Linking Security and Environmental Security from a theoretical perspective

VC Shushant Parashar, Dr. Shalini Saxena,

PhD Research Scholar, Amity Institute of Social Sciences, Amity University, Noida Campus, UP-201305.
Assistant Professor, Amity Institute of Social Sciences, Amity University, Noida Campus, UP-201305
Corresponding Author: VC Shushant Parashar

ABSTRACT: *Global politics has undergone tremendous change in the post-Cold War era. With the emergence of many players on the global stage, the security paradigm has evolved wherein issues such as human security, economic security, political security and environmental security and other issues have been incorporated into the security umbrella. One such issue that is gaining momentum in today's evolving world is environmental security. The world of today is facing a host of environmental issues as these issues have a long-term effect on the innerworkings of a nation. This is so because environmental issues are not unique to a particular nation rather, they play a major role in the realm of human security as well as global security. Based upon this notion, it becomes important to look into the theoretical aspects of security and how they propose to incorporate environmental security into the current evolving security paradigm. The proposed research paper aims to do the same.*
Keywords: Environmental Security, Security, Realism, Regional Security Complex.

I.   INTRODUCTION

The word security has been characterized by researchers in various courses throughout history. As the worldwide situation continues to change, the talk in global politics on the meaning of security likewise is changing itself. In its non-specific and strict meaning, security passes on as the state or feeling of being free from fear, stress, risk, peril and so on, thus guaranteeing a feeling of safety[1]. Nonetheless the idea of security has changed its meaning in contemporary times. Amid the 19th century, it was characterized as the security of the state and the legislature formulated was in terms of maintaining the security of the state. This idea of security experienced further change due to WWI taking place, which threatened the security and emphasized the need for a worldwide security network thus making security the concern of everyone. This prompted the foundation of the "League of Nations" in 1919 and it was foreseen that it would work in turning away another war. The League before long proved to be ineffective and the world saw the rise of WWII. However, the urge and need for collective security was not abandoned in the face of insecurity, instead in the place of the League of Nations came in another an organization known as the "United Nations Organization" in 1945 whose main aim was to promote and establish global peace and security. In spite of various multilateral organization aimed at the implementation of security at a global level, the concerns over national security have not yet withered away and was seen in relation to military security and it was only after the end of the 20th century, that the security paradigm changed drastically to include within its reasonable space various non-militaristic dimensions.

With the reign of Cold War over, those specializing in International Relations reached to a conclusion that there is the requirement to develop a theory which incorporated the ideas that were prior barred from the ambit of the security paradigm. One of the many issues that gained enough traction was that of environmental security and gave rise to the notion that welfare of the environment will dictate future agendas as the destruction of the environment is now being seen on a global scale and in the coming future can undermine the monetary base and the social texture of frail and poor states by creating or worsening intra/interstate pressures and conflicts[2].

Security in International Relations

War, strife and security have been spoken deeply about in the realm of international relations since olden times as the theme of those days were security and struggle. Works composed by Thucydides, is one of

---

[1] Kalam, Abul. (1998). Environment and Development: Widening security frontier and the quest for a new security framework in South Asia. *BIISS Journal*. 19(2), pp116.
[2] Ibid. (1998). pp 299.

the prior works that talks about International Relations and ideas like security[3].The idea of security has remained a focal issue in the present day and yet has different perspectives to it thus making it hard to reach a common consensus. Customarily, the idea of security has fundamentally been identified with the utilization of military power as mentioned beforehand. In today's cutting-edge world, different variables such as monetary contemplations and welfare issues are progressively becoming essential and pertinent parts of the idea of security[4]. The idea of security alludes to various arrangements of issues, goals and values; it regularly mirrors the contention that takes place in international relations. The verbal confrontations that take place among scholars about the conceptualization of security is an on-going process and that to at the level of examination and the scope of the study of security. This argument though academic in nature is not limited to academics only.

Amid the years prior to the Cold-War, numerous scholars had accepted that the idea of security had a particular definition, principally at the level of the nation-state and that the nature of security was militaristic. The predominant idea of security amid the Cold-War was connected to the theory of realism, which concentrated on the conduct of states in guaranteeing security by military means thus equating military might to the strength of the nation. This notion of security has been progressively been tested on various issues. A few researchers have condemned the need to look at every threat from a militaristic approach; instead they urge to focus on a plethora of issues and bring them into the idea of security. Others have justified that there needs to be a multi-level examination of security instead of the state-centric approach. Recently, many have stressed upon the need to focus upon certain issues as a major aspect of the security issue. In this view, there are no security threats, but only issues developed by specific actors through practices and discourses. During the time spent securitization, a threat is assigned a status which requires prompt activity or measures to battle it out[5]. With the end of the Cold-war, there emerged logical discussion on the survivability of national and international security. Emerging research in the realm of security has turned out to be more extensive by nature as numerous researchers started to concentrate on the impact of various issues on the concept of security. The most overwhelming issues that took birth from the discussions and intellectual debate among scholars were related to globalization, the relationship between state and the newly emerging non-state actors etc. Post-Cold war there also emerged the notion to re-think the existing political theories with respect to considerable measure of issues to the idea of security. With the fall of the Soviet Union, scholars started to work on building a more extensive idea of security which is not only militaristic by nature. The rise of new worldwide factors and issues prompted the development of another look towards the security idea in international relations. Issues and factors such as ethnic issues, conflict over resources and a great deal of developing issues have given another dimension to the idea of security in international relations[6]. In the mid-nineties, international relations entered onto a new phase wherein the period of bi-polar rule ended thus leading to a reduction in global military clashes of which emerged a period of global stability and the rise of the forces of globalization and liberalism that aided in the growth of concepts such as human rights, identity of the individual and the most important being the assertion of the self. A key advancement inside the academic mainstream of security studies took place in 1983 with the publication of Barry Buzan's book "People, States and Fear"[7]. Buzan contended powerfully, through his book, that security was not just about states but rather should be related with all the human collectivities and shouldn't be focused only on military power and emphasized upon military, political, economic, social and environmental security[8].

II. THEORETICAL CONCEPT

The study of security in the worldwide setting is a sub-part of the more extensive subject typically referred toInternational Relations and is related to the investigation of every single political association between global actors that include states (represented by the governments), global associations (either intergovernmental or non-governmental) and to a lesser degree some well off private people. The study of security frets about a sub-set of these political collaborations set apart by their specific significance in regards to keeping up the security of the actor and the individual. Expanded political cooperation between actors, other than through the conventional state-to-state course, has served to obscure the demarcation between domestic and foreign policy and has extended the reach of International Relations. The procedure generally referred to as globalization has

---

[3] Kagan, Donald. (2003). *The Peloponnesian War*. Viking New York. pp 511.

[4] Al-Rodhan, Nayef R.F. (2007). *The five dimensions of global security: proposal for a multi-sum security principle*. LIT Verlag.

[5] Baylis, John. (2005). *The globalization of world politics*. Oxford University Press. pp 213.

[6] Lang, Anthony & Beattie, Amanda Russell (eds.). (2009). *War, Torture and Terrorism: Rethinking the rule of international security*. Routledge. pp 3-5.

[7] Williams, Paul. (2013). Security Studies: An Introduction. In Williams, Paul (eds.). *Security Studies: An Introduction*. Routledge. pp 4-8.

[8] Ibid, (2013). pp 4-9.

prompted internal political issues to be externalized and external political issues to internalized. Generally domestic policy concerns are more conspicuous than ever on the political agenda while on the other hand events occurring in other states are esteemed to be more politically aware for individuals not personally affected. In the light of these progressions, and the lessened pervasiveness of inter-state war, it has turned out to be a dispute among the scholars of International Relations (IR) that whether the study of security ought to keep its customary accentuation on military dangers to the security of the state or extend its area of focus.

Theory gives us a state of mind wherein the issues that span across the globe be broken down and analyzed in precise ways. It helps in the process of describing, clarifying and anticipating certifiable occasions[9]. The expansive field of global relations has led to the creation of numerous theoretical methodologies, ideas, and also apparatuses for understanding global security issues. Theory in conjunction to international relations revolves on the basic premise of clashes and collaborations between nation-states. Post-World War II, a vast majority of scholars were concerned on the flow of Cold-War that was taking place between erstwhile Soviet Union and the United States of America. This period also saw the rise of growing financial relations between countries thus leading to the rise of trade and mutual dependency, a rise in the numbers of international organization which did not belong to any one country, collective security measures and lastly the rise of global environmental issues[10].

With the end of Cold-War, the 90's saw the addition of a new dimension in the study of security at a global level. New concepts of security (i.e. Environmental Security, Human Security etc.) started to emerge that were different from the customary/traditional idea of state-centrist security ideas which were more or less militaristic by nature. As another option to the traditional comprehension of security undertakings, the security of individual was put forth which included removal of poverty, securitization of the environment, conflict as threat to an individual's life[11]. Thus, there arose a paradigm shift were traditional concepts of security were slowly and steadily being replaced by non-traditional concepts of security. However, the traditional concepts of security were not be eroded in light of development as many developed nations in today's day and age still follow the realist perspective of security. Under realism, Power is security[12]. In realism, security is firmly connected to the military capacity of a state. The realists trust that disorder at a global level cultivates clashes and rivalry among states, which in turn hinders their progress and the need to collaborate on the international stage in order to look for solutions to common problems. Realists see the nation-state as mere units and do not consider the issues that impact the external and internal wellbeing of nation-state at national and regional levels. The realists likewise support one-sided activity if an issue is perceived as a potential risk with a specific goal to streamline the state's access to resources. Also, the realists advocate action by the state in order to have a firm grasp on the resources required for the development of the state and that military power is to be used in order to maintain the state's favorable position[13].

Scholars of Liberalism see a world that can be managed via collaboration. They state that states are significantly more reliant that what realists perceive them to be. In our current reality where nation-states rely upon each other for shared peace and success, there is a solid impetus to collaborate in order to achieve common goals. Solid variations on liberal theories do, indeed, play a vital part of the global law-making process for the international community which consists of nation-states and other actors[14].

Be that as it may be, there are divergences among nations in regards to their way to deal with security. Some are more impacted by the realist viewpoint while some are more impacted by the liberal theory. For instance, recently the United States of America left the Paris Climate Deal as the US administration felt the treaty was unfair towards the Americans[15] which in turn proves that the US administration has no confidence in the system arranged by the international organizations and that its security agenda is run by a realist approach which puts more emphasis on military might above others. Similarly, on the other hand, many developing nations have a liberal approach when it comes to security issues as they have a firm belief that the international organizations will aid in solving global issues by bringing both developed and developing nations under one roof.

---

[9] Neill, Kate. (2009). The Environment and International Relations. Cambridge University Press. pp 8-10.

[10] Ibid. (2009). pp 8-10.

[11] United Nations Development Program. (1994). *Human Development Report 1994*. Oxford University Press. pp 23-25.

[12] Elman, Collins. (2008). *Realism*. In Williams, Paul (ed.). *Security Studies: An Introduction*. Routledge. pp 15-18.

[13] Ibid. (2008). pp 15-18.

[14] Ibid, (2009). pp 8-10.

[15] Teffer, Peter. (2017). US leaves Paris Climate Deal. *euobserver*. Retrieved form: https://euobserver.com/environment/138099. Accessed on: 12.01.2019.

Concept of Environmental Security

On the linkages between security and environment, it has not been of prime worry in the discipline of international relations until recent times. Generally, scholars of international relations who have aided in the management of national security concentrated solely on the protection of the state from military assault through military means only. However, with a global climate change taking place, international relations have developed a new security paradigm wherein it is being heavily emphasized upon that the security of the state and the individuals residing within its borders is under danger from threats emerging from the natural environment itself. Nations are facing a double edged sword when it comes to environmental threats as they have to protect the access to resources in order for the nation to survive and on the other hand protect the state and its individuals from threats originating from the natural environment itself which in turn can be man-made or by nature itself.

By far most of the 21st century populace increments will happen in the developing world. Developing nations are anticipated to develop in total populace from 5.6 billion to 7.6 billion by 2050. By correlation, developed nations are anticipated to make an unimportant commitment to worldwide populace with total populace expanding form 1.23 billion to 1.28 billion. Least Developed Nations (LDC's) which are now developing at the most astounding rates internationally will make up a lot of worldwide demographic changes as their total populace could dramatically increase by 2050[16]. Numerous states are anticipated to significantly increment in populace amid the following 50 years and as of now are battling to meet the fundamental social and monetary needs of the population.

Thoughts on environmental security have originated from numerous sources albeit conspicuous among think-tanks. The Soviet Union, in its sensational 'new reasoning' on security in the late 1980's, likewise recommended that environmental security was currently vital. The Chernobyl atomic reactor mishap in 1986 had concentrated the attention of numerous Soviet masterminds in way that numerous analysts in Washington neglected to see at that time. Arguing for the need to consider a global environment security the Soviets were tuned in to talk about ozone gaps and in addition the rising worry about environmental change. Similarly, the 1987 Brundtland Report depicted mankind's incipient ability to influence environmental frameworks amid the late 20th century. The report investigates mankind's multifaceted association with the natural environment and mirrors the expanding considerations that this relationship had collected since the mid-1970s[17]. The report also states that mankind has vastly increased its capacity to alter the natural environment and goes on to say that initially neither human populace nor innovation had the capability to fundamentally change planetary frameworks but as time has progressed, ever increasing human populace and their exercises have gained the power to cause unintended changes in the climate, in the soil, in water etc. and also in the connections among them[18].

Another proponent of the link between environment and security, Homer Dixon all throughout the 1990's unequivocally and deliberately tended to ecological worries as potential reason for violent clashes. He proposed the relation with environment and security by stating (1) ecological difficulties of the land and the oceans are being ignored, (2) most of the contemporary work is narrative by nature, (3) marvels of the environment have numerous circumstances and end results and a mass of interceding factors in a perplexing, intelligent, non-direct structure and are subsequently characteristically hard to dissect, (4) Prevailing epistemological and ontological ways to deal with social sciences not suited for connecting physical and social factors, (5) Researching ecological conflict requires a wide cluster of trans disciplinary information, (6) and lastly, modern international relations theory used to comprehend security is adequate for clarifying elements of an ecological conflict[19]. Homer-Dixon perceives that to better understand the relation between environment and security, one must form a substantive research plan for future natural security enquires that investigates the possible causal connections between ecological pressure and vicious clash[20].

The consideration of environmental threat in the ambit of security has altogether extended the extent of security. It has additionally thrown a shadow on the current national needs and tested the overall ideas of security. There has been moderate yet consistent acknowledgement that dangers of the environment may have genuine financial and human expenses; thus, they cause frailty and that they can't be settled by the one-sided choices of states.

---

[16] UNDESA. (2009). *World Population Prospects: The 2008 revision*. United Nations Publications.
[17] De Sombre, Elizabeth R. (2007). *The Global Environment and World Politics*. Continuum International Publishing Group. pp 8-10.
[18] World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future: The World Commission on Environment and Development*. Oxford University Press. p 1.
[19] Dixon, Homer. (1991). On the threshold: Environmental changes as causes of acute conflict. *International Security*, 16(2). pp 76-116.
[20] Ibid, (1991). p 87.

Environmental Security: A Theoretical Approach

Rising economic backwardness and negative effect of environment degradation on the society has led to great discussions at the level of international relations theories to study the ways to secure the environment from further and future disturbances. Henceforth, environmental security has become one of the topics being now addressed by theories of international relations. The following theoriestry to address the global environment crisis: Realist theory, Copenhagen School approach and Regional Security Complexes (RSCT) theory.

Realism

Thinkers and proponents of realism believe in the view point that global politics is basically an unchangeable battle amongst states for power and position under conditions of disorder, with each contending state seeking its own national interest[21]. Henceforth, all nations ought to search and protect self-interest by building a financial and military framework to remain alive.

Be as it may be, in contemporary times the conventional perspective held by realism (and its types) and its adherent ends up being well outfitted to manage the coming of new threats presented by debasement of the environment and various ecological changes. This is particularly valid in todays globalized world as circumstances which undermine the states security can emerge both internally and externally. For example, in connection with degradation of the environment, nations depend on a regular asset base for their advancement. As the condition of degradation increases, a country bears gigantic mishaps in its agricultural industry with budgetary options available to the agrarian state beginning to vanish. The state reliant on its asset extraction capabilities has to now safeguard itself through a developing section of jobless populace. The absence of monetary opportunities leads to the rise of social distress, which in turn annoys the current delicate political regime. Nationals see their administration as unfit to give fundamental human services, subsequently undermining the expertise of the state and the authenticity of those ruling on the behalf of the state. Pressure can rise in the form of strife induced by those who are unable to support their family. Endeavors to topple the administration can take place and the ongoing conflicts can overflow into neighboring nations that are not of now confronting similar challenges[22]. Thus, the spread of conflict starting from a neighboring state represents a huge risk due to the changing global environmental conditions. Therefore, in order to prevent such scenarios in the coming future, powerful states have personal stake in observing that the balance of power in the global framework was not endangered by such spillover events[23]. Also, in order to gain access to scarce resources in case of a spillover event, nations can do so through aggressive measures[24] and thus maintain the level of human security its territory[25].

Copenhagen School approach

Copenhagen School is one of the cutting-edge schools on international relations which have concentrated on security studies in international relations. Compositions of Barry Buzan, Jaap de Wilde and Ole Weaver have added to spreading the ideas of this school. The Copenhagen School lays emphasis on anarchy being a fundamental part of international relations.

The Copenhagen school does identify environmental security as a part of its security umbrella. Because the international system is anarchical by nature, states would seek to achieve environmental security and thereby being self-sufficient and then promote their economic, military and social capabilities. Security, therefore, is the direct result of threat in the case of environment and according to the school there are 3 scenarios when it comes to environmental security. They are as follows:

- Danger to human civilization from the natural environment that are not caused by human activity. These range from terrestrial events such as tremors to volcanic eruptions to extraterrestrial events such as meteor showers etc.[26].
- Danger from human actions to the exiting natural frameworks or structures of the globe when the progressions made do appear to present existential threat to human advancement. From the depletion of the ozone layer to the rise in global temperature due to global greenhouse emissions etc. clearly outline the threat posed to mankind and the environment form mankind itself. The mentioned correlation can also be

---

[21] Elman, Collins. (2008). *Realism*. In Williams, Paul (ed.). *Security Studies: An Introduction*. Routledge. pp 15-18.
[22] Busby, Joshua. (2008). Who cares about the weather?: Climate change and US National Security. *Security Studies*. 17(3), pp 468-504.
[23] Mearsheimer, John. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. New York.
[24] Ibid, (2001).
[25] Waltz, Kenneth. (2001). *Man, the state and war: A theoretical analysis*. New York.
[26] Ibid, (1997). p 79.

seen at territorial and regional levels, due to the over-extraction of resources which in turn leads to disturbance in the financial bases and social texture of the states involved[27].

- Danger from human movement to existing natural framework or structures of the planet when the progressions made don't appear to present existential dangers to human advancement. For instance, use of mineral resources wherein cheaper mineral resources are used to diversify technology and thereby preventing huge loss of other mineral resources[28].

Regional Security Complexes

Regional Security Complexes is a theory of regional security proposed by Barry Buzan and Ole Weaver[29]. The idea of regional security complexes covers how security is grouped in topographically molded areas. Security concerns don't travel well over an area and thus dangers are accordingly destined to happen in the locale. The security of every actor in an area connects with the security of alternate actors. There is regularly extreme security relationship inside a region, yet not between two or more regions which in turn makes regional security an interesting topic of study. In short Regional Security Complex can be defined as a gathering of security difficulties amassed in a particular geographic territory, where the reasons of risk dependably exist between two or more nations.

Regional Security Complex theory can be characterized as an "arrangement of units whose real procedure of securitization, de-securitization or both are interlinked to the point that their security issues can't be sensibly be broken down or settled[30]". Region building has been a gradual procedure in progress since World War II. In any case, the effect of Cold War contention between the United States of America and the Soviet Union has had an exceptional effect on the process of region building. The capacity of these states to extend control and meddle in the elements of different states basically froze territorial improvements in different territories as it incidentally suspended the rise of regional dynamics. It was in the 1990s the structural arrangement changed in terms of regional lines which was further facilitated by the rise of regionalism, regionalization and the emergence of non-military actors[31].

In relation to environmental security, regional security complex can be defined as follows:

"First criteria being the level of threat perception on particular ecological issues will be higher in some regions and lower in others. The second criterion is that within a region cooperation is necessary from the side of all nations in order to take successfully care of the ecological issue. If there is a state that doesn't agree with the terms in order to settle an ecological issue then it can lead to inter-state tensions in the region"[32].

Therefore, regional environmental security can be defined as the existing interaction between two or more states in the field of energy through the protection, use or transfer of environmental resources. In any case, this sort of connection may create reliance between the states which can turn out to be a threat in the near future. Therefore, the very nature of environmental security complex can be change in accordance to the dependence on environment or shifts in the concept of environmental dependency

Importance of Environmental Security

Environment is the source for overall economic and social progress for all countries in the world. In short it is the source of life for all. Henceforth, all countries need to build and develop an environmental security system to protect the environment and the individual. Consumption of the environment is essential for the growth of a nation/individual and vice-versa due the limited availability of ecological assets. Therefore, it is necessary to build an environmental security system for dealing with situations that can negatively affect the economy of a nation and thereby shunting its growth.

Similarly, the rapid economic growth of developing nations such as India and China can create new problems such as straining the already strained environment resources and creating problems related to climate change and global warming. It is therefore, necessary to create a system environmental security in order to reduce the pressure on the environment and promote sustainable use of the environment. Also building a global environmental system can provide mechanisms for international cooperation and coordination in order to strengthen the collective environmental security and to promote sustainable use of the environment.

III.   CONCLUSION

---

[27] Ibid, (1997). p 80.

[28] Ibid, (1997). P 80.

[29] Buzan, Barry & Weaver, Ole. (2003). *Regions and Powers: The structure of international security*. Cambridge. p 40.

[30] Ibid, (2003). p 491.

[31] Ibid, (2003). p 17.

[32] Lee, Geun.(2002). Regional Environmental Security Complex Approach to Environmental Security in East Asia. *Asian Perspective*. 26 (2). pp 1-20

The concept of environmental security, upon its review, is tangible concept and differs from region to region. According to the needs of the global arena, there are different perceptions in various schools of thought about the very definition of this concept. An attempt has been made to examine each theory about the situations on international environmental security and ways to ensure the achievement of environmental security either through force or through cooperation and coordination or through the influence of international institutions. However, in all eventualities all the nation-states are trying to achieve environmental security by all means possible, which in turn has become an important point of discourse in the foreign policy apparatus of both developed and developing nations. For developed nations, environmental security means having steady stream of access to various ecological assets at cheaper rates. On the other hand, for developing nations environmental security means having access to the environment and at the same time trying to come up with different policies in order to have access to the already strained environmental base for long term survival.

The concept of environmental security also includes internal political stability of developing nations which in turn has a direct impact on the regional stability is of utmost importance to providing support to the concept of environmental security. On other hand the stability and economic growth of developed nations is one of the many pillars that support environmental security as these nations have the access to a vast technology base that can in turn promote sustainable growth of the environment in both the developed and the developing nations. However, most of the times this is not the case due to the presence of international anarchy and the same time the urge for developing nations to reach the level and stature of the developed nations. In short many factors influence environmental security and that it can be concluded that environmental security refers to a set of strategic, political, economic and institutional measures that should be taken by all countries to protect environmental resources and in turn maintain a steady state of socio-economic development. The responsibility of environmental security lies in the hands of everyone as building an integrated global environmental security system will not protect the environment but aid in the developing of stability and the sustainable development of the environment.

REFERENCES:

[1]. Barnett, Jon.(2007). Environmental Security. in Collins, Alan.(ed.). *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford University Press.
[2]. Booth, Ken. (2007). *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge University Press.
[3]. Buzan, Barry & Hansen, Lene. (2009). *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge University Press.
[4]. Buzan, Barry. (1987). *State and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*. Harvester Press.
[5]. Buzan, Barry. (1991). *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. Pearson Education Limited.
[6]. Buzan, Barry; Waever, Ole & Wilde, Jaap de. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Lynne Reinner
[7]. Chopra,K.(1989). Land Degradation: Dimensions and Casualties. *Indian Journal of Agriculture Economics*. 44(1): 45-53.
[8]. Detraz, Nicole.(2015). *Environmental Security and Gender*. Routledge.
[9]. Gallie, W.B.(1956). 'Essentially Contested Concepts'. *Proceedings in the Aristotelian Society*. 56, 167-198.
[10]. Liftin, Karen.T.(1998). The Greening of Sovereignty: An Introduction. in Liftin, Karen.T.(ed.). *The Greening of Sovereignty: An Introduction*. The MIT Press.
[11]. Mehovic, J & Blum, J.(2004). Global warming and melting of glaciers in South Asia: environmental, economic and political implications. *SARID*. Retrieved from http://www.sarid.net/sarid-archives/04/040917-mehovic-blum.htm.
[12]. Morel, Benoit &Linkov, Igor.(2006). *Environmental security and environmental management: the role of risk assessment*. Springer.
[13]. Myers,N.(1986).The environmental dimension to security issues. *Environmentalist*. 6(4). 251-257.
[14]. Nye, Joseph. (ed.). (1968). *International Regionalism, Readings*. Little Brown and Co.
[15]. Paterson,Mathew.(2001*). Understanding Global Environmental Politics: Domination, Accumulation and Resistance*. Palgrave.
[16]. Rolfe, Jim (2008): Regional Security for the Asia-Pacific: Ends and Means. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*. 30(1), p 101.
[17]. Rothschild, Emma. (1995). 'What is security?'. *Daedalus*. 124(3): 53-98.
[18]. Scherecker, Ted. (1997). *Surviving Globalism: The Social and Environmental Challenges*. St. Martin's Press
[19]. Westing, Arthur. Expanded concept of international security. In: Westing, Arthur. (ed.) (1986). *Global Resources and International Conflict: Environmental Factors in Strategic Policy and Action*. Oxford University Press. pp 183-200.
[20]. Williams, Paul. (ed.). (2008). Security Studies. *Routledge*.