

II-M. Profile of the United States¹

Version 1 – 30 March 2006

Prepared by *Rita Taureck*² and
*Geoffrey D. Dabelko*³



1. How does the United States define Environmental Security?

The U.S. government does not currently utilize in prominent policy, strategy, or office the explicit term environmental security or offer a formal definition. U.S. government definitions of environmental security have varied over time and by agency or department. The U.S. government has used the term sparingly, with some notable exceptions, even during the Clinton administrations when the terminology was in greater favor. However the U.S. government has numerous programs, policies, strategies, and organizations that fall within the rubric of environmental security as an umbrella term more widely used in other governmental, intergovernmental, or non-governmental forums. In some cases, the environmental security activities are continuations of activities started under prior administrations but downgraded, renamed, or reframed under the current administration. Other efforts at lower levels of government (such as military officer training at military universities or long-range) have continued to the present.

Environmental security has been defined implicitly and explicitly by different government entities, they have focused on:

- Ensuring the health and safety of ecosystems
- Greening the impact of security institutions
- Repositioning statist security assumptions to privilege human well-being as well as state well-being
- Monitoring, preventing, and/or countering environmental contributions to conflict and instability, typically in the developing world
- Utilizing collaborative environmental management to build confidence between former parties in conflict, particularly across the East-West divide of the Cold War

Many of these component responses to perceived environmental threats to security persisted simultaneous, at times within the same agency or department. Definition and emphasis depends primarily on the government body's particular focus, resources, and tools at its disposal. Most prominent environment and security actors within government have included the Department of Defense (DoD); the Department of Energy (DoE); the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of State (DoS).

¹ Copyright © 2006 **Environmental Change and Security Program, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars**, Washington, D.C. and **Institute for Environmental Security**, The Hague

² **Rita Taureck** is an Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) funded doctoral student at the University of Birmingham, UK in the Department of Political Science and International Relations. She is writing her dissertation on securitisation theory, utilising the U.S. environmental security strategy from 1993-2006 as a case study.

³ **Geoffrey D. Dabelko** is Director of the Environmental Change and Security Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC <www.wilsoncenter.org/ecsp>. He is a member of the UN Environment Programme's Environment and Conflict Prevention Initiative and co-vice chair of the International Human Dimensions Program on Global Environmental Change.

The height of U.S. government environmental security came between 1990 and 2001. From 2001 to present, the more overtly labelled environment and security efforts have declined in visibility, resources, and prominence. This decline corresponded with the election of George W. Bush and gained further momentum after the attacks of September 11, 2001. The government responses to September 11, commonly referred to as the "war on terror," has priority in all the U.S. government's foreign and security policies. This policy priority context is critical for understanding the positioning and priority assigned to environmental security within the U.S. government.

Despite this lower political priority and the continued absence of an official environmental security policy for the U.S. government, it is nonetheless possible to group specific environmental, energy and health related foreign policy objectives within the realm of a broad reading of environmental security. Environmental security is understood as an umbrella term as outlined by Michael Renner in the introduction to this project and in other works.⁴

2. United States Overarching Environmental Security Priorities

Given the umbrella definition of environmental security adopted in this report, it is possible to identify a number of issue areas where the United States government is active. Many of these efforts are actively pursued by the current Bush administration but are not necessarily labelled as environmental security. These include:

- Sustainable Development
- Energy Security
- Climate Change and Disaster Management
- Greening the Armed Forces

Sustainable Development

In preparation for the 2002 *World Summit on Sustainable Development* in Johannesburg, South Africa, the first Bush Administration developed its approach to sustainable development whereby it is "the means to unlock human potential through economic development based on sound economic policy, social development based on investment in health and education, and responsible stewardship of the environment that has been entrusted to our care by a benevolent God."⁵

Such an integrative approach to global issues is typical for the Bush Administration. Economic development, good governance, and environmental protection are always named as objectives that must be tackled together. Similarly, security objectives, most prominently fighting the war on terror, are a powerful underlying narrative informing all foreign policy. Sustainable development provides no exception: "Sustainable development is also a security imperative. Poverty, destruction of the environment and despair are destroyers of people, of societies, of nations, a cause of instability as an unholy trinity that can destabilize countries and destabilize entire regions."⁶

⁴ See Dabelko, Geoffrey D. and P.J. Simmons 1997. "Environment and Security: Core Ideas and U.S. Government Initiatives" *SAIS Review*. 17 (1):127-146. Dabelko, Geoffrey D. 2004. *Tactical Victories and Strategic Losses: The Evolution of Environmental Security in the United States*. Dissertation. (College Park, MD: University of Maryland).

⁵ Powell, Colin L. (2002) 'Making Sustainable Development Work: Governance, Finance, and Public-Private Cooperation' Remarks at State Department Conference, Meridian International Center, Washington, DC July 12, 2002 Retrieved from:

<<http://www.state.gov/secretary/former/powell/remarks/2002/11822.htm>>

⁶ Powell op.cit.

Energy Security

Concerns surrounding "energy security" has come to the forefront during the second Bush Administration. While energy security is only mentioned in passing in the 2002 U.S. National Security Strategy (NSS) (page 19ff.), energy security and dependence on foreign sources of energy have risen to a major security concern in the 2006 NSS. This increased attention comes as the long deliberations over new federal legislation finally culminated in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. The subsequent war in Iraq and larger U.S. government goals for spreading democracy in the Middle East, have raised increasing concern about U.S. dependence on foreign sources of oil and what those petrodollars are funding. The Administration's concern with the dependence on foreign oil appeared in the 2006 State of the Union Address where President Bush introduced The Advanced Energy Initiative 'to help break America's addiction to oil, 'which is often imported from unstable parts of the world.'⁷

Climate Change and Disaster Management

While the United States is not participating in the 1999 Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework on Climate Change, the Bush Administration has initiated a number of domestic and international initiatives aimed at addressing the problem of global climate change. Of significance on the international level are the Asia- Pacific Partnership for Ocean Development and Climate (known as APP and also as AP6 - made up alongside the United States of Australia, Japan, India, China and the Republic of Korea), the International Partnership for a Hydrogen Economy, the Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum and the Generation IV International Forum. On the domestic level the most important initiatives are the Climate Change Technology Program (CCTP), the Climate Change Science Program (CCSP) and the National Goal to reduce Emissions Growth. On both levels (domestic and international) these initiatives focus on technological innovations.

Two notable episodes have linked climate change to security in the U.S. context during the Bush administrations. In 2003, the Pentagon's long-range planning office headed by Andrew Marshall commissioned risk analyst scenario writers Peter Schwartz and Doug Randall to examine whether climate change may pose a threat to U.S. security. Their dramatic scenario postulated dramatic security implications including endemic "disruption and conflict" from abrupt climate change.⁸ Posted on the Pentagon website, the report went little noticed until picked up by *Fortune* and subsequent overseas media coverage that erroneously called the report "secret" and "classified."⁹ The resulting public attention to a perceived difference between White House and Department of Defense climate change threat assessments led to the removal of the report from the website and from subsequent Department of Defense comment on climate change.

The costly 2005 hurricane season in the United States and the political fallout from the inadequate government response raised the profile and political sensitivity of climate change debate in the country. Managing both natural and man-made disasters shot to the highest levels of the U.S. policymaking agenda in September. While shrill NGO attribution of Hurricane Katrina to climate change led to a political backlash by climate doubters and scientists alike, the residual political sensitivity to climate change continues

⁷ Bush, George W. (2006) President Bush delivers State of the Union Address United States Capitol, Washington DC. January 31st 2006. Retrieved from: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/01/20060131-10.html>

⁸ Schwartz, Peter and Doug Randall. 2003. "An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for United States national Security." (October). Available at http://www.climate.org/PDF/clim_change_scenario.pdf

⁹ Townsend, Mark and Paul Harris. 2004. "Now the Pentagon tells Bush: climate change will destroy us." *The Guardian* (February 22).

to resonate. This sensitivity to environmental disaster likely contributed to the inclusion of environmental disasters in the 2006 National Security Strategy.

Greening the Armed Forces

Limiting the environmental impact of the U.S. military is a process that began in the 1970s. This greening of the military comprised a significant part of the Clinton administration's environmental security efforts with the creation of the office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security. The Bush administration downgraded the prominence of these issues and joined them with the Office of Installations and Environment (ODUSD- I&E). The Armed forces remain under legal obligation to obey environmental laws and regulations, leaving green stewardship of the environment as part of the military's environmental (but not environmental security) responsibilities. These obligations and larger environmental responsibilities continue to be taught within the U.S. militaries universities and colleges.

In the wake of September 11, 2001, some Republican Senators such as Senator James M. Inhofe (R-Oklahoma), pushed for repealing some domestic environmental regulations that applied to the U.S. military. The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Inhofe and allies argued that environmental regulations constrained military training and readiness. By contrast, a 2002 report by the General Accounting Office (GAO, now renamed Government Accountability Office) "found that DoD's readiness reports did not indicate the extent to which environmental requirements restrict combat training activities, and that such reports indicate a high level of readiness overall."¹⁰ Congressional advocates of loosening environmental regulations, in alliance with a willing executive branch, have continued efforts to loosen environmental laws and regulations arguing that the Armed forces needed to "train like they fight"¹¹ and that anything that impeded this training constituted a risk to national security.

The 2003 and 2004 Defense Authorization Acts granted the DoD some of the desired exemptions. These exemptions included a provisional exemption for military readiness activities from the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, exemptions from the Marine Mammal Protection Act and partial exemptions from the Endangered Species Act. All of these exemptions are granted with for training purposes within wider national security goals. The 2006 Defense Authorization Act provided further exemptions from some requirements of the Clean Air Act, Solid Waste Disposal Act, and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

3. Factors that have promoted the United States' Environmental Security Approach

Two decisive factors have promoted the current United States environmental security approach: the war on terror and the institutionalization of environment and security-related activities that remain from prior administrations. Most U.S. security and foreign policy objectives, including environmental considerations, cannot be considered outside of the wider framework of the war on terror.

Sustainable development aimed particularly at the eradication of poverty is at times framed as a means to address security concerns. According to the 2002 NSS, although 'poverty does not make people into terrorists and murderers' it is one of the factors that

¹⁰ Bearden, David M. (2005) Exemptions from Environmental Law for the Department of Defense: An Overview of Congressional Action p.3 CRS Report for Congress Retrieved 3/06 from <<http://www.ncseonline.org/NLE/crsreports/05aug/RS22149.pdf>>

¹¹ Rumsfeld, Donald H. (2002) "Transforming the Military" *Foreign Affairs* May/June 81 (3) p.20-30 Retrieved 11/2005 from <www.weblinks1.epnet.com>

can make 'states vulnerable to terrorist networks.'¹² Energy security, with its specific focus on the independence on foreign oil, is viewed as particularly salient in light of the current war with Iraq and tensions with Iran. Climate change and particularly disaster management are also linked to the war on terror as the perceived lack of preparedness for natural disasters has drawn negative parallels to preparations against terrorist attacks. In the words of President Bush it is imperative for the United States to be "better prepared for any challenge of nature, or act of evil men, that could threaten our people."¹³

The U.S. government's limited action on climate change and the greening of the military cannot be as explicitly linked to the war on terror, but must rather be explained by a certain level of continuity from previous administrations. Some environment and security programs, often derivatives of the 1996 Memorandum of Understanding on Environmental Security, have remained in place although with fewer funds and less political prominence. Military-to-military engagement around environmental issues remains a tool for engaging friendly countries and former adversaries. Transboundary water cooperation in the Middle East is supported with behind the scenes diplomatic and financial support. Other examples include teaching of environmental security in military universities or the integration of natural resource considerations into conflict management and mitigation development work.

4. How has the United States addressed its Stated Environmental Security Priorities as regards the Selected Themes?

Mainstreaming Environmental Factors into Foreign and Security Policy

On climate change, the U.S. government has initiated four key international programmes the: Asia- Pacific Partnership for Ocean Development and Climate (APP), the International Partnership for a Hydrogen Economy, the Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum (CSLF) and the Generation IV International Forum.

The APP focuses on "voluntary practical measures...to create new investment opportunities, build local capacity, and remove barriers to the introduction of clean, more efficient technologies."¹⁴ Indeed, the participating governments are eager to stress that APP does not only focus on climate change, but proposes an integrative approach that views sustainable development, access to energy resources (energy security), poverty alleviation and global climate change as parts of a larger integrated approach. To paraphrase current Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs Paula Dobriansky, APP is about: integration, collaboration and implementation.¹⁵ These issue areas are being addressed through eight public/private task forces comprised of participants from the six member states. The first meeting of these groups was in January 2006 with future annual meetings planned. For 2007, the U.S. government has pledged \$52 million for this initiative, with plans to spend \$260 million on APP over the course of the next 5 years.

The International Partnership for a Hydrogen Economy is a multilateral approach aimed at providing "a mechanism to organise, evaluate and coordinate multinational research, development and deployment programs that advance the transition to a global hydrogen

¹² *National Security Strategy 2002 p.4* Retrieved 11/05 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf>

¹³ White house fact sheet on Hurricane Katrina (op.cit)

¹⁴ Office of the Press Secretary (2005) President Bush and the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Cleaner Development 27th July Washington DC. Retrieved on 03/03/2006 from: <http://www.state.gov/g/oes/rls/fs/50314.htm>

¹⁵ US Department of State (2006) Briefing: US Participation in the Asia-Pacific Partnership on clean Development and Climate Change 6th January 2006 Washington DC. Retrieved 03/03/2006 from <http://www.state.gov/g/rls/rm/58780.htm>

economy.”¹⁶ The Partnership is made up of 15 countries plus the European Union. In November 2003 the United States pledged \$1.7 billion in research funding for the next five years.

With the Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum (CSLF) the United States is member of a third multilateral environmental technology research programme. Also launched in 2003, the CSFL focuses on “the development of improved cost-effective technologies for the separation and capture of carbon dioxide for its transport and long-term storage.”¹⁷

Finally, the U.S. government leads the Generation IV International Forum that is concerned with research into “the next generation of safer, more affordable, and more proliferation-resistant nuclear energy systems. This new generation of nuclear power plants could produce electricity and hydrogen with substantially less waste and without emitting any air pollutants or greenhouse-gas emissions.” Making the GEN IV yet another initiative that combines climate change with energy security.

Energy security is also an issue of concern for the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). The Office of Transnational Issues (OTI) “produces analytic assessments on critical intelligence-related issues that transcend regional and national boundaries. Drawing on a broad range of experts in engineering, science, and social science disciplines, OTI’s analysis addresses energy and economic security, illicit financial activities, societal conflicts, humanitarian crises, and the long-term military and economic strategic environment.”¹⁸

Mainstreaming Conflict Prevention and Livelihood Protection into Development Cooperation

The most noteworthy new foreign assistance programs initiated by the Bush Administration in 2003 are the Millennium Challenge Account (subsequently changed to the Millennium Challenge Corporation) and the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR).¹⁹ The MCC has recently begun to provide some of the promised billions of U.S. assistance to countries that are deemed to be investing in their people, markets, and good governance. PEPFAR dramatically increased (\$15 billion over five years proposed but not appropriated by Congress) U.S. contributions to the world’s struggle against HIV, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean. Although some characterizations of these programs, particularly the MCC, are cast in security terms,²⁰ the funding rarely targets fragile or failing states identified as posing greater probability of instability or harbouring terrorists. Neither of these programs have significant environmental components per se. PEPFAR does not by definition and MCC could but the focus on the assistance depends heavily on the proposals of the recipient countries.

By contrast, the environment as a cause of conflict thesis received extensive U.S. government attention in the 1990s. While it is no longer a prominent focus, a number of security institutions continue to track environmental and demographic variables in light of stability and conflict concerns. The long-range 2015 National Intelligence Council Estimate including environmental demographic concerns. The 2020 NIC Estimate did not. The Director of Central Intelligence’s Environmental and Societal Issues Center from the

¹⁶ See: <http://www.eere.energy.gov/hydrogenandfuelcells/international_activities.html>

¹⁷ White House Climate Change Fact Sheet Op. cited

¹⁸ CIA website, retrieved on 3/03/2006 from
<http://www.cia.gov/cia/di/organization_oti_page.html>

¹⁹ For MCC, see <<http://www.mca.gov/>>. For PEPFAR, see
<http://usinfo.state.gov/gi/global_issues/HIV_AIDS/hiv_aids_initiative.html>

²⁰ Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (2002) *Fact sheet Millennium Challenge Account* August 23rd Retrieved on 12/2005 from
<<http://www.state.gov/g/oes/rls/fs/2002/12952.htm>>

Clinton years was disbanded, but the CIA continues to track transboundary water issues as potential sources of conflict. The Department of State continues to quietly support transboundary water cooperation between Palestinians and Israelis.

In the 1990s, the U.S. Agency for International Development was not an integrated player in the government's environment and conflict efforts such as the DoD, EPA, and DoE Memorandum of Understanding for Environmental Security. However USAID began a new focus on conflict and development during the tenure of Andrew Natsios as USAID Administrator from 2001 to 2005. While DoD and especially EPA and DoE have lowered their previously high levels of attention to environment and conflict, USAID is increasing attention to environment and conflict considerations through its newly established Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation (CMM) organized within USAID's Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA).²¹

Endowed with a \$10 million budget in FY05, the official mission statement of CMM 'envisions an agency that effectively prevents, mitigates and manages the causes and consequences of violent conflict and fragility.'²² The agency aims to incorporate conflict prevention work into the mainstream USAID profile, with the aim of addressing the causes of conflicts before conflict breaks out.²³ Through a combination of country conflict assessments, USAID staff training, early warning methodologies, and toolkits for integrated conflict interventions, CMM is designed to serve as a "change agent" within the agency.

The toolkits are directly addressing the environment and conflict linkages so typical of environmental security programs. Designed to provide technical assistance to USAID staff in the field, completed toolkits focus on water and conflict, land and conflict, minerals and conflict, forests and conflict, and youth and conflict. The *Forests & Conflict* toolkit, as well as the *Minerals & Conflict* toolkit engaged a substantial number of experts from prominent NGOs.²⁴ The toolkits reports begin with a lengthy clarification the relationship between the resource and conflict. Lessons learned in the minerals toolkit for example include the recommendations to: 1) empower local communities through information access; 2) increase participation, dialogue, and partnership; 3) create sustainable livelihoods for artisanal and small-scale minerals; 4) reduce Macroeconomic dependence and vulnerability; 5) address gaps in national governance of host countries; 6) promote responsible behaviour by large and small companies; 7) strengthen governance of the international mineral trade; 8) create a safe space for reform and 9) monitor and assess development. The toolkits typically end with possible options for breaking the conflict

²¹ Other USAID offices are also pursuing related environment and conflict linkages such as the Asia and Near-East Bureau's work on forest and conflict. See *Conflict Timber: Dimensions of the Problem in Asia and Africa*, available at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNACT462.pdf.

²² Office of Conflict Management USAID official website at http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/about/index.html

²³ It should also be noted that the Administration has created a Directorate for Foreign Assistance (DFA) within the State Department that is primarily concerned with spending the foreign aid budget more effectively. (NSS, 2006, p.33).

²⁴ The *Forests & Conflict* Toolkit emerged from collaboration with Adelphi Research (Berlin, Germany), the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) (Bogor, Indonesia), and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (Washington, DC, USA). Project coordinators were Alexander Carius (Adelphi Research), Geoffrey Dabelko (Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars), and Doris Capistrano (CIFOR). The lead authors were Esther Schroeder-Wildberg (Adelphi Research), Doris Capistrano (CIFOR), Olivia Voils (Adelphi Research), and Alexander Carius (Adelphi Research). The *Minerals & Conflict* toolkit was initially authored by a team of researchers, including Alexander Carius (Adelphi Research); Geoffrey Dabelko (Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars); Doris Capistrano (CIFOR); Moira Feil (Adelphi Research); and Jason Switzer (International Institute for Sustainable Development).

linkages violence and outlining in more detail how USAID specifically should address the identified problems.²⁵ These toolkits served as models for the OECD Development Assistance Committee's Conflict and Peace Issue Briefs on environment and conflict.²⁶

Environmental Peace Building

The U.S. Department of Defense operates a *Defense International Environmental Cooperation Program* (DEICP), an effort first created under the Clinton administration's strategy of preventive defense which aimed to foster environmental cooperation and peace building. This program was run alongside the domestic defense environmental security programs out of the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security. By the end of the second Clinton administration, the Office had developed military-to-military environmental relations with an array of different countries, including the Philippines, the Arabian Gulf States, South Africa, the Czech Republic, the European Union, Argentina, Chile, Australia, Canada, the Baltic states, and the states of the former Yugoslav Republic. The programme focused on issues such as: delegation exchanges, joint collection and analysis of environmental data, information sharing, bilateral or multilateral development of handbooks, and hosting or attending conferences.

Today the DEICP still exists. However, while the number of countries involved into the program has declined each year, the effort itself has actually expanded. A program started for environmental cooperation has spilled over into other sectors, and today addresses alongside environmental issues the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and coordinated response to "natural, accidental, or terrorist disasters."²⁷ The environmental engagement programs are no longer under the jurisdiction of the DoD environmental office, but rather they have become part of Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD).

Natural Disaster and Conflict Mitigation and Adaptation

The 2005 Hurricanes 'Katrina' and 'Rita' have put natural disasters (and man made disasters) right onto the map of U.S. policymakers. The 2006 National Security Strategy – unlike its 2002 predecessor – makes reference "to environmental destruction, whether caused by human behaviour or cataclysmic mega disasters such as flood, hurricanes, earthquakes or tsunamis."²⁸

The *Federal Response to Hurricane Katrina: Lessons Learned* report drafted by the Department of Homeland Security and commissioned by the President identifies three immediate priorities of what needs to be done. The three priorities read as follows:

- First, implementation of a comprehensive National Preparedness System to ensure that a fully national system that ensures unity of effort in preparing for and responding to natural and man-made disasters is in place;
- Second, create a Culture of Preparedness that emphasizes that the entire Nation - at all levels of government, the private sector, communities, and individual citizens - shares common goals and responsibilities for homeland security;

²⁵ USAID CMM (2005). *Minerals & Conflict a Toolkit for Intervention* (USAID: Washington DC)

²⁶ Available at

<http://www.oecd.org/document/53/0,2340,en_2649_34567_34538357_1_1_1_1,00.html#environment>

²⁷ Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress Fiscal Year 2004; section Q 1

Retrieved from <<https://www.denix.osd.mil/denix/Public/News/OSD/DEP2004/deparc2004.html>>

²⁸ US NSS (2006) p.47 retrieved on 16/03/06 from

<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2006/nss2006.pdf>>

- Third, implementation of corrective actions to ensure that the problems encountered during Hurricane Katrina will not be repeated.²⁹

This priority for responding to natural and man-made environmental disasters was reflected in the 2006 NSS. Plans to respond to this type of threat include developing a civilian reserve corps. According to the NSS 2006 this corps would: “utilize, in a flexible and timely manner, the human resources of the American people for skills and capacities needed for international disaster relief and post-conflict reconstruction.”³⁰

5. How does the US Government characterise the overall Strengths and Weaknesses of its Environmental Security Approaches

The current Bush Administration is positive in its appraisals of efforts in traditional environmental security areas although this term is rarely if ever used. Like most recent administrations, the executive branch does not speak critically of its own policies and approaches.

6. Key Policy Lessons learned in terms of the Development and the Implementation of Environmental Security Policy

The “war on terror” dominates foreign and security policy under the current administration. Combining this focus with the administration’s broadly negative view of environmental issues generally makes for lower priority assigned to policy that could be grouped under an environmental security umbrella. Separate from the post-September 11 context, the close identification of environmental security programs with defeated 2000 Democratic Presidential candidate Al Gore also ensured that the administration would have moved away from the environmental security frame regardless.

Despite these strong forces arguing against a prominent role for environmental security approaches under a Bush administration, some environmentally-security related efforts continue (green responsibilities for the military), some efforts continue in new bureaucratic homes (environment and conflict in USAID rather than DoD), and some efforts have responded to events (disaster management and environmental destruction re-emerging on the 2006 NSS). These continuities would suggest that analysts and practitioners focus on the activities and not the labels or frames when trying to catalogue and understand the extent and focus on U.S. government activities in the area of environmental security. Furthermore, the bureaucracy is sufficiently diverse and large that considerable environment and security-related activity can continue at non-political levels, evading a more hostile political climate for the environmental security frame.

7. Summary

The U.S. government no longer utilizes an environmental security frame that held sway from the early 1990s until 2001. Adopting an inclusive perspective of programs found under the environmental security umbrella during the 1990s and in other countries, it is clear that a range of programs and initiatives in the environment and security area persist under the current Bush administration. All of these programs, and in fact all foreign and security policy efforts, must be viewed in relation to the post-September 11 war on terror strategies.

Copyright © 2006 **Environmental Change and Security Program, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars**, Washington, D.C. and **Institute for Environmental Security**, The Hague

²⁹ The White House Website, retrieved on 03/03/2006 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/hurricane/>

³⁰ Op. cit. p.45

