Energy, Governance and Security in Thailand and Myanmar (Burma)

A Critical Approach to Environmental Politics in the South

ADAM SIMPSON

ENERGY, GOVERNANCE AND SECURITY IN THAILAND AND MYANMAR (BURMA)

Transforming Environmental Politics and Policy

Series Editors:

Timothy Doyle
Keele University, UK and University of Adelaide, Australia

Philip Catney
Keele University, UK

The theory and practice of environmental politics and policy are rapidly emerging as key areas of intense concern in the first, third and industrializing worlds. People of diverse nationalities, religions and cultures wrestle daily with environment and development issues central to human and non-human survival on the planet Earth. Air, Water, Earth, Fire. These central elements mix together in so many ways, spinning off new constellations of issues, ideas and actions, gathering under a multitude of banners: energy security, food sovereignty, climate change, genetic modification, environmental justice and sustainability, population growth, water quality and access, air pollution, mal-distribution and over-consumption of scarce resources, the rights of the non-human, the welfare of future citizens – the list goes on.

What is much needed in green debates is for theoretical discussions to be rooted in policy outcomes and service delivery. So, while still engaging in the theoretical realm, this series also seeks to provide a 'real world' policy-making dimension. Politics and policy making is interpreted widely here to include the territories, discourses, instruments and domains of political parties, non-governmental organizations, protest movements, corporations, international regimes, and transnational networks.

From the local to the global – and back again – this series explores environmental politics and policy within countries and cultures, researching the ways in which green issues cross North-South and East-West divides. The 'Transforming Environmental Politics and Policy' series exposes the exciting ways in which environmental politics and policy can transform political relationships, in all their forms.

Other title in the series:

Community Gardening as Social Action
Claire Nettle

Energy, Governance and Security in Thailand and Myanmar (Burma)

A Critical Approach to Environmental Politics in the South

ADAM SIMPSON
University of South Australia, Australia

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

LONDON AND NEW YORK

For Ann, Graham and Guy

This page has been left blank intentionally

Contents

This page has been left blank intentionally

List of Figures and Tables

Figures

Tables

This page has been left blank intentionally

List of Acronyms

AASYC	All Arakan Students and Youth Congress
ADB	Asian Development Bank
ALD	Arakan League for Democracy
AOW	Arakan Oil Watch
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ATCA	Alien Torts Claim Act
BLC	Burma Lawyers' Council
BRN	Burma Rivers Network
BSPP	Burma Socialist Programme Party
CBO	community-based organisations
CGG	compromise governance group
CNOOC	China National Offshore Oil Corporation
CNPC	China National Petroleum Corporation
CSR	corporate social responsibility
DKBA	Democratic Karen Buddhist Army
ECODEV	Economically Progressive Ecosystem Development
EG	emancipatory group
EGAT	Electricity Generating Authority of Thailand
EGG	emancipatory governance group
EGS	environmental governance state
EIA	environmental impact assessment
EITI	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
ERI	EarthRights International
ESCR-Net	International Network for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
EU	European Union
FDI	foreign direct investment
FoE	Friends of the Earth
FoEI	Friends of the Earth International
GAIL	Gas Authority of India Ltd
GSP	gas separation plant
IDP	internally displaced peoples
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
KCG	Kanchanaburi Conservation Group
KDRG	Karenni Development Research Group
KEG	Karenni Evergreen
KESAN	Karen Environmental and Social Action Network

KHIS	Korean House for International Solidarity
KHRG	Karen Human Rights Group
KNLA	Karen National Liberation Army (military wing of KNU)
KNPP	Karenni National Progressive Party
KNU	Karen National Union
KORD	Karen Office of Relief and Development
KRW	Karen Rivers Watch
KWO	Karen Women's Organisation
MDRI	Myanmar Development Resource Institute
MOGE	Myanmar Oil and Gas Enterprise
MoU	memorandum of understanding
MSG	Multi-Stakeholder Group
NCGUB	National Coalition Government of the Union of Burma
NGO	non-governmental organisation
NIMBY	not-in-my-back-yard
NLD	National League for Democracy
NSM	New Social Movement
ONGC	Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd (India)
PAD	People's Alliance for Democracy
PPP	People's Power Party (Thailand – formerly TRT)
PTP	Pheu Thai Party (Thailand – formerly PPP)
PTTEP	Petroleum Authority of Thailand – Exploration and Production
PWYP	Publish What You Pay
RNDP	Rakhine Nationalities Development Party
RNP	Rakhine National Party
SAIN	Southeast Asian Information Network
SGM	Shwe Gas Movement
SLORC	State Law and Order Restoration Council
SPDC	State Peace and Development Council
TERRA	Towards Ecological Recovery and Regional Alliance
TNC	transnational corporation
TRT	Thai Rak Thai (Thailand)
TTM	Trans Thai-Malaysian (Pipeline)
UDD	United Front for Democracy Against Dictatorship
UN	United Nations
USDA	Union Solidarity and Development Association
USDP	Union Solidarity and Development Party
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society (US)
WWF	World Wide Fund For Nature

Notes on Language and Terminology

Throughout the book I have used the Myanmar government's new terminology for most names and places. This is not intended as a political statement on the validity of these changes, which were made under the previous military government, but simply a recognition that many names are unlikely ever to revert back to the original, although some old terms are still in common usage and employed here. In particular, I use the term 'Salween River' throughout the book instead of the official 'Thanlwin River' as it is the subject of one the campaigns and the new term is rarely used. Below are some of the new terms used throughout this book:

Myanmar – formerly Burma
Yangon – formerly Rangoon
Kayin – formerly Karen
Kayah – formerly Karenni
Rakhine – formerly Arakan
Bamar – formerly Burman
Tanintharyi Region – formerly Tenasserim Division
Ayeyarwady River – formerly Irrawaddy River

Thai family names are often long and unfamiliar, even to other Thais, and both ethnic Bamar (Burmans) and most ethnic minorities in Myanmar (except the Chins, Kachins and Nagas) have no family name. I have therefore followed the custom adopted by other academics specialising in this region by citing Thai and Myanmar authors in the text and reference list by their first, rather than last, names (Brown 2004; Fink 2009; Hewison 2005; Lintner 1999: 496; McCargo and Ukrist Pathmanand 2005; Warr 2005: xv). Romanisation of Thai and Myanmar names and words can result in several different spellings. I have endeavoured to maintain consistency throughout the book but in cases with various spellings in common usage I have noted the alternative spellings.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Series Editors' Preface

The beginnings of this series emerged at Keele University in a collaboration between Tim Doyle and Phil Catney. Since the late 1970s, Keele has been renowned across the globe as one of the leading universities engaged in teaching and research into the politics and international relations of the environment.

Our initial conversations with Ashgate were around two objectives. First, we wanted to transform the rather narrow, dominant conceptions of environmental politics and policy – particularly in the global North – by opening it up to include issues more central to traditional human politics and policy making. Gone are the days when the 'environment' is something that people engage in (and with) as some kind of 'luxury' pursuit, when and if they have the time and the resources to do it. Nowadays, environmental issues – both in the North and the South – are front and centre. Secondly, we strongly felt that much needed in environmental debates was for theoretical discussions to be rooted in policy outcomes and service delivery. In short, the series would look at the exciting ways in which environmental politics and policy can transform governance, in all its forms.

Timothy Doyle, Keele University, UK and University of Adelaide, Australia
Philip Catney, Keele University, UK

This page has been left blank intentionally

Acknowledgements

This page has been left blank intentionally

Chapter 1
Introduction

Introduction

Access to cheap and plentiful energy is the foundation of modern economies and the search for energy security is one of the key dynamics that is re-shaping global politics, governance and security in the twenty-first century. With the energy needs of Asia rapidly increasing centrally placed Thailand and Myanmar (Burma) are taking on greater significance in the emerging energy supply and demand chains that criss-cross the region. Contracts for hydropower dams, gas pipelines and other large energy projects have been signed at a furious rate in Beijing, Delhi, Bangkok and Naypyidaw, the new Myanmar capital.

While helping alleviate energy security concerns in relatively affluent states the growing global reliance on energy sources from energy-rich states in the less affluent South has also resulted in detrimental effects on the environmental security of marginalised communities across the South. Effective environmental governance of energy projects, particularly those that cross national borders, is therefore necessary to ensure that the pursuit of energy security does not exacerbate local injustices or fuel localised environmental insecurity. Globally, an increasing understanding of environmental concerns has led to improved environmental governance at many levels but often the most important issues remain the least well governed; energy – and the impacts of its production, trade and consumption – provides a key example. The centrality of energy security to modern states and economies ensures that it is often a key focus of foreign policy activities but there have been limited attempts to construct an effective global energy governance system and those that do exist have often bypassed the United Nations, the central global governance institution (Florini and Sovacool 2011; Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen 2010; Lesage, Van de Graaf and Westphal 2010). In the absence of a coherent global system, formal governance is largely undertaken in an ad-hoc manner at regional or national levels. Although this arrangement is far more subject to the vagaries of national political regimes it can also allow for less powerful non-state actors to influence local or regional outcomes.

The formal governance of transnational energy projects is usually undertaken by an array of administering bodies attached to the governments of the states involved in the projects. Environmental activists can play an important informal role in communicating community concerns to these bodies, as well as to transnational corporations (TNCs) and their governments, but the extent of their influence depends on the nature of the political regimes under which they operate. This activism is most efficacious under democratic systems where domestic

popular opinion is regularly tested in free and fair elections, although it can also sway more authoritarian regimes (Mertha 2009: 1002–6). Despite regular opposition by powerful business and political interests, this activism, particularly in its emancipatory form, is a potentially significant tool in contributing to the environmental governance of transnational energy projects.

The history of the two core states in this book, Thailand and Myanmar, contrasts the opportunities and openings available for engaging in this activism, which can be defined as 'activist environmental governance', under two very different political regimes. Despite the democratic limitations in Thailand's political landscape, including a recent intervention by the military, in general there have been significant opportunities for political dissent and debate. As a result Thailand developed a dynamic, if fragmentary, domestic environment movement that played a key role in the environmental governance of its transnational energy projects. In contrast, enduring military rule in neighbouring Myanmar provided few opportunities for domestic activism. Until the new quasi-civilian government was formed under President Thein Sein in 2011 activists held no hope of directly influencing their own government. As a result they focused almost entirely on transnational modes of environmental governance, particularly those exiled activists who removed themselves from the military's sphere of influence to the contested border regions.

This activist environmental governance is particularly important in the South, where environmental security is most precarious and energy-rich states are often ruled by authoritarian or illiberal regimes. Due to either limited will or governance capabilities, or both, the effectiveness of formal environmental governance institutions and regimes in these regions is particularly lacking. For states in the South with plentiful energy resources the export of energy via transnational energy projects takes on a high priority, either as a source of government revenue for development or a stream of rent that facilitates corruption. Under military rule in Myanmar – a state with few established democratic institutions – five decades of authoritarianism and relative international isolation ensured that rent seeking was the norm, leaving much of the country in poverty. In Thailand, characterised by a more dynamic economy and civil society, corruption and rent seeking still influenced decision making, although the benefits of development were more widely distributed.

As the analysis in this book suggests, the pervasiveness of environmental insecurity within a country often mirrors the degree of authoritarianism that characterises its domestic political regime. In situations where states are either unable or unwilling to provide environmental security for their citizens, environmental activists often provide the most effective environmental governance of cross-border energy projects. The conditions that face environmental activists in the South are, however, fraught with risks and hazards that are entirely foreign to most activists in the North and which provide significant impediments to engaging in activism. In Thailand activists faced harassment, and occasionally assassination, by developers and the state but in Myanmar civil conflict between the Myanmar

military and ethnic minorities, widespread poverty and, until recently, a repressive authoritarian state, combined to stifle domestic dissent and significantly magnify the hurdles to undertaking activism.

These circumstances can be illustrated by the situation on a remote conflict-ridden stretch of the Salween River where it forms the border between Thailand and Myanmar.[1] The Ei Tu Hta camp for ethnic Kayin (Karen) internally displaced peoples (IDPs) was established in 2006 on the river between the proposed Dar Gwin and Wei Gyi Dam sites in Karen National Union (KNU)–controlled Myanmar. In 2009 Hsiplopo, the camp leader, was unable to visit his family. Although they only lived three hours walk away, the camps of the Tatmadaw, the Myanmar military with which the KNU was engaged in the world's longest-running civil war, lay in between.[2]

Boxed in against the western shore of the Salween River, the camp was also built on the steep hillsides of a valley, denuding the limited forest cover to provide accommodation in the narrow area available. Due to poor soils and limited space the residents were unable to grow their own rice, relying instead on regular donations from the UN and other non-governmental organisations (NGOs) shipped upriver by longtail boat.[3] This type of insecurity coloured the daily existence of both the Kayin people in this camp and many other ethnic minorities in Myanmar. Nevertheless, despite these conditions, Hsiplopo's commitment to the campaign against the nearby dams was resolute: 'we don't want dams … the military cannot build the dams because the KNU will not let them while the people do not want them'.[4]

Hsiplopo's stance reflected that of many environmental activists and groups who inhabited the nebulous and dangerous borderlands of eastern Myanmar. The dams were opposed for many reasons: they were likely to require forced labour from local ethnic minority communities; they would submerge villages and large areas of pristine forest and arable land; they would adversely impact food security and fisheries; they would cut off a major route for refugees fleeing repression into Thailand; and they were unlikely to alleviate energy insecurity for the local ethnic communities. While the campaign against the dams emphasised the universal human rights of the affected ethnic minority communities in Myanmar, it also promoted their culturally specific identities and was emancipatory in its outlook. This cultural particularism extended into the ecological realm where the activists highlighted the importance of indigenous knowledge of biodiversity, making a direct connection between environmental and political concerns (KESAN 2008: 5). Despite the civil conflict, exiled Myanmar environmental groups undertook

---

1   The Salween River is now officially known as the Thanlwin River but this term is still rarely used so throughout this book I have continued to use the term 'Salween'.

2   Hsiplopo, interview with author, Ei Tu Hta Camp, KNU-controlled Myanmar on the Salween River, 6 January 2009.

3   Nay Tha Blay, interview with author, Mae Sariang, Thailand, 7 January 2009.

4   Hsiplopo, interview with author, Ei Tu Hta Camp, KNU-controlled Myanmar on the Salween River, 6 January 2009.

perilous work with the KNU in this region to promote human and environmental security for the Kayin people. As an exiled activist from the Karen Environmental and Social Action Network (KESAN) explained: 'KESAN's programs are in the KNU area [in Myanmar] so we have a close relationship with the KNU leaders'.[5]

It can be difficult for environmental activists from the affluent North, unfamiliar with this precarious existence, to fully comprehend the existential struggle that dictates much environmental activism in the South. As a result, many Northern environment movements, and the American environment movement in particular, have been largely apolitical, with the issues of 'human health, shelter, and food security' traditionally absent from their agendas (Doyle 2005: 26). Despite increased attention from the North much more research is required to provide a more robust and nuanced picture of environmental activism in the South.

Rationale for this Book

This book developed during a decade and a half of research on environmental activism in Thailand and Myanmar.[6] Its origin can be linked to a residential course I was attending on Buddhist economics in 1998 at Schumacher College in the UK where one of the course teachers, Sulak Sivaraksa, a renowned Thai social activist and advocate of Engaged Buddhism, told me about forest protests that he was participating in over the Yadana Gas Pipeline Project that was to carry natural gas from Myanmar to Thailand.[7] Later that year I travelled to Thailand to make contact with the major environmental actors involved with the protests including the transnational NGO EarthRights International (ERI) and the local Kanchanaburi Conservation Group (KCG). Many of the issues that activists were addressing in this campaign were quite different from the ones often examined by scholars from the North, including my own previous research (Simpson 1998). The Yadana Pipeline was to transport gas through the Thai–Myanmar borderlands populated by the ethnic Kayin people. Decha Tangseefa described the experience of the people living in this region, many of whom, such as the IDPs at Ei Tu Hta camp, had been displaced from their homes in attacks by the Tatmadaw:

> Although these people are living in danger zones, the territorial sovereignty
> of the despotic state renders them imperceptible to the 'outside' world. Their

---

5   Alex Shwe, interview with author, Chiang Mai, Thailand, 8 January 2009.

6   Some of the research in this book has already appeared in various forms including in the Taylor & Francis journals *The Pacific Review* (Simpson 2013b), *Third World Quarterly* (Simpson 2007) and *Environmental Politics* (Doyle and Simpson 2006). Taylor & Francis was also generous enough to allow publication of research that appeared in a chapter in a book edited by Francesco Cavatorta on *Civil Society Activism under Authoritarian Rule: A Comparative Perspective* in the Routledge/ECPR Studies in European Political Science Series (2013a).

7   Sulak Sivaraksa, interview with author, Devon, UK, 25 January 1998.

sufferings have rarely been accounted for by the international community. Most of their stories have never been disclosed, and even when they have, they have often been ignored. No matter how loud they have screamed, a large number of forcibly displaced peoples 'inside' the Burmese nation-state have been tortured and killed without being heard as they dissolve back to the soil they hoped would be their homelands. (Tangseefa 2006: 405)

As my research project developed it became apparent that insecurity in these communities was exacerbated by the civil conflict and environmental degradation that accompanied large-scale energy projects. The research for this book therefore coalesced around the attempts by environmentalists to improve human and environmental security for local communities by contributing to the environmental governance of four transnational energy projects based in Thailand and Myanmar. It became clear that the extent and nature of the environmental campaigns against these projects was highly dependent on the level of authoritarianism of the political regimes under which the activists operated, and that this affected local and transnational activism differently. Local and transnational business interests that supported the energy projects also collaborated with illiberal political regimes in the pursuit of profits and rents. It became apparent that, while the proponents often cited improved energy security as a rationale for pursuing the projects, the actual impacts on the environmental security of local communities were often detrimental. This paradox drove the research project from its inception.

By examining the campaigns against these energy projects in Thailand and Myanmar I focus on how environmental politics is played out in both the states and transnational spaces of the less affluent South. Throughout the book I use the terms 'North' and 'South' as useful shorthand to distinguish between states, regions or communities that differ markedly in affluence. Interests in particular countries are far from homogenous, however, and throughout the countries of the South 'one can find dominant "local" elites supporting and sustaining global capitalism' (Chaturvedi 1998: 704), while it is also challenged by counter-hegemonic forces allied to the marginalised and exploited (Gramsci 1971; Harvey 2005). As a result there is a North (affluent class) in what is generally termed the South (poor states) and vice versa. While using these dualisms indiscriminately can be problematic (Eckl and Weber 2007), they can be usefully employed if their shortcomings are acknowledged and understood.

The North and South differ not only in levels of affluence but also, as a result, in the issues on which their environment movements tend to focus. Southern movements are often more concerned about immediate existential 'environmental security' priorities, such as access to food and water, while Northern movements are often motivated by post-materialist or longer term issues such as wildlife conservation and climate change. These differences can also be discerned between countries within the South that exhibit relative disparities in wealth (Doyle and Simpson 2006). Although some environmental movements in the North have shifted their focus over the last two decades to include social justice issues,

differences in foci between activists based in the South and those in the North remain. These differences are also reflected in academia, which is dominated by scholars in the North.

Despite an increased focus on environmental issues over the last two decades, most book-length approaches to environmental politics still examine predominantly ecological issues or regulatory regimes and focus particularly on the affluent states of the North (Howes 2005; Kutting 2000; Paehlke and Torgerson 2005). Although there has been increased attention on environmental movements in recent years, much of the material still focuses primarily on movements within the North (Bomberg and Schlosberg 2008; Carter 2007; Connelly et al. 2012; Doherty 2002; Doyle 2000; Dryzek et al. 2003; Gottlieb 2005; Hutton and Connors 1999; Paterson 2000; Rootes 2007; Sandler and Pezzullo 2007; Shabecoff 1993; Wapner 2010). Large business interests play a significant role in pursuing inappropriate development in the South, yet studies that examine the role of business in environmental politics also tend to focus on the business interests of the North (Blair and Hitchcock 2000; Doyle and McEachern 2008). There has been some analysis of environment movements in the South (Doherty 2006; Doherty and Doyle 2006; Doyle 2005; Duffy 2006; Dwivedi 1997; 2001), and various studies of transnational activism more generally (Atkinson and Scurrah 2009; Bandy and Smith 2005; Cohen and Rai 2000; della Porta et al. 2006; Edwards and Gaventa 2001; Eschle and Maiguashca 2005; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Khagram, Riker and Sikkink 2002; Reitan 2007; Routledge, Nativel and Cumbers 2006; Rupert 2000; Tarrow 2005), but few comparative studies examining how authoritarian regimes in the South impact on environmental activism or policy (Doyle and Simpson 2006; Fredriksson and Wollscheid 2007). There are numerous studies that examine civil society under authoritarianism more broadly but these tend to focus on more traditional and formalised civil society organisations (Jamal 2007; Liverani 2008; Sater 2007). Some studies have demonstrated the importance of domestic environmental movements in undermining authoritarian regimes, particularly in the former communist countries in the Soviet bloc (Galbreath 2010; Kerényi and Szabó 2006: 805), but the role of exiled environmental movements in particular remains understudied.

It is also rare to see book-length analyses of environment movements or campaigns using a multilevel (Dwivedi 2001) or multiscalar (Kaiser and Nikiforova 2006) approach. Most studies of activism tend to focus on the local (Ford 2013; Rootes 2008), or the transnational level (Reitan 2007), although a recent edited collection takes an innovative look at local activism in the South against transnational environmental injustices (Carmin and Agyeman 2011). None, however, undertake comparative analyses of activism within the same campaigns at both local and transnational scales. An edited collection by Piper and Uhlin (2004) considers transnational activism in Asia, with each case study providing some linkages to national activism in a different country, but, as with other edited books, it is a disparate collection of case studies by a variety of authors rather than an integrated book-length analysis.

A book by Forsyth and Walker (2008) provides useful analysis that complements the research I undertake here. It examines the construction of environmental knowledge in northern Thailand, a cultural and geographical territory that overlaps with the case material of this book, and is focused on the environmental narratives deployed by various actors to underpin their arguments over contested land use. It provides a juxtaposition of the mythical social construction of different upland ethnic groups as either 'forest guardians' or 'forest destroyers' and provides compelling arguments regarding the implications for conservation or development policies but, as with many other environmental works, it avoids mention of energy issues, focusing instead on forests, water and agriculture, and is a single country study.

In this book I contribute towards filling these gaps in the literature by adopting a comparative approach in the analysis of the strategies, tactics and organisation of local and transnational environment movements under two illiberal, yet distinct, political regimes in the South to develop a model of 'activist environmental governance'. I undertake a multilevel, multiscalar analysis that examines both the various levels of environment movements – individuals, groups, NGOs, coalitions and networks – and also the various scales at which activism is undertaken, particularly the local and transnational dimensions.

In addition to the focus on governance these environmental campaigns provide an opportunity for the theoretical development of critical approaches to energy and environmental security. The concept of energy security has an uneasy place within the environmental politics literature. While it is driving the transformation of relationships within global politics, particularly throughout Asia and the emerging economies of the global South, its customary connection to the more traditional field of security studies has left it under-analysed by more self-consciously critical approaches. With increasing rates of energy consumption predicted for many parts of the world there is an urgent need to critically re-assess the more traditional approaches to energy security and the assumptions on which they are based. Although there exist various studies of human and environmental security whose foci have shifted away from the state (McDonald 2012; Thomas 2000), the importance of energy to the military and economic power of modern industrialised societies has resulted in the concept of energy security remaining one of the last bastions of predominantly state-centric analysis. As with other aspects of security, however, the state is often not the best means of pursuing energy security for marginalised individuals or communities, particularly in non-democratic states (Bellamy and McDonald 2002). Furthermore, state-centric approaches tend to preclude both an emphasis on more localised communities and a normative emphasis on justice.

The concept of energy security plays a dual role throughout this book as proponents in receiver countries often cite it as the rationale for pursuing the energy projects while marginalised communities in the vicinity of the projects often remain energy insecure, even following the project's completion. The impacts of this energy exploitation are felt most acutely in the environmental capital and processes that these communities rely on, such as food, water and

more sustainable localised energy sources. The research in this book demonstrates that this relationship was particularly relevant for ethnic minority communities in Myanmar, on whose land energy projects were often sited. Most communities in Thailand were more energy secure, due to more advanced energy and economic infrastructure, but energy projects still had the potential to adversely affect other aspects of their environmental security.

The social and political context within which these communities existed played a significant role in determining the specific outcomes of the projects, and whether they proceeded at all. A critical approach to environmental security, such as the one adopted by Barnett in his seminal book *The Meaning of Environmental Security* (2001), which acknowledges the relationship between these communities and both their environment and the socio-political structures they inhabit, is therefore best placed to capture the significance of these impacts. Barnett argued that environmental security should be defined as the way in which 'environmental degradation threatens the security of people' (2001: 12). This approach adopts a human security standpoint and focuses on the inequitable distribution of degradation resulting from unequal social structures; '[a] human-centred environmental security concept places the welfare of the disadvantaged above all else' (2001: 127). Although the concept of environmental security is also relevant for people in the North, in the South it tends to embody more immediately existential threats, with precarious living conditions due to poverty and authoritarian governance. In addition, the North can usually afford to mitigate detrimental environmental impacts but in the South perilous living conditions render environmental security and the struggle for justice inseparable.

Within the environmental politics literature there are, however, few studies that link environmental activism to critical approaches to environmental security. Most studies tend to focus primarily on the actual threats posed by environmental change rather than the response of activists and communities (Dodds and Pippard 2005; Doyle and Risely 2008; Floyd and Matthew 2013; Liotta et al. 2008). Although this book does not provide a detailed analysis of the environmental security implications for each energy project examined, the threat of environmental insecurity was a key rationale for the activism generated.

Due to its centrality to all life, energy security should be a central fixture within the critical environmental security literature but it has been largely overlooked, with the energy security debate dominated by the realist (Klare 2012) or liberal (Yergin 2011) state-centric streams of security studies. The concept can, however, be critically re-imagined by adopting a justice focus with a particular emphasis on marginalised individuals and communities. In recent articles Mulligan (2010; 2011) has defined his energy security approach as 'critical' but, although these are valuable additions to broader energy security debates, there remain aspects of his work that could benefit from more overtly 'critical' analysis. As Nunes (2012) has noted, the proliferation of the 'critical' label in security studies has led to critique being sometimes 'blunted'. Although in part this is an inevitable result of the popularity of alternative approaches, as there is less traditional

analysis to critique, in the energy security literature there is no shortage of the more traditional analysis. Although Mulligan employs critical tools to conclude that security should shift from a state-centred military focus to one 'grounded in discourses of global and human security' (2010: 85), he tends not to address issues specific to the global South, where existential energy shortages are so prevalent. He also focuses primarily on fossil fuels, and peak oil in particular, which is not, in general, a critical concern; as Dalby notes 'oil is not a resource that the marginalised peasantry of the Third World are directly fighting over; it's a matter of superpower competition' (2009: 75).

In Mulligan's analysis of the security literature he focuses on the Copenhagen School's concept of 'securitisation', which can result in authoritarian responses by the state: 'securitisation is thus a tool that enables states to take exceptional measures, including repression or the suspension of the public freedoms considered normal in the West' (2011: 639). While the Copenhagen School is in some ways clearly constructivist, and it helped broaden the security agenda away from purely militaristic national security approaches, its deployment within 'critical' literature can have a limiting effect. As Browning and McDonald (2011) note, the logic of security in the Copenhagen School is inherently pernicious while within the Welsh School of Critical Security Studies, for example, it is inherently progressive. In comparison to the 'panic politics' that accompanies securitisation under the Copenhagen School, in the Welsh School approach 'true security refers to the emancipation of the poor and disadvantaged' (Floyd 2010: 48), which is a far more critical conception of security. As Nunes argues, the Copenhagen School and other approaches that conceive security as having an 'undesirable logic' have been detrimental to the 'commitment to politicisation that constitutes the cornerstone of critical security studies' (2012: 357).

As it was the more critically normative arguments in favour of equity and justice that drove the politicised activism in this book, in the last chapter I use the campaigns and the projects they oppose to develop the criteria for a model of both critical energy *and* environmental security that challenges the more traditional security studies approaches. These models develop and systematise some of my earlier thoughts on critical approaches to energy security (Simpson 2007; 2013c) and aim to clarify the key contributing elements of a genuinely critical analysis. This analysis can then be deployed in the evaluation of energy or other development policies to promote outcomes focused on sustainability and justice and can therefore provide guidance on manifesting 'emancipatory activist environmental governance'.

Research Methodologies

This book is fundamentally about environmental politics but it draws on the fields and subfields of political science, international relations, international political economy, sociology and environmental studies. It is also written in the same tradition as other practitioners and theoreticians within the academy who consider