Reader in Political Science, Department of Political Science, M.S. College, Baramba, Cuttack, Orissa. His email: [narottam\\_gaan@yahoo.com](mailto:narottam_gaan@yahoo.com)

© Bangladesh Institute of International and Strategic Studies (BIISS), 2005

Although many recent approaches, such as constructivism, critical geopolitics, postmodernism and historical sociology have strongly disavowed the idea of 'state security' propounded by the realists, neorealists, and the neoliberals, they have not been able to dilute the centrality of security in International Relations. The analysts favouring the realist paradigm hold that the international system is fundamentally anarchic in the sense that political life therein is dominated by states not subject to any authority superior to their own sovereignty. Within this anarchic system, states will pursue relentlessly their respective national interests in order to ensure their survival in the face of formidable forces trying to deny this. The core concept of national interest is to be defined in terms of power as the only means of attaining national prosperity and security. Within the anarchic system, states are in constant competition, which, however, does not prevent them from accommodating their respective interests through cooperation where it directly serves them in their quest for national security and prosperity.

The central assumption of Kenneth Waltz's *Theory of International Politics* (1979) is typically Hobbesian. He wrote: "The state among states, it is often said, conducts its affairs in the brooding shadow of violence. Because some states may at time use forces, all states must be prepared to do so – or live at the mercy of their militarily more vigorous neighbours. Among states, the state of nature is state of war."<sup>1</sup> Waltz conceives the international system as self help system and treats states as defensive actors, in as much as their primary, though not exclusive, intention is self preservation. Thus, while states are not necessarily self-aggrandizing, they are compulsively self-help units, looking for their own security amidst an anarchical milieu where the probability of threats to their survival is always real. Thus, states are primarily concerned about their own security and forced to view other states as potential threats. States are

---

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth W. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1979), p-102.

basically self-help units within an anarchical system devoid of an authoritative or commanding sovereign regulator.

The end of Cold War and disintegration of Soviet Union in the 1990 and 1991 led many idealists to dream about the outlines of a New World Order that would give a quietus for ever to the anarchic international system. These significant events could make a toll of the usefulness of realist paradigm especially as these laid bare some of its weaknesses and contradictions like the fact that it failed to foretell or give hints about the collapse of Cold War and the tumble of mighty Soviet Union<sup>2</sup> But the euphoria about the envision of a New World Order did not last long and as the subsequent events such as the unexpected failure of the Somalia intervention, the disasters in the former Yugoslavia, events in Haiti and Rwanda, plight of refugees in Zaire and American military intervention in Iraq bypassing UN, showed that the New World order was conveniently buried into oblivion. This, in turn, strengthened of age old held view that the realist paradigm still dominates the international system. No doubt the delivery was a still born New World order baby but the birth pangs it left resulted in the shaking up the global agenda, the surfacing of hitherto neglected and side tracked issues such as environment, human rights, human security and protection of minorities in the center stage, resurgence of regionalism, universalization of liberal market economy and evolution of international institutions and regimes, and the growing importance of non state actors.<sup>3</sup>

While attending to these turbulent changes in the international system, the states again struck to the pursuit of national interest as

---

<sup>2</sup> Richard N. Lebow, "The Long Peace, the End of the Cold War, and the Failure of Realism", *International Organization*, vol.48, no. 2, 1994, pp.249-77.

<sup>3</sup> Michel Fredrick, "A Realist's Conceptual Definition of Environmental Security", in Daniel H. Deudney and Richard A. Matthew eds., *Contested Grounds: Security and Conflict in the New Environmental Politics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), p.92

their dominant stake understood on realist paradigm. American involvement in Afghanistan crisis and in Iraq for the second time ousting Saddam Hussein in the face of stiff opposition from world public opinion, United Nations and other dominant powers such as German, France, Russia and China, only attested to this and American President Bush's rejection of Kyoto protocol reinforced the view that the realist paradigm of national interest and security remains still dominant. Over recent decades, the environmental crisis has brought to the center stage the "non military dimension of security as an important feature of state behaviourism."<sup>4</sup> This led many strategic analysts to redefine the concept of national security as to broaden its scope,<sup>5</sup> as the traditional approach reflected too narrow a vision not only of the problems but also of the solutions available to cope with threats<sup>6</sup>. A broader definition instead is felt essential that would take into consideration the fact that a threat to national security exists once an action or sequence of events "threatens.... to degrade the quality of life for the inhabitants of a state or ...threatens significantly to narrow the range of policy choices available to the government of a state or private non governmental entities within the state"<sup>7</sup>. While defining the concept of environmental security one authority opines, "The emergence of the concept of environmental security became inevitable once national security became associated with 'quality of life' within a sociopolitical context marked over

---

<sup>4</sup> Charles Philippe David, "Strategic Studies in Crisis", *Etudes internationales*, vol.20, No.3, 1989, pp.513-15

<sup>5</sup> Barry Buzan, "Change and Insecurity: A Critique of Strategic Studies", in Barry Buzan and R.J Barry Jones, eds, *Change and the Study of the International Relations: The Evadual Dimension* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981), Lester Brown, "An Untraditional View of National Security", in John Reichart and Steven Sturm, eds, *American Defence Policy*, 5th edn (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984).

<sup>6</sup> Norman Myers, "Environmental Security" *Foreign Policy*, vol. 74,1989, pp.23-41

<sup>7</sup> Richard Ullman, "Redefining Security ", *International Security*, vol. 8, no.1, 1983, pp.129-53

recent years by the introduction of environmental questions into overall national and international concerns.”<sup>8</sup>

### **Realist View of Environmental Security: Primacy on State**

Realists, as argued by Michel Frederick, are of the view that the unreliability of international institutions, mechanism and rules, regulations and law to manage the environment has recapitulated to state's primacy in providing security to its people against the environmental threats. For example, despite existence of over twenty international and regional agents on the prevention of marine pollution, each year finds tens of millions of tons of waste and polluting substances being dumped into the sea. Over these years adduced as a priority concern for the international community, quality of the environment has remained yet elusive and not incorporated into a genuine right to a safeguarded environment. International environmental regimes such as agreements and conventions on climate, forest, biodiversity, pollution, WTO, signed over these recent years have been able to halt the slide in environmental deteriorations, let alone manage it for human safety. Emission of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere goes on increasingly with the prospects of global warming looming large. As argued by Frederick, the unreliability of the existing mechanisms, environmental regimes and institutions for managing the environment has introduced an element of uncertainty into the international system, putting primacy on state as the only security paradigm against the perils of nature and environmental degradation. He writes, “Consequently, it is through the prism of their own national security and hence their national interest, that states will analyze the impact of global environmental problems along with state behaviour apt to upgrade the situation or further harm it. Within such a context, the environmental security concept will then take all the importance that states will effectively grant it ”<sup>9</sup>. On realist

---

<sup>8</sup> Michel Fredrick, *op.cit*, p.94

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, p.96

parlance this means reducing the environmental factor not an independent but dependable and subordinate variable to the politico-military construct of national security.

From the realist perspective, the environmental security being a dependent variable, thus, takes on the meaning of security of the environment involving three elements: (1) the sustainable use of renewable and non-renewable resources, (2) protection of the elements - air, water, soil - so as to prevent pollution from stifling natural regeneration; and (3) the maximum reduction of hazards related to industrial activities.<sup>10</sup> According to Arthur Westing, its scope covers the overall problems associated with the protection and use of the environment. In his words, "environmental security has two basic sub-components. The first of these - environmental protection has three parts: protection from wartime and similar vandalism; protection from medically unacceptable environmental pollution; and protection for special areas, from all permanent human intrusions. The second sub-component of environmental security is the sane resource utilization, whether non-extractive or extractive depends upon exploitation, use or harvesting at all levels and employing procedures that either maintain or restore optimal resource services or stocks... exploitation of renewable resources must be carried out strictly on the principle of sustained use or sustained discard, with exploitation of non-renewable resources strictly on the principle of frugality."<sup>11</sup> The use of the words 'sustained use or sustained discard and frugality' suggests impliedly the challenges to the established notion of development within the dominant social-cultural context and the security system built around it. At the same time, it calls for an ethical resurgence in human beings impinging on them the need to moderate and delimit their

---

<sup>10</sup> Sverre Laggard, "The Transformation of Europe and the Gulf War: Implication for the Research Agenda", *UNIDIR Newsletter*, vol.4, no. I, 1991, pp.7-9.

<sup>11</sup> Arthur H.Westing, "Comprehensive Human Security and Ecological Realities" Guest Comment, *Environmental Conservation*, vol.116, Winter 1989, p. 295

inordinate consumption and life style. Thus, rethinking the dominant view of development and the ethical imperatives comes within the ambit of what is redefined as environmental security. The realist interpretation of environmental security ignores these imperatives for reviewing the dominant ethnocentric definition of what so far has been universalized as development. The realist view of environmental security devoid of the development aims at the security of the environment for the perpetuation of the dominant paradigm of development. The realist understanding of environmental security does not envisage any plan or proposal to end its self-help, divided, hierarchical and anarchic inside/outside constriction of international system. Rather, these intrinsic features of international system as outlined by neo-realists and neo liberals can be better explained by the insistence of the rich industrialized North, especially the US on security of the environmental in the South and their meaningful participation for an equity based management of the crisis and sharing of the burden. But this equity was ignored while exploiting the natural resources of the earth. The idea of environmental security stems from an essentially globalist view of inter-state relation. Its main focus is on security of the planet and its resources in totality that contributes to the survival of humanity and to development perpetuity.<sup>12</sup>

Homer Dixon and others deal with the question differently: the environment is looked upon as an independent variable, whereas state security which is involved, acts as a dependable variable. Environmental security, thus, takes on the meaning of "the environmental component of national security."<sup>13</sup> These studies demonstrate that the environmental crisis can be a threat to state's

---

<sup>12</sup> Daniel B.Botkin, *Discordant Harmonies: A New Ecology for the Twenty First Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990) Rice Odell, *Environmental Awakening: The New Relation to Protect the Earth* (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1980)

<sup>13</sup> Johan J. Holst, "Security and the Environment: A Preliminary Exploration", *Bulletin of Peace proposals* vol.20, no-2, 1989, pp.123-28.

national security depending on the gravity of the social effects it produces in terms of economic decline, poverty, social unrest, migration and threats to national and territorial integrity. The dominant environmental conflict paradigm focuses on the conflict dimension of the inter-state relations or intra-state situations, which will stem from environmental antagonism, be it local, regional or global in nature.

The correlation between national security and its environmental components is seen from, first, the direct environmental causes of conflict, where the environmental problems such as over water, fisheries, trans-border pollutions, are directly the bone of conflict between nations, and second, the indirect environmental factors of conflict where environmental problems - not the main insecurity factor but the accessory insecurity factor - in association with preexisting political, economic, social and military contexts exacerbate the situation adding a new dimension to them or acting as catalysts.<sup>14</sup> In the words of Frederick, "this is a seductive approach because it blends well with the view of international relations that attributes rational behaviour to state entities engaged in power politics."<sup>15</sup>

If analysis of environmental conflict is within the classical range of military confrontation between and among states, then on realist parlance, these conflicts are in no way different from the political, economic or military factors of state security. Environmental causes of conflict are simply an addition to the other politico-military construct of conflict. Consequently, as argued by the realists, since the inter-state conflicts caused by environmental crisis are state centric and responded within the military apparatus of states, the environmental security is not at all different from traditional state security, and to study 'environmental security' in terms of inter-state conflicts is to deal with the symptoms and not with the root causes. What has provided grist to the realists not countenancing the

---

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*, p.123.

<sup>15</sup> M.Fredrick, *op.cit*, p.98.



dominant environmental conflict paradigm is the latter's circumscribing the environmental security to the scenarios of inter-state conflict within state military apparatus.

### *Realists redefining environmental security*

If security denotes a situation of tranquility resulting from an absence of danger, then from a realist perspective, this tranquility situation is valued in the context of the dominant entity, the state in the international system. International system as comprehended by realists is largely an inter-state affair when matters of security are raised, they always hinge on state and pertain to the ability of states, and the societies within, to maintain their independent identity and their functional integrity.<sup>16</sup> According to realists,<sup>17</sup> survival is, in fact, the key: the survival of the unit as basic political unit (sovereign state) "security refers to those cases where a threat or development is designated as incompatible with state's sovereignty which leads to a test of will and force – thereby testing whether the state is a sovereign state. If it designates a problem as a security problem and does not manage to fence it off, its status will be threatened."<sup>18</sup> Security is, thus, in their eyes, an ordering of prioritization of state's will exercised upon a congeries of conditions, economic, political, social and environmental in their interactions for its survival and international community. The environmental condition is not the determinant of state's prioritization of will, but a subordinate and dependent factor. This is what Barry Buzan points out explaining the realists' standpoint. Each condition defines a focal point within the security problematic and a way of ordering priorities.<sup>19</sup> This is no

---

<sup>16</sup> Barry Buzan, "Environment as a Security Issue", *Geopolitical Perspectives on Environmental Security*, Paul Painchand, ed. (Quebec: Laval University, GERPE Occasional Paper, 92-05,1992), p.4

<sup>17</sup> Raymond Aron, *Peace and War: A Theory of International Politics* (New York: Doubleday, 1966), pp.72f and 798f.

<sup>18</sup> Ole Waever, *Securitization and Desecuritization*, **Working Papers**, Centre for Peace and Conflict Research, Copenhagen, 5,1993, p.5

<sup>19</sup> Barry Buzan, "Environment as a Security Issue", *op.cit.* p.4.

doubt true that all these conditions cannot be studied in isolation from one another. But the pursuit of dominant socio-politico economic order - a western synonym for development and survival and identified often with national interest - can become a threat to the ecological fabric of the society. To address these with the military components of national security has spurred the realists to refute the arguments of the dominant environmental conflict school of thought for isolating the environmental causes from others and warn the latter avoid falling into such a trap. What came in for being widely swiped at by the realists is the dominant discourse of environmental conflict paradigm in military components of the state and segregation of the environmental component from others as the causation of conflict. The case studies made by the environmental conflict schools stand a testimony to the interactive linkages between environment and violent conflict. When Barry Buzan in *People, States and Fears* divagates from the military sector to discussing security in the four other sectors, political, economic, ecological and societal, the logic clearly says that security began as military but the military definition is increasingly challenged by the new sectors. Question is: what was it that made the military sector conspicuous, and what is that now qualifies the other to an almost equal status? This is not really addressed squarely by Buzan but he does actually give the answer or hints at it<sup>20</sup> He argues more extensively like this:

Because the use of force can wreck major undesired changes very swiftly, military threats are traditionally accorded the highest priority in national security concerns. Military action can wreck the work of centuries in all other sectors. Difficult accomplishments in politics, art, industry, culture and all human activities can be undone by the use of force. Human achievements, in other words, can be threatened in terms other than those in which they were created, and the need to prevent such threats from being realized is a major underpinning of the state's military protection function. A

---

<sup>20</sup> Ole Waever, *op.cit.*, p.5

defeated society is totally vulnerable to the conqueror's power which can be applied to end ranging from restructuring the government, though pillage and rape, to massacre of the population and resettlement of the land. The threat of force thus stimulates not only a powerful concern to protect the socio-political heritage of the state, but also a sense of outrage at the use of unfair forms of competition.<sup>21</sup>

This is used to characterizing the military sector. When the same can be done through economic or political means overturning the political order these will be security problems too. Thus, the basic definition of security problems is that they can undercut the political order and thereby "alter the premises for all other questions"<sup>22</sup> – therefore, they have to be addressed before all other questions. Because if they are not, there will not be any other questions because the unit will cease to exist as a sovereign unit. Thus, the environmental security is not mere narrative diagnosis of the causative linkage between environmental degradation and violent conflict affecting the security of the state and international system, or halting at the use of military apparatus of the state for settling the environmentally induced and caused conflict. It challenges the premises of the dominant existing socio-politico economic system that identifies with the state, which have been a nuisance to the environment and ultimately to the people. The defect with both the realist and environmental conflict schools is that they incline to make the state the referent for security, not the individuals, people, and the alternative premises that questions the established dominant western paradigm of development and security thinking.

---

<sup>21</sup> Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for Security Studies in the Post-Cold War era* (Hemel Hemstead: Wheatsheaf, 1991), p.117.

<sup>22</sup> Egbert Jahn, Pierre Lemaitre and Ole Waever, *Europe Security: Problems of Research on Non-Military Aspects* (Copenhagen: Copenhagen Papers of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Research 1987) p.9

According to the realist framework, “environmental security represents an absence of non-conventional threats against the environmental substratum essential to the well-being of its population and to the maintenance of its functional integrity.”<sup>23</sup> On the basis of this realist definition, the environmental security must be understood within a state perspective. In chime with realism, within which the concept of environmental security cannot simply be given a “security of the environment” meaning without the risk of distorting the very notion of security, since the latter remains the state’s prerogative. The notion of security can be understood as such under all its aspects, be they political, economic, social, military or environmental. This means notion of security under state perspective remains supreme and all-inclusive and the environmental security is subsumed within it, contrary to what environmental security has been defined in this work. It is the other way round that the environmental security is the overall vast design that challenges the premise on which the traditional notion of security rests and goes beyond the framework of state security. Realist thinking has not recognized that environmental security is the key and foundation of all other security. According to Taylor, under international law, there is no such thing, as the idea of world environmental order common to all does not exist.

The world has been divided on the basis of politically earmarked territorial units. The concept of sovereignty and territorial integrity in which are ingrained the notion of national security are the very foundations of international law. In this picture of the realist territorially and politically divided sovereign state systems, “there is no direct protection of the environment *per se*”<sup>24</sup> If modernity is understood as the rendering of nature into territorially and politically carved out states, then these are incongruent with the eco-geographical region. An eco-geographical region can be terrestrial or

---

<sup>23</sup> Michel Frederick, *op.cit*, p.100

<sup>24</sup> Prue Taylor, “The Failure of International Environmental Law”, *Our Planet*, vol.4, no.3, 1992, pp.14-15

aquatic or both. It may be conceived of essentially as an ecological subsystem made up of living and non-living components of the environment that interacts to form a life support system. It is by no means fully self-contained because it has numerous feedback relationships with subsystems in the adjoining areas and beyond. Thus, it is a part of the global ecosystem. But then it has a dynamics of its own so that it may also function independently of the contiguous and more distant regions as well as of the globe as a whole.<sup>25</sup> The various sorts of socially and politically determined territorial regions such as ethnic, linguistic, religious ones and so forth are superimposed upon the ecogeographical region. However, lack of correspondence and congruence between the two has often in the face of environmental degradation generated situation of conflict between and among these ethnic, religious or linguistically divided societies and states. Force or war within the military apparatus of the state has never been a solution to these conflicts.<sup>26</sup> So long as the root causes of these conflicts mainly embedded in environmental factors, remain unaddressed and determine what constitutes security not with state as the referent, force or war will only aggravate the situation dealing not with causes but with symptoms. The very threats that stem directly from environmental degradation and indirectly in combination with other factors are lost sight of or downplayed in the analysis of realism. On the other hand, what the realists suggest is that in the core of the environmental security states need to be given preponderance.

Given the nature of the existing international system as a power game, and the little role that the transnational forces, public opinion,

---

<sup>25</sup> Arthur H. Westing, ed; *Comprehension Security for the Baltic: An Environmental Approach* (London: Sage, 1989) pp.1-13.

<sup>26</sup> L.H. Brown, "Regional Collaboration in resolving third world conflict", *Survival*, (London) vol.28, 1986, pp.208-220. See, also L.J. Cantori and S.L. Spiegel, ed., *International Politics of Regions: A Comparative Approach* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970), p.432; B.M.Russet, *International Regions and the International System: A Study in Political Ecology* (Chicago: Rand -McNally, 1967), p.252.

ideologies, international organizations and small developing nations play for the preservation of the power equilibrium, to give preponderance to power maximizing states, as argued by realists, is not only necessary but natural. Since the environmental crisis is global in terms of climate change, global warming, thinning of ozone layer and loss of biodiversity, the proponents of environmental security advocate not for a conventional statist military approach. But the realists are of the view that the state is the only referent for security to make its own judgment as to what constitutes the threat to its security and survival. Further, the notion of security is tied with state, which is in an advantageous position to translate in terms of issues. "It can be considered that a threat to state's environmental security exists once an action or sequences of events directed in a non-military perspective against its environmental substratum threatens the quality of life of its population and/or the range of policy choices available to the government in its main areas of activity."<sup>27</sup>

In realist notion of security is involved subjective variation as the propensity to perceive events through the prism of a security threat varies from state to state. What is considered a threat to one state may not be a threat to another. A close link is always found between security and the population's quality and style of life, social and political way of thinking. A sovereign state's prerogative to secure that identity is what comes within the purview of realism as security. For example, the underpinnings of western power maximizing state for security are based on the western life style, pattern of development and inordinate consumption. To secure that commodious living, which is the identity of western populace distinguished from that of other continents, has been the main objective of national interest defined always in terms of power which will enable it to secure resources from other parts of the world even by the use of force. The traditional wars over resources, and raw materials in the past and in the present over oil can be explained by

---

<sup>27</sup> Michel Frederick, *op.cit*, p.101.

this realist logic. What is perceived as a threat to the luxurious and rich people in the North is the scenario of non-availability of resources or any kind of compromise on their way of life. Thus, America is not in a position to reduce emission of CO<sub>2</sub> to the atmosphere, as it believes that it will put a compromise on their way of life. So, in realism's notion of security is involved the subjective and differential analysis of security based on a hierarchical, divided and power maximizing world. All these situations presuppose a state of war as well as an armed intervention by the state under attack. Whereas considerations of oil played a significant part in the security thinking of America in relation to Middle East and Iraq, denial of it is perceived as a security threat. However, other nations and world public opinion and even the UN could not buy American idioms and logic to define security threats in the case of American attack on Iraq. So in realist framework of security consideration, there would be no question of perceiving or analyzing even the environmental issues other than within the diagnostics of military security. In other words, the realist notion of security cannot be greenized.

On the other hand, environmental security does recognize the link between population's quality of life and environment or nature. Nature is not a heap of raw materials, an object and a lifeless other to be exploited for what has been defined ethnocentrically as prosperity and development. A coordinated, symbiotic and organic view of the evolutionary process of the entire nature where both animate and inanimate play a significant role to sustain livelihood is required to form the basis of what should constitute the paradigm of development and security. It is not a hierarchically divided and disjointed world based on exploitation and inequity and widening hiatus between the rich and the poor, but a scheme of development and security where equity is established between and among the present generations but also between the present and future generations both living and nonliving. It is not the realist notion of security that view the ecosystem, resources and natural cycles not only within its territory but also in other parts of the globe to be exploited for the prosperity and security which is the identity referent

for its populace. Thus, what is sustained and conducive to security is unsustainable and security threats to other people. On the other hand, environmental security challenges the very basis of the realist framework of security and its logic. It does not acquiesce in statist frame of security based on duality, division between the rich and the poor, nature and the universe and the present and future generation. It is universalistic, planetary and cosmic view of security that will determine not only the national security of each and every state, but also security of the people. Contrary to this logic of environmental security, the realist definition of security centers round the state's social well being and the maintenance of its functional integrity. These two criteria are not any way to be compromised in the name of environmental security. In realist thinking, these two criteria provide the frame of reference to map out the notion of security on militarist and statist denominations. If states act first and foremost in line with their national self-interest defined on the basis of the above two criteria and in terms of power and security, then pollution problems, environmental scarcity and degradation of resources, such as water, fish, air etc. can be measured in terms of national security thus threatened.

This is to reiterate what many scholars on environment and conflict such as Homer Dixon and others have tried to prove calling from many case studies that environmental security and degradation of resources directly or indirectly in combination with other factors depending on the severity and magnitude of environmental crisis, social effects and adaptive failure of the people, can contribute to violent conflict both inter-state and intrastate having serious implications on the stability and security of the international system. In the realist framework, the criteria of social well being and preservation of functional integrity remain uppermost while perceiving the threats from environmental degradation, whereas in the analysis of Homer Dixon and others, environmental factor remains preponderant and determinant to challenge the established conventionally understood meaning of security. War or use of force in response to environmental threats in terms of statist and military



framework does not provide the solution and ensure environmental security. Environmental security traverses beyond recognizing the environmental threats to security as the frame of reference to provide a second look at what so far constitute the copingstone of development, security and prosperity so that security to all both animate and inanimate and future generations can be ensured taking all as subjectivities important players in a cosmic vision of the universe.

According to Daniel H. Deudney,<sup>28</sup> in three major ways, the linkage between environmental degradation and military violence can be established. The first point is that the states in the pursuit of their national security to secure freedom from violence through military means spend a lot of resources which can be diverted towards conservation of environment. Second, war is destructive of the environment that is both unintentional and intentional. He cited examples showing how the military destruction of olive groves in Mediterranean land, led to the long lasting destruction of the land's carrying capacities,<sup>29</sup> the US bombardment and use of defoliants in Vietnam caused significant environmental damage<sup>30</sup> and more recently during the Gulf war of 1991, Saddam Hussein's forces set the oil fields of Kuwait on fire causing massive ecological damage and resource wastages.<sup>31</sup> Further extensive use of nuclear weapons would have significant ominous impacts on the global environment

---

<sup>28</sup> Daniel Dendney, "The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security", Daniel Deudney, "Environmental Security: Muddled Thinking", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* vol.47, no.3, 1991, pp.22-28.

<sup>29</sup> Clive Ponting, *A Green History of the World: The Environment and the Collapse of Great Civilization* (New York: St. Martin's, 1992).

<sup>30</sup> SIPRI, *Warfare in a Fragile World: Military Impact on the Human Environment* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1980).

<sup>31</sup> T.W. Hawley, *Against the Fires of Hell: The Environment Disaster of the Gulf War* (New York: Harcourt Brue Jovanovich, 1992). Arthur H. Westing, "Environmental and Ecological Consequence War", sent on email to author on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2004

in terms of altered weather pattern i.e. nuclear winter and depletion of the ozone layer.<sup>32</sup> Even the conventional war in industrialized countries can be environmentally devastating with release of radiation from civilian nuclear plants.

Third, preparation for war and production of both nuclear and conventional weapons has also deleterious effects on environment. Literatures are not wanting to show how “over the last century, the nuclear weapon states, particularly the United States and the former Soviet Union, generated enormous quantities of radioactive waste as a byproduct of the nuclear weapons development and production.”<sup>33</sup> According Deudney, as put forth by the proponents of environmental security, the resources and costs used for preparation and use of nuclear and conventional weapons can be invested for improving the environmental conditions. Deudney opines that “there is nothing distinctively national about either the causes, the harms or the solutions that warrants privileging the national grouping” on the grounds that environmental problems, causes, and effects are confined to the boundary of a state.<sup>34</sup> He has ignored how the environmental degradation or development activities in one state have been a security threat to another nation. For example, the predicted sea level rise submerging low-lying areas of Bangladesh, Maldives, and Egypt affecting millions of people is not the doing of these affected countries. Sea level rise is the result of global warming

---

<sup>32</sup> Paul R. Ehrlich, Carl Sagan Donald Kenedy, and Walter Orr Roberts, *The Cold and the Dark: The World After Nuclear War* (New York: Norton, 1984).

<sup>33</sup> Animesh Roul, *Environmental Effects of the Production and Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction*, Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University, for M.Phil, New Delhi, 1998. See also Michael Renner, “Assessing the Military’s War on the Environment”, in Lester Brown, ed., *State of the World 1991* (New York: Norton, 1991), pp.132-52.

<sup>34</sup> Daniel H. Deudney “Environmental Security: A Critique”, in Daniel H. Deudney and Richard A. Matthew eds., *Contested Grounds* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), pp.192-93.

caused by the rich North countries' mindless historic emission of CO<sub>2</sub> to the atmosphere in pursuance of their domestic imperatives for luxurious and commodious living, inordinate life style and profligate consumption and production of wealth. Even if his arguments that "most environmental problems are not international", because, the causes, sources, problems, consequences and victims of environmental degradation are confined within the borders of one nation state<sup>35</sup> are accepted, as studied by Homer Dixon, environmental scarcity and degradation of resources within a territory can lead to various social effects in terms of poverty, economic deprivations, decline in agricultural productivity, migration and weakening of social and political institutions i.e. state which, in turn, contribute to intra-state conflicts such as insurgencies, coup d'etat, guerrilla warfare resulting in shifting of allegiance and legitimacy. These intra-state violent conflicts are having international impacts inviting intervention from external powers.<sup>36</sup>

Deudney is of the view that "military organizations" which are "sensitive extremely hierarchical, and centralized, and typically deploy expensive highly specialized, and advanced technologies" to give protection from violence and threats are not the same with environmental security. "In contrast, responding to the environmental problems requires very different approaches and organizations"<sup>37</sup> Environmental degradation that rekindles intra-state or inter-state violent conflict is not dissimilar with the other causes triggering armed conflict. With the advent of nuclear weapons, chemical and other biological weapons, the type of organization, methods and approaches required in case of classical military operations gets changed. Similarly, in case of environmental security, the types of organization, techniques and approaches are bound to be different. If changes in techniques and approaches required in case of nuclear weapons do not in any way denude it of

---

<sup>35</sup> Deudney, *ibid*, p.193

<sup>36</sup> Thomas F. Homer Dixon, *Environment, Scarcity and Violence* (New Jersey/ Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), pp.142-47.

<sup>37</sup> Deudney, *op.cit.* p.194.

its importance, how the different approaches, methods and organization to deal with various aspects of environmental degradation could disrobe the environmental security of its significance and meaning? That environmental security needs different kind of organizations, approaches methods and techniques different from those of classical military warfare, according to Deudney creates "a conceptual muddle rather than the paradigm or world view shift"<sup>38</sup> Environmental security does include not all kinds of evils as threat but only those that are caused by environmental degradation or scarcity of resources along with its social effects, which, in turn, creates intrastate violence with implications on international security and stability. The critics of environmental security underrate the magnitude of the crisis, and challenges to this worldview are considered as "dedefinition rather than a redefinition of security".<sup>39</sup>

It is said that environmental security is a motivational, psychological and rhetorical strategy to divert the social, political and economic wherewithal now expended on military towards alleviating the environmental conditions. In the United States have been launched on many social issues 'war on drugs', war on poverty or war on crime' movements as "moral equivalent to war"<sup>40</sup> in the past without any success. But these movements are different from environmental security in that the latter aims at reinventing the established view of the world, its political and economic thinking on which hinges the concept of national security. No doubt, Ken Conca and others are right when they are of the view that discourse of national security has a set of powerful associations that cannot simply be redirected.<sup>41</sup> This is what led United Nations Secretary

---

<sup>38</sup> Deudney, *ibid.* p.194.

<sup>39</sup> Deudney, *ibid.* p.194.

<sup>40</sup> William James, "The Moral Equivalent of War", *Memories and Studies* (New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1911)

<sup>41</sup> Ken Conca, "In the Name of Sustainability: Peace Studies and Environmental Discourse", in Jyrki Kakonen, ed., *Green Security or Military Environment* (Aldershot, U.K.: Dartmouth, 1994).

General Kofi Annan to note in his Millennium Report that while security policy had traditionally focused on the defense of territory from external attack, it has now come to embrace “the protection of communities and individuals from internal violence”. This focus on the protection of individuals rather than borders is the central element of what has become known as human security.<sup>42</sup> The very definition, scope and range of environmental security never advocates military prowess necessary to protect the people against the threats from environmental degradation, then Jyrki Kakonen’s fears of “militarized environment”<sup>43</sup> are not in tune with what environmental security suggests. As nuclear weapons make nuclearisation of war, the environment makes security the environmentalisation or greening of security.

It is also argued that war, nation and state are intrinsically connected and reinforced by each other in realist frame of security. As historian Michael Howard has observed: “self consciousness as a Nation implies, by definition, a sense of differentiation from other communities, and the most memorable incidents in the group memory usually are of conflict with, and triumph over, other communities. It is in fact very difficult to create national consciousness without a war”.<sup>44</sup> Echoing the dominant perspective of national security strengthened by war, Charles Tilly observes that “states make war and war makes states”<sup>45</sup>. It is not the jingoistic forces of war but the envision of a universal self different from the

---

<sup>42</sup> Kofi Annan, *We the Peoples: the Role of the United Nations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century March 2000*, quoted in Andrew Mack “Human Security in the New Millennium”, *Work in Progress: A Review of Research Activities of the United Nations University*, vol.16, no.3, Summer, 2002, p.4

<sup>43</sup> Jyrki Kakonen, ed., *op. cit.*

<sup>44</sup> Michael Howard, “War and the Nation-State”, *Daedalus*, vol.108, no.4, Fall 1979, pp.101-10.

<sup>45</sup> Charles Tilly, “War Making and State Making as Organized Crime” in Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpal, eds. *Bringing the State Back in* (Cambridge, UK.: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp.169-91.

self help, tied symbiotically with others living and nonliving in a timelessness frame beyond territorial exclusivity and spatial distancing of traditional nation state, and new planetary interests, ethics and wisdom that will define the national security. Nobody can refute the fact that to deal with environmental problems, their management and regulation entails the expansion of state capabilities but not on military terms. This requires coordinated efforts of science and technology, socio-political institutions, finance, various organizations and state machinery including the international community. Jason Clay has been quoted to point out that in many parts of developing countries, and particularly its tropical rain forests, states are dispossessing and destroying indigenous people whose claim to distinct national identity is high but whose potential for statehood is very low or non-existent.<sup>46</sup> This is what the proponents of environmental security are going to address not in terms of enhanced military capabilities but in terms of relooking at the western pattern of development based on fossil fuel technologies and industrialization.

It is the imposed western liberal market economy in the name of globalization, the entry of multinational corporations into the developing countries that is mostly responsible for deterioration and depletion in their environment. Environmental scarcity of resources along with their social effects in terms of poverty, economic deprivation and weakening of state capabilities has led to in these countries insurgencies, group violence questioning the very basis of legitimacy. The cases of banditry in rural Sind in Pakistan, the guerrilla war waged by the Sendero Luminoso in Peru and the New People's Army (NPA) insurgency in the Philippines are good illustration of the links between environmental scarcities, grievance

---

<sup>46</sup> Jason Clay, "Resource Wars: Nations and State Conflicts of the Twentieth Century" in Barbara Rose Johnston, ed, *Who Pays the Price? The Sociocultural Context of Environmental Crisis* (Washington D.C.: Island Press, 1994).

and violence.<sup>48</sup> What has led to coercive conservation<sup>47</sup> in many fragile and despotic regimes in African countries by dispossessing local inhabitants of their traditional natural resources, is not part of a design to fulfill the requirements of environmental security, it is to benefit state elites, multinational corporations and the western nations.<sup>49</sup>

### **Sovereignty and National Security: An Environmental Perspective**

Contemporary national security is closely connected to the institution of state sovereignty as defined in Westphalia convention. In the international realm, sovereignty has come to mean the existence in polity of a final and undivided authority over a particular territory, which only states can possess, and the reciprocal recognition of this authority, which states extend to one another.<sup>50</sup> Claimants within state and outside the state to the prerogative of sovereignty are considered not legitimate but encroachments. Similarly, it is said, responding to international and global pulls and pressures exercised upon state sovereignty on environmental issues and problems mean a diminished or dilution of the sovereignty – state's legitimate authority. Thus, the requirements of environmental security come in direct clash with the enhanced concern for its sovereign prerogatives. When nations clash over environmental scarcity of renewable resources such as river water as found in

---

<sup>47</sup> Nancy Peluso, *Rich Forests, Poor People* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), and Charles S. Wood and Marianne Schmink, "The Military and the Environment in the Brazilian Amazon", *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, vol.21, Summer 1993, pp.81-105.

<sup>48</sup> See, Thomas F. Homer Dixon, *Environment, Scarcity and Violence*, *op.cit.* p.144.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>50</sup> Michael Ross Fowler and Julie Marie Bunck, *Law, Power and the Sovereign State: The Evolution and Application of the Concept of Sovereignty* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995).

various parts of the globe, for example, India and Bangladesh over Ganges water, water conflict in Middle East and Africa, they lay claims to water within the non-negotiable prerogative of sovereignty. When intra-state conflicts in terms of group violence, insurgencies, and guerilla warfare occur in fragile and weak states presided over by authoritarian regimes and exacerbated by environmental scarcity of resources in combination with other factors like social, political, economic and cultural context, these conflicts occur over the issue of legitimacy to the sovereignty state system. The environmental issues, which are global, need global governance and management. In that case, traversing beyond the straightjacket of sovereignty is what is required of environmental security. Traversing beyond is not always an erosion of sovereignty rather an extension of its effectiveness and influence in dealing with environmental problems. Changes in international situation are taking place so fast and pervasively that to think solution in terms of the rigid logic of Westphalia sovereign state system in the changing scenario is an expression of European arrogance. Barry Buzan, who recognizing environmental degradation as a security threat keeps it at par with economic and political factors. He is of the view that "the sources of threat are also diversifying away from the state. Many of the new threats seem to stem from complex systems both natural (the ecosystem) and the human made (the global economy), and the operation of these systems is often poorly understood."<sup>51</sup>

Two perspectives on sovereignty and environment linkage continue to be debated. The first perspective led by Deudney and others observe that there has been erosion or weakening of sovereignty. Environmental concerns are said to be erecting new and effectively global standards for state behaviour. These new global standards are said to manifest themselves in many ways: in formal dealings among states such as the creation of international

---

<sup>51</sup> Barry Buzan, "Rethinking Security after the Cold War", *Nordic Journal of International Studies*, vol.32, no.1, March 1997,p.12.



environmental regimes, in rules of environmental conditionality attached to the actions of international organizations such as the World Bank<sup>52</sup>, in the evolving norms of a growing body of international environmental law<sup>53</sup>, and in the political pressures brought to bear on governments by increasingly transnational environmental movements, citizen's networks, and non-governmental organizations.<sup>54</sup> Ecosystems and environmental processes do not respect state borders, sovereignty itself becomes a key institution of global scale environmental destruction. It creates a scale for decision-making, adjudication, and authority that does not coincide with fundamental ecological realities, and thus frustrates ecologically responsive management.<sup>55</sup>

The second perspective is that the emergence of multilateral institutions for environmental protection does not inevitably erode state sovereignty and may even strengthen it. By placing states at the center of institutional responses and strengthening their capacity to act collectively, it is argued the menu of choices available to state is

---

<sup>52</sup> On environmental conditionality, see, Andrew Council 'Green Conditionality', *Overseas Development Council Policy Paper*, March 1993.

<sup>53</sup> See, Patricia Birnie, "International Environmental Law: Its Adequacy for Present and Future Needs", in Hurrell and Kingsbury Ed. *The International Politics of the Environment* (Oxford: UK: Clarendon Press, 1992), p.84.

<sup>54</sup> Kathryn Sikking, "Human Rights, Principled Issue- networks, and Sovereignty in Latin America", *International Organization*, vol.47, no, 3, Summer 1993, pp.411-41, and Ronnie D.Lipschitz, "Reconstructing World Politics: The Emergence of Global Civil Society", *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, vol.21, no.3, Winter 1992, pp.389-420.

<sup>55</sup> See, Hurrell and Kingsbury, "introduction" in Hurrell and Kingsbury, Eds. *op.cit*, pp.6-8.

being expanded, not restricted.<sup>56</sup> Levy, Keohane and Haas have argued that, although environmental regimes may limit the scope of governments to act unilaterally, they also facilitate collective state based problem solving.<sup>57</sup> Ken Conca, striking a balance between the two, perspectives states that “sovereignty is in fact being transformed as a result of global ecological interdependence, but not in the manner sketched by either of the above claims, or even by the net effect of the two taken together.”<sup>58</sup> A new universal norm of environmental responsibility is emerging in a highly segmented set of activities, including the lobbying of scientists, the pressure of public opinion, the calculation of governments, and the targeted political pressures of eco activists. Responding to international environmental pressures can create resources and purchase legitimacy, at the same time, it may constrain the menu of policy choices. Sovereignty, as conceptualized in Westphalia, carries with a complex bundles of rights: equality among states, non-intervention, exclusive territorial jurisdiction, the presumption of state competence, restrictions on binding adjudication without consent, exclusive right to wield violence, and the embeddeness of international law in the free will of states.<sup>59</sup> This is not to argue that a particular set of international pressures affects these various components norms of sovereignty equally or in parallel fashion.

---

<sup>56</sup> Mark A Levy, Robert O Keohane, and Peter M.Haas, “Imposing the Effectiveness of International Environmental Institutions” in Haas, Keohane and Levy, eds. *Institutions for the Earth: Sources of effective International Environmental Protection* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993), pp.415-17.

<sup>57</sup> Ken Conca, “Rethinking the Ecology Sovereignty Debate”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, vol.23, no.3, 1994, p.702.

<sup>58</sup> Ken Conca, *ibid*, p.703.

<sup>59</sup> Quoted from Ruth Lapidoth, “Sovereignty in Transition”, *Journal of International Affairs*, vol.45, no.2, winter 1992, pp.325-46.

There is reason to expect that some normative pillars of sovereignty can be strengthened as others are undermined or eroded. For example, in the case of transboundary pollutant flows, "institutional mechanisms" and agreements "to control them could erode the sovereign right to exclusive territorial jurisdiction, but at the same time, strengthen aspects of the principle of non-intervention, if the flows themselves are viewed as unjustified intervention".<sup>60</sup> The Westphalian straightjacket sovereignty is based on the legal framework that it has exclusive jurisdiction over the territory. This constitutes the *raison d'être* to claim the status of the international standing. The claim of the enduring sovereignty in the face of environmental pressures stresses states as problem solvers. Deudney's view that "an enhanced state concern for its sovereign prerogatives could greatly impede international environmental cooperation"<sup>61</sup>, stand discredited. Hardly the ink on the major agreements signed at the 1992 UNCED conference at Rio dried than the Brazilian diplomat Marcos Azambuja offered the following analysis: "Brazilian interests are reinforced in the majority of the documents. At no time did we face opposition to our basic interests ... we came out of the negotiations without the slightest scratch to our sovereignty"<sup>62</sup>.

While assuming that the concept 'sovereignty' is based on the foundation of territorial exclusivity and spatial distancing, its internal capability to ensure that the legitimacy given to it by society and various sections of people on the basis of its performance continues, is lost sight of by those who want to confine environmental security to the Westphalia procrustean bed. Environmental scarcity and degradation of resources when coalesced with other economic,

---

<sup>60</sup> Conca, *op.cit.* p.706

<sup>61</sup> Deudney, *op.cit.* p.198.

<sup>62</sup> Summit Document "Safeguard Brazilian Interests", *Daily Report: Latin America, FBIS-LAT-92-114-5*, 12 June 1992, p.27.

political and cultural factors accentuates economic deprivation, decline in agricultural productivity and weakening of political institutions such as state. In this situation “ if the state fails to meet the grievances of the disadvantaged people, then threat of violence, guerrilla warfare and other forms of conflict manifest challenging the legitimacy of those who are in power and their claim to sovereignty. This internal failure in terms of lack of capability and effectiveness to ensure environmental security is a reflection of limitations of sovereignty. When Brazilian government was very much concerned that there are no scratches on the wall of its sovereignty, its inside surface shows signs of being scratched. The following excerpt shows the irony:

Whenever one looks in the Amazonian economy, the state is in retreat; unable to finance tax breaks or build highways without the aid of multilateral banks, unable to include more than one percent of the rural population in official colonization schemes, unable to control land tilting or land conflicts, unable to register or tax the greater part of the Amazonian economy, unable to enforce federal law on more than a sporadic basis<sup>63</sup>.

Efforts to scratch the wall by constructing a regime for the preservation of the world's remaining rainforests and of the Amazon, in particular, were defeated. Assessment of the limits of state capabilities comes at a time when the Brazilian state has been placed squarely at the center of most schemes for sustainable development in the region. Far from prohibiting state action, the net effect of international pressures has been to stimulate a more active, interventionist role in the region under the rubric of supporting sustainable development. Without eroding sovereignty, these pressures strengthened the presence of state in the region and in Brazilian society as a whole. A multifaceted character of sovereignty is emerging where “the freedom of state to undertake, promote or

---

<sup>63</sup> David Cleary, “After the Frontier: Problems with Political Economy in the Modern Brazilian Amazon”, *Journal of Latin American Studies*, vii, 25, part.2, May 1993, pp.331-49.

tolerate process of environmental degradation is being limited and many of the limits emanate from sources external to state itself. At the same time, there is little doubt that new international institutions have made some governments more effective problem solvers. That both effects could be happening at once is testimony to the multi-faceted character of sovereignty.<sup>64</sup> What is lost sight of by the many critics of environmental security is that the internal forces questioning the capability of state to deal with environmental scarcity of resources are downplayed to magnify the international environmental agreements as constraints on external sovereignty. But as seen from the above analysis, rather the international environmental forces and pressures strengthen the role of the sovereign state system as problem solvers. The requirements of environmental security do not aim at the proselytization of sovereign state system or its erosion. It aims at coordinated and cooperative efforts of sovereign state systems in dealing with the management of environmental problems. Given the magnitude of the crisis and the threats to the very survival of humanity on the earth, the new planetary interests would constitute the national interests of sovereign states. The need is to reflect upon what this means for humanity as a whole, and for each nation state. It is time that the planetary interests became the principal political concept guiding decision-making on survival issues such as sustainability and environmental integrity. It is time that the sovereign nations pursue a legitimate national interest that is, in each case, compatible with the greater good of us all. On the true global issues, a new approach for decision-making is required. Instead of negotiations being the consequences of competing claims of all national interests, the global objectives need to be identified first and accepted as binding, with subsequent negotiation determining what national obligations must arise from this. The relationship between national and planetary interests has been the focus of environmental security. The impending environmental crisis, global and transboundary in its nature and scope coming as greater threats to humanity, calls for the

---

<sup>64</sup> Conca, *op.cit.*, p.711.

institutionalization of supranational loyalties to the planet and to humanity as a species. This means a subordination of national sovereignty to the imperatives of environmental ethics and values.<sup>65</sup>

In 1995 a commission headed by former Swedish Prime Minister Innguar Carlsson and former Commonwealth Secretary General Shridath Ramphal declared: "the idea that people have common interests irrespective of their national or other identities and that they are coming together in an organized way across borders is of increasing relevance to global governance".<sup>66</sup> Alleviating the fears of eco-fascism of the critics of environmental security, the very requirements of environmental security suggest a global governance of environmental crisis with involvement of all institutions including the state, non-state actors, regions and groups. Given the sources of many of the new threats stemming from complex systems both natural and human made, and diversifying away from the state into diverse, regional and local in character, the monolithic statist Westphalian approach quite familiar with realist paradigm seems to be inadequate to solve the environmental crisis, "Global environmental governance emerges because the spatial scale of the state is inadequate in dealing with the scales of environmental change, and thus the practices of governance move towards regional and global levels and at the same time towards local levels in response."<sup>67</sup> The ecological project of governance envisions a world of small interacting communities, what Bookchin named as municipal confederalism<sup>68</sup> or what Karliner termed it as grass roots

---

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid*, p.311.

<sup>66</sup> Quoted in Kennedy Graham, "Leadership ethics for the future: Trend lightly on the Planet", *Point of view*, UNU nexions, April 2002, p.5.

<sup>67</sup> Matthew Paterson, "Interpreting trends in global governance", *International Affairs*, vol.25, no.4, 1949,p.795; and Lamont Hempel, *Environmental governance; the global challenges* (Washington D.C: Island Press, 1996)

<sup>68</sup> Murray Bookchin, *The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy*, Revised Edition, (Montreal and New York, Ny: Black Rose Books, 1991).

globalization,<sup>69</sup> which means a myriad locally organized, but transnationally networked, social movements and NGOs are becoming increasingly mobilized to resist the dominant practices of TNCs and states. To create alternative forms of the western dominated political economy, the most common phrase used is the "common". It is defined as a site of ecologically sustainable and socially just, political economy. This means the construction of myriad small-scale societies organized around common regimes through resistance to the globalising practices of TNCs, state and international development agencies.<sup>70</sup> To quote Caldwell:

Rhetorical assertions of national sovereignty continue to be heard, but the imperatives of geophysical hazards to all nations are pushing their governments toward modification of their asserted freedom to act as they please in relation to their natural resources, industrial practices, and the environment. A rhetorical strategy to evade the sovereignty roadblock is the concept of 'merged sovereignty', which in fact occurs when nations seek to realize their own national objectives through treaties with other nations having interests in common.<sup>71</sup>

Deudney is of the view that "national identity and security collides directly with world views and identities supportive of sustainable environmental practices. The nation is not an empty vessel or blank slate waiting to be filled or scripted but is instead profoundly linked to us versus them thinking". Further he states, "nationalism means a sense of us versus them, of the insider vs. the outsider, of the compatriot vs. the alien."<sup>72</sup> The "us vs. them"

---

<sup>69</sup> Joshua Karliner, *The Corporate Planet: ecology and politics in the age of globalization*, (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1997), Chapter-7.

<sup>70</sup> Matthew Paterson, *Understanding global environmental politics: domination, accumulation, resistance* (London: Macmillan, 2002).

<sup>71</sup> Lynton Keith Caldwell, *International Environmental Policy: Emergence and Dimension* (New Delhi: Affiliated East-West Press pvt. Ltd., 1991). p.68.

<sup>72</sup> Deudney, *op. cit.* p.199.

thinking comes in direct conflict with environmental political thought which stresses on 'one world' and global village sensibility of environmental awareness.

As Homer Dixon and his associates have shown in their studies, many conflicts that arise directly out of environmental scarcity of the renewable resources such as water, fish and others can be put into the "us vs. them" framework, where one nation knows that the causes of conflict lay directly with the environmental degradation of certain sources of the other countries. Where there is differential degree of contribution among nations to the degradation of the environment, lack of scientific precision to quantify the magnitude of each country's contribution, and scientific certainty about the imminence of environmental catastrophe and about its country and region wise impact, all argumentations against applying this "us vs. them" paradigm into international relations on environmental problems seem to be contextualization of national security within the Westphalian model. On environmental issues in international forums a clear line is drawn between North and South. The seemingly inapplicability of this "us vs. them" thinking does not mean that environmental crisis is not a national security issue in the sense of a realist framework but in the sense that the environmental problems will affect the livelihood of its citizens whose security has traditionally been tied with territorial impregnability. How security defined in terms of this territorial, impregnability, exclusivity and spatial distancing stands in the face of flow of pollutants, climate change, change in precipitation patterns, global warming, acid rain, and ozone hole impact? The scientifically arrived at findings can no longer be ignored in the name of adherence to classical model of sovereignty and Eurocentric realist understanding of the world and on the other hand, requires rethinking of security in terms of environment.

### **A Critique of Realistic Approach**

This reality of struggle among nations for survival and dominance resulting in elitism enforces local and domestic



hierarchies and legitimizes the existence and use of military apparatus, while life is permanently threatened by the imperatives of military security. Military imperatives dictate that states develop and deploy the most effective military technology available. The effects on land and nature are little considered. No military technology could be more environmentally damaging than nuclear weapons. Thus the environmental effects of producing, storing, developing, and dismantling them, not to mention the effects they would have on the environment if ever used, are considered secondary. A similar argument could be adduced about the entire range of military technologies, from cluster bombs to napalm to defoliants to biological weapons.<sup>73</sup> Land has no moral or little worth except that it is a spiritless Other that humans can rightfully exploit to serve their own ends. Just-war theory generally evaluates collateral damage's significance in the context of civilians killed or injured due to military operations. Yet collateral damage also kills and injures animals and destroys biotic nature that have even less stake and less say in the conflict than civilians. Where is their right to life? The realist ethic to disrupt or destroy the evolutionary process, which includes all its organic and non-organic components, reducing the diversity of life and stability and beauty of the natural system, is unethical.<sup>74</sup> Responding to power politics, the ecologists allege that if power politics is real, it is a constructed and deconstructable reality. "Reality is a social construction". It is "created and constructed by beliefs and behaviour. Structures do in fact shape beliefs and behaviour the way some positivists thought, but these structures are

---

<sup>73</sup> See, William Thomas, *Scorched Earth: The Military's Assault on the Environment* (Philadelphia, PA, and Gabor Island: New Soviet Publishers, 1995), See, also Matthias Finger, "The Military, the Nation State and the Environment", *The Ecologist*, vol.21, no.5, 1991, pp.220-25.

<sup>74</sup> John Barkdull, "Why Environmental Ethics Matters to International Relations", *Current History*, vol.99, no.640, November-2000, p.362.

the product of human action".<sup>75</sup> To hold such logic of structural realist assumptions of power politics as permanent is the result of application of Thomas Hobbes and Isaac Newtonian view of man "as particles of constant motions" to social relations. From the realist axioms of structural and motivational conflictuality flow a series of corollaries with a devastating impact on life and freedom, of which hierarchy or elitism is the obvious problem. This gives rise to the emergence of a strong state always embarking on devising a system of accumulation and control from the top.

Realism is also criticized for its homogenizing worldview in its power politics framework. It reduces motives to a few universals, such as power quests and physical growth. "In the process, realism has also homogenized the political unit by emphasizing a statist ontology that not only ascribes a natural aura to such a form of association, but also minimizes its internal variance"<sup>76</sup> This is particularly characteristic of Waltz's third image.<sup>77</sup> By reducing all to a narrow groove of power motives, and holding these as immutable and permanent, realism imposes a structural straitjacket upon all cultural issues, diversities and anthropological insight. In the words of Eric Laferriere, "From an ecological perspective, the power assumptions and political language of realism can only portray the world as a giant machine fixated on the goal of survival or victory; they can only trivialize culture and accultured individuals in the process of social creation"<sup>78</sup>

In its idioms of anti-ecological dimension of power, realism depicts the world as basically materialistic, conflictual and elitist

---

<sup>75</sup> John A. Vasquez, "The Post-positivist Debate: Reconstructing Scientific Enquiry and International Relations Theory After Enlightenment's Fall", in Ken Booth and Steve Smith ed., *International Relations Theory Today* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 1995), p.221.

<sup>76</sup> Eric Laferriere, *op.cit.*, p.68

<sup>77</sup> Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press. 1959).

<sup>78</sup> Eric Laferriere, *op.cit.*, p.68.

devoid of any social utopia and idealism. By arraigining one individualized self in case of a group or class, or one super power nation, against the other to satisfy the elite's interests in terms of accumulations, consumption and control, realism super imposes an artificial, fictitious construct over and above a universalized or expanded self, typical of ecological portrayal of the natural world. "By limiting the definition of threat to the Other's potential ambitions over the finite, zero sum game of the state system, and by turning this preeminent reality into the main engine of history, the call to arms by realism turns nature into raw materials and legitimizes warfare as a vehicle of the good"<sup>79</sup>

Impelled by the objectifying bias of Newtonian science, the positivism and behaviouralism taking cue from the classical realism took the recurrent pattern of history as constants, quantified the power and state capabilities and replaced ethics with problem solving. Thus, realism as the a historical science of the state stunting human development and questioning its survival stood opposed to organics, subjectivity and historicism characterizing the ecological thought. Critical Theory challenges these statist denominations of realism. "If states dominate the arena, this is a feat of power politics representing other dimensions of reality that could potentially replace the states if an emancipatory praxis could- with the help of Critical Theory - empower other subjectivities than those who dominate at present. The social world does not exhibit any iron laws, all regularities can be broken, and it is the task of Critical Theory to show this...".<sup>80</sup> Ecological approaches can add to completion of emancipatory project in this direction by relying on what Bookchin said earlier about municipal confederalism. Critical Theory can take non-military environmental security threats as a part of its argumentation against established discourses of security, thereby relativising conventional wisdom.

---

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> Barry Buzan, "Rethinking Security after the Cold War", *op. cit.* p.19.

## Critique of Liberalism

Liberalism, which started as a doctrine of freedom was based on possessive individualism of Hobbes and Locke in search for accumulation of wealth, profligate and commodious lifestyle. At the individual level, he/she needs freedom to achieve the goals set by the materialistic world opened before him/her by the Newtonian age. At the state level, liberal democratic government legitimized by the individuals' criteria of wealth production, profligate and inordinate lifestyle and commodious living emerged as the guarantor of these goals to its individuals by introducing into the world, its market economy, liberal ideas, free exchange, trade, and protectionism.

The liberal tradition set by America and Western allies was to guarantee these objectives to the individuals at home by getting unimpeded access to resources available any where in the world even by the application of force. Like realism, it viewed the nature and other nations as the other to be exploited for satisfaction of individuals' material needs at home. The liberal institutionalism cannot escape its entanglement with and commitment to the capitalist market system. Its anthropocentric view of nature and universe and consequent emphasis on economic growth leads to a relative lack of concern for the stability, integrity, and beauty of the earth. Obsessed with growth fetish the western liberal market economy destroyed both the nature and the poor. In other words, "If Judeo-Christian monotheism took nature out of religion, Anglo-American economists took nature out of economics"<sup>81</sup>. Overconsumption and inordinate life style of the western people has proved to be a nuisance to nature. The liberal tradition combining individual consciousness with responsibility is eminently attractive to ecologists. Liberal literatures in International Relations articulate a normative commitment to freedom by favouring a cooperative utopia based on open exchange, material growth, positive law and

---

<sup>81</sup> J.R.McNeill, "Ideas Matter: A Political History of the Twentieth-Century Environment", *Current History*, vol.99, no. 640, November 2000, p.374.

specialized knowledge. These include the early advocates of free trade,<sup>82</sup> the functionalist and neo-functionalist arguments stressing the relationship between peace and elite co-operations<sup>83</sup> the regime literature and its descriptive emphasis on 'mechanics of cooperation',<sup>84</sup> and part of the contemporary normative literature on global humanism.<sup>85</sup>

The liberal cosmopolitan project aims at the attainment of a global commonality with the gradual eliminations of borders. But the overriding concern was unity. From an ecological perspective, the question pertains to the purpose of liberation in espousing unity. The ecologists are in favour of global concert but surely not at the cost of integrity, and diversity of member communities. The worst nightmare for the ecologists is the current spread of western liberal market economy throughout the world culminating in globalization. It involves the most fundamental centralized restructuring of socio-economic and political relations since the industrial revolution. It has created a new corporate colonialism in TNCs to which all individuals and nations must adjust. The new corporate colonialism is likely to dispossess, impoverish, and marginalize more people, destroy more cultures, and cause more environmental devastations than either the

---

<sup>82</sup> Richard Cobden, *Political Writing*, vol.1 (London: T Fisher Unwin, 1903), Norman Angell, *The Great Illusion* (New York, NY: Knickerbocker Press, 1911)

<sup>83</sup> David Mitrany, *A Working Peace System* (Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books, 1966), Ernst B. Haas, *Beyond the Nation-State: Functionalism and International Organization* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1969)

<sup>84</sup> Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984) and Stephen D. Krasner, ed., *International Regimes* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983)

<sup>85</sup> Robert C. Johansen, *The National Interest and the Human Interest: An Analysis of US Foreign Policy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980)

colonialism of old or the development of the last 50 years.<sup>86</sup> In the current context, it means the homogenization of prices, products, wages, rates of interest and profits to become the same all over reinforcing the economic interests of North countries. The process of economic globalization advanced by the Bretton Woods institutions promoted the interests of the super-rich so successfully that it also damaged their concern for and obligations to less fortunate inhabitants and their natural ecosystem in the developing world. In other words, it is nothing but another euphemism for the continuing exploitation of the underdeveloped by the developed, and redistribution of resources and wealth from the less to the more developed.<sup>87</sup> Globalization has not created a global village in transcendence of national boundaries, rather a highly divided, hierarchical elitist political structure. Thus, the ecologists' critique of liberal cosmopolitanism stands vindicated in that the homogenizing logic of liberalism is ruining ecosystems and decimating cultural specificity. The integration theory of the 1950s and 1960s for all its neutral tone, also assumed a basic link between global freedom and increasing communication.<sup>88</sup> In contemporary liberalism, as held by James Rosenau, global culture based on 'reason' and 'analytical skills' can be disappointingly defended as an emancipatory tool for the individual.<sup>89</sup> Trade based globalization and unfolding of western liberal market based economic-political order has been raised to a high moral level a synonym for development to which the developing world has been asked to dedicate themselves in slavish

---

<sup>86</sup> Edward Goldsmith, "Development as Colonialism", *World Affairs*, vol.6, no.2, April-June 2002, p.36.

<sup>87</sup> Ismail Shariff and David M.Littig, "Globalization old wine into new bottles", *World Affairs*, vol.6, no.2, April-June 2002, p.42

<sup>88</sup> See, Karl Deutsch *et al.*, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area* (Princeton, NJ; Princeton University Press, 1957), and Amitai Etzioni, *Political Unification: A Comparative Study of Leaders and Forces* (New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965)

<sup>89</sup> James N.Rosenau, *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), p.289.

adulation of what the west terms it as good. Siphoning off the resources and materials from the developing world like an inverted blood transfusion from the sick to the healthy, the globalization has enabled the rich North to promote their domestic imperatives in terms of guaranteeing the profligate, inordinate consumption, life style, and production of wealth. Thus the approach of liberals to global growth is based on total disregard of the imperatives of finiteness and diversity of nature, and the ever increasing hiatus between the rich and poor, freedom of the individuals and right to life of all other non human living and non-living.

The ecological critique should examine what David Mitrany and Harold Laski propounded their commitment to the materialist utopia in their defense of efficient servicing. For Mitrany, servicing formed a clear path to freedom.<sup>90</sup> Normative endorsement of growth is also found in Peace studies and within the Southern Perspectives on world order reform.<sup>91</sup> Ecologists can appreciate Mitrany's attempt at replacing a mere voting democracy with a working one.<sup>92</sup> But they are distrust of "the enlightened mission of experts". In their views, "technocratic depoliticisation rather is viewed as the embodiment of totalitarianism, the vehicle for a very distinct brand of politics".<sup>93</sup>

### Ecologicalising Emancipatory Mission

An ecological approach to International Relations Theory and global governance rests on alternative ontologies, epistemologies, and ethical/political prescription. The mechanical view of nature and

---

<sup>90</sup> Mitrany, *op.cit.*, p.96, Hoarold Laski, *A Grammar of Politics* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1967), p.614; See, also David Long, "International Functionalism and the Politics of Forgetting", *International Journal*, vol.48, no.2, 1993, pp.356-79.

<sup>91</sup> Bruce Russett, "Causes of Peace" in Carolyn M Stephenson ed., *Alternative Methods of International Security* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982), pp.188 & 191.

<sup>92</sup> Mitrany, *op.cit.*, p.36.

<sup>93</sup> Eric Laferriere, *op.cit.*, p.72.

attribution of the 'Other' need to be reconsidered. Nature is finite, whole, an interdependent body connecting all living matter in a cyclical and non-hierarchical manner. It is more often a function of cooperation within and between species. Diversity and timelessness are the other attributes of nature. Diversity allows nature to withstand the demise of individual life forms while maintaining its grandeur, beauty and bounty. Timelessness shows life is not imposed or spontaneously created but is undissociable from time. It is a long, slow and cumulative process. Recognition of longevity supports the assumption of mutual aid in nature. Thus it rejects the traditional utilitarianism, and mechanical view of nature, and ontologies of conflict. What Pope John Paul II said in the Conference of Roman Catholic bishops in the Philippines and Dominican Republic in 1988 deserves excerption: "... One cannot use with impunity the different categories of beings, whether living or inanimate – animals, plants and natural elements—simply as one wishes, according to one's economic needs. On the contrary, one must take into account the nature of each being and its mutual connection to an ordered systems, which is precisely the cosmos".<sup>94</sup> It advocates a harmonization with physical surroundings admonishing against imposition of structures of domination. The principle of classical theory of democracy, freedom, individual fulfillment and equal treatment are vindicated by ecological ethics. Instead of looking the world of nature as the other, a more coordinated view of the world embracing both the world of nature and the world of humanity<sup>95</sup> is what the ecological approaches insist on. "To deny moral value to ecosystem because they are not integrated in the same way as centralized individual organisms is to make a category mistake. In

---

<sup>94</sup> Origins: NC Documentary Service 17, 3 March 1988, p.645; Quoted in J.Ronald Engel, "Introduction: The ethics of sustainable development", in J.Ronald Engel and Joan Gibb Engel ed., *Ethics of Environment and Development* (London: Belhaven Press, 1990), p.4.

<sup>95</sup> Stephen Toulmin, *The Return to Cosmology: Postmodern Science and the Theology of Nature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), pp.255-56.



thinking about the value of social and biotic communities, we should be concerned for a matrix of interconnections between centers, not for a single center".<sup>96</sup>

Thus the mechanical view of the world and nature must be replaced by an organicistic one<sup>97</sup> which reads the world not as a soulless machine subjected to cause and effect, and repetitive patterns – *sine qua non* of scientific investigations, positivism and behaviouralism. To confine the study to the limitation of cause and effect syndrome means to fall short of understanding the complexity of nature and its inextricable connections with the evolution of life in a timelessness frame. Not that these scientific investigations, assumptions and methods are not helpful, but should not constitute the principal means of understanding or attributing meaning without organicism being attached with mysticism.<sup>98</sup> The ecological project calls for a rejection of the detached object of study, objectivity and mechanism forming the core of the Cartesian–Newtonian dominance in social sciences in favour of subjectivity.

The ecological teleology points to the significance of historicity and dialecticism in understanding the current human conditions as the dynamic ebb and flow and product of synergistic forces through time. This suggests getting rid of Westphalian straightjacket,<sup>99</sup> the prevalence of a historical bias in formulating the concept of international system reinforced by the dominance of an economic, natural science based understanding of the social world.

---

<sup>96</sup> Holmes Rolston, III, and *Environmental Ethics: Duties to and Values in the Natural World* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988), p.174.

<sup>97</sup> Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (New York, NY and Toronto: Harper and Row, 1980).

<sup>98</sup> Janet Biehl, *Finding Our Way: Rethinking of Ecofeminist Politics* (Montreal and New York, NY: Black Rose Books, 1991), pp.89-90.

<sup>99</sup> Barry Buzan and Richard Little, "Why International Relations has Failed as an Intellectual Project and What to do about it", *Millennium*; vol. 30, no.1, 2001, pp.25.

“A silent acceptance of this cultural bias” the imposed dominant economic and political thinking of western paradigm--” is virtually universal, not only within the context of a Western centred parochialism, but also among IR scholars who have tragically abandoned their own quite different historical and cultural traditions”<sup>100</sup> Seducing all cultural diversities, civilisational essences, regional specificities and bioregimes’ particularities and their coordinated interconnections woven into the warf and woof of cosmos, into wearing the western straightjacket is to block communication of the mainstream International Relations with other disciplines and snap man’s eternal chord with the cosmos. It calls for a multi-disciplinary and multidimensional approach that will travel beyond microeconomic analogies, handling forces that are much more elusive and much less amenable to behavioural manipulation than the heavily magnified state. Awakening it from the Westphalia Procrustean bed, it should be studied as an historical action and a social actor among many. Thus, the ecological vision includes a system cosmology, a theory of democracy of global structure of governance, a new scientific epistemology supplementing behaviourism and Newtonian objectivity, a strategy for global peace and security on the basis of cooperation and a recognition of intergenerational equity and accountability, and interspecies responsibility.

### **Revisiting Globalist Criticism**

Deudney is impervious to the above changing views on the relationship between man and nature and its impact on the international relations. Critique of realism and liberalism from an environmental perspective challenges the very basis of Deudney arguments denouncing the linkage between environmental degradation and conflict. To sum up, his perspective sees environmental politics as subversive of the state, and the state as subversive of the emergent global environmental political sensibility. He makes three basic claims. First, he claims that it is ‘analytically

---

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.* p.26.

misleading' to characterize environmental degradation as a threat to national security, because "the traditional focus of national security has little in common with either environmental problems or solutions". Second, he argues that "the effort to harness the emotive power of nationalism to help mobilize environmental awareness and action may prove counter productive by undermining globalist political sensibility. Taking the position that the security notion is still primarily linked to the states system and national security, he argues, "environmental degradation is not a threat to national security. Rather environmentalism is a threat to 'national security' mindsets and institutions". He further buttresses that dressing the environmental program in the "blood soaked garments of the war system" will undermine environmental "core values" and create "confusion about the real task at hand". Third, he contests the thesis that environmental degradation will be significant cause of interstate wars.<sup>101</sup> Eric K. Stern disagreeing with Deudney is of the view that his "globalist orientation actually undermines the foundations of the domestic international decision. Recent history, most notably the tragic civil wars in Somalia, and Rwanda, and the conflicts associated with the break up of the former Yugoslavia, indicate that this distinction is becoming less significant to the international community."<sup>102</sup> Buzan's conceptualization of security, which challenges the privileged status of national or state security, provides a more realist approach. He observes that "the concept of security binds together individuals, states, and the international system so closely that demands to be treated in a holistic perspective, and that "a full understanding of each can only be gained if it is related to the other too". Given this, "attempts to treat security, on any single level

---

<sup>101</sup> Deudney, "The Case Against Linking Environmental degradation and National Security", *Millennium* vol 1990, pp.461-76

<sup>102</sup> Eric K.Stern, "The Case for Comprehensive Security", in Daniel H.Deudney and Richard A. Matthew, Eds. *Contested Grounds, op.cit.* p.139.

invite serious distortions of perspective”.<sup>103</sup> While ‘balancing enduring tensions between the several levels at once’, Stern is of the view that, “an increasing sensibility to environmental threats by national communities and a resulting incorporation of environmental values into national security policy does not necessarily undermine more global efforts to protect the planetary environment”.<sup>104</sup> He is of the further view that “the likely scenario for the next half century is one of a mixed system of governance characterized by an uneasy distribution of authority between autonomous sub national entities, national governments, and emergent supra national institutions, such as regional and global formal organizations, regimes, and a developing body of international law”.<sup>105</sup> The post cold war period resembles to that of medieval Europe with its characteristic uneven process of integration and disintegration<sup>106</sup> Stern also questions Deudney’s characterization of common security as a marginal phenomenon and an unstable conceptual foundation for environmental security. ‘By equating security exclusively with the national security from violence problematic, Deudney “tends to discount the significance of a broad range of parallels and interrelationship between environmental values and military security’. He further states that Deudney’s “approach prematurely dismisses the viability and persuasiveness of conceptual innovations building upon the notion of security and acknowledging the interdependence that actually characterize the problem of ‘security from violence’ to nearly the same extent as the problem of protecting the global environment”.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Barry Buzan, *Peoples, States and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983), p.245.

<sup>104</sup> Eric K.Stern, *op.cit.*,p139

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>106</sup> Ken Booth,"Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice," *International Affairs*, vol.67, no.3, 1991, pp.527-45

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid*, p.140

## A Critique of Orthodox Realism

Rejection of treating environmental problems as security issues with a narrow definition of national or international security delimited to concern with threats originating in the military capabilities of the other states has been the main thrust of mainstream contemporary American realists. Reflecting the view held by mainstream American neo-realism, Stephen Walt has recently defined the scope of security studies as "the study of the threat, use and control of military forces"<sup>108</sup> He argues that the security studies "explore the conditions that make the use of force more likely, the ways the use of force affects individuals, states, and societies, and the specific policies state adopt in order to prepare for, prevent, or engage in war"<sup>109</sup> According to Walt, incorporating non-military phenomena expands the scope of security studies. In his words, "defining the field in this way would destroy its intellectual coherence and make it more difficult to devise solutions to any of these important problems"<sup>110</sup> "Walt's realist orientation is an orthodoxy seeking to protect a core of security studies focused on state and military security issues".<sup>111</sup>

Adherence to this conceptual exclusiveness does not prevent Walt from incorporating "economics and security" in a peremptory place in his proposed "research agenda for security studies".<sup>112</sup> He justified his stand by pointing to the linkage between military spending and economic performance, posture resources, and the impact of the military industrial complex. But his exclusion of other non-military threats from his security agenda is less understandable.

---

<sup>108</sup> Stephen Walt, "The Renaissance of Security Studies," *International Studies Quarterly*, vol.35, no.2, 1991, p.212

<sup>109</sup> Joseph Nye and Sean Lynn Jones, "International Security Studies: A Report of a Conference on the State of the Field," *International Security*, vol.12, no.4, 1988, p.6

<sup>110</sup> Walt, "The Renaissance of Security Studies," p.213

<sup>111</sup> Stern, *op.cit.*, p.135

<sup>112</sup> Walt, *op.cit.*, p.135

“Once the door is opened to non-military economic activities, it became difficult to justify exclusively other non-military issues from the security studies agenda”.<sup>113</sup> A study of the links between environmental degradation and military issues in terms of environmental contamination from weapons development/production, pollution and influence attempts, the environmental consequences of warfare and environmental degradation as a cause of conflict will show the unjustifiability of Walt’s exclusion. The environmental consequences of production, storage and use of nuclear weapons, biological, and chemical weapons, and even the conventional weapons development, production, and storage<sup>114</sup> have led to discard the non-admission of the linkage between environment and security on the part of realists. Deliberate pollution has been a significant military and political device designed to influence the behaviour of other actors in world politics.<sup>115</sup> The intentionally taking steps to produce environmentally catastrophic consequences in pursuit of political aims by the terrorist and non-state actors being enraged at the injustice meted out to them in world system, can not deny the linkage between environment and security. According to T.W. Hawley, the oil spills and oil fires of the Gulf war unleashed by Iraqi forces in 1990-1991 were “an environmental catastrophe on the order of the explosion at the Chernobyl plant or the lethal release of methyl isocyanate at Union Carbide’s chemical plants in Bhopal, India”.<sup>116</sup>

“The threat and intentional inducement of environmental catastrophes bears a striking family resemblance to the threat and use

---

<sup>113</sup> Stern, *op.cit.*, p.135

<sup>114</sup> See, M D'Antonio, *Atomic Harvest: Hanford and the Lethal Toll of America's Nuclear Arsenal* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1993); and Murray Fesbach, *Ecological Disaster: Cleaning up the Legacy of the Soviet Regime* (New York; Twentieth Century Press, 1995)

<sup>115</sup> See, David Baldwin, *Economic Statecraft* (Princeton; NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985)

<sup>116</sup> T.W Hawley, *Against the Fires of Hell: the Environmental Disaster of the Gulf War* (New York: Harcourt Brace Javonovich, 1992), p.8

of economic sanctions as a diplomatic instrument, the importance of which Walt concedes".<sup>117</sup> Examples do not want to show the intentional inducement of environmental disasters, as a part of warfare is not a new phenomenon. It has already been pointed out by Dixon that environmental degradation along with its social effects causes simple scarcity conflicts, group identity conflicts, and relative deprivation conflict, which increase the probability of resort to inter and intra-state violence. Other analysts also similarly argued that the economic and social dislocations associated with climate change might result in civil and international wars.<sup>118</sup> Lodgaard's proposal for a regime of environmental confidence and security building measures (CSBMs) to mitigate the tendencies to violence identified by Homer Dixon further points to the untenability of a rigid separation between the environmental and traditional security concerns.

Another interface concerns opportunity costs,<sup>119</sup> multiple purpose capabilities and conversion. Opportunities costs are incurred when assets invested in military security projects become unavailable for the purpose, a phenomenon Buzan sees as a part of "defense dilemma".<sup>120</sup> Such tradeoffs occur between defense and education, health care and environmental clean up. Another interface is the multiple purpose capabilities, which the military through its capability is engaged in various rescue-and disaster relief missions, required of in natural cataclysms or technologies disasters having serious environmental consequences. Finally, conversion alludes to the possibilities of reallocating existing military assets and

---

<sup>117</sup> Stern, *op.cit.* p.136

<sup>118</sup> N.Brown, "Climate, Ecology, and International Security", *Survival* vol.31, no.6, 1989, pp.519-32

<sup>119</sup> S.Lodgaard, "Environment, Confidence Building and Security ", in Hjort af Ornas and Lodgaard, eds., *The Environment and International Security* (Uppsala: PRIO/Uppsala University Program on Environment and International Security, 1992), pp.11-22

<sup>120</sup> Barry Buzan, *Peoples, States and Fear*, 2nd ed., *op.cit*

capabilities to other uses outside the military sector such as environmental clean up measures.<sup>121</sup>

Stern sums up saying the realist argumentations against incorporating the environmental phenomena into the security agenda are not well founded.<sup>122</sup>

### Reformist Criticism of Environmental Security Revisited

Levy defines the term environmental as referring to “issues involving biological or physical systems characterized by significant ecological feedbacks or by their importance to the sustenance of human life”.<sup>123</sup> He makes a commendable attempt to specify the central terms involved and to assess soberly the costs and benefits associated with integrating environment and security. Stern, on the other hand specifies the types of environmental values most likely to be perceived as security threats in the following, admittedly anthropocentric terms: “threats to human health (such as highly contagious bacterial or viral diseases), threats to essential resources which support life in human eco system (e.g. air, water supply, and food production), and threats to the integrity of valued non human ecosystem and local/global biological diversity”.<sup>124</sup> Three arguments made by Levy deserve examination. First, Levy holds that “the assertion that many environmental problems constitute security risks is correct, and is of very little importance”.<sup>125</sup> He argues that the two key threats – ozone depletion and climate change-do appear to constitute “environmental problems that currently pose a direct physical harm to US interests”, but he questions whether anything is gained by labeling them security issue.<sup>126</sup> Second, Levy argues that

---

<sup>121</sup> Stern, *op.cit.*, p.138

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>123</sup> Marc A Levy, "Is the Environment a National Security Issue"? *International Security*, vol.20, no.2, 1995, p.39

<sup>124</sup> Eric K.Stern,"High Politics and Crisis: Military and Environmental Dimensions of Security", in Hjort af Ornas and Laggard, eds., *The Environment and International Security*, *op.cit.*, p.90

<sup>125</sup> Levy, "Is the Environment a National Security issue?", *op. cit.* p.60

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.* p.61



taking these environmental issues out of the realm of "low politics" where significant progress has been made may actually be counter productive. Third, Levy recommends that the study of indirect threats produced by environmentally induced conflict be left to researchers studying more general processes of social conflict, instability and war. These researchers should incorporate environmental factors into their more general models of conflict escalation and de-escalation. Overall, Levy essentially defends continued compartmentalization and advocates more research within the traditionally defined sub-fields of international relations and comparative environmental policy. Despite Levy's arguments giving a number of good observations on environment security, his study is stymied by several serious limitations. First, walking on the same furrow left by Deudney, Levy deliberately puts a primacy on the issue of national security and was averse to considering the implications of tying the environmental issues with supranational security concepts. Furthermore, Levy seems to frame the more general types of conceptual issues on the basis of the specific configuration of US interests. That means his study of security and seriousness of the climate change threat is rated high and low on the basis of the magnitude of the disastrous effects it will have on US interests, natural resources and its capability to cope with these changes. The crucible is the US interests on which is to be tested the magnitude of the environmental crisis. On the basis of the impact on US interests, resources and capability, the qualifications required of environmental security to be incorporated into the mainstream of national security, are to be defined. If the scientists' prediction about the immediacy of effects of climate change on the survival of human lives, more specifically the submersion of small island states under sea come true due to even the modest rise of sea level, then there are obvious reasons to argue for associating environmental security with the fundamental national security goal of survival.

According to Stern, problematic is with Levy's claim that it is counter-productive to raise environmental issue to the status of "high politics". Levy challenges the assumption that assigning an issue to

the realm of high politics automatically increases the likelihood that forceful action will be taken. But his argument hinges primarily on a single historical example – policy with regard to protecting the ozone layer. Levy<sup>127</sup> claims that “sub cabinet officials operating out of the limelight and with little Congressional meddling” made progress on this issue.<sup>128</sup> He claims “it is hard to escape the conclusion that we probably saved more lives by treating the stratosphere as low politics than as high politics”.<sup>129</sup> “Yet is it really possible to draw far reaching conclusions on the basis of a single case of alleged policy success? It may be the case that a ‘high politics’ route might well more effectively and rapidly address other issues, arising under other circumstances. Stern further says, “Issues requiring significant investment and research, and public sacrifice, might require high level and more public leadership.”<sup>130</sup> Levy argues that climate change, in contrast to the relatively straight forward ozone problem is “much more like the problem of containing Soviet Union; it requires a ground strategy to guide actions in the face of distant, uncertain threats, and an overarching commitment from high levels of leadership to stay the course through the ebb and flows of popular sentiment.”<sup>131</sup> Thus, for this important environmental issue, Levy calls for a high politics type solution. Third, most importantly and seriously, he delimits his concern to only “links from process of environmental degradation to deterioration in security positions and excludes from considerations “connections that run in the opposite direction (from use of force to deterioration of environmental quality).”<sup>132</sup> In the words of Stern, “Nor are links between preparations for the use of force and environmental degradation are considered. Thus his overall conclusion is based upon an

---

<sup>127</sup> See, for details, Eric K.Stern, "The Case for Comprehensive security ", *op.cit*, p.141

<sup>128</sup> Levy, Is the Environment a National Security Issue "? *op.cit*, p.50

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>130</sup> Stern, "The Case for Comprehensive Security", *op.cit*, p.142

<sup>131</sup> Levy , " Is the Environment a National Security Issue?" *op.cit.*, p.54.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid*, p.36.

examination of only part of the case made by advocates of environmental security."<sup>133</sup>

### Comprehensive Security

As seen from the above analysis, the security problematic is caught between two extreme positions. The traditionalist position represented by Deudney, Stephen Walt, and others envisages keeping environmental affairs off the security for variety of different reasons, none of which seems compelling. Stephen Walt giving probably the strongest statement of the traditionalist position is averse to widening the security agenda outside this strictly military domain. He argues that this tendency to widen the security domain:

runs the risk of expanding 'Security Studies' excessively; by this logic, issues such as pollution, diseases, child abuse, or economic recessions could all be viewed as threats to 'security'. Defining the field in this way would destroy its intellectual coherence and make it more difficult to devise solutions to any of these important problems.<sup>134</sup>

Walt does import economics and security into his picture but only as they relate to military issues, and not as economic security per se. According to Barry Buzan, given the political function of the word security, it extends the call for state mobilization to a wide range of issues. Central among the arguments for the conceptualization of environmental security is the mobilization potential: the concept of national security

has an enormous power as an instrument of social and political mobilization, and therefore, the obvious reason for putting environmental issues into the security agenda is the possible magnitude of threats posed, and the need to mobilize urgent and unprecedented responses to them. The

---

<sup>133</sup> Stern, "The Case for Comprehensive Security", *op.cit.* p.142.

<sup>134</sup> Stephen M. Walt, "The Renaissance of Security Studies", *International Studies Quarterly* vol.35, no.2, 1991, pp.212-13.

security label is a useful way both of signaling danger and setting priority, and for this reason alone it is likely to persist in the environmental debts.<sup>135</sup>

So the traditionalist's criticism of the wideners that they risk intellectual coherence can be a powerful point. Further, he said, "the wider agenda tends, often unthinkingly, to elevate security into a kind of universal good thing—the desired conditions towards which all relations should be moved."<sup>136</sup> The debate over whether security label is worthwhile appending to environment remains dominant in the conception 'comprehensive security'. It points to the emerging values of environmentalism establishing their own moral basis, which according to Buzan are already emerging as a new norm of international society<sup>137</sup> Deudney in a similar vein talks about ecological awareness being linked to "a powerful set of values and symbols" that "draw upon basic human desires and aspirations" which should be mobilization basis and not the regressive logic.<sup>138</sup>

Given the nature and scope of environmental problems, which are global in character, the state centric paradigm of national security evades the solution. The concept of 'security' tends to carry with it the implications that the answer, the defence, is to be given by the state. This is what stated by Moss:

The most serious consequences of thinking of global change and other environmental problems as threats to security is that the sorts of centralized governmental responses by powerful and autonomous state organizations that are appropriate for security threats are inappropriate for addressing most environmental problems. When one is

---

<sup>135</sup> Barry Buzan, "Environment as a Security Issue" in Paul Painchaud, ed., *Geopolitical Perspectives on Environmental Security*, Cahier du GERPE, No.92-05, Université Laval, Québec, pp.1 and 24f.

<sup>136</sup> Barry Buzan, "Rethinking Security after the Cold War", *op. cit.* p.11.

<sup>137</sup> Barry Buzan, n.135, p.26.

<sup>138</sup> Daniel Deudney, "The Case Against Linking Environment Degradation and National Security" *op.cit.* p.469

reacting to the threat of organized external violence, military and intelligence institutions are empowered to take the measures required to repel the threat. By this same logic, when responding to environmental threat, response by centralized regulatory agencies would seem to be logical. Unfortunately, in most cases this sort of response is not the most efficient or effective way of addressing environmental problems, particularly those that have a global character.<sup>139</sup>

As argued above, the concept of security includes the message that here is an issue where the state is or should be licensed to take appropriate steps, but “the instinct for centralized state response to security threats is highly inappropriate for responding effectively to global environmental problems”.<sup>140</sup> At the other extreme is found the concern for environment in a privileged position, in effect tumbling the threat of international violence from its traditionally privileged and hegemonic position at the core of the security discourse, and replacing it with a new environmental “king of mountain”.<sup>141</sup> How to chart a course of policy action between these two extremes - one is a politico-military construct of state security and the other is environmental security as national security? “A unifying conceptual” framework “is needed from which to overview the complex relationships and trade offs among domains of life and values held by political communities such as nation states”. Instead of giving a primacy to either environmental security, military or any other threats, “we should attempt to level the playing field in order to better appreciate the side effects associated with particular choices and has best to allocate scarce collective resources.”<sup>142</sup> Psychological and organizational constraints stand in the way of achieving such a

---

<sup>139</sup> Richard H. Moss, ‘Environmental Security? The illogic of centralized state Responses to environment threats’, in Paul Painchaud, ed., *op. cit.* p.24.

<sup>140</sup> Moss, *ibid.*, p.32.

<sup>141</sup> Patricia M. Mische, “Ecological Security and the Need to Reconceptualize Sovereignty”, *Alternatives*, vol.14, 1989, pp.389-427.

<sup>142</sup> Stern, “The Case for Comprehensive Security”, *op.cit.* p.143.

unifying overview. Alexander George identified the perennial problems of value complexity in policymaking. Policy problems “are laden with competing values and interest” and “the standard textbook model of rationality cannot be employed in such instance, because the multiple values embedded in the policy problems cannot be reduced to a single utility function that can then be used as criterion for choosing among options”<sup>143</sup> It so happens in the decision making process that sometimes the core values go unnoticed only to be identified with hindsight. “Even where a range of competing values are identified by a decision making process, there are strong organizational and cognitive pressures towards suppressing value conflict rather than confronting it”.<sup>144</sup>

A myriad of psychological theories and empirical research findings suggest that individuals betray a subconscious need for cognitive consistency.<sup>145</sup> Yugo Verzberger has argued “people see the social environment as consistent and balanced”. As a result, ‘they believe that a policy that serves one value is also likely to contribute to other values, thus avoiding consideration of value trade offs’, and “even salient internal contradictions are often ignored”.<sup>146</sup> In order to deal with these problems Ralph Kenney propounded a radically different decision paradigm: “value focused thinking”. In this paradigm: significant effort is devoted to articulating values”, prior to other activities. Then, “the articulated values are explicitly used to identify decision opportunities and to create alternatives”.<sup>147</sup> In his view, such a value-focused orientation will help “create better

---

<sup>143</sup> Alexander L. George, *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy* (Washington, D.C.: US Institute of Peace Press, 1993), p.27.

<sup>144</sup> Stern, “The Case for Comprehensive Security”, *op.cit.* p.143.

<sup>145</sup> Irving Janis and L.Mann, *Decision Making: A Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice, and Commitment* (New York; Free Press, 1977)

<sup>146</sup> Y.Vertzberger, *The World in Their Minds* (Palo Alto, California: Stanford University Press, 1991), pp.138-39.

<sup>147</sup> R.Kenney, *Value-Focused Thinking: A Path to Creative Decision Making* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1992).

decision situation with better alternatives which should lead to better consequences.”<sup>148</sup>

According to Stern, the concept of comprehensive security formulated by Barry Buzan, Arthur Westing, and others promises to serve this important integrating function by explicitly recognizing the multiple and interrelated dimensions and core value clusters of domestic and international life”.<sup>149</sup> Buzan’s formulation is useful because it includes military, economic, environmental, societal, and political dimensions. In the first edition of Barry Buzan’s *People, States and Fear* was evident that security at the three levels individual, state and international were central to the argument, but in some sense national security was still privileged. “Did Buzan want to make a three-decker out of the concept of security, or was it a conceptualization of national security?”<sup>150</sup> It was clarified in the second edition (1991). The state level is privileged, and the argument about the levels is the absolutely correct one that national security cannot be comprehended at the state level alone: the dynamics of national security can only be grasped by seeing the interaction with processes at the societal / individual and the international level. Thus the argument is no longer one for “the right balance between the three levels”, but one for enlightened national security taking in dynamics at all levels.<sup>151</sup> “The security label is one solution”, says Barry Buzan – but tends himself towards recommending the other path: to ‘identify by environmental issues as part of the economic agenda’ which has the “advantage of sitting the issue at the heart of the action that is most relevant to it.

There might, in the long run, be more advantage to making producers, consumers, tax men and economists factor environmental costs into their accounting activities, then to arming the state with

---

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid*, p. IX

<sup>149</sup> Stern, “The Case for Comprehensive Security”, *op.cit.* p.144.

<sup>150</sup> Ole Waever, *Securitization and Desecuritization*, *op.cit.* p.3.

<sup>151</sup> Egbert Jahn, Pierre Lemaitre and Ole Waever, *European Security: Problems of Research on Non-Military Aspects*, *op.cit.* pp.51-53.

emergency powers derived from an analogy with war. It might be argued that process type threats are better met by the process type remedies of economics, than by the statist solution of security logic."<sup>152</sup> In Buzan's analysis is found dominant the economic content approach to environmental crisis, though the security label at the state seems to be privileged. His later writings after the end of the cold war seem to have shifted the security label down from the state, but the state "remains central but no longer dominates either as the exclusive referent objective or as the principal embodiment of threat in the way it did previously".<sup>153</sup> A spurt of a new range of referent objects for security and sources of security is found above, below and alongside the state. What ascend above the state to the status of referent objects are new international regimes, rules, norms and institutions on matters ranging from climate change, to economic liberation and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. If the predictions of scientists about the imminence of climate change, major changes in temperature and precipitation pattern due to global warming become certain and accurate within a few years, Buzan does not mind keeping environmental security at the top of the global agenda. A dilution of his earlier stand that attaches the privileged security label at the state takes place. In the environmental sector the range of possible referent objects is very large, ranging from relatively concrete things such as the survival of individual species (animals, human kind) or types of habitat (rain, forest, lakes) to the maintenance of the planetary climate and biosphere. The relationship between the human species and the rest of the biosphere not only within the present time frame but also beyond timelessness and carried into the future remains central to whether that relationship can be sustained without risking either or both resulting in the collapse of the achieved levels of civilization or a whole sale disruption of the planet's biosphere. At either the macro or micro extremes" of interplay amongst all of these things " there are some

---

<sup>152</sup> Buzan, "Environment as a Security issue" in Paul Painchaud ed., *Geopolitical Perspectives on Environmental Security*, *op.cit.* p.25.

<sup>153</sup> Barry Buzan, "Rethinking Security after Cold War", *op.cit.* p.11.



pretty clear cases of existential threat (the survival of species, the survival of human civilization) that are to be securitized.”<sup>154</sup>

### Critical Security Studies

Critical security studies engage security in constructive terms. It challenges the traditionalists and widens by applying post positivist perspective, such as critical theory and post structuralism.<sup>155</sup> Much of the work on this like Buzan's deals with social reconstruction of security. But the Critical Security Studies shows that change is possible because things are socially constituted. If states dominate the arena, this is a feat of power politics repressing other dimensions of reality that would potentially replace the states if an emancipatory praxis with the help of critical theory empowers other subjectivities than those dominate at present. The social world does not exhibit any inexorable iron laws, all regularities can be broken, and it is the task of critical theory to show this. On the issue of security, the Critical Security Studies is often less constructive. “As part of the argumentation against established discourses of security, it will often try to mobilize other security problems- environmental problems, poverty and unemployment as more important, more threatening and there by relativizing conventional wisdom. By this method they often end up reproducing the traditional and objectivist concept of security.”<sup>156</sup> As observed by Waever, this approach will often contribute to the general securitization of ever-large spheres of social life.<sup>157</sup> But the critical theory remains half way emancipating without taking into mainstream of its thinking ecological crisis or the environmental movement as sources of emancipatory change. They

---

<sup>154</sup> Barry Buzan, *ibid.* p.18.

<sup>155</sup> Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams, “From Strategy to Security: Foundation of Critical Security Studies” in Krause and Williams , *Critical Security Studies* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1996).

<sup>156</sup> Barry Buzan, “Rethinking Security ...”, *op.cit.* p.19

<sup>157</sup> Ole Waever, “Securitization and Desecuritization in Ronnie Lipschutz ed., *On Security* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), pp.46-86.

here not yet pursued the many insights offered by ecological thought.  
158

Treating nature as whole while observing its rich diversity, the critical theory would appreciate the patterns of mutual aid and the complexity of natural phenomena, and question arguments based on ontological stratification or linear thinking.<sup>159</sup> Holism would not associate with global control and homogenization but with an expanded self.<sup>160</sup> How the widening view of security proposed by Critical Theorists is possible for it emancipatory mission without the environment forming it mainstream thinking? In this paper, the above discussion of the ecological critique of both realism and liberalism forming the mainstream of the dominant international prospective on security shows, the critical theorists need to make a review of the dominant hegemonistic portrayal of human nature, its relationship with nature and a dismantling of self help versus the other syndrome as a basis of redefining its security from a widening perspective. The ecological approach gets it at the root of emancipation by revealing the relationship between the control of nature and control of man/woman. In this sense, ecology is the holistic approach par excellence. By definition, it cannot limit its defence of freedom to specific constituencies, for no long-term freedom may be gained for any group at the expense of nature; nature is nothing but the larger self of human kind.<sup>161</sup>

### Conclusions

As the above discussion shows, despite cataclysmic changes in International Relations, environment and ecology, a dominant group

---

<sup>158</sup> Eric Laferriere, "Emancipatory International Relations Theory: An Ecological Perspective", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* vol.25, no.1, and 1996.

<sup>159</sup> Peter Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (Boston, M.A: Extending Horizon Books, 1955).

<sup>160</sup> Warwick Fox, *Towards a Transpersonal Ecology: Developing New Foundations For Environmentalism* (Boston, MA: Shambhala, 1990).

<sup>161</sup> Eric Laferriere, *op.cit.* P.74.

remains adamant and unwilling to disrobe themselves of Westphalian straightjacket while understanding the diverse strands and security perspectives, the source of security threats no longer lie embedded in the state.

At the core of this mainstream thinking and portrayal of International Relations remains dominant the ontology of an egoism-anarchy thematic. The boundaries of what is ethically possible are established within a rigid universal closed power politics logic, which not surprisingly, gives politico-ethical legitimacy to great power dominance and hegemonic systems of global order. Thinking beyond this thematic of any unconventional seems to be anathema to this school of thought. The deepening environmental crisis with catastrophic consequences on socially and human beings and their views of world hastened to the center stage to challenge the dominance of this statist school of thought customarily inclined to view security in politico-military terms. When the new threats from unconventional sources i.e. from environmental degradation were put to fit into their Westphalia procrustean bed, and could not match their logic and parameters, these are termed as dependent variables and not causal and cannot ascend to the status of national security. Rather view them as predominant and separate security threats from the environmental crisis, they try downplaying these threats and associate these with political and economic factors as Buzan does. Another thing that is mostly ignored is the very assumption that when environmental security is held as national security, it does not mean that it seeks solution to the environmental crisis through the military apparatus of the state only. What is central to the realist logic is that the response to the threats if done through the exercise or use of force is worth being named as having acquired the status of national security. Deudney, Dalby and others fearing their stand slipping into parochial statism have set all argumentations against bestowal of national security status to environmental threats. On the other hand, Homer Dixon and others like Myers, Libiswezski have shown empirically that environmental degradation and security of resources will produce social effects in terms of poverty, decline in

agricultural productivity, displacement of people and weakening of political and social institutions i.e. state which in turn will culminate in various violent intra- or inter-state conflict such as simple scarcity, group identity conflict, insurgencies and other forms of violence depending on the severity of the environmental crisis, the nature of the society and other contextual factors. The mapping out of the scenario of violent conflict, from environmental scarcity of resources along its social effects, is not within the politico-military construct of national security. On the issues of environmental scarcity and degradation of renewable resources such as water, the conflict has taken the form of intra-state conflict such as insurgencies, group identity conflict having implications on international security and stability. The thrust of their argument rests on the fact that the environmental scarcity of resources unless properly addressed to has the dangers of violent inter-and intra-state conflict. Hence environmental degradation comes as a non-military security threat to the people of a state to occupy the status of national security.

National security understood in parochial and conventional wisdom needs to be redefined in view of the disastrous transformation and changes in environmental sector of the planet. The referent object of security is no longer the state, but other referent objects have appeared to be taken note of by the security strategists. These are the people, the individuals, the non-human beings, future generations, the biotic community and the integrity of the cosmos. The trend towards dissociating security and nation state now clearly visible in world politics has been "strong enough to avoid the dangers of falling down the slippery slope toward a parochial statism that Deudney, Dalby and others fear".<sup>162</sup> The confinement of the debate over whether environment and conflict linkage assumes the status of national security to the Westphalian logic and wisdom cannot be a solution to the environmental crisis. If environmental degradation like the military can be assumed to be a threat and needs a military response, then confinement of the issues

---

<sup>162</sup> Eric K.Stern, "The Case for Comprehensive Security", *op.cit.* p.145.

to the power politics of the sovereign states system, blurs the distinction between the two and aggravates the crisis. The hegemonic, homogenization and linearity logic typical of world power structure and arrangements comes in to dominate the issue and not to find a solution with different, and alternative parameters that would challenge the above conventional logic and wisdom.

Going beyond the dominant environment and conflict paradigm, the very logic of the concept environmental security suggests a solution not in military but in non-military terms. This means traversing beyond the strict allegiance to the sovereign state system. This is suggested by Stern:

Blind allegiance to the nation state system and inability to contemplate shifts of sovereignty 'upward' or 'downward' needlessly limit the range of institutionised or adhoc security strategies, which may be brought to bear in adverting or coping with military and non military threats to individual and collective well being.<sup>163</sup>

Looking beyond the sovereign state system means assurance of environmental security to all. It is a kind of positive peace not based on violence, or just absence of interstate war but focuses on dismissal of hegemonic, ordering, fixity and certainty connotations of the present international system which is responsible for much of human fear, suffering and ecological disaster.<sup>164</sup> Ecological ethics and insight on which environmental security is based can offer purpose and direction to human kind by stressing natural cycles as well as the cooperative tendencies of nature.

Environmental security envisages a political project, and reconstruction of human society for human kind in biological imperatives, as aimed by critical theorist but not on ecological insights. It does not assume that human relation is fixed and

---

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>164</sup> See, Beverly Neufeld, "The Marginalization of Peace Research in International Relations", *Millennium* vol.22, no.2, 1993, pp.165-84.

therefore, cannot accept the principle of cultural superiority. In a sense, ecological insights “evoke the notion of natural law, but as a much different sort of essentialism divested of hierarchical preference”.<sup>165</sup>

The ecological insight challenges the ethnocentric western paradigm of development, its anti-nature and perception of other as different from self, its inordinate life style, and exorbitant consumption and philosophy of life based on pure materialism, commodious living and production of wealth at the expense of others (nature, human beings, non-human living and non living, future generation). Pursuance of this hegemonic ideology and its universalization in the name of liberal economic emancipation, globalization and world order has been the root causes of the pauperization and despoliation of the planet. The proponents of environmental security and its critique and even the critical theorists have never touched upon this point and seem to have displayed the cultural superiority bias of hegemonic mainstream of International Relations. The author in this work stress upon a new planetary wisdom and vision that will be notably the foundation of environmental security but also the national interests of each and every sovereign state. The imperatives of environmental security must bring to realization of policy makers, that ‘emphasizing environmental values at a variety of levels including the national may help drive home the insight that self help nationally based strategies will probably not prove a sufficient basis for coping with the environmental threats now on the horizon’.<sup>166</sup>

Environmental threats assume the status of national security on the basis of what Homer Dixon and others propounded, and what Deudney denounced. Dixon’s mapping out of inter-and intra-state conflicts arising out of environmental scarcity and degradation of resources assume the status of national security in Westphalian logic with the emergence of new referent objects of security other than the

---

<sup>165</sup> Eric Laferriere, *op.cit.* p.74.

<sup>166</sup> Eric K.Stern, “The Case for Comprehensive Security”, *op.cit.*, p.145.

sovereign state, the environmental degradation affecting these referents will be perceived as security threats demanding not solution in terms of military frame work of sovereign state system. The very survival of the people, eco-system and bio-regions demands new planetary ethics, which ultimately will define the national security interests. The redefinition of national security prompted by environmental degradation replacing the traditional understanding of national security makes the Deudney's disparagement of Homer Dixon and other's analysis discredited, if protection of the people against the threats stemming from non-conventional sources i.e. the environmental degradation – the consequences of which are more disastrous than the war itself.

What emerges significant is to construct a way of rethinking the debate around the environment and sovereignty, which moves beyond what Karen Litfin calls the geological model of sovereignty being eroded by environmental change and environmental regimes.<sup>167</sup> The Greening of Sovereignty in World Politics, as a fixed thing, akin to a rock being clearly recognized as socially constructed and consisting of a bundle of rights whose composition and location shift continuously across time. Further the study suggests that sovereignty should be conceived in terms of three elements - autonomy, control and authority - all of which can be attached to different institutions over time, not necessarily just states, and be constructed themselves in differing ways.<sup>168</sup>

Moving beyond the western straightjacket, the concept 'environmental security' envisions:

- Rethinking western pattern of development, its cultural superiority, hegemonic power structure and universalization doctrine.

---

<sup>167</sup> Karen Litfin, "The greening of sovereignty: an introduction", in Litfin, ed., *The Greening of Sovereignty in World Politics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998).

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.* See, also Karen Litfin, "Sovereignty in World Politics", *Mershon International Studies Review*, 41, 1997, pp.167-204.

- Replacement of mechanical, the other view of nature and human beings by an organicism view which studies human beings, nature, future generations and all interconnected, coordinated in a symbiotic relationship as members of a cosmos.
- Global governance of environmental matters through a coordinated network of NGOs, environmental regimes, norms, regional organizations, and communities cutting across the rigidity of sovereignty state system. This means not a proselytization but shifting of sovereignty state system to other centers, at every level. The traditional unidimensional view of sovereignty appears superficially to be inconsistent with the multidimensional requirements of planetary environmental protection.
- Pronouncement of cultural diversities and differentiated civilizational values and not deification of western values.
- An ethical and moral rebuilding of human nature on a spiritual plank to think in terms of an expanded self within a timelessness frame.