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• Climate security: a new discourse?
• Environmental Conflict in the climate security debate: exploring the consequences
• The impacts of the environmental conflict debate
• A way forward? Linking securitization with institutional analysis
Riots, looting, chaos, panic, curfews, wars and famine

What the security chiefs are not telling you about climate change
Constructing the link

• The broad environmental security debate and the relevance of climate change
  • Peace Research
  • Non confrontational perspective on security
  • Common security

• Focus on Conflicts (since 1990s)
Focus on conflict

• Logic of security/national security:
  • Divide between social sciences and natural sciences
    • Riftkin, Deudney and the problem of naturalism
  • Realist understanding: security of the state, military means, cumulative scientific knowledge, high and low politics

• Consequences:
  • Focus on the South
  • Divide between conflict analysis and conflict management
  • Environmental conflict as a threat to global order
  • Marginalization of climate change
Impact of the environmental security and environmental conflict debates

- Little evidence of interstate conflicts, conflicts tend to be sub-national and cooperation is a possibility

Relevance of the environmental conflict paradigm in promoting:
- human security
- precautionary approaches
- Global governmentality
- Non traditional security capabilities

- From emergency to risk management: new actors, increasing resilience, public private partnership
Impact of the environmental conflict debate: on research perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict Management/economics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Importance of institutions</td>
<td>• Limits of equilibrium approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political ecology</td>
<td>• From management to governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Socio-ecological system as common pool resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential and limits of securitization theory

• Focus on the social construction of threats
• Focus on the transformation of political communities
• Fixity of security practices (and logic)
• Emphasis on “de-securitization”
Securitization and institutional transformation

- Securitization as a political moment
- Security practices as socially constructed: reflexive securitization
- Contextualized approach
- Critical Realism vs. constructivism
Conclusions

• The conflict debate as an hard case in the transformation of security practices

• Appeals to security (securitization, threats politics) have relevant impact on institutional transformations

• These transformations reflect the social construction of threats, the actors involved and their capabilities, even if the success of securitization move remains on a political community
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WE NEED A POLICY OF "PRE-EMPTION."

AND "DEFENSIVE INTERVENTION."

TO STOP THREATS BEFORE THEY CAN HURT US.

EXCEPT GLOBAL WARMING?

OUR NEW POLICY IS TO SHUT HIM UP BEFORE HE CAN SAY THAT!

IF NOTHING IS DONE... GUARDS!