Title of Paper:

Environmental Security, Climate Governance, and Peace: An Indian Perspective on Conflict in the Twenty-First Century

---

Submitted to:

India Think Council (ITC), Cultural Economy Conclave (CEC26)

Submitted by:

Aadya Chakravorty

Heritage International Xperiential School, Gurugram - Grade 12B

Research Intern

Theme / Subject Line:

Climate Credit and Environmental Concerns During Conflict and Analysis of Global Peace Indexation

Type of Submission:

Abstract Paper (Research Internship Requirement)

Date of Submission:

30th June 2026

Abstract

Contemporary conflicts lead to complex consequences that are far beyond immediate military and political outcomes and disrupt environmental systems, economic stability, human wellbeing, and long-term development pathways. In an era of deep global interdependence, conflict-driven environmental shocks reverberate through international energy markets, maritime trade networks, food production systems, and multilateral climate governance architecture, affecting sovereign states well beyond the active theatres of violence. This paper examines the critical intersection of environmental security, conflict, and peace through an India-centric analytical lens. It evaluates how environmental degradation stemming from far-off geopolitical friction points influences India's core domestic development priorities, energy import vulnerabilities, national decarbonization pathways, and strategic resilience.

Drawing upon foundational paradigms in Global Politics and Economics, this study scrutinizes the systemic ecological collateral associated with contemporary crises, specifically the Russia-Ukraine conflict and the humanitarian crisis in Gaza along with high-level maritime disruptions within crucial shipping chokepoints like the Strait of Hormuz and the Red Sea corridor. The analysis assesses how these combined external stressors work with India's domestic climate governance architectures, market-based carbon credit mechanisms, and overarching resource security frameworks. The analysis shows that the environmental spillover of modern warfare isn't localised but instead shapes international macro-economic stability, supply chain predictable pathways, and multilateral climate compliance. For India, these cross-border disruptions pose severe challenges as the states try to navigate the trilemma of rapid industrial expansion, comprehensive energy transition, and long-term environmental sustainability. Which is why the study also evaluates the conceptual limitations of the Global Peace Index (GPI), demonstrating its structural shortfall in properly representing the slow-moving environmental vulnerabilities that dictate structural peace and human security in the twenty-first century. The paper hence concludes by presenting an architecture for security indexation by arguing that sustainable peace needs the structural integration of environmental resilience alongside traditional matrices of military and institutional stability.

Introduction

Conventional paradigms of international security have historically defined peace through the absence of armed conflict and the maintenance of Westphalian political equilibrium between sovereign entities.[1] However, the operational realities of the contemporary international system show that genuine stability can't just be evaluated through a military or diplomatic lens. Transnational economic shocks, systemic environmental degradation, structural resource scarcity, and acute climate vulnerabilities heavily shape the stability and institutional resilience of modern

societies.[3] [34] This systemic shift has lead to an analytical evolution towards more holistic models of human security by recognizing that environmental, economic, and societal risks operate in a closed feedback loop that fundamentally defines the parameters of sustainable development and global peace.[1] [3]

The structural relationship between conflict architectures and environmental safety is extremely significant in recent times as modern warfare mechanisms have created environmental damage that outlasts active geopolitical hostilities which is what causes systemic ecosystem destruction, widespread contamination of critical freshwater reserves, structural disruption of agrarian output, and the physical annihilation of essential civic infrastructure.[7] [8] [10] These compounding ecological shocks grow beyond the local conflict geography within a highly integrated global economy, cross-border environmental shocks directly reshape global energy market liquidity, international food trade networks, maritime logistics efficiency, and macro-developmental trajectories in regions physically separated from the primary zone of combat.[7] [9]

For the Republic of India, these structural vulnerabilities impose growing strategic challenges. Operating as one of the world's leading macro-economies while simultaneously implementing aggressive domestic climate mitigation and developmental milestones, India remains profoundly exposed to shifts in global energy volatility, maritime transit security, and international climate governance frameworks.[17] [18] [19] Simultaneously, India's explicit commitment to sustainable development mandates unhindered operational progress across carbon reduction pathways, clean energy transition targets, and domestic ecological adaptation.[26] As a consequence, conflict-driven environmental shocks occurring well outside India's sovereign domain possess the distinct capacity to undermine domestic price stability, national energy supply chains, and overarching developmental roadmaps.

These systemic threats raise vital questions regarding the analytical adequacy of contemporary peace indexation simply because most established evaluation frameworks like the Global Peace Index, offer quantitative assessments of physical violence, state militarization, and standard societal safety metrics, detailing valuable cross-national stability indicators.[5] [6] Nonetheless, as environmental parameters become structurally embedded within macroeconomic resilience and national capability, there are still doubts as to whether conventional peace indices accurately show the slow-moving environmental vulnerabilities that erode structural stability, even during periods devoid of direct military engagement.[5]

This paper hence contends that the environmental spillovers of contemporary cross-border conflicts undermine India’s national energy security, climate compliance architectures, domestic development mandates, and human security variables. While these ecological vulnerabilities work as core determinants of contemporary state stability, they're structurally underrepresented within

standard international metrics like the Global Peace Index. So by evaluating conflict-driven environmental stress points, institutional climate governance bottlenecks, India's changing strategic resource map, and the architectural limitations of contemporary peace indexation, this study shows that security evaluation in the twenty-first century must utilize an expanded matrix that integrates environmental security as a core pillar of international stability.

Environmental Consequences of Conflict: Why India Cannot Remain Isolated

Throughout modern strategic history, the ecological fallout of armed conflict was typically given a secondary status because of being overshadowed by the immediate humanitarian, fiscal, and tactical computations of active warfare. However, the modern conflict landscapes show that environmental destruction isn't a peripheral consequence of military engagement but rather, it acts as a structural crisis that alters long-term development trajectories, public health baselines, post-conflict economic restructuring, and regional institutional equilibrium.[7] [8] Right now, contemporary state capabilities are environmentally grounded and economically integrated so the environmental consequences of warfare work beyond the local operational zones, hence triggering negative shocks within non-belligerent and geographically insulated states.[9]

Recent structural crises are clear empirical evidence of the persistence and geographic reach of conflict-driven ecological shocks. For example, in the Ukrainian theatre, systemic military strikes targeting heavy industrial clusters, centralized energy grids, agricultural land reserves, and hydrologic infrastructure have lead to deep environmental damage requiring decades of remediation.[11] The destruction of the Kakhovka Dam in 2023 is a stark baseline example of conflict rapidly expanding into a structural ecological emergency because the breach led to immediate flooding across major population nodes, highly productive agricultural belts, and unique freshwater biomes, permanently compromising vital water distribution systems relied upon for regional civic and industrial output.[11] [1]$_2$ Apart from the immediate humanitarian catastrophe, this disruption exposed the severe vulnerability of critical environmental infrastructure during modern high-intensity campaigns, proving that its physical destruction led to a cascading negative externalities far beyond active combat frontiers.[13]

The Gaza Strip's humanitarian crisis has a similar pattern as alongside severe civilian casualties, international monitoring agencies highlight the structural decimation of water processing networks, centralized wastewater treatment centers, essential healthcare facilities, and foundational environmental management structures.[14] [15] The collapse of municipal sanitation and restricted access to potable water has triggered widespread public health crises, emphasizing the direct alignment connecting baseline environmental infrastructure and civilian security during prolonged hostilities.[16] In these environments, ecological degradation can't be separated from societal survival

as structural damage to natural and civic environmental frameworks immediately affects public health trends, localized living standards, and the macro-prospects for long-term regional reconstruction.[10]

These conditions show a fundamental change in the nature of twenty-first-century security because environmental spillovers work well beyond local containment as physical degradation of agricultural topsoils, water tables, energy storage, and transport choke points directly destabilizes international agricultural commodity pricing, global freight parameters, foreign direct investment flow calculations, and cross-border supply chain integrity.[7] [9] Environmental security works in direct symmetry with macroeconomic stability and human survival, generating systemic externalities that affect non-aligned nations independent of their direct diplomatic or military positioning.[10]

For a major developing state like India, this structural integration carries serious policy implications. While India maintains non-belligerent status across these active conflicts, external environmental shocks heavily change and hence affect global market regularities, resource accessibility matrices, and international developmental finance priorities. This is why tracking the environmental dimensions of modern warfare is necessary not only to evaluate localized post-war remediation but also to safeguard domestic economic stability against systemic shocks in an era defined by deep geopolitical and ecological vulnerability.

Energy Security, Environmental Stability and India's Development Goals

Energy markets work as the primary transmission vector through which cross-border conflict impacts non-aligned developing states. So, within a globalized economic paradigm, the localized disruptions affecting critical energy-producing centers, international maritime corridors, and transport bottlenecks create immediate supply shocks well beyond the states directly involved in the conflict.[20] For India, where industrial capacity expansion, structural urbanization, and infrastructure development depend on a predictable, uninterrupted volume of energy inflows, geopolitical volatility inside vital transit channels presents a direct threat to domestic macroeconomic planning.[17] [19]

This exposure is highly evident within the Strait of Hormuz which is a primary chokepoint for international seaborne crude oil logistics.[20] Because a vital share of global petroleum trade navigates this narrow maritime passage, localized regional hostilities trigger immediate price spikes, supply line re-allocations, and heightened anxiety across international energy trading desks.[20] While global energy trading desks have historically shown short-term adaptation to localized shocks, repeating structural instability across these concentrated channels exposes the systemic vulnerability of depending heavily on centralized maritime transit passages.

For the Indian economy, these external shocks carry immediate domestic consequences. As a premier global consumer and structural importer of petroleum products, any escalation in the international crude baseline impacts domestic transportation costs, raises industrial manufacturing input prices, complicates fiscal inflation management, and challenges public expenditure calculations.[17] [19] These imported energy price hikes quickly radiate outward from fuel market by increasing baseline logistics expenses, domestic agricultural production inputs, manufacturing margins, and aggregate household expenditure. Thus, geopolitical friction in geographically distant sectors creates real negative impacts on domestic welfare and state investment allocations inside India.

Furthermore, contemporary disruptions across international shipping corridors show the convergence of energy security and environmental damage. Escalating kinetic strikes on commercial cargo lines within the Red Sea basin have forced global shipping networks to divert vessels away from the Suez route by rerouting traffic around the Cape of Good Hope, which expands total voyage lengths, aggregate fuel burn, maritime insurance premiums, and total operational costs.[21] [2]$_2$ While these disruptions are analyzed primarily through a fiscal or logistical framework, they carry heavy environmental dimensions because using the longer transit corridors significantly expands gross carbon emissions and intensifies global resource consumption across international logistics streams.[21] [2]$_2$ The relationship connecting conflict architectures and environmental sustainability hence moves beyond direct localized ecosystem damage by introducing substantial indirect carbon costs via the structural destabilization of international transport networks.

Simultaneously, India's sovereign development targets need a precise alignment of short-term energy stability with long-term climate compliance because the state continues to target high GDP growth milestones while trying to scale up renewable generation capacity and lower the aggregate carbon intensity of its industrial profile.[19] Meeting these domestic goals depends heavily on external energy market stability which directly shapes private investment predictability, domestic energy affordability metrics, and state-level infrastructure planning.[19] Geopolitical conflict affecting international energy grids can disrupt near-term financial projections and challenge the broader implementation of sustainable long-term development roadmaps.

From a global political perspective, these dynamics show the structural intersection binding environmental safety, economic resilience, and state security so energy distribution infrastructures work as strategic levers whose operational stability directly conditions domestic industrial capacity and international leverage. For India, achieving long-term environmental sustainability needs more than localized conservation guidelines and demands structural insulation against macro-external shocks generated by conflict, systemic great-power competition, and physical instability across critical energy transport networks.[18] [19]

Climate Governance, Climate Credits and India's Green Transition

The execution of global climate change mitigation depends on stable international institutional alignment, sustained multi-decade investment streams, and coordinated multilateral policy frameworks. But current geopolitical crises confirm that environmental governance systems don’t work inside a political vacuum because as sovereign states confront existential security challenges, localized economic recessions, and heightened strategic friction, long-term environmental targets must compete against immediate national survival priorities. Armed conflict disrupts environmental outcomes through direct landscape damage and by undermining the institutional structures, climate finance mechanisms, and global policy agreements required for long-term mitigation.[25]

This institutional friction can be seen within international carbon markets and climate finance frameworks. Here, carbon credit networks serve as a primary architecture through which sovereign actors and corporate entities incentivize carbon reductions while channeling capital toward sustainable development infrastructure.[24] These market mechanisms are designed to create clear economic rewards for emission drawdowns and help steer industrializing states toward low-carbon trajectories.[24] The operational efficacy of these instruments relies on stable cross-border regulatory standards, deep investor certainty, robust multilateral consensus, and predictable macroeconomic environments.[24]

Geopolitical instability challenges these measures as structural warfare, escalating trade controls, international sanctions regimes, and macro-economic volatility frequently divert state resources away from long-term sustainability initiatives toward immediate defense and energy requirements.[25] This shift shows historical structural disagreements between advanced economies and developing nations regarding historical emissions liability, climate financing transfers, green technology sharing, and the equitable distribution of transition costs. These disputes confirm that geopolitical polarization directly shapes international environmental governance, even when facing shared global ecological threats.[25]

For India, these structural challenges carry serious significance because domestic poverty alleviation and decarbonization goals need to be pursued at the same time. India’s developmental agenda needs sustained industrial growth, expanding base-load energy access, extensive manufacturing modernization, and massive infrastructure creation, while its climate targets demand capital allocation for renewable grids, carbon reduction, and clean tech deployment.[26] Balancing these goals clearly needs access to international finance, clean technology transfers, and reliable global cooperation to execute a large-scale green transition without slowing down industrial development.

In response to international financing volatility, India has focused on building domestic climate governance mechanisms. The Carbon Credit Trading Scheme (CCTS) by the Government of India shows an institutional push to generate domestic, market-based pricing signals for industrial emissions while supporting national sustainability milestones.[2][3] By establishing internal market incentives, the state seeks to build institutional capacity that aligns environmental mandates with industrial expansion by reducing vulnerability to external climate finance fluctuations.[26]

Furthermore, the long-term viability of climate governance can't just be assessed only through localized environmental indices because transition policies directly impact private capital deployment, industrial cost structures, domestic job creation, and overall state economic resilience.[24] External conflict shocks and geopolitical fragmentation can stop climate action by distorting the broader economic conditions necessary for policy implementation. Which is why environmental governance simultaneously acts as an ecological target and a core strategic policy challenge. From an Indian perspective, climate management and state security have become deeply linked so executing the state's green transition needs domestic policy clarity as well as stable international financial architectures and resilient global partnerships to withstand the political disruptions reshaping the international system.[2][3] [25] [26]

Human Security, Development and Environmental Vulnerability

While macroanalyses of environmental security prioritize state interactions, institutional compliance, and international treaties, the ultimate consequences of environmental damage are borne by individual citizens and communities. So, conflict-driven ecological degradation directly undermines food sovereignty, compromises regional public health safety, limits agrarian livelihoods, and reduces overall human security.[3] Long-term social stability relies on the negative absence of military operations as well as on protecting the underlying economic and ecological conditions that sustain daily human life.[1] [3]

The main way through which environmental instability erodes human security is the destabilization of food systems because agricultural output remains dependent on stable regional microclimates, dependable water access, and open transit logistics. When cross-border conflicts target rural environmental infrastructure, contaminate regional water tables, or block vital maritime routes, food production and global distribution channels suffer.[27] Inside an interconnected global food system, these localized disruptions cause international food commodity price spikes, export restrictions, and heightened vulnerability for populations already experiencing structural poverty. These inflationary shocks hit lower-income households hardest, as they allocate a high share of disposable income to basic nutrition and have minimal financial buffers to absorb sudden price increases.[28]

Likewise, environmental degradation introduces severe public health challenges because the targeting of municipal water distribution networks, regional sewage processing hubs, and environmental management facilities exposes populations to waterborne pathogens, restricts access to clean drinking water, and weakens community health baseline standards which is what's seen happening in Gaza.[3] Beyond immediate epidemiological crises, long-term environmental degradation causes population displacement, structural loss of agrarian livelihoods, and diminished access to basic resources, creating developmental challenges that outlast active warfare.[29] Ecological disruption directly destabilizes the social foundations required to maintain civic cohesion and economic progress.

For India, these vulnerabilities need careful policy attention given the scale and complex distribution of its domestic development challenges so despite substantial progress in poverty reduction, industrialization, and infrastructure building, large demographic segments remain exposed to external environmental and economic shocks.[28] Transnational climate stress, regional resource constraints, and global energy price volatility directly impact rural communities, informal workers, and economically vulnerable households. External environmental shocks can alter domestic poverty alleviation trends by distorting international trade networks and resource availability matrices.[27]

This systemic intersection linking environmental stress and human development is evident in climate vulnerability contexts. Rising ambient temperatures, shifting monsoon predictability, and intense resource extraction challenge agricultural margins and water safety globally.[29] While these trends stem from long-term industrialization, geopolitical conflicts amplify them by stalling international climate consensus, diverting adaptation budgets, and delaying necessary resilience investments for vulnerable regions. Conflict and environmental stress can create a damaging cycle that complicates both local development and broader peacebuilding initiatives.[10] This leads to assessing societal stability and requires looking beyond standard indicators of state militarization or political violence. A state can be free from direct armed invasion while facing severe ecological and resource constraints that threaten its long-term social fabric. This is why the Twenty-first-century security analysis must explicitly track the human impacts of environmental shocks and evaluate a society's underlying adaptive capacity to withstand compounding external stresses.[13] [29]

Rethinking Peace: Environmental Security and the Limits of Global Peace Indexation

The Global Peace Index works as a premier international framework for assessing and ranking state stability by evaluating quantitative matrices across societal safety, ongoing domestic or international conflict, and militarization, the index provides useful comparative insights into global

state stability.[5] Its methodology has enhanced international policy discourse by confirming the positive correlations linking structural peace with macroeconomic performance, governance quality, and human development indices.[6] Nonetheless, the changing nature of twenty-first-century security threats raises critical doubts regarding whether conventional metrics accurately capture the slow-moving environmental vulnerabilities that shape long-term institutional stability.

Conflict-driven environmental degradation impacts state energy security, macroeconomic resilience, food systems, and public health far beyond active conflict zones. Yet, these systemic disruptions remain only indirectly accounted for within conventional indexation models.[5] A sovereign state can maintain low internal violence and report favorable scores on traditional security indices while simultaneously facing deep environmental pressures capable of inducing industrial stagnation, resource shortages, developmental delays, and social unrest. Traditional metrics focused primarily on military variables risk overlooking these non-kinetic disruptors of institutional peace.[6]

From an Indian strategic perspective, this measurement limitation is highly relevant because India's long-term internal stability is linked to physical border security as well as to systemic monsoon predictability, long-term energy import stability, regional water management, and sustainable industrial development.[30] Transnational environmental shocks can strain public resources, impact vulnerable demographics, and disrupt long-term infrastructure planning even during periods of geopolitical non-engagement.[31] Evaluating national stability through only traditional military metrics may leave a state unprepared for emerging ecological threats that shape domestic welfare and sovereign decision-making.[31]

This assessment doesn't reduce the utility of existing peace indices as the Global Peace Index remains highly valuable for tracking physical conflict patterns and institutional militarization trends.[5] Rather, the compounding nature of contemporary environmental, fiscal, and tactical threats suggests that global security analysis needs to broaden the matrix. Environmental resilience, institutional adaptive capacity, resource security, and climate preparedness are key variables in a state's ability to handle external crises.[3]$_2$ Incorporating these environmental baselines into international peace metrics is necessary for both academic analysis and realistic policy planning.

Furthermore, environmental insecurity often develops gradually by making its structural impacts less immediately visible than conventional kinetic warfare. Soil degradation, ground-water depletion, climate-induced migration, and ecological stress accumulate over decades before manifesting as open industrial disruption, resource disputes, or governance challenges.[31] Because these slow-moving vulnerabilities operate below the tracking thresholds of traditional military metrics, they can be underestimated until the resulting damage becomes costly to fix. Expanding contemporary indexation frameworks leads to a practical path forward as the structural framework of environmental security addresses this gap by recognizing that ecological balance, sustainable

resource distribution, and climate adaptation are necessary for lasting peace and human development.[30] Environmental resilience should be treated as a core component of sustainable stability in an interconnected world.[32]

Conclusion

The strategic relationship connecting conflict architectures, environmental degradation, and sustainable peace is rather complex because while traditional security analysis has historically emphasized military capabilities, kinetic operations, and great-power border competition, modern conflicts show that the structural spillovers of warfare extend far beyond active battlefields. Conflict-driven ecological damage degrades long-term ecosystems, impacts public health, compromises food and water security, disrupts international energy markets, and slows down structural development. Consequently, environmental security has become a vital variable in contemporary international relations and sustainable peacebuilding.[7] [9]

This study has clearly shown that cross-border environmental shocks have a growing impact on India's domestic stability despite the state's non-belligerent positioning across distant conflicts. Environmental crises in one region can disrupt energy import pricing, international maritime trade routes, global logistics lines, and national economic planning. The systemic fallout from conflicts in Ukraine and Gaza, alongside disruptions within vital shipping passages like the Strait of Hormuz and the Red Sea, shows how environmental externalities can impact non-aligned developing states.[11] [14] [20] [22] For India, managing these vulnerabilities is necessary because the state must balance industrial growth, energy import stability, climate resilience, and sustainable development. Maintaining this equilibrium requires clear domestic execution as well as a predictable international environment that supports global trade, capital access, and climate cooperation. Transnational ecological shocks create challenges that can disrupt broader developmental and strategic goals.[18] [19] [26]

The analysis also clearly shows the integration of climate governance and environmental resilience into national security planning. Amid intensifying geopolitical competition and environmental resource constraints, climate compliance can’t be treated as a peripheral environmental mandate focused only on emissions targets. It interacts directly instead, with industrial competitiveness, resource management, clean tech leadership, and long-term societal stability. For India, scaling up domestic climate resilience and advancing the green transition function as key priorities for both environmental sustainability and long-term strategic security.[23] [24] [26]

At the human level, the impacts of environmental stress are centered on livelihood stability, food safety, and public health baselines. Ecological shocks can worsen existing structural inequalities,

impacting communities with limited financial assets to absorb external disruptions and this reinforces the principle that comprehensive peace involves more than the absence of military conflict and needsthe presence of stable ecological and economic conditions that allow citizens to live with security and dignity.[13] [27] [29] Finally, this paper suggests that contemporary frameworks for peace indexation could be expanded to better capture environmental vulnerabilities within global affairs because while tools like the Global Peace Index is essential for tracking kinetic trends and militarization, the growing impact of environmental stress on human development and governance suggests that security concepts must evolve.[5] [6] [30] Modern global realities confirm that peace, economic stability, and environmental sustainability are deeply linked. In an era defined by resource constraints and shifting geopolitical dynamics, lasting peace will rely on preventing physical conflicts as well as on building the environmental resilience required to sustain long-term human development and international cooperation.[16] [3]$_2$

References (MLA 9)

1. Galtung, Johan. “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research.” Journal of Peace Research, vol. 6, no. 3, 1969, pp. 167–191.

2. Waltz, Kenneth N. Theory of International Politics. McGraw-Hill, 1979.

3. United Nations Development Programme. Human Security Framework: Advancing Human Development. UNDP, 2024, hdr.undp.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

4. United Nations. Our Common Agenda. United Nations, 2021, www.un.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

5. Institute for Economics & Peace. Global Peace Index 2025: Measuring Peace in a Complex World. Institute for Economics & Peace, 2025, www.visionofhumanity.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

6. Institute for Economics & Peace. Positive Peace Report 2024. Institute for Economics & Peace, 2024, www.visionofhumanity.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

7. United Nations Environment Programme. The Environmental Impacts of Armed Conflicts. UNEP, 2024, www.unep.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

8. United Nations Environment Programme. Environmental Cooperation for Peacebuilding Programme. UNEP, 2024, www.unep.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

9. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. “Climate Security and Armed Conflict.” SIPRI, 2025, www.sipri.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

10. International Committee of the Red Cross. When Rain Turns to Dust: Understanding and Responding to the Combined Impact of Armed Conflicts and the Climate and Environment Crisis. ICRC, 2020, www.icrc.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

11. United Nations Environment Programme. Ukraine: Environmental Assessment and Recovery Priorities. UNEP, 2024, www.unep.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

12. World Bank. Ukraine Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment. World Bank Group, 2024, www.worldbank.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

13. United Nations Development Programme. The Human Impact of Environmental Damage in Ukraine. UNDP, 2024, www.undp.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

14. United Nations Environment Programme. Environmental Impacts of the Conflict in Gaza. UNEP, 2025, www.unep.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

15. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Humanitarian Situation Update: Gaza Strip. OCHA, 2025, www.unocha.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

16. World Health Organization. Public Health Conditions in Gaza During Conflict. WHO, 2025, www.who.int. Accessed 8 June 2026.

17. Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas. Indian Petroleum and Natural Gas Statistics 2025. Government of India, 2025.

18. NITI Aayog. India Energy Security Scenarios. Government of India, www.niti.gov.in. Accessed 8 June 2026.

19. International Energy Agency. India Energy Outlook 2025. IEA, 2025, www.iea.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

20. International Energy Agency. “The Strait of Hormuz and Global Energy Security.” IEA, www.iea.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

21. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Review of Maritime Transport 2025. United Nations, 2025, unctad.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

22. World Economic Forum. “How Red Sea Shipping Disruptions Are Reshaping Global Trade.” World Economic Forum, 2025, www.weforum.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

23. Government of India. Carbon Credit Trading Scheme, 2023. Ministry of Power, Government of India.

24. World Bank. State and Trends of Carbon Pricing 2025. World Bank Group, 2025, www.worldbank.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

25. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Nationally Determined Contributions Synthesis Report. UNFCCC, 2025, unfccc.int. Accessed 8 June 2026.

26. Government of India, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. India’s Long-Term Low Emission Development Strategy. Government of India, 2022.

27. Food and Agriculture Organization. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2025. FAO, 2025, www.fao.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

28. World Bank. Poverty, Prosperity and Planet Report 2024. World Bank Group, 2024, www.worldbank.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

29. United Nations Development Programme. Human Development Report 2025. UNDP, 2025, hdr.undp.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

30. Observer Research Foundation. “Environmental Security and India’s Strategic Future.” ORF, 2025, www.orfonline.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

31. Observer Research Foundation. “Climate Security and India’s Development Challenges.” ORF, 2024, www.orfonline.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.

32. Centre for Policy Research. “Climate Governance and Sustainable Development in India.” CPR, 2025, www.cprindia.org. Accessed 8 June 2026.