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Over the last two decades the discussion of environmental security has evolved from some tentative assertions in policy making through exhaustive academic inquiry and debate to a mature discussion of multiple modes of human vulnerability in a fragile and changing biosphere. Initial hypotheses that environmental degradation might lead to conflict between states were quickly discounted although small scale conflicts and disruptions due to migration are a persistent concern. Subsequent work has lead to rethinking security in terms of development and to a recognition of the links between poverty and the global economy. More recent thinking suggests that many of the "new wars" in the global south are driven more by struggles to control the rent streams from mineral, timber and petroleum production than by environmental scarcities. This links to attempts to think about connection between rural peripheries and metropolitan consumption in a biosphere being actively changed by these economic activities. Most recently attention has turned to possible consequences of climate change and the vulnerabilities of both marginal peoples and the global economy.
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Security and Environment Linkages Revisited

Simon Dalby

Introduction

The debate over the linkages between security and environment has evolved since its high profile articulation as a factor in the case for sustainable development in the World Commission on Environment and Development in the 1980’s (WCED 1987). Sceptics and advocates have tangled repeatedly on conceptual, methodological, and political grounds while simultaneously the context for the discussion has evolved both as geopolitical events occurred and as science, and particularly research on climate change, has progressed (Brauch 2002, 2003). This chapter focuses on the innovations in thinking in the early years of the 21st century, suggesting that the linkages between security and environment are now understood in a number of ways, all of which show that matters are much more complicated than early assumptions in the 1980’s about scarcity leading to violence (Hagmann 2005).

The suggestions in recent literature also make it clear that relationships of environment and security need to be understood in much broader conceptualizations than were usually included in the narrow empirical studies of the relationships of violence and scarcity which dominated much of the discussion in the 1990’s. It is now clear that the links between violence and environment in the case of conflict over resources are often matters of political struggles over the control of relatively abundant resources in poor economies. In so far as humanity does face a common future, it is one in which global climate disruptions may well cause much more damage to poor peoples than any locally caused environmental disturbances. In addition, it is now understood that development, and the rapid incorporation of the remaining rural areas into the circuits of the global economy, is also frequently a violent process involving environmental change.

It is important to note that the linkages between security and environment continue to be formulated as the basis for advocacy and for policy initiatives, apparently in ignorance of
some of the most trenchant critiques frequently directed at such thinking (Deudney 1999; Nucleous 2000). Much of the early literature, at least, took security for granted without troubling to trace its intellectual lineage to the emergence of modernity where it was closely linked to private property and the protection of the social order that promoted property’s extension (Rothschild 1995). As a result much of the initial thinking assumed that its task was to perpetuate a social order that was in fact, as later thinking made abundantly clear, causing many of the disruptions in the first place (Dalby 2002a; 2000b). Even so, when it comes to reconsidering the role of the American military in particular, these conceptual difficulties remain in the literature despite repeated critiques (Foster 2001, 2005).

The focus of the discussion about environment and its links to security has shifted as a result of criticism, but also as research has made its findings public and as new perspectives have been added into the discussion. This chapter emphasises the recent discussions, and the importance of how both the terms of discussion and the research findings are placed in appropriate contexts. Overall it suggests that political economy and political ecology insights about connections between peoples and places are usefully connecting with analyses of global environmental change so that human vulnerabilities and the causes thereof now get a more appropriate emphasis than in the earlier literature. Policy recommendations too now focus more on human security and vulnerability, and on the multiple implications of resource wars, rather than on the potential of environmental degradation for causing overt largescale violence.

The Early Stages of the Environment-Security Debate

In the early stages of the discussion the contention that environmental degradation would cause misery, and probably conflict, in many situations, was frequently taken as axiomatic. What was far from clear, however, was precisely how insecurity would manifest itself and who would be the victims. Much of this discussion was shaped from within a Northern security studies perspective which assumed a perspective that surveyed the whole world as though from afar. The important points that follow from noting this
important point about who asked these questions in the 1990’s is that the knowledges that are constructed, especially the knowledges that look to universal explanations of the relationships between environment and conflict, are usually urban and modern knowledges, ones that take an imperial view of matters for granted (Barnett 2000, 2001). Combined with satellite imagery and modes of monitoring statistics compiled by states and international agencies, and the assumptions of the inevitability of economic development in terms of the expansion of carboniferous capitalism, these formulations of the resource and environment problematic inevitably downplayed the rural, the contextual, and the disruptions inflicted on traditional peoples by expanding modernity. They did so also within a state cartography, one that draws lines between places, ensuring that civil wars “over there” are not usually a matter of responsibility “in here” in the metropoles (Dalby 2002a).

Thomas Homer-Dixon’s initial work questioned the early premises and posed the question of where and in what circumstances conflict was likely as a result of environmental degradation. Homer-Dixon’s early work, which included canvassing the contributions of many scholars in a variety of disciplines, suggested clearly that what violence was in some way related to environmental matters was likely to be diffuse and subnational rather than taking the form of inter-state warfare (Homer-Dixon 1994). This work suggested that while conflict might happen in specific circumstances, many of the more alarmist suggestions that war between North and South over specific resources or over largescale phenomena such as climate change and ozone depletion, were unlikely. None of the more recent literature has seriously challenged this finding. His subsequent detailed case studies tried to specify the conditions and circumstances in which violence was likely (Homer-Dixon/Blitt 1998). When the overall framework for analysis is studied carefully, it is clear that one can posit connections between scarcity and violence, but the intervening conditions which lead to violence are usually key determinants of where and when violence occurs (Homer-Dixon 1999).

Critics charged that this empirical work did not proceed on appropriate methodological lines and that the causes of war were not well explored by assuming that environment did
in fact cause conflict (Levy 1995; Gleditsch 1998; Diehl/Gleditsch 2001). But the calls for comparative quantitative studies and the insistence of the importance of null hypotheses frequently overlooked the earlier careful evaluation of various scholarly evidence that had dismissed much of the alarmist thinking about proclivities to warfare among marginal peoples suffering environmental stress. The focus on war or the implications for the national security of Northern states frequently obscured the important point that the insecurity under discussion was a matter of poor and marginal people in the South, whose insecurity needed attention as a research issue in its own right, separate from the discussions of the causes of inter-state wars.

The initial assumptions about scarcity causing conflict quickly came to be understood as highly constrained by numerous political, economic, and social factors. The supposed causal link between environmental scarcity and political conflict is exemplified in the debate over water. It is especially important when linked to concerns about global climate change and disruptions of rainfall patterns and evaporation rates. Supposedly in the face of scarcities and disruptions, states vying for control over specific rivers will fight to secure access to supplies of fresh water. But empirical research into the matter suggests that, ‘water wars’ have been very rare and are generally unlikely (Toset/Wollebæk/Gleditsch/Hegre 2000). Few states are so tied to the waters of a river that the extreme dynamics of interstate warfare unfold when water shortages happen. The pitfalls of conflict that might destroy shared infrastructure essential to both sides are much greater than any possible benefits of going to war. The water wars debate has made it clear that vulnerabilities are a complex matter, but also that environmental change presents numerous possibilities for cooperation (Lonergan 2002).

Environment-Security Linkages and Development

Meanwhile other research in the 1990’s, in particular the large number of case studies encompassed in the ENCO project directed by Günther Bächler (1998), emphasised the likelihood of violence in the context of marginal peoples in the face of rapid change tied into strategies of development and the spread of commercial economies into subsistence
based societies. Maldevelopment and the disruptions caused by modern states and economies were understood to be the sources of many insecurities in developing states. ENCOP studies suggested that environmental conflict was most likely to occur where poverty ridden marginal lands in mountainous areas, and remote parts on the margins of major ecological areas in Africa, were being integrated into the global economy. But there were other dimensions to the relation of environment and conflict too, not least the damage done to specific environments and local peoples by the dislocations of major development projects. The struggles by indigenous peoples to protect rainforests and other lands from oil wells and mining corporations are part of this larger pattern (Gedicks 2001).

This research links to the literature in “political ecology”, drawing from anthropology, development studies, geography and political economy, which focuses much more on the political economy of re-sources and in particular the complexity of local re-sources intersecting with the global commercial economy (Peluso/Watts 2001). Showing how local power structures, gendered access to farm land, traditional modes of subsistence agriculture and fishing were overlain with new modes of resource extraction, this literature challenges the arguments about scarcity in the neo-Malthusian formulations, while not denying that some environments were indeed violent. This critical literature has made very clear that the complexities of the global economy have to be factored into local vulnerabilities, and that this has to be done with considerable care to ensure that the specifics of local circumstances are appropriately incorporated into the analysis. In explaining local vulnerabilities, both global environmental change and economic change matter.

Another theme that quickly emerged in the early literature on environmental security was the importance of recognising that in a global sense resource prices of most commodities were in long-term decline. A combination of improved technologies and expanding global trade has ensured that the supplies of most essential minerals are not an issue for the future of the global economy. In some cases technological innovation has produced spectacular decreases in the use of metals; copper has been rendered much less important
than previously by the introduction of satellite communications, fibre optic cables and the increasingly ubiquitous use of cell phones. But while the materials needed to make these items are not in short supply, they are nonetheless valuable enough to be worth fighting for in poor parts of the world economy where other economic options are not available. Petroleum appears to be an exception to this generalisation, one that may yet involve the world in yet further geopolitical conflicts (Klare 2004).

This discussion parallels a fifth literature which in the late 1990’s suggested that resource shortages were rarely correlated with conflict (Berdal/Malone 2000). The converse, it was suggested, was the case. The “new wars” of the 1990’s in the South were tied into the struggle to control the rents from resource streams that were being exported to the global economy. Controlling resources, whether timber, diamonds or oil, was the way to get rich quick, rather than follow the painful and slow routes of economic development (de Soysa 2002). Elite rivalries and the promise of wealth are, so the argument goes, powerful incentives to initiate hostilities, especially where tribal or other sectoral loyalties can be mobilised (Bannon/Collier 2003). But these wars were not largely about either subsistence lands or the politics of agriculture (Ross 2004). The extraction of diamonds, oil, and other minerals frequently has environmental consequences, but apart from tropical timber, most of these are not technically “renewable resources”. Nonetheless, their inclusion within a discussion of “environmental security” is a useful addition to the debate because it emphasises the importance of globalisation’s resource extractions as a factor in contemporary violence and insecurity, although it is important to remember that the geographies and the material qualities of resources do not make it easy to draw lessons from one that may be directly applicable to others (Williams 2003).

**Global Environmental Change and Vulnerability**

Some of these themes link to the approach in the Global Environmental Change and Human Security (GECHS) literature which in many ways offers a synthesis of the lessons learned in the other approaches. Vulnerabilities of populations to changing environments, and specifically concerns with the impact of global change, is the driving
force in many of these studies (Renner 1996). The welfare and survival of people and their environments is the key focus of research in contrast to the earlier focus on states and potential wars (Mathew 2001, 2002). This overlaps in part with the ENCOP concerns with human development and its focus on the juxtaposition of violence with the parts of the world that have the worst scores on the UN human development indices (Bächler 1998). It emphasises the importance of understanding the complexity of both environmental and social processes in specific contexts, and the obvious point that the poor in rural areas are frequently most vulnerable to both environmental change and the disruptions caused by political violence.

In parallel with the focus on the complex sources of vulnerability for poor and marginal peoples, the early years of the twenty-first century have returned matters to consideration of the largest scale disruptions of the biosphere, principally as a consequence of climate disruptions driven by fossil fuel consumption. Early in 2004 American media attention was drawn to a scenario exercise prepared on the part of Global Business Associates (GBA) (Schwartz/Randall 2003) for the U.S. Department of Defence that focused attention on the importance of abrupt climate change as a possible security threat. Subsequent discussion on these themes focused on the 2004 Hollywood disaster movie “The Day After Tomorrow” in which rapid climate change caused instant disaster, flooding, and flash freezing across much of North America. The science on this theme is inconclusive in terms of what precise scenario is most likely, but there is growing reason for concern (Alley 2004, Schneider 2004). The GBA scenario however reproduced the assumptions in the earlier literature that scarcity would induce conflict rather than trading, and disruptions would thus present a security threat. In doing so it ignored other research into matters of future scenarios and the potential for warfare in the face of climate change which in summary has once again suggested that the potential for inter-state warfare is low: “In this assessment, no militarily relevant security threat presently exists resulting from environ-mental stress but there are severe short- and long-term non-military challenges confronting many countries that have been victims of natural disasters that may put at risk both the governability of several states and the survivability of regions” (Brauch 2002: 103). Nonetheless, the GBA scenario exercise did represent
an interesting extension of the discussions of security in Washington in that it explicitly dealt with climate change as a threat in a context in which this was not congruent with the administration’s priorities.

Even the 2002 National Security Strategy of the United States of America document, which set out the priorities for American policy in the aftermath of the 11 September 2001 attacks, does include a brief discussion of the importance of limiting greenhouse gas emissions from the American economy, despite the rejection of the Kyoto protocol by the Bush administration. However, closer inspection of this document suggests that it is unlikely to lead to reductions of emissions. Specifically the Security Strategy states that (NSS 2002): “Economic growth should be accompanied by global efforts to stabilise greenhouse gas concentrations associated with this growth, containing them at a level that prevents dangerous human interference with the global climate. Our over-all objective is to reduce America’s greenhouse gas emissions relative to the size of our economy, cutting such emissions per unit of economic activity by 18 percent over the next 10 years, by the year 2012”. But given the enthusiasm for economic growth expressed in the rest of the document it is clear that its authors expect the economy to grow by more than 18% over this period, hence ensuring that the overall emissions will continue to grow. Hence the great distance between rhetoric and policy outcomes that might address the real needs to reduce greenhouse gases only emphasise the need for an ecological under-standing of security that focuses on the throughputs of materials rather than more abstract notions of environmental scarcity. This is especially important because climate change may well be most dangerous for poor vulnerable populations in the global South, precisely those who have done the least to cause the phenomenon in the first place (Barnett 2003).

Ecological Footprints and Environmental Peacemaking

This perspective, using an ecological viewpoint of what constitutes security, is taken furthest by the ongoing research at the Wuppertal Institute in Germany where researchers have been tracking the material dimensions of production and transportation in the global system. The overall ecological footprint of developed states includes accounting for the
import of materials and the use of sinks beyond their borders to absorb the waste products of metropolitan life. Specific activities can be described by looking at their “ecological rucksacks”, the term used to describe the ecological impact of a particular process or product, and which includes material waste and erosion caused by the production and shipping of a resource or commodity. Frequently resources are extracted from poorer parts of the global economy and much of the rucksack resides there, while the benefits are gained by investors and consumers elsewhere (Schütz/Moll/Bringezu 2004). Individual products also require specific materials, mineral and agricultural, to be imported from specific places, effectively carrying an ecological rucksack made up of damage done at a great distance.¹

Connected directly to the discussion of resource wars it becomes clear that consumption in the metropolises of the global economy has direct environmental impacts in numerous parts of the periphery, as well as indirectly through such things as ozone depletion and climate change. These categories make it possible to calculate very roughly the overall impact of various modes of economic activity, the overarching result is, when viewed in global terms, the unavoidable conclusion that it is the wealthy of this world who have the largest footprints and are thus causing the largest disruptions of environmental systems (WWF 2004). Hence globalisation is now increasingly understood in terms of environmental change (Pirages/DeGeest 2004). But the assumptions that scarcity in the periphery are the problem is now overtaken by discussions of the importance of the consequences of consumption. But this too emphasises the importance of thinking about security in terms of distant consequences and interconnections that might be amenable to cooperative action rather than necessarily a cause of conflict. It also requires further attention to matters of global forests, a topic in need of further study in relation to both conflict and ecological integrity (Klubnikin/Causey 2002).

¹ The ecological footprint refers to land use, to the space that a country’s citizens need for erecting houses, growing/raising food on fields and pastures, building traffic links, etc. The ecological rucksack describes the ecological impact of an individual product or process. They are mostly “filled” in developing countries, and can be calculated to express the environmental impacts of individual products, economies, or human beings. See <http://www.wupperinst.org/FactorFour/Factor Four_FAQ.html>.
In parallel with the focus on human security as a necessity in the face of both natural and artificial forms of vulnerability, recent literature has emphasised the opportunities that environmental management presents for political cooperation between states and other political actors, on both largescale infrastructure projects as well as more traditional matters of wildlife and new concerns with biodiversity preservation (Matthew/Halle/Switzer 2002). Simultaneously, the discussion on water wars, and in particular the key finding the shared resources frequently stimulate cooperation rather than conflict, shifted focus from conflict to the possibilities of environmental action as a mode of peacemaking. Both at the international level in terms of environmental diplomacy and institution building, there is considerable evidence of cooperative action on the part of many states (Conca/Dabelko 2002). Case studies from many parts of the world suggest that cooperation and diplomatic arrangements can facilitate peaceful responses to the environmental difficulties in contrast to the pessimism of the 1990’s where the focus was on the potential for conflicts. One recent example of the attempts to resolve difficulties in the case of Lake Victoria suggests a dramatic alternative to the resource war scenarios. The need to curtail over-fishing in the lake and the importance of remediation has encouraged cooperation; scarcities leading to conflict arguments have not been common in the region, and they have not influenced policy prescriptions (Canter/Ndegwa 2002). Many conflicts over the allocations of water use rights continue around the world but most of them are within states and international disputes simply do not have a history of leading to wars.

Some of these efforts on building cooperative mechanisms are directly related to efforts to enhance conservation efforts in conflict regions as a deliberate strategy to facilitate conflict resolution. Some such projects fall under the auspices of the International Union Conservation of Nature and their collaborative volume Conserving the Peace (Mathews/Halle/Switzer 2002) suggests clearly the diversity of geographical and cultural contexts within which such efforts might be applicable. It is worth noting that this particular project is also supported by the “environmental security team” of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom government which is involved in
environmental aid projects in Asia and Africa, suggesting very clearly that conservation and peacemaking are now understood as matters of environmental security.

Both international diplomacy and conservation efforts are involved in the establishment of so called “Peace Parks” on the borders of a number of Southern African states. But it is important to note that these are also tied into matters of economic development connected to tourist industry strategies to provide “eco-tourism” experiences to international clients. Here the local population is not always rendered more secure in their daily livelihoods which may not be enhanced by such modes of development. (Singh/van Houtum 2002). But the intention behind these initiatives is to simultaneously build trust and cooperation in areas where international tension might otherwise occur, although the complicated agendas and conflicting state priorities suggest caution in assuming these are going to be much of a panacea (van Amerom 2002). Using environmental initiatives to gain both ecological and political benefits is at the heart of other similar initiatives, such as the United Nations Environmental Programme’s efforts to improve understanding of environment and conflict and to investigate the policy options to meet the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (UNDP 2004).

In some ways the discussion has come back to where it started in the 1980’s, focusing on the vulnerable populations in the South and their need for a broadly understood human security. But what has changed is that simple assumptions of environmental degradation or resource scarcity leading to conflict are no longer accepted. Vulnerability is now understood as a complex problem; cooperation is understood as more likely than violent conflict in the face of environmental change. The importance of understanding the specific circumstances of human vulnerability in different places is also now part of the discussion; environment, development and human security are understood as parts of the same issue. But while it is clear that solutions have to be tailored to fit local circumstances, it is also now understood that neither global change nor globalisation can be ignored. Environmental changes are not strictly “local” phenomena triggering “local” social responses. Human insecurity is context dependent, but context is not simply a matter of local phenomena.
Environment, Development and Resource Wars

More generally the historical pattern of development and the appropriation of resources is one connected to the rapid urbanisation of humanity; modernity and industrialisation have accelerated the imperial pattern of appropriation of resources from distant places to feed the metropolises; globalisation studies linking environmental stresses to these processes are now increasingly common (Sachs/Loske/Linz 1998). The twentieth century, whatever designations it might be given in terms of the nuclear age or the growth of the number of post-colonial nation states, was notable for the huge expansion of population and its movement into urban areas. We are now an urban species and have wired and paved the planet to move food, timber, oil, electricity, minerals and all sorts of commodities from the rural areas into these burgeoning cities (Dalby, 2003a; 2003b).

In a way loosely analogous to earlier imperial arrangements the flow of commodities inevitably disrupts traditional forms of economic life. Just as wheat flowed from Africa to Rome so now does oil flow from the Mid East to other parts of the new imperium (Dalby 2003c; 2003d; 2004). Materials policy is a matter of improving sustainability by reducing ecological throughputs and increasing recycling; it is also a matter of industrial innovation which works ecological design into production (Geiser 2001). But to think in these terms requires a focus on consumption and a recognition that “environmental protection”, understood as something “out there”, is replaced by a conceptualization that materials and energy to support consumption cultures “in here” are at the heart of ecological disruptions where producers and consumers are connected by complex commodity chains that now span the globe (Hughes/Reimer 2004).

The Roman Empire built roads to facilitate communications and so too do modern states. Indeed, it is possible to argue that such infrastructure provision is a key part both of state structures and the commercial culture of the automobile. Promotion of the privately owned automobile is a major part of the function of states (Paterson 2000). Car ownership is understood as a matter of status in numerous developing states while the
pollution and congestion problems that result are ignored much of the time. The latest
gas guzzlers in North America, the rather-inaptly named Sports Utility Vehicles, are
presented to would-be buyers in tropes of conquering nature, of “civilising nature” in
Nissan corporation’s advertising slogan terms, a matter of being able to go anywhere
regardless of obstacles (Paterson and Dalby 2005). But these vehicles are frequently
understood as the causes of many problems of environmental degradation due to their
size and fuel consumption. Other automobiles, including hybrid vehicles that use
innovative electrical systems in conjunction with gasoline engines, are explicitly
marketed as part of the answer to environmental disruptions; the drivers encouraged to
save fuel costs while being more environmentally responsible.

But as the literature on resource wars now makes clear, the consequences of modes of
extraction in distant places is tied into violence, dispossession, and environmental
destruction in many places (Watts 2004). And many of these links can be traced and
acted upon politically as numerous campaigns for boycotting corporations, and ethical
investment strategies have made clear in the last decade. To think in these terms is to
challenge the conventional geographies of security and the geopolitical assumptions that
underlie the assumptions that democracies are peaceful because they do not go to war
with each other, and that they provide the appropriate vision of a sustainable and non-
violent future. Putting the geography of resource extractions back explicitly into the
picture changes the terms in which it is possible to construct both “resources” and
“conflict” (Le Billon 2004). It also suggests the possibilities of innovation to facilitate
less ecologically destructive modes of living. Above all, it challenges the taken for
granted geography of danger as external to the modern spaces of prosperity (Jung 2003).
In short, it requires a shift away from an understanding of environment as the external
context of humanity to a recognition of life within a changing biosphere.

**Environment and Human Security**

In stark contrast to the early literature suggesting that environmental change would cause
violence, much of the literature on human security has suggested that the sources of
human insecurity are a necessary place to start for more effective understanding (Najam 2003). Although some of the literature on Human Security in the early twenty-first century has dropped environmental security as a theme in their formulations, the logic of putting vulnerable people at the centre of analysis, rather than seeing them as a subsequent variable in an analysis focused on other matters, follows from human security thinking (O’Riordan/Stoll-Kleemann 2002; Chen et al. 2003). As the United Nations Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS) suggests. Instead of starting with a focus on natural hazards and their quantification, the assessment and ranking of the vulnerability of affected groups should serve as the starting point in defining priorities and means of remedial interventions.\(^2\)

**Conclusions: Towards a Fourth Stage of Research on Environment and Security**

Refocusing security thinking on the factors that render humans insecure in specific places means taking the geographical dimensions of insecurity seriously. While the local disruptions in particular places remain the focus of much analysis, in light of the discussions of resource wars and globalization now the distant consequences of both resource extractions and subsequent pollution and consequent atmospheric change also have to be included. An ecological approach is now essential in which human activities are understood as part of the biophysical processes of global change; global environmental change and economic globalization are effectively two ways of looking at the same process of change. Thus, in future environmental security research will have to conceptualise its research agenda in awareness of the potential disruptions of climate change and myriad other ecological factors in an increasingly artificial global “environment”.

These changes in humanity’s habitat are perhaps clearest - if we understand contemporary local changes and global connections as taking place in an urbanizing planetary biosphere where insecurity of many kinds frequently appears in the rapidly

---

\(^2\) See [http://www.ehs.unu.edu/PDF/PresentationEHSgeneral.ppt](http://www.ehs.unu.edu/PDF/PresentationEHSgeneral.ppt)
growing urban slums of the new Southern megacities (Davis 2004). These are in some ways connected into the global consumer economy, as vehicle sales and the presence of internet cafes attest, and in others as informal food markets demonstrate, remain primarily connected to local food and water supply systems.

The future of environment and security research will have to come to terms with the resource flows and health consequences of these burgeoning places in addition to its traditional focus on the rural regions of the South. This chapter has clearly suggested the importance of how these interconnections are conceptualized in the formulation of both international and state policy, and also in the development of practical survival strategies for the poor, struggling to provide their own security in the new increasingly urban realities of the twentyfirst century.
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