Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences 3 (2014 7) 370-380
~ ~ ~

УДК 551.588.7

Environmental Challenges, Climate Change & Development

Manaswini Pradhan[a] and Satya Prakash Dash[b]*
[a] *Department of Information & Communication Technology, Fakir Mohan University Balasore, 756 019, India*
[b] *Department of Political Science & Pub. Admn., Sambalpur University Burla, Sambalpur 768 019, India*

Received 12.12.2013, received in revised form 15.01.2014, accepted 05.02.2014

Development and environment are the two most debatable themes in the present global context. Both have become incompatible, thereby resulting in controversies, challenges, and contradictions. The paper presents a moderate background of steps taken for environmental preservation and the controversy to the north-south debate. It analyses the threat to the global environmental situation in the context of globalization. It presents the case of Niyamgiri hills in Orissa and its significance in the context of 'environmentalism of the poor'. It presents some of the important global meets and its consequences and relevance. The paper also analyses the action taken by the government of India in its endeavor to contribute substantially.

Keywords: climate change, environment, development.

Environment is a misnomer to the common person in the streets of India, particularly in the smaller towns and rural areas. Concern for the environment is certainly on the rise in the bigger cities, but the same level of awareness is lacking at other places. Reasons for this may be because of the awareness generated by the advocacy groups, or the practical problems experienced by the people, etc. However, to talk of the environment, as such, in the smaller towns and rural areas dies not evoke the same response and anxiety. On the other hand every effort is taken to further deteriorate the environmental conditions of the area, very often with the connivance of the officials engaged to protect and preserve the environment. One reason attributed for the failure to protect the environment is 'development'. Due to the ostensible reason of development, environmental degradation is expeditiously taking place, and in the process, the common people suffer from the double burden of 'environmental degradation' and 'developmental woos'.

Environment though sounds as a simple terminology, depends upon various factors. A combination of all these factors contributes to a good and healthy environment essential for human existence and survival. Such an environment cannot be build within a short span

* Corresponding author E-mail address: satya.csd@gmail.com

of time but takes years. However, the same can be destroyed within a very short period of time bringing catastrophic effects upon humankind. The understanding of this destruction is also known to the destroyers, but the greed to exploit the natural resources assumes greater proportions and seldom corrective measures are taken. The effects of this destruction is immediately reflected on the people dependent on that environment, and in the long run, the destroyers are also not spared due to the havoc caused to the environment gradually. A bright example of this is the phenomenon of 'global warming', and the depletion of the ecology on which the indigenous people are dependent for their life and livelihood. Many instances of such hazards are plenty throughout the world. In some cases the people have protested and opposed the plunder of the environment and have also successfully protected the environment. International agencies and advocacy groups have supported the cause of the indigenous people in their effort to protect the environment. This all happens in the name of development.

No one is against development, and infact every person wants expeditious development so as to facilitate life and livelihood. However, the main question that arises in the process of development is at whose cost is the development taking place? Is it the persons who are designing the developmental plans or is it the persons who are living in the place where the development is supposedly to take place. Quite certainly those who are designing the developmental plans are remaining at a safe distance leaving aside the people becoming the victims of the development.

The global north and south are divided over the development debate. The north accuses the south of being over exploitative in their run for development and economic supremacy, while the south criticizes the north of being intolerant to its developmental pursuits. At the world Population Conference held at Bucharest in 1974, the south rallied under the twin slogans: 'Development is the best contraceptive' and 'Take care of the people and the population will take care of itself'. At the International Conference on Population held at Mexico City in 1984, the US emphasized upon the interrelationship between economic development and population growth. "The difference between the South's continuing insistence on development being the best contraceptive and the US's Mexico City position that 'sound economic policies' were the best contraceptive is subtle but profound. The South's call, at least in theory, has been for development at large, an improvement in the quality of life, an expansion of economic options available to the poor; the US view at Mexico, on the other hand, was a political tactic, an ideological call for 'a market economy….. [which would] encourage a vital private sector' {emphasis added). In short, the South had been calling for development; the US was trying to push a particular brand of economics" (Najam, 1996: 7). At the Rio Conference on Environment & Development in 1992, the developed north claimed that the south is responsible to clean the environment, since due to rapid process of industrializations in the developing south countries, the environment is being polluted. Again, at the Cairo Conference on Population & Development in 1994, the US stressed upon strong 'population control measures' and the south on 'development'. "Principles included in treaties, for example equity, not only raise difficult questions and leave them unanswered, but also have reservations to these principles recorded in them in areas that deal with issues in the North-South context. The most important principles, Principle 7, referring to common but differentiated responsibilities in the Rio Declaration [UN 1992], and benefit-sharing in the Convention on Biological Diversity [UN

1993] have not been accepted by the US and the EU, respectively" (Sanwal, 2008; 51).

Whereas development is essential for all nations, and more particularly for the south, effective remedial measures are also required in order to counter any negative impacts upon the people due to the developmental efforts. Development should not be, by any means, anti-people. It should encompass the people living in and around and contribute for a 'holistic' development. While considering the needs of the people, development should focus on all the ancillary components on which the needs of the people are based upon. This includes, land, forests, water, mountains, etc. The local people and the indigenous people are very much dependent on such components for their life and livelihood. It is not a strange fact that the people living mostly at a disadvantageous position are worst affected by the developmental plans of the government. Their life is threatened by the governments that pledged to bring in development for their benefit. The habitations of the indigenous people or the tribal in India are rich in mineral deposits. The extraction of these minerals threatens the life and livelihood of these tribal people and seriously jeopardizes the natural environment. Barbara Rose Johnston (1995, 112-3) is of the view that,

> Vulnerability to the changes in the biophysical realm is a factor of social relations: human action and a history of social inequity leave some people more vulnerable than others (Wisner, 1993). In spite of international and national structures establishing inalienable rights for all Human Rights and the Environment 113 people, some people experience greater harm than others. In many cases, this differential experience is often a result of government induced and/or sanctioned action: powerless groups and their rights to land, resources, health, environmental protection and thus, their future, are expendable in the name of national security, national energy, and national debt. It is this socio-cultural context of selective exposure to hazardous and degraded environmental settings that constitute a form of human environmental rights abuse. At one level, human environmental rights abuse occurs because people happen to be living in the wrong place…… At another level, human environmental rights abuse occurs because people are in the way of progress and "national" needs supersede individual and community concerns.

Environment is a serious matter for the community dependent upon it and it should be left entirely to the community to decide how best to utilize it. The community knows the effective utilization of their environment and how to conserve its productive assets. The resources derived from the environment are never over exploited by the community. It is not only limited to judicious utilization of the environment by the community, but they regard it with reverence and worship it since their very life depends on the smooth continuance of the environment. An example to this is the Niyamgiri hills in Kalahandi district of Orissa, where the tribal i.e. *Dongria Kondh* worship the mountain and forest, as their survival depends on it. "It is a place of quiet beauty, of lush green paddy fields and huge mango trees, where self-sufficient tribes still share the jungle with elephant, tiger and leopard. Yet this most unlikely place is now the frontline in a clash of civilizations that has pitched the indigenous population up against the corporate might of the British mining company Vedanta resources, intent on dragging Niyamgiri into the modern world" (Chamberlain,www.guardian.co.uk). Vedanta and the Orissa government did not care about the ecological and human costs of mining in the upper reaches of the Niyamgiri hills in the Kalahandi and Rayagada districts

of Orissa, threatening the very survival of the Dongaria and Kutia Khond tribes, both notified, in official parlance, as "primitive tribal groups" (EPW, 2010; 7). The Orissa government issued a false certificate that the mining land lease does not come under the Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006, popularly known as the Forest Rights Act (FRA).

It is the same Niyamgiri hills and forest that was permitted by the Orissa government to Vedanta group to extract bauxite and in the process destroying the forests and mountain. This would have caused heavy damage to the environment and ecology of the area. One of the local tribal stated, "once they start mining, the mountain will be bulldozed and the rivers will dry up and our livelihood will be lost. We will become fish out of water. We don't know how to adapt and survive and our way of living is not available in the cities. We will be extinct" (Chamberlain, www.guardian.co.uk, dtd. 24.05.2010). The tribals living here protested and were against the project. The agitation of the tribal people was not only limited at the state and national level, but it went at the international level. Ultimately, the government of India cancelled the license given by the state government to the Vedanta group to extract minerals in the Niyamgiri forests and the life of thousands of tribal was saved. The rejection was the most drastic of the measures taken by the government, which has generated the impression that noose could be tightening around Anil Agarwal's Vedanta $1.7 billion operations in Orissa. "It is in favor of Niyamgiri's – and Orissa's – poorest of the poor people, and strongly endorses the concept of environmentalism of the poor. People across the country are fighting for survival. They know their poverty will only be replaced by more destitution if and when these projects are built, and they are not going to allow that to happen" (www.cseindia.org). This 'environmentalism of the poor' is alternately remarked by Jairam Ramesh (2010) as 'livelihood environmentalism' and opposed to 'lifestyle environmentalism' of the rich.

The Supreme Court in the Godavarman case appointed a *Central Empowered Committee* (CEC) that reported gross collusion on the part of government officials in giving environmental and forest clearance to Vedanta group to mine in Niyamgiri hills. Highlighting the significance of the Niyamgiri hills, the CEC reported that:

> "Niyamgiri forests are historically recognized for its rich wildlife population. It was declared a game reserve by the ex-Maharaja of Kalahandi. It has also been proposed to notify it as a wildlife sanctuary in the Working Plan for Kalahandi Forest Division, and which has been approved by the MoEF on 16th December, 1998. This area has been constituted as an Elephant Reserve by the State of Orissa vide Order N4643/WL(Cons)34/04 dated 20.8.2004. It contains elephant, sambhars, leopards, tigers, barking deers, various species of birds and other endangered species of wildlife. More than 75 % of the hill is covered by thick forests with an average density of 0.6. Wild relatives of sugarcane plant are found here and which are valuable genetic sources for the future hybrids and therefore need preservation to maintain a pure gene bank; it has more than 300 species of plants, trees, etc. including about 50 species of medicinal plants. Six of the species are listed in the IUCN Red Data Book. These forests are yet to be surveyed properly for their floral and faunal wealth."

> "The alumina plant and the mining project linked with it will have serious adverse effect on the flora and fauna due to mining, overburden dumping, construction of proposed road through the dense forests, liquid and gaseous effluents

> emissions, bright illumination, blasting with explosives, drilling and resultant vibration and dust, operation of heavy loading and unloading equipment, pollution etc."

The globalization era has further marginalized the disprivileged communities, threatened their survival and has posed a challenge to the environment. The government that is responsible for the welfare and development of the people is now more eager to bring in their socio-economic development ostensibly, and in the process is facilitating the industrial class to set up their commercial interests. The whole focus on environment and sustainable development is very cunningly avoided in order to maximize profits for the multi-national corporations and industries. Without government regulation and pressure from civil society, corporations lack incentives to protect the environment sufficiently; they actually have an incentive to despoil it if doing so saves them money (Stiglitz, 2007; 191). This also contributes towards the maximization of problems and hardships for the local people. "In this highly compartmentalized world, environment as a concept no longer represents a natural system of which humans are a part. It is a commodity controlled and manipulated by global market forces" (Johnston,1995; 115). The community is distanced from the decision-making mechanism and in its place the MNCs and government officials take decisions on behalf of the community. The Indian government provision, as per the Environment Protection Act, 1986, of obtaining the consent of the local villagers through convening *gram sabha* (village committee) meetings has turned into a farce. Though the meeting is convened, the villagers' opinion is never taken into consideration and their voice gets suppressed in the presence of the political-administrative-economic power-holders. The option left before the people is either to appeal the judiciary/appellate authority or in extreme case, to protest and agitate against the design of alienating them from their land and environment. This is not an easy option for the poor and disorganized people, but against all odds the local people try to put forth their voice unitedly, and have also succeeded in some instances.

Globalization has directly affected the environment through the occurrence of global warming. Large scale commercial and industrial activities have led to emission of greenhouse gases causing global warming and other hazards to the environment. Industrial units and mining activities are often conducted diverting the forest lands. The lost forest cover is to be regenerated by afforestation programmes. "…. Compensatory Afforestation Management and Planning Authority, is an innovation ordered by the Supreme Court in 2002, according to which every party, whether government or private, that wishes to divert forest area for non-forestry purposes, has to deposit a certain sum equivalent to the total value of ecological benefits lost per hectare diverted for such purpose. …. This approach has served us well – today we have almost Rs 11,000 crores available to state governments for reforestation and regeneration of natural forest cover" (Ramesh, 2010; 14). This positive side has been stated by the central Minister for Environment & Forests, but it lacks the sincerity and commitment required for the purpose. Compensatory forestry, as per the law, is not accorded priority and this decreases the forest cover. "Unless we lessen environmental damage, conserve on our use of energy and other natural resources, and attempt to slow global warming, disaster lies ahead. Global warming has become a true challenge of globalization" (Stiglitz, 2007; 17). The most intriguing part of this is that the polluter is not being penalized for its action but the effect is experienced by others. Global

warming is threatening to submerge vast tracts of land in Bangladesh and the Maldives due to the melting of the polar ice-caps and subsequent increase in sea level. It is not surprising that the world's worst polluter, the United States, which adds almost 6 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere every year, pretends that it does not believe the evidence that there is a need to curtail its greenhouse gas emissions (Stiglitz, 2007; 165). These greenhouse gases (GHGs) comprise, principally, carbon dioxide (mostly from fossil fuel combustion and forest burning), plus other heat-trapping gases such as methane (from irrigated agriculture, animal husbandry and oil extraction), nitrous oxide and various human-made halocarbons. Mit Roomney, the Republican nominee for the 2012 US Presidential campaign, said that the Americans use almost twice as much energy per person as does a European, and more like three times as much energy as does a Japanese citizen (www.boston.com). According to him, human activity is a contributing factor for climate change and global warming. In order to reduce GHGs, Roomney opines to pursue for more oil drilling as well as natural gas and nuclear energy.

It is the developed and rich countries that contribute the most towards polluting the environment, but the sufferers are the people living in the developing and poor countries of the south. These people become the victims of global warming and climate change. The vast majority of extreme weather events associated with the change in climate devastate those populations that do the least to pollute the world. Recent figures suggest that of the 1.4 million people killed directly by weather disasters around the world over the past 30 years, 83 % lived in low and lower middle income countries (www.guardian.com).

In the context of controlling environmental pollution, the *World Bank* has undertaken measures to be implemented while sanctioning loans to developing countries for its developmental projects. It initiated the method of triple alliance to check environmental pollution that was quite effective and successful. This triple alliance includes (a) project in-house environmental unit, supported by (b) Ministry of environment, and (c) independent review body. The triple alliance approach has been successfully implemented in a number of countries including Indonesia, India, China, Thailand, Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina. Further, the *World Bank* has introduced the concept of 'Adjusted Net Savings', also known as genuine savings, is an indicator of green national accounts. It measure the true rate of savings in an economy after taking into account investments in human capital, depletion of natural resources and damage caused by pollution. Adjusted Net Saving helps make the growth-environment trade-off more explicit, since countries that choose to prioritize growth today at the cost of the environment will have depressed rates of adjusted net savings. According to the *World Bank* data, India's gross national savings was around 34.3 % of GDP in 2008, but its Adjusted Net Saving in the same year was 24.2 %, the difference arising due to the depletion of natural resources and pollution-related damages, in addition to conventionally measured depreciation of the nation's capital assets (Ramesh, 2010; 15). "Although the Bank is a marginal player in global issues, it realizes that the world's life – support systems are being overstressed and could break down because of carbon dioxide loads, CFCs, deforestation, desertification, toxic wastes, pollution, and other environmental stresses. Global environmental problems have started to hurt the average citizen. But the problems are not yet perceived to be compelling enough to force adequate international cooperation" (Goodland, 1990; 153).

Realizing the impact of the greenhouse gas emissions, the world community met at Kyoto

city in Japan in 1997 to devise ways to minimize the emissions of the greenhouse gases and to give an equal share among the north and the south in their development agenda. This was followed by the Kyoto Protocol that stated a specified level of cut in emissions by the year 2012 by the developed countries only. However, the United States has not ratified it due to the opposition to the protocol in the Senate. With the withdrawal of the US, the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions may not be significant. By February 2005, when it went into effect, 141 countries, accounting for 55 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, had ratified the protocol. "The world in general needs environmental policies on how to manage the global commons prudently and sustainably. The Montreal Protocol (September, 1987) to reduce some cholorofluorocarbon gases (CFCs) by only 30 to 50 per cent by 1999, is an example of what can be done" (Goodland, 1990; 152). It can be expected that just as the Montreal Protocol of 1987 to reduce the CFCs was a success, greenhouse gas emissions may also be reduced to save mankind.

A consequent of global warming is climate change that will have adverse impact upon mankind. India is also to experience these adverse effects of climate change along with other countries. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has predicted that with climate change, monsoon precipitation patterns will shift and extreme rainfall events will become more frequent (IPCC, 2001). The IPCC has also warned of melting of the Himalayan glaciers and its complete disappearance by 2035, if the current rate of global warming is not receded. Apart from these, climate change will also seriously hamper agricultural output, rural livelihood options, health hazards, etc. Climate change certainly leads to catastrophic events and severely hampers human activity and occupations. "This has happened, for example, in sub-Saharan Africa, with changing environmental and climatic conditions. Erstwhile productive workers may, then be without work or earnings….." (Sen, 2000: 167). Climate change has now assumed much higher proportions threatening the people with dire consequences. Civilizations' came into existence due to favorable climatic conditions, and in the event of unfavorable climatic conditions, the same civilizations' may be completely wiped out. Every effort should be adopted to halt the process of climate change and to save the people.

The IPCC (2007) stated that, "Human beings are exposed to climate change through changing weather patterns (for example, more intense and frequent extreme events) and indirectly through changes in water, air, food quality and quantity, ecosystems, agriculture, and economy. At this early stage the effects are small but are projected to progressively increase in all countries and regions". It is not that climate change has no positive effect, and one such is the decrease in death rate due to cold conditions. However, the negative impacts far out-weigh the positive impacts. It can also increase the risk of vector borne diseases carried by mosquitoes, like malaria, dengue fever, encephalitis, and yellow fever. Also, algal blooms could occur more frequently as temperatures warm particularly in areas with polluted waters, in which case diseases (such as cholera) that tend to accompany algal blooms could become more frequent. The IPCC has noted that the global population at risk from vector-borne malaria will increase by between 220 million and 400 million in the next century. While most of the increase is predicted to occur in Africa, some increased risk is projected in Britain, Australia, India and Portugal (IPCC, 2007). World Health Organization estimated, in its *World Health Report 2002*, that climate change was estimated to be responsible in 2000 for approximately 2.4 % of worldwide diarrhoea, and 6 % of malaria in some middle-income

countries. Environmental pollution is leading to serious concerns in public health in India. People are falling prey to the pollutants in the water and air. Not only is urban India suffering from it, but rural India is also not spared from its ill-effects. "Recent reports show that people in different parts of India are raising serious concerns about a series of health issues due to air, water and industrial pollution. Climate change is expected to exacerbate these already serious public health problems" (Ramesh, 2010; 15).

Climate change may also be responsible for increasing the concentration of ground-level ozone, that can damage lung tissue, and particularly harmful to persons suffering from asthma and other chronic lung diseases. Sunlight and high temperatures, combined with other pollutants such as nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds, can cause ground-level ozone to increase.

The international community met at Cancun, Mexico, in the late 2010 to reach at a decision to reduce the GHGs so as to halt the climate change phenomenon. However, the Cancun meet reached only with modest agreements and not a conclusive one required bringing concrete measures to cease global warming. "But it laid the groundwork for stronger measures in the future, if nations are able to overcome the emotional arguments that have crippled climate change negotiations in recent years. The package, known as the Cancun Agreements, gives the more than 190 countries participating in the conference another year to decide whether to extend the frayed Kyoto Protocol, the 1997 agreement that requires most wealthy nations to trim their emissions while providing assistance to developing countries to pursue a cleaner energy future. At the heart of the international debate is a momentous tussle between rich and poor countries over who steps up first and who pays most for changed energy menus" (www.nytimes.com). Earlier at a meeting prior to the Cancun meet, Jairam Ramesh had said that, "Equity is the key to the climate change negotiations. In the context of the 2 deg C global goal, the issue of equitable access becomes even more important. The phrase equitable access is not the right to pollute, but the right to sustainable development" (www.moef.nic.in). Averting climate change is no longer a possibility, but its effects can be far better managed and predicted and its costs more equitably borne. The best protection against global warming remains the spread of the most sustainable technologies – in irrigation and agriculture and flood defence – and the more equal distribution of the kinds of resources – education as well as finance – that will allow those most vulnerable to its effects to survive (www.guardian.co.uk).

India, being a developing economy, is adopting a 'wait & watch' policy with regard to climate change. It is waiting for the response of the developed countries. India has long argued for a per capita based allocation framework as the most equitable approach for thinking about greenhouse gas reduction commitments, given the variation in the national attributes of responsibility and capability (Pew Center, 2008). Economic growth that propelled India into the ranks of the world's major economies coincided with soaring emissions (King, 2009; 44). India's emissions increased 65 percent between 1990 and 2005 and are projected to grow another 70 percent by 2020 (Pew Center, 2008). Jairam Ramesh, the Indian Environment Minister, at the Asian Development Bank Conference in November 2010 said, "Although we are a very small emitter in per capita terms, we are today the world's fourth largest emitter in absolute terms. China is at number 1, with 23 % of world greenhouse gas emissions, the United States giving the Chinese a run for their money at 22 %, the EU would be about 13 % and India and Russia are roughly almost on par at about 5 %". If a per

capita approach is accepted by the international community then all the developing countries would benefit in continuing their development agenda with a lesser degree of restriction. In 2008, the government of India notified the National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC). It focuses on eight areas intended to deliver maximal benefits to development and climate change (mitigation and adaptation). However, detailed action plans for each mission, and any clear targets were not specified in the report. The Climate Change Division of Ministry of Environment & Forests (MoEF) is India's nodal agency for climate change cooperation and global negotiations. It is also the nodal unit for coordinating the National Action Plan on Climate Change.

The government of India has enacted the Environment Protection Act, 1986, to safeguard and protect the environment. In January, 1997, the National Environment Appellate Authority was established by virtue of an Act passed in the Parliament. The purpose of this authority is to "to hear appeals with respect to restriction of areas in which any industries, operations or processes or class of industries shall not be carried out or shall be carried out subject to certain safeguards under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto". However, the authority was not sufficient to deal with the environmental cases brought before it. In February 2009, the Delhi High Court came down heavily against the union MoEF for its failure to implement the National Environment Appellate Authority (NEAA) Act (Rosencranz *et al*, 2009; 10). Rosencranz *et al* (2009) have made a detail analysis of the futility of the NEAA on various grounds, and conclude that "the future of NEAA looks bleak with the central government now apparently determined to abolish it". In 2010, the Indian Parliament passed the National Green Tribunal Act (NGT), which has brought in a series of specialized environmental tribunals to safeguard and protect the environment. Initially, the NGT is proposed to be set up at five places of sittings and will follow circuit procedure for making itself more accessible. New Delhi is the principal place of sitting of the Tribunal and Bhopal, Pune, Kolkata and Chennai shall be the other 4 place of sitting of the Tribunal. The central government is "now finalizing the establishment of a National Environmental Protection Authority (NEPA) that will be a permanent professional body to appraise projects and monitor compliance" (Ramesh, 2010; 16).

The Indian environment minister at the Cancun Meet in December 2010 said that India is progressing to check the vulnerabilities arising due to climate change. Among the actions taken in this regard were, (a) First, reducing the emissions intensity of India's GDP by 20-25 % by the year 2020 on a 2005 reference level, (b) Second, taking firm steps to diversify our energy fuel-mix, (c) Third, pursuing aggressive strategies on forestry and coastal management, (d) Fourth, setting up an elaborate Indian Network for Comprehensive Climate Change Assessment–an Indian IPCC as it were, & (e) Fifth, actively engaging in partnerships with our neighbors and other countries to deal with climate change. He assured the global gathering that India will not only be amongst the fastest growing economies in the world as measured by GDP–Gross Domestic Product–but will also be amongst the most responsible in ensuring a high rate of growth of the *real* GDP–*Green* Domestic Product. This reflects the commitment of India towards a global problem that is created by the human community. The core problems with environmental governance in India are several and are all embedded in the larger debate on environment, local livelihoods and development (Lele *et al*, 2010; 13).

Environment must be perceived for what it is-a global security issue, paramount for all nations, and a common phenomenon. It is a matter

of the global commons and is not restricted to any group or conglomeration of nations. Every national government must act in a sensitive manner to deliver to the community what they require the most for their survival in the face of new challenges threatening their existence. We are all aware of sustainable development, but in practice we are adopting destructible development. Development is in no way antagonistic to life and livelihood, but it supplements it. Every individual has a right to development, but this right should not be implemented without their consent and concern. The people should give their consent and simultaneously the governments should be concerned about the welfare of the people. This can certainly lead to development in the real sense and will be welcome by the common people. Shamelessly, in the name of "development", the central and state governments looked the other way, at times, even conniving in this whole "profits over people" approach (EPW, 2010; 7). 'Environmentalism of the poor' or 'livelihood environmentalism' should be the approach to any development programme at the national level. Environment contributes to the fuller development of the individual with its positive effect on agriculture, health and well-being, poverty eradication, etc.

References

1. Chamberlain, Gethin. (2009), "Vedanta versus the villagers: the fight for the sacred mountain", www.guardian.co.uk, 12 October 2009, accessed on 24.05.2010.

2. Economic & Political Weekly (EPW) (Editorial) (2010), "Reversing a Trend", Vol. XLV, No. 44.

3. Goodland, R. J. A. (1990), "Environment and development: progress of the World Bank", The Geographical Journal, Vol. 156, No. 2, July 1990, pp. 149-157.

4. IPCC (2001), "Impacts, Adaptation & Vulnerability", Third Assessment Report.

5. IPCC, 2007: Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Parry, Martin L., Canziani, Osvaldo F., Palutikof, Jean P., van der Linden, Paul J., and Hanson, Clair E. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

6. Johnston, Barbara Rose. (1995), "Human Rights & the Environment", Human Ecology, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 111-23.

7. King, Samantha. (2009), "The US & India: Making Progress Together", Indian Economic Review, Vol. VI, December.

8. Lele, Sharachchandra, Dubash. Navroz K, & Dixit. Shantanu, (2010), "A Structure for Environment Governance", Economic & Political Weekly, Vol. XLV, No. 6, 9.

10. Najam, Adil. (1996), "A developing countries perspective on population, environment & development", Population Research & Policy Review, Vol. 15, February.

11. Pew Center on Global Climate Change, (2008), "Climate Change Mitigation Efforts in India", September.

12. Ramesh, Jairam. (2010), "The Two Cultures Revisited", Economic & Political Weekly, Vol. XLV, No. 42.

13. Rosencranz, A. Sahu, Geetanjoy. & Raghuvanshi, Vyom. (2009), "Whither the National Environment Appellate Authority", Economic & Political Weekly, Vol. XLIV, No. 35.

14. Sanwal, Mukul. (2008), "Sustainable Development Perspective of Climate Change", Economic & Political Weekly, April, 1215.

16. Sen, Amartya. (2000), Development as Freedom, OUP, New Delhi17.

18. Stiglitz, Joseph, E. (2007), Making Globalization Work, Penguin Books, London.

19. Wisner, B. (1993), "Disaster vulnerability: Scale, power and daily life", Geojoumal Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 127-140.

20. World Health Report 2002: Reducing risks, promoting healthy life, WHO, Geneva, 2002.

21. http://www.boston.com/news/local/new_hampshire/articles/2011/06/04/romney_reaffirms_stance_that_global_warming_is_real/, accessed on 05.06.2011.

22. http://www.cseindia.org/content/niyamgiri-vedantas-battleground-bauxite,accessed on 28.5.2011.

23. http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/effects/health.html, accessed on 04.06.2011.

24. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/jun/05/observer-leader-extreme-weather-poor, accessed on 05.06.2011.

25. http://www.moef.nic.in, accessed on 06.06.2011.

26. http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/globalwarming/index.html#, accessed on 05.06.2011.

Экологические проблемы, изменение климата и экономическое развитие

Манасвини Прадхан[а], Сатья Пракаш Даш[б]

[а]Отделение информационных технологий и коммуникации
Университет Факир Мохан
Индия, 756019, Баласор
[б]Отделение политологии,
Самбалпурский университет
Индия, 768019, Самбалпур, Бурла,

Экономическое развитие и окружающая среда являются двумя наиболее обсуждаемыми темами в сегодняшнем глобальном контексте. Они стали несовместимы, что приводит к спорам, проблемам и противоречиям. В статье представлен план действий, предпринятых для сохранения окружающей среды и решения споров между севером и югом. Анализируется угроза глобальной экологической безопасности в контексте глобализации. В статье рассматривается ситуация с добычей полезных ископаемых у подножия гор Ньямгири в штате Орисса и ее значение в контексте «охраны окружающей среды для бедных». Также представлены некоторые важные глобальные встречи, их результаты и актуальность. Приведен анализ мер, принятых правительством Индии в своем стремлении решать проблемы глобального потепления и изменения климата.

Ключевые слова: изменение климата, окружающая среда, развитие.