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Abstract: In recent years climate change has been featured much more prominently in scholarly and public discourse. Especially since 2003 and 2007 the focus has shifted towards the security implications of climate change and the necessary measures to deal with climate change. The discourse commonly portrays climate change as a threat that substantially affects national and human security. Using frameworks of the Copenhagen School and Paris School, as well as discourse analysis, this thesis shows that climate change as a security issue is mainly understood in human security terms and seen to exacerbate already existing problems, such as poverty and food insecurity. The social and discursive construction of climate change as a security issue has influenced the policies and practices of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees as well as the United Nations Development Programme, as it has become a central element of their work. It is argued that the Paris School’s climatization framework has more analytical value for the security analysis of climate change than the Copenhagen School’s securitization theory.
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1. Introduction

Climate change refers to the process in which the composition of the global atmosphere alters, leading to a variety of climate-related changes in ecosystems and the biosphere in general. While this alteration is a rather slow natural process, human activities are seen to spur it on considerably by emitting various kinds of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, such as carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide (IPCC 2014). More recently, the debate on climate change and its challenges has gained increasing prominence in political discourse. The portrayal of climate change’s potential impacts often paints a very grim, dystopian or even catastrophic picture of our and our planet’s future. The underlying narrative surrounding climate change includes increased likelihoods of war, food and clean water scarcity, disease, mass dislocation and more (Gemenne et al. 2014). Additionally, the media and movies such as The Day After Tomorrow or An Inconvenient Truth have reinforced our understanding of climate change as a substantial threat to our very existence (Trombetta 2008). In practice, however, there is a considerable lack of convincing empirical evidence to explain causality – not correlation – between climate change and increased insecurity for the political, economic and social sectors (Barnett and Adger 2007). Furthermore, we yet have to understand fully the complexity of this global process.

Despite (or perhaps due to) the contemporary lack of understanding, much of the political and scholarly discourse tends to oversimplify the linkages of climate change and ‘global’ insecurity, often portraying climate change as a direct substantial threat to human and/or national security. While such a rhetoric has provided a much greater deal of attention for climate change per se, it also has contributed to the ‘securitization’ of climate change, which could mean “the issue is primarily addressed via traditional means of security policy” (Brzoska 2009: 137). In that case, finding environmentally sound and sustainable solutions to climate change might fade into the background, whereas traditional security measures gain prominence. Thus, it widely is debated within the scholarly field of ‘environmental security’ whether such an approach is the most appropriate way to deal with climate change, its root causes and its impacts (see Foster 2013).

2. Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to further engage with the uncertainty surrounding the general understanding of climate change and security. First, I aim to provide insight into how climate
change is perceived and portrayed in political discourse, but also how climate change is included in different policy fields as well as in their related practices. Second, I hope to provide more knowledge to the ongoing debate about the extent to which there is ‘securitization’ of climate change or rather so-called ‘climatization’ of policy fields. Third, I seek to explore how the practical approaches correspond to the climate discourse on the international level. Therefore the research questions guiding this thesis are: How is climate change discursively produced as a security issue at the international level? And, how does climate change as a security issue influence the practices of the policy fields of migration as well as development?

Taking a critical security studies approach and using insights from the Copenhagen School’s securitization theory and the Paris School’s framework on climatization, I analyze the discourse and practices regarding climate change employed by different United Nations (UN) bodies, as well as the extent to which an actual ‘securitization’ of climate change is evident. An analysis of discourse and practice allows for an assessment of whether or not an issue, here climate change, within the environmental sector is necessarily understood in terms of traditional security conceptualizations, or alternative security understandings instead.

Lastly, I aim to fill a gap within the broader environmental security literature. A large part of the literature “considers how the effects of climate change need to be accounted for in security policies”; however, the opposite relationship is left mostly unexplored (Gemenne et al. 2014: 6). It is precisely this opposite relationship that I am interested in – meaning the relationship in terms of the effects certain security considerations or discourses have on “the way political institutions respond to climate change” (Gemenne et al. 2014: 6).

2.1 Relevance to International Relations

Although this topic might appear to reside on the margins of International Relations (IR), I argue that it is in fact very much germane to the field of IR and of great importance to international politics. First, this thesis contributes knowledge to one of the central fields of IR, namely security. It also places one of the main international institutions, the UN, at the center of its analysis. This thesis utilizes a critical security and, to some extent, constructivist approach, drawing on well-established critical security theories and also engaging in theory testing of these frameworks. Thus, the thesis contributes knowledge to the field of critical security studies and aims to further develop that approach. The research does so by analyzing the security understanding of climate change and investigating the relationship between rhetoric and practice within the policy fields of migration and development. Not drawing on
one of the conventional theoretical approaches of IR, such as Realism or Liberalism, but instead using a counter theoretical approach such as critical security studies might help to broaden IR’s horizon, which regularly has been called for by various IR scholars (e.g., see Buzan and Little 2000; Held and McGrew 2007).

Moreover, this thesis engages with one of the allegedly top ranking threats to international peace and security of the 21st century – climate change (see Kerry, 2014). As climate change becomes an increasingly relevant topic, it is important to provide a critical understanding of the way climate change is approached and how it is linked to security. Rather than right away accepting that climate change poses an existential threat to all kinds of security, it should be analyzed how climate change and security are linked through discourse and practice. Further, research on climate change, security, and the UN contributes to the fields of security studies and environmental security, which have been part of IR security scholarship for quite a while now (see Barnett 2013; Wæver and Buzan 2013).

2.2 Thesis Outline

The rest of this thesis is structured as follows. In order to provide the reader with an early understanding of how this research approaches climate change and security, the concepts of ‘securitization’ and ‘climatization’ are presented in the next chapter on ‘Understanding Climate Change and Security’. Following this, the relevant body of relevant literature from the field of environmental security and previous research on climate change and security is presented in the ‘Literature Review’ chapter. A discussion of the thesis’ research question and hypothesis follows in the ‘Research Question’ chapter. The ‘Theory’ chapter provides the important theoretical frameworks for this thesis and additionally, engages in a theoretical discussion on which school of thought holds most analytical value in regards to this thesis. Furthermore, ‘Methodology and Method’ shows how discourse analysis is used in this thesis, which materials are used, how the research is conducted, and the delimitations. In the chapter on ‘Analysis’ the actual research on three different United Nations documents is conducted and the research findings are discussed. Finally, the ‘Conclusion’ chapter summarizes the main findings and gives suggestions for further research.

1 US Secretary of State, John Kerry (2014), has argued that climate change is one of the top global threats, equal to threats such as terrorism, epidemics, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.
3. Understanding Climate Change and Security

So why should we care if climate change is being linked to security? The short answer would be: because producing climate change as a security issue has very specific implications for the way(s) with which it is dealt. Yet, to answer this question in greater detail and in order to show what we can make of climate change as a security issue, I shortly introduce the concepts of ‘securitization’ and ‘climatization’. Even though these concepts are discussed mainly in the theory chapter, I would like to familiarize the reader with the concepts already, as they constitute important cornerstones of this thesis.

3.1 Securitization and Climatization

The Copenhagen School and Paris School both represent critical security approaches. Yet, the Paris School has tried to move beyond the Copenhagen School, by not relying on a fixed understanding of security. The Schools respective concepts of securitization and climatization provide the theoretical basis, helping to understand the production/construction of climate change as a security issue.

According to the Copenhagen School, the process of securitization is essentially a negative development, in which an issue is expressed as a security concern that requires extraordinary means. Through securitizing speech acts and securitizing moves, an issue can be constructed discursively as a threat to security. Once an issue is commonly referred to as an existential threat to security, and is accepted as such by a relevant audience, the particular issue can be considered ‘securitized’. An advantage of such securitization is the increased attention paid to the issue, which might include more funds being made available to it (Nyman 2013). However, securitization also is used to justify “exceptional political measures” to deal with the securitized issue, which can involve traditional security/military means (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams 2010: 77). Buzan et al. (1998) consider securitization as an indicator of a failure to address an issue within ‘normal’ politics, and Waever (1995) has called for “less security, more politics!” Nonetheless, as shown above, climate change commonly has been expressed as a substantial threat to national and human security, indicating that a securitization of climate change might be at play.

The Paris School offers another framework, the so called ‘climatization of the security field’, to understand how climate change is produced as a security concern. The Paris School argues that the discursive construction of climate change as a security issue certainly hints that “professionals of (in)security (i.e. intelligence, military, police, defense ministries) are producing climate change as a legitimate threat in their everyday practices” (Oels 2012: 185).
At the same time, however, the security field is being expanded because climate change professionals and their practices, such as risk management or climate modeling, are being included, which transform the security field and its practices (Oels 2012: 185). Since the Paris School relies on a broader understanding of security, the ‘security field’ is more than just the defense sector, and also includes fields such as migration and development. The Paris School contends that evidence of security transformations can so far be found within the policy fields of defense, migration and development. Furthermore, in contrast to the Copenhagen School, the Paris School argues that to understand how climate change is produced as a security issue we need to assess not only the discourse but also the policy implications and practices. Moreover, whether the production of climate change as a security issue should be considered a positive or negative development depends on the employed strategies and policy implications (Oels 2012: 190-191). In doing so, the Paris School adopts a crucially different understanding of the concept of security. Unlike the Copenhagen School, the Paris School understands processes of security as not necessarily negative – it depends on the practices. Consequently, securitization rhetoric is not inextricably linked to extraordinary measures.

4. Literature Review

The literature has identified multiple connections between climate change and security. The general discourse on climate change is very complex and there are evidences for both securitization and climatization. First, a broader overview of existing perspectives within the ‘environmental security’ literature is provided. Second, more in-depth knowledge is provided by looking at previously conducted research relating to the discourse and practices surrounding climate change. Overall, the literature review provides the basis on which to build this research, and simultaneously locates it within the existing body of literature.

4.1 Climate Change and Security – Where Are the Links?

Several links between climate change and security have been established within the environmental security literature. Climate change commonly is seen to threaten national and human security directly or through secondary impacts, e.g., causing resource scarcity. Gemenne, Barnett, Adger and Dabelko (2014: 4) identify four key areas of investigation within the literature on climate change and security: violent conflict, forced (mass) migration, reversed causality, and risks to human security. These ‘themes’ often can be found within the political discourse as well.
First, probably the largest body of research has been done on the connections between climate change and violence. Specifically this type of research considers if and how “climate change may increase the risk of violence” as well as “the potential mechanisms through which climate change may increase that risk” (Gemenne et al. 2014: 4). While some scholars have made strong claims about causal connections between climate change and increased risk of violent conflict (e.g., see Hsiang and Burke 2014), others remain critical to that connection and have found little evidence to explain convincingly the relationship between climate and conflict (see Gleditsch 2012). Thus, instead of portraying climate change as a direct cause of conflict it has often been referred to as a ‘threat multiplier’ instead (Barnett 2013: 198). This body of research is connected closely to the ‘environmental conflict thesis’, by Thomas Homer-Dixon. A commonly featured theme is resource scarcity as a key driver for various conflicts. As natural resources are seen to decrease, civil strife and the likelihood for violent conflict could increase (Floyd 2008; see also Homer-Dixon 1999).

Second, another focus within the ‘climate security’ literature is on forced (mass) migration as a result of a changing climate, but also how climate-induced migration might cause and spread violent conflict. Major decreases in living conditions or loss of territory due to rising sea-levels could trigger mass migration in various regions. Similar to the first body of literature, climate change is considered a substantial threat to the security of states and people. However, some scholars point out that a clear-cut connection between climate change, migration and violent conflict is hard to establish empirically (e.g., see Gemenne et al. 2014: 4).

Third, a lot less attention has been paid to reversed causality where “conflict is a powerful driver of vulnerability to climate change” (Gemenne et al. 2014: 4). While it remains contested to which extent climate change can directly or indirectly cause violent conflict, some scholars are certain that it is violent conflict that renders people more vulnerable and exposed to climate change (see Barnett 2006) This body of literature considers that this reversed causality applies to migration as well, as migration actually is an important mechanism of adaption to climate change (see Tacoli 2009).

Lastly, another main area of investigation has evolved around the risks posed by climate change to human security. The causal connections between climate change and human security increasingly are considered and some studies have concluded that “climate change poses risks to livelihoods, communities, and cultures” (Gemenne et al. 2014: 4; see also Barnett and Adger 2007). Human health and security can be affected directly or indirectly by
various impacts of climate change, such as more intense natural disasters, decreasing natural resources, loss of geographical space etc. A common critique to this human security approach, however, is that it is too all-encompassing and offers little advice on realizable policy-making (Floyd 2008: 57).

Floyd (2008: 58-61) identifies another, yet rather small, discussion within environmental security that focuses on environmental peacemaking or environmental cooperation and explores the possibilities of joint environmental action to foster international cooperation. The idea of environmental peacemaking or environmental cooperation certainly provides a starting point for a counter-discourse to the securitization of climate change and might open up space for a ‘de-securitization’ of the matter (Floyd 2008: 58-61).

4.2 States, Discourse and the Climate-Security Nexus

When it comes to the overall debate on climate change or the environment in general, Gemenne et al. (2014: 2) point out an important factor that hampers a constructive debate on the most critical aspects of a continuously changing climate and environment. This factor is that the debate often has been phrased in an environmentally deterministic way in which environmental issues are portrayed as the driver for various social outcomes, despite a lack of an empirical understanding regarding the links between climate change and security (Gemenne et al. 2014: 2). The remainder of this section is organized to frame the literature in the current academic debate on climate change and security.

Another insightful and important contribution on securitization and policy advice regarding climate change comes from Brzoska (2009). Drawing on insights from the Copenhagen School, he explains that securitization can lead “to all-round ‘exceptionalism’ in dealing with the issue” which promotes, among other things, an increased reliance on security experts, military and police (Brzoska 2009: 138). Additionally, he points to the fact that “while there is no necessary link between higher military expenditure and a lower willingness to spend on preventing and preparing for climate change, both policy areas are in competition for scarce resources” (Brzoska 2009: 138). Thus, the portrayal of climate change and the policies connected to it determine the overall approach of states, i.e., a traditional security approach versus more sustainable approaches. Furthermore, similar to Gemenne et al. (2014), Brzoska (2009: 138) contends that “the acceptance of the security consequences of climate change as an intractable problem could well reduce efforts to find peaceful solutions” to the risks and dangers associated with it.

Nevertheless, it also needs to be pointed out that not all scholars agree with this notion of
‘securitization’. As an example, some argue that with new understandings of security, new logics and actors enter the field which in turn transform traditional security policies, making the Copenhagen School’s notion of ‘securitization’ a matter of the past, mainly relevant to the Cold War (Trombetta 2008: 539; see also Brzoska 2009: 138-139). The Paris School’s idea of the climatization of the security field entails such an understanding. Instead of a mere securitization of climate change, there seems to be a reflexive relationship between the security field and climate change, meaning that certain security strategies are applied to climate change, while climate policies alter security practices (Oels 2012: 185).

Testing the securitization hypothesis, Brzoska (2009) investigates whether the portrayal of climate change as a threat necessarily leads to policy advice that relies on traditional security approaches. In order to do so, he analyses four different studies on the impacts of climate change with broad and narrow understandings of security. Despite focusing on different referent objects of security (state and individual) all four studies regard climate change “as a great, if not the greatest danger for international peace and security in the 21st century” (Brzoska 2009: 139). Yet, Brzoska (2009: 144) finds that only one of the four studies explicitly concluded that greater ‘military preparedness’ is needed as a response to climate change in order to “combat the outbreaks of violence” and other serious effects associated with climate change. The other three studies did not give such recommendations and rather focused on multiple mitigation and adaptation strategies. One of these studies directly suggested making “cuts in military spending to free financial resources for adaptation”, while the other two “warn[ed] against falling back towards the use of traditional security policy” (Brzoska 2009: 144). However, Brzoska also acknowledges that in contrast to these studies, a ‘securitization’ of climate change may very well be at work on the international level, as for example both NATO and the EU have prioritized climate change as a top threat to security.

Similar to Brzoska’s research, Detraz and Betsill (2009) have examined how the connections between climate change and security generally have been understood and whether there have been any major discursive shifts in public discourse. In their study, Detraz and Betsill (2009) conducted a discourse and content analysis of the UN Security Council debate on global climate change in 2007. They found that the debate mostly has been framed in a way that they call ‘environmental security’. Thus, most states expressed their concern about the negative security implications “of environmental degradation for human beings”, representing a human security understanding of climate change (Detraz and Betsill 2009:

---

2 It should be noted that this particular study was conducted by a think tank of the US Navy.

---
Even though 85 percent of the speakers acknowledged a link between climate change and armed conflict, they mainly did so in a broad understanding of security instead of a narrower national security understanding. Moreover, the speakers remained divided on whether the UNSC is the right forum for discussing climate change. Detraz and Betsill (2009) then compared the discourse employed at the 2007 UNSC debate to earlier debates and documents on climate change, e.g., by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). They found that the ‘environmental security’ perspective was largely the dominant one. In comparison, relatively little evidence was found for a narrower traditional security understanding, which they call ‘environmental conflict’ (Detraz and Betsill 2009). According to Detraz and Betsill (2009), climate change commonly has been understood to increase human vulnerabilities and affect human security. However, they do not rule out the possibility of a future discursive shift to an ‘environmental conflict’ understanding of climate change – a shift they would consider counterproductive. While the findings Detraz and Betsill (2009) provide detailed insight into the discourse on climate change, they do not connect discourse and practice.

In another study, Brzoska (2012) creates a clearer link between discourse and practice when analyzing the discourse on climate change in various states’ White Papers and national defense documents. Using the terms ‘environmental security’ and ‘environmental conflict’ from Detraz and Betsill (2009), Brzoska (2012) also finds that the broader ‘environmental security’ perspective represents the most common way the links between climate change and security are understood. A few states, such as USA, UK, Finland, Russia and Australia, see climate change as a potentially large or very large threat and add to the broader human security understanding also a narrower national security understanding, i.e. the ‘environmental conflict’ perspective (Brzoska 2012). Yet, a clear majority of states do not seem to adopt such a perspective, but rather they estimate that climate change threatens the lives as well as livelihoods of individuals. Accordingly, disaster management, to ensure human security, represents the dominant focus of policy measures within the security documents. Other policies suggested by the various documents include adaptation, crisis management, conflict prevention, and in very few cases enhancing military capabilities (Brzoska 2012). Even though many of the proposed policy measures, such as disaster management and conflict prevention, make room for active involvement of the armed forces, Brzoska (2012) concludes that there are generally few suggestions for a clear role of the
armed forces in regards to climate change. Brzoska (2012) provides in-depth knowledge of national understandings of and approaches to climate change. However, an analysis of how different policy fields incorporate climate change and security remains open.

Regarding the practical approaches to climate change, Oels (2013) has found that ‘traditional risk management based on prediction’ and ‘risk management through contingency’ are the dominant risk managing approaches. The traditional risk management approach aims to “[r]educe risks to a ‘tolerable level’ defined by science and technology” (Oels 2013: 19). This type of risk management represents the risk of climate change as knowable, calculable and controllable, while aiming to reduce possible vulnerabilities of some social groups (Oels 2013: 19). Rather than reducing risks to a ‘safe’ level, the risk management through contingency approach aims to “[m]obilise and empower people to adapt to radical contingency”, which includes capacity building, data-mining and surveillance (Oels 2013: 19). Climate change is presented as an uncertain, hard to predict, and inevitable risk which calls for preparedness and resilience. Furthermore, Oels (2013: 21) finds that besides mitigation, which focuses on the control of greenhouse gas emissions in order to prevent ‘dangerous’ climate change levels, adaptation has become a rather dominant approach to responding to climate change. The adaptation approach aims to manage the impacts of climate change and considers certain impacts of climate change as inevitable. Oels (2013) argues that adaptation or security concerns have not replaced mitigation, but instead “adaptation and security emerge alongside mitigation” (Oels 2013: 21, emphasis in original). Based on the dominant approaches to climate change and the risk management practices, Oels (2013) concludes that there are only very few suggestions for ‘conflict prevention’ strategies, and no evidences for securitization of climate change, at least in the way the Copenhagen School understands securitization. The links between climate change and security should rather be understood as climatization, evident in the policy fields of defense, migration and development.

On a more general level, various scholars have warned about the linking of the environment to security. Even though the securitization of the environment and climate change raises awareness and attention paid to the issue, it also can backfire. For example, Deudney (1999) claims that securitizing environmental change is in fact counterproductive to developing effective solutions for a sustainable future, and that we should abandon the security framing of environmental concerns entirely. Moreover, scholars within the environmental security field, especially those dealing with ‘ecological security’ (meaning the
environment is the referent object to be protected from harmful practices) warn that a traditional security approach and even our general anthropocentric view on the environment is the wrong way to deal with environmental concerns, as this type of approach tends to neglect the root causes of climate change (see Barnett 2013; Detraz 2012; Booth 2007).

5. Research Question

The literature review has shown that there is a certain ambiguity surrounding the relationship between climate change and security. On the one hand, there are a few instances of ‘securitization moves’ and most of the political discourse surrounding climate change is very much concerned with the various security implications of a changing climate. On the other hand, there is a general variation among security understandings of climate change and so far there is little evidence of any ‘exceptionalism’ or extraordinary means being applied to it.

In this thesis I try to clear some of this ambiguity by analyzing not only the international discourse on climate change, but also the practices and strategies being applied to climate change. Furthermore, drawing on the Copenhagen School and Paris School’s respective theoretical frameworks for security analysis, this thesis aims to investigate whether we should understand climate change and security in terms of a securitization of climate change (Copenhagen School) or rather in terms of a climatization of the security field (Paris School). An analysis of discourse and practice also sheds light on which security understanding is employed regarding climate change, how climate change is portrayed, and which measures to deal with climate change are considered appropriate. Thus, the research questions guiding this thesis are:

*How is climate change discursively produced as a security issue at the international level? And, how does climate change as a security issue influence the practices of the policy fields of migration as well as development?*

The first question is concerned with the discursive practices and fixing of a certain (security) understanding of climate change. Moreover, it also considers which practical approach dominates the suggested solutions in dealing with climate change, e.g. mitigation, adaption and/or conflict prevention. Rather than merely accepting that climate change necessarily and substantially affects our security, I hope to reveal the social construction of climate change as a security issue. I deliberately chose to ask a how rather than a why question here. Since
climate change is an ongoing process and our understanding of it continues to evolve, it might be very difficult to trace the explanatory factors and their interaction contributing to why climate change is produced as a security issue. Instead, asking how limits the scope of the thesis and makes it much more researchable (Halperin and Heath 2012: 111). Furthermore, although the first question is rather descriptive it still contains an explanatory element, as it explains how the discourse manifests a certain understanding of climate change.

The second question continues the research process initiated by the first question, as it considers in greater detail the effect of climate change’s articulation and climate-related practices on the different policy fields of migration and development, as well as their respective strategies and policy recommendations. I seek to find out which practical approaches or policies are devised and how these connect to the broader discourse on climate change. The aim is to help deepen existing understandings of how climate change and security are linked in these specific policy fields, and how climate change is seen to threaten security. This approach also helps to further develop the Paris School’s framework for climatization of the security field, as the Paris School has called for more research regarding the climatization of the ‘security field’, meaning the policy fields of defense, migration and development (see Oels 2012).

5.1 Main Assumption and Working Hypothesis

Based on the idea that discourse informs the way we act, as it shapes commonly shared understandings, meanings and beliefs, as well as creates intersubjective perceptions of security or ‘threats’ (Klotz and Lynch 2007), I derive the following assumption. The type of climate change and security discourse employed, first and foremost, by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and by the other UN bodies, shapes the overall perception of climate change and its ‘level of threat’. Accordingly, climate change is rendered governable in a specific way, leading to either more or less securitized approaches. However, I assume that there is more than discourse to the construction of climate change as a security issue. Therefore, I mainly rely on the Paris School’s framework and consider the linkages between discourse and practice. Consequently, a rhetoric that indicates securitization is not necessarily followed by extraordinary means, as the Copenhagen School would suggest. Using the insights from the literature, I hypothesize that climate change is mainly understood in human security terms and that climate change as a security issue transforms practices within the fields of migration and development. Although climate change might not be best understood as a ‘successful’ securitization, climate change still is being linked to security.
Therefore, the concept of climatization is the most suitable framework for the security analysis of climate change, as it relies on a more open conceptualization of security.

6. Theory

This chapter aims to show how the theoretical choices fit with the research problem at hand and how the theory informs the way this research is conducted. I build on the Copenhagen School’s securitization theory to understand why the portrayal of climate change matters and how we can understand discursive practices surrounding climate change. Furthermore, I discuss important critiques and shortcomings of the Copenhagen School’s theoretical model when studying the securitization of climate change. This discussion is followed by a presentation of the Paris School and ‘climatization’. I argue that, using securitization theory offers a foundation to understand the discursive construction of climate change as a threat but that understanding the nature of the relation between climate change and security, as well as relating practices, is better understood from the perspective of the Paris School.

6.1 The Copenhagen School and Securitization

The most important contribution from securitization theory to this research is the process of securitization. As already mentioned above, there is evidence for securitization of climate change, which impacts the understanding of climate change and shapes responses to it. But how does securitization work?

According to the Copenhagen School, securitization is a process through which an issue, such as climate change, terrorism or AIDS, is being linked to security by repeatedly referring to it as a security issue. Thus, security is firstly a discursive process, also called ‘speech act’, in which a certain issue receives special attention as it is being linked to security in order to give that issue a supreme priority status. Simply by speaking security the process of securitization is already initiated (Nyman 2013). However, speaking security does not always result in ‘successful’ securitization. The positioning of the securitizing actor is an important factor for the securitization of an issue. Actors in a position of power or authority are generally much more likely to prompt securitization. Furthermore, successful securitization depends on a variety of factors such as the general features of the ‘threat’, timing, the audience’s acceptance of the ‘threat’, and the relationship between speaker and audience. (Nyman 2013: 59).

---

3 The notion of ‘successful’ and ‘failed’ securitization might sound misleading, as the Copenhagen School actually considers any ‘successful’ securitization a negative development.
Even though securitization raises the attention paid to a particular issue and might free up extra funds for it, the Copenhagen School does not perceive this process as a positive one because it “evokes an image of threat-defense, allocating to the state an important role in addressing” the issue (Waever 1995: 47). Once something has been ‘successfully’ securitized it can be placed “above normal politics and decision-making processes” (see Figure 1) which can justify measures that would otherwise be considered illegitimate (Nyman 2013: 54). As the literature review has shown, there is an awareness of the increasing security discourse surrounding climate change and the discourse’s potential for lifting the topic out of the political realm and into the security realm (e.g., see Brzoska 2009; Gemenne et al. 2014; Deudney 1999). Following the logic of securitization theory, portraying climate change as a substantial security threat might lead to a greater reliance on “security organizations – such as more use of arms, force and violence” in order to counter some of the risks associated with climate change, e.g., increased likelihood of (civil) conflict due to scarce resources, mass migration and loss of geographical space (Brzoska 2009: 138).

However, successful securitization does not always have to be connected to military means, as it is in the case with the ‘Global War on Terror’. Rather, securitization is about the overall exceptional status an issue receives and the emergency measures taken in response to that issue. For example, the financial crisis of 2008-2009 could be considered a case of successful securitization because it was “responded to with frequent exceptional ‘crisis talks’ by heads of government”, legislation was passed as emergency measures with little consultation, and for a large part the issue was dealt with outside the scope of normal politics (Oels 2012: 193).

Figure 1: Classification of issues according to securitization theory, Source: Nyman (2013: 54).
Yet, the Copenhagen School has received a substantial amount of critique, especially regarding the level of analysis as it has been described as too state-centric (Nyman 2013: 60). In order to study securitization at the system level, Buzan and Waever (2009) revisited securitization theory and developed the concept of ‘macrosecuritization’, which combine various other securitizations from lower levels and bring them together into a larger order. The central aspect of macrosecuritizations is their “possibility to operate as the interpretive framework for other securitisations” (Buzan and Waever 2009: 265). Buzan and Waever (2009) consider Global Warming as a potential candidate for a macrosecuritization because it resides on the global/system level and often is portrayed as an existential threat which includes various other security concerns such as forced mass migration due to environmental issues, global energy insecurity, civil conflicts due to food and water scarcity, and more. However, whether climate change should be understood in the framework of the Copenhagen School’s securitization, let alone a macrosecuritization, remains doubtful.

6.1.1 A Case of Scholarly Blindness?

Various critical security scholars remain unconvinced of the Copenhagen School’s framework (Nyman 2013). This is largely because in their securitization analysis, the Copenhagen School connects the meaning of security to ‘existential threats’ and policy responses are fixed to one option, i.e., extraordinary measures (Oels 2012: 193). Furthermore, Bigo (2007) claims that narrowing the meaning of security to existential threats and extraordinary means only scratches the surface and leaves other important processes and practices of security untouched. Moreover, due to the ‘narrow’ and inflexible understanding of security dynamics, the Copenhagen School has at various instances assessed that climate change represents a failed securitization because “there is no evidence of undemocratic procedures and of extraordinary measures” (Oels 2012; see also Brauch and Oswald Spring 2011). Yet, it remains blind to other practices of security that should be considered in a different context. Similarly, the human security perspective has claimed that the Copenhagen School is blind to alternative security discourses or to “transformations in the logic of security and in the practices of security” (Oels 2012: 194). If security were to be understood in terms of human security, the counterproductive effects of securitization (in the sense of the Copenhagen School) could be averted, and the daily insecurity as well as vulnerabilities of people could be addressed effectively (Oels 2012: 194; see also Kerr 2013).

However, the human security perspective itself is not devoid of theoretical issues. Ambiguity in the concept’s definition/understanding and its potential abuse for future
responsibility-to-protect interventions render the concept not unproblematic (Oels 2012; Peoples and Vaughan-Williams 2010). Nonetheless, the human security perspective’s critique of the Copenhagen School’s fixed understanding of security is an important point to consider. It is important because with a more open understanding of security dynamics we might be able to see that the Copenhagen School’s assessment of climate change as a ‘failed’ securitization is not completely accurate and, in fact, misses other ongoing security dynamics or even transformations of security conceptualizations.

While securitization theory can provide a basic framework for understanding the social and discursive construction of threats, the Paris School can offer a richer and more holistic approach for security analysis (Oels 2012: 202).

6.2 The Paris School and Climatization

The Paris School represents another approach to the study of how subjects and objects can be produced as security issues. In contrast to the Copenhagen School, the Paris School does not fix the meaning of security, thus allowing for a different kind of approach to understanding security. Instead, the Paris School draws on Foucault’s security dispositif which depicts how various elements such as “discourses, legal texts, institutions, technological devices, and the daily practices of actors” are interconnected and jointly contribute to the production of a social problem as a security issue (Oels 2012: 197). Hence, the Paris School considers discursive and non-discursive elements in its analysis of the social construction of threats/security, and is not limited to speech acts only. Furthermore, this perspective holds that practice and policy implications, rather than merely the discourse, indicate whether a securitization should be considered a ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ development (Oels 2012: 198). Similar to the Copenhagen School, the Paris School understands that security and threats are socially constructed, and therefore, the whole security field is a socially constructed space. This socially constructed space changes as legitimate members and/or would-be members engage in a constant renegotiation of the security field’s ‘boundaries’, meaning that understandings of security, referent objects and security practices can change over time (Bigo 2008). As a result, the security field, in the Paris School’s understanding, does not include only the military, police, and intelligence, but also other “securitized sectors like migration and development – and more recently climate change itself” (Oels 2012: 197). Due to the different approach in its security analysis, the Paris School largely moves away from studying ‘extraordinary means’ and rather investigates the heterogeneous network surrounding various security practices and discourses, which includes “the routine practices of (non-elite)
professionals of security, and [to analyze] how their practices produce security discourses (and are incited by them)” (Oels 2012: 201). Therefore, discourse, policy and practice are mutually important elements to consider when studying security. Further, in this sense the Paris School remains both more open and more critical to various security dynamics as it does not generalize about security, its logics, and its related practices.

6.2.1 Climatization of Defense, Migration and Development

Oels (2012: 201) argues that what the Copenhagen School understands as a failed securitization of climate change should instead be reconceptualized as the ‘climatization of the security field’. The climatization of the security field can be understood as an ongoing process in which “existing security practices are applied to the issue of climate change and that new practices from the field of climate policy are introduced into the security field” (Oels 2012: 197). The Copenhagen School, however, is likely to miss these practices as they do not represent extraordinary means, yet. While the international community widely understands climate change as an issue of human security (see Brzoska 2012; Detraz and Betsill 2009; Oels 2012), it is unclear to what extent the articulation of climate change as an issue to human security has led to any particularly productive policies and practices. Using the Paris School’s framework, Oels (2012) explains that various security practices can be identified within the fields of defense, migration and development.

Security practices within the field of defense involve strategies such as capacity building, increasing disaster management capabilities, and monitoring so called ‘climate change hot spots’, meaning areas which are especially vulnerable to climate change (Oels 2012: 199). As mentioned before, while such measures are not exceptional or outside the ‘normal’ political realm, they do open up the way towards more militarized means, or even military responsibility-to-protect interventions within such ‘climate change hot spots’ or states failing “to offer sufficient levels of protection to their population after a climate-induced disaster” hits them (Oels 2012: 199, emphasis in original).

In the field of migration the climate security discourse adds the risk of ‘millions and millions of climate refugees’ to already existing (unreasonable) fears about large-scale migration flows from the Global South to the Global North. Practical approaches include enhancing resilience to weather variability and increasing the adaptive capacities of local populations (Oels 2012: 200). An important aspect to remember about the Paris School is that it does not judge ‘securitization moves’ as necessarily negative – it depends on the actual policies and their practical outcomes. Hence, security measures do not always indicate a
failure of ‘normal’ politics or lead to more militarized responses to an issue, as the Copenhagen School might predict.

The climatization of the development field is largely about “the introduction of adaptation as a new goal of development policy” (Oels 2012: 200). Hence, using disaster planning and adaptation measures to increase resilience, coping capacity and self-reliance is increasingly important, perhaps even more than the actual reduction of poverty levels (Oels 2012: 200). Furthermore, there is a possibility for future development assistance to prioritize ‘climate change hot spots’ in order to mitigate vulnerabilities and prevent migration as well as conflict or instability (Oels 2012: 201).

6.3 The Schools in Comparison

Both schools have a critical approach to security and both of them pay attention to the kind of security rhetoric applied to an issue. The Copenhagen School shows that “invoking the concept of security is a discursive process that erases all rules of normal politics” (C.A.S.E. Collective 2006: 473). Therefore, it is of utmost importance to analyze the type of rhetoric used to describe an issue. Yet, while the Copenhagen School’s focus on speech acts and extraordinary means can be seen as an analytical strength, it is also one of the school’s biggest weaknesses and most critiqued points (Floyd 2010). Necessarily understanding security as a negative development, and in terms of exceptional measures, prevents the Copenhagen School from understanding security in a broader, more alternative way, e.g., like the human security approach does (McDonald 2008). The Paris School takes the critique against the Copenhagen School into account and argues that there is more to the construction of security and threats than speech acts. Hence, the Paris School points out that the actual practices and policies need to be looked at in order to fully understand the nature of a particular securitization of an issue. That is, simply speaking security does not always indicate how an issue is dealt with, however, analyzing the practices of various policy fields does. Oels (2012) suggests that looking at the policy fields of defense, migration and development, while using the concept of climatization, is more appropriate to understanding the links between climate change and security than the Copenhagen School’s concept of securitization. Therefore, this research analyzes the kind of climate change and security rhetoric employed but also considers the practices in order to make inferences about the nature of climate change’s securitization.
7. Methodology and Method

This chapter provides a discussion of the methodological choice, methods used, and how relevant data is gathered. As explained in the theory section, the Copenhagen School and Paris School both include discursive elements in their respective security analyses. Hence, discourse analysis is the methodology and method of choice here, as this research is interested in the connection between discourse and reality, i.e. the rhetoric on climate change and the related practices. Analyzing the discourse on climate change provides greater insight into how climate change is constructed as a threat but also which responses to climate change are regarded appropriate. Furthermore, following the Paris School’s framework, practical approaches and policy suggestions in the field of migration and development are considered as well. The analysis includes looking at three different UN bodies, namely the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP). The reason for choosing the UN is because studying the UN is a good way to see the conceptual understandings on a broader, system level, thereby building on the state-level work already conducted in this area.

In line with the theoretical approaches, this thesis can be situated clearly in the post-positivist spectrum, since it holds that a certain reality (in this case security and threat) is subjectively created and that meaning needs to be inferred through interpretation. Thus, this thesis follows an interpretivist understanding as it argues that the links between climate change and security do not exist independently of our knowledge (Halperin and Heath 2012: 40-41). Even though climate change has some ‘real’ physical implication for humans and the environment, it still is subjectively created which threats should be focused on, how they should be understood, and which referent object is seen to be threatened. Furthermore, there is no objective security either since fundamental ideas of security are also products of social construction, indicated by the different conceptual understandings of security, such as national security, human security, ecological security etc. Discourse analysis reflects such a post-positivist understanding and helps the researcher to maintain a “skeptical attitude towards claims of a single rationality and objective truth” (Feindt and Oels 2005). In this sense, there is also no one understanding of climate change, its impacts on security, and which measures are needed, but rather there are different discourses that construct a certain understanding of climate change and security. This thesis employs discourse analysis in order to understand the meaning attached to climate change and security, as well as to see how climate change is
produced as a security concern (Halperin and Heath 2012). So what does discourse analysis entail?

### 7.1 Discourse Analysis

Social sciences as a whole, including political science and IR, have consistently grown in its reliance on textual analysis. The analysis of language, discourse, and meaning has proven very useful to a wide range of political research. Discourse analysis has become an integral part of IR research by now (Halperin and Heath 2012). The term *discourse* can be understood as “a specific ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categorizations that are produced, reproduced, and transformed in a particular set of practices and through which meaning is given to physical and social realities” (Hajer 1997: 44). A discourse analysis is a qualitative type of textual analysis that tries to uncover the way a certain reality is produced and how that reality fits within a particular context (Hardy, Harley and Phillips 2004: 19). Discourse analysis is both interpretive and constructivist. It is interpretive because “it assumes that people act on the basis of beliefs, values, or ideology that give meaning to their action” and thus, we need to study the meaning that people attach to their actions (Halperin and Heath 2012: 310-311). Discourse analysis is constructivist in the sense that it assumes that people socially and discursively construct meaning. Therefore, a discourse analysis needs to pay close attention to the discursive practices that construct meaning “through the production, dissemination, and consumption” of a wide range of written, oral, and visual ‘texts’ (Halperin and Heath 2012: 311). Moreover, discourse analysis is not just concerned with a text *per se*, but also with the relation between text and context (Halperin and Heath 2012).

Considering the relation between text/discourse and the broader context is often seen as a great strength of discourse analysis (see Hardy, Harley and Phillips 2004; Hopf 2004). In comparison to other qualitative methodologies, discourse analysis is unique since it is “a set of assumptions concerning the constructive effects of language”, rather than merely a set of techniques (Hardy, Harley and Phillips 2004: 19). Even though discourse analysis is a method of textual analysis, it also is a methodology based on “a strong social constructivist epistemology” and the belief that meaning, or social reality, “arise out of interrelated bodies of texts – called discourses” that create new ideas, objects and practices (Hardy, Harley and Phillips 2004: 20). Thus, discourses “produce a material reality in the practices they invoke” and should be at the center of a study that is concerned with meaning and social reality (Hardy, Harley and Phillips 2004: 20).

In this sense, the Copenhagen School and the Paris School are concerned with the relation
between discourse and reality as both try to understand the *context* of a discourse when analyzing who is producing meaning and the connection between discourse and practice. The theoretical approaches together with discourse analysis provide a framework for my research and a framework for how to understand the power of discourse, in terms of demonstrable effects, i.e., practical approaches to climate change (Halperin and Heath 2012). The theoretical and methodological approach synergizes well with one another as both seek to understand “the relationship between discourse and reality in a particular context”, e.g., the practical implications connected to a security rhetoric/understanding. Using discourse analysis to place the climate change discourse in a broader context also enables this research to further judge the nature of the link between climate change and security, i.e. Copenhagen School’s securitization or Paris School’s climatization. Furthermore, discourse analysis fits with the theoretical frameworks and the research aim as it takes “an interest in practices (i.e. professional and everyday practices) as constitutive of power relations and knowledge systems”, and how these produce and problematize an issue in a certain way (Feindt and Oels 2005: 163).

This unobtrusive method of data collection helps to reduce bias and avoid unwanted effects such as the ‘interview effect’, allowing for an analysis without the interference of someone else’s interpretation (Halperin and Heath 2012: 318-319). Furthermore, this approach also can identify the fixing of meaning, called ‘articulation’. Articulation refers to a process through which an association between different elements is repeatedly established, so that these elements are seen to be inherently or naturally connected. Articulation is accompanied by ‘interpellation’, which refers to a “social process through which discourses ‘fix’ meanings and become naturalized” (Halperin and Heath 2012: 316). While, the aim here is not necessarily to doubt a certain fixed meaning, identifying a dominant meaning or understanding still is helpful to point out the social construction element of the discourse and the dominance of a certain discourse. For example, exploring the established links between climate change and security can reflect a choice, by the authors/agencies, to employ one security understanding over another and thus, produce or reproduce specific knowledge (see Jasanoff 1990).

**7.2 Case Selection**

As mentioned earlier, the Paris School argues that a climatization is evident in the fields of defense, migration and development and has called for more research within these fields on “policy implications of climate change as a security issue” (Oels 2012: 202). This thesis
focuses on the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), leaving out the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), i.e., the field of defense. Focusing the analysis to the fields of migration and development is done to limit the scope of the research, but there are more reasons for choosing the UNHCR and UNDP over the UNSC. First of all, however, an assessment of the latest IPCC report is done, in order to provide insight into the most recent findings regarding climate change and its impacts.

Looking at the IPCC assessment reports has proven useful to various scholars in their analysis of dominant understandings of climate change, its threats and impacts on security (e.g., see Detraz and Betsill 2009; Oels 2012). The IPCC’s produces “consensus knowledge on climate change” and its discourse can be seen to ‘set the boundaries’ for other discourses on climate change (Oels 2012: 186). Thus, looking at the 2014 Fifth Assessment Report (FAR) of the IPCC does not only provide an up-to-date analysis of the latest major research on climate change, but it also provides insight into how climate change is produced as a security issue by this highly legitimate climate-oriented institution. The analysis of the IPCC’s understanding of climate change and security provides a context in which the UNHCR’s and UNDP’s discourse as well as practices can be located.

The UNHCR and UNDP have both identified climate change as a challenge for their respective fields and thus, included climate change in their plans of action (UNHCR 2014; UNDP 2014). The UNHCR foresees that it will have to respond to climate-induced migration, as natural degradation, changes in food security and availability of natural resources might force people to migrate (UNHCR 2014). Therefore, the UNHCR has released a multitude of documents on the UNHCR’s understanding of climate change and its challenges, which role the UNHCR has in regards to climate change and climate-induced migration, and which strategies are appropriate/necessary. Similar to the UNHCR, the UNDP also has released documents and launched several projects on climate change and development. These documents and projects reflect the UNDP’s understanding of the links between climate change and security, as well as which strategies are needed to respond to the issue of climate change in connection to development. Overall, the UNHCR and UNDP documents allow for an analysis of how climate change, as a security issue, is addressed and included in various strategies. This analysis allows for an assessment of how the fields of migration and development produce climate change as a security issue and how climate change is responded to within these fields.
The UNSC, on the other hand, has not taken any action on climate change so far and is also not speaking with a unanimous voice, as the states within the Security Council remain divided as to whether or not the UNSC should deal with climate change (Detraz and Betsill 2009). Thus, studying the UNSC in regards to climate change provides more insight into each of the states’ understanding of the links between climate change and security. Brzoska (2012) has conducted such an analysis already. Furthermore, as the literature review has shown, Detraz and Betsill (2009) already have studied the discourse at the UNSC on climate change and security. It appears, that not much has changed since then as the UNSC so far has not taken any climate change-related action and recent discussions have rather focused on climate change in relation to energy security, instead of climate change per se (UN Security Council Report 2014). Hence, the UNHCR and UNDP represent more suitable cases for this research.

7.3 Materials

This section provides an overview of which materials are used for the analysis and why they have been chosen. The materials can be categorized in two groupings, each fulfilling a different purpose in the analysis. All materials used for the analysis are openly accessible on the web pages of the respective agencies.

First, I look at the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC on climate change from 2014. More specifically, I focus on the ‘Summary for Policymakers’ (SPM) of Working Group II, which deals with ‘Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability’. This part of the IPCC report, compared to the other parts, is the most relevant to this thesis as it assesses the risks of climate change, where vulnerabilities lie, and how to manage climate change’s impacts (IPCC 2014). Thus, the Working Group II report is very appropriate in order to see how climate change is perceived and produced as a security issue, as well as which threats are considered most pressing. Furthermore, Detraz and Betsill (2009: 309) also have focused on the IPCC’s Working Group II since these reports provide “valuable input into the intergovernmental deliberations […] and thus could be expected to shape the way that government negotiators conceptualize the problem of climate change.” Similarly, it could be expected that the IPCC’s conceptual understanding of climate change and security also affects the way the UNDP and UNHCR assess climate change.

Second, the analysis of two documents from the policy fields of migration and development follows. Analyzing these documents helps to identify the employed understandings of the links between climate change and security. Moreover, this analysis provides greater insight into how these policy fields perceive/portray climate change in their
respective discourses and which practical approaches are considered appropriate. The two documents analyzed are:

(1) The UNHCR’s paper ‘Climate change, natural disasters and human displacement: a UNHCR perspective’ from 2009. This paper includes the UNHCR’s understanding of climate change as a security concern, the role of the UNHCR in regards to climate change, and provides suggestions for future responses to climate change.

(2) The UNDP report ‘Adapting to Climate Change’ from 2011. This report represents the UNDP’s overarching understanding of climate change and its impacts, the UNDP’s role in regards to climate change, and the general strategies of the agency.

It could be argued here that since these documents are not as new as the IPCC report it is difficult to see if the IPCC’s understanding of climate change informs the UNHCR’s and UNDP’s understanding of it. Nevertheless, the latest (fifth) IPCC report simply represents the most contemporary understanding of climate change, whilst strongly building on the knowledge developed in previous reports. Therefore, the UNHCR’s and UNDP’s perspective on climate change can still be compared to the IPCC’s perspective. Furthermore, as the UNCHR and UNDP have not released any major documents on climate change since the release of the latest IPCC’s report, I assume that their reports from 2009 and 2011 still are very relevant. However, it might be interesting for future research to see how the perspectives on climate change have evolved in relation to the IPCC reports.

All materials used should be seen as representative for the general understanding and approach of the various agencies regarding climate change.

7.4 Coding

Qualitative research designs and especially interpretive methods have at times been critiqued for being too vague and not clear enough about how the researcher came to certain findings. In order to avoid such critique, qualitative research “must be conducted in a systematic manner”, meaning the research should be clear, plausible and coherent, but also credible and ‘fruitful’ (Sadovnik 2007: 423; Halperin and Heath 2012: 317). Thus, a discourse analysis and any other textual analysis requires a clear ‘guide’ on what the researcher is looking for in the texts, how the texts are being looked at, and how to show the presence of certain findings. The researcher can provide such a guide by taking the reader through the coding process of the selected material (Halperin and Heath 2012). The population of used texts is presented in the
The approach to coding used in this research is ‘open coding’ and thus, relies on so called grounded codes. Grounded codes, in contrast to priori codes, “emerge from the data as the researcher reads it” and focus on finding themes in the texts (Halperin and Heath 2012: 323). Open coding involves that broad themes are noted, and then documents are scanned while keeping these themes in mind. Furthermore, “patterns are labelled, and passages are ‘tagged’ as belonging to one or more categories” (Halperin and Heath 2012: 323). Thus, different passages of text with similar codes can be matched together or contrasted, and the emerging data within as well as across different materials can be analyzed.

The categories or topics of interest that I am looking for are generally about climate change and security. Since aim is to see how climate change is produced as a security issue and therefore, it is necessary to see how climate change is being linked to security and seen to affect a certain kind of security. This includes making inferences about the dominant security understanding applied to climate change, i.e. national security, human security etc. Accordingly, themes are the main recoding unit within the texts. Themes delineate an idea or an assertion about a certain subject and are a useful recording unit when looking at values, attitudes, and beliefs (Halperin and Heath 2012: 321).

The analysis is done in two different steps. The first step is the coding of the aforementioned IPCC report. As the IPCC’s rhetoric might influence or dictate others rhetoric on climate change, the finding of themes within the text mainly focuses on the way climate change is understood and presented as a security issue. Key terms to watch out for during the finding of themes are: risk, threat, vulnerability, (in)security, (in)stability, conflict, prevention, mitigation, adaptation. Even though this is not a quantitative content analysis, key terms can still be indicators for a specific discourse or rhetoric. ‘Risk’, ‘threat’, ‘conflict’, ‘vulnerability’ ‘security’ or ‘insecurity’ might indicate that a passage of text is about the impacts of climate change on security, which kind of threats and risks are perceived most urgent, and which referent object is commonly in focus (see Detraz and Betsill 2009, Brzoska 2012). For example, climate change might be seen to spur on civil conflict due to resource scarcity, or threaten the livelihoods of people, thereby increasing insecurity and their overall vulnerability to natural disasters etc. However, as the analysis relies on an open coding approach, further key terms or themes might appear throughout the research process.

Throughout the research process, a passage of text containing a certain category (a theme or a perspective) can then be coded and ‘tagged’ in order to match different sections with
similar themes. Thus, reoccurring, matching or contradicting discourses can easily be put together across all materials and the data can be analyzed (Schneider 2013; Halperin and Heath 2012). Note that ‘mitigation’, ‘adaptation’ and ‘conflict prevention’, defined as existing practical approaches to climate change by Oels (2013), are also included in the key terms. These terms are important as they can indicate sections on how climate change should be dealt with in practice.

This brings us to the second step, which is the coding of the second group of material. The materials here include the UNHCR’s paper and the UNDP’s report on their respective understanding of climate change as well as their respective approaches to dealing with climate change. These documents follow a similar coding process like the IPCC document. The aim is again to find matching or opposing themes across all the materials. More specifically, step two focuses on the UNCHR’s and UNDP’s understanding of and perspective on climate change and security, in order to find out more about the climatization of these policy fields, or possibly securitization. Different understandings, practical approaches, and themes can then be compared between all three UN bodies, which allows to make further assessments about climate change’s impact, as a security issue, on the practices of the policy fields of migration and development.

7.5 Delimitations
As mentioned before, this research is interested in how climate change is produced as a security issue and how practices within the policy fields of migration and development unfold. Therefore, this thesis does not attempt to solve why climate change is produced as a security issue, apart from raising awareness. Neither does this thesis answer why climate change has not led to any exceptional measures yet, despite the commonly used security rhetoric, or why one security understanding is more dominant than the other. I believe that in order to answer these questions, among other things, a deeper engagement with social constructivism and evolving understandings of security is necessary. Due to the limited scope, this thesis unfortunately only scratches the surface of social constructivism’s contributions to this topic.

In terms of cases, the thesis does not look at changes over time in the dominant understanding of climate change. Rather it considers the contemporary state of knowledge and contemporary practices that produce climate change as a security issue. However, with the help of the literature and previous research, the findings of this research can still be situated within a historical context.
Lastly, I am fully aware that there is a multitude of documents on climate change, climate strategies, and especially projects by the UNHCR and UNDP. Looking at all of these documents and projects would completely blow this research out of proportion and reduce the depth of the thesis. As an example, the UNDP has over 1000 projects focusing on the environment (UNDP 2014). In order to reduce selection bias it was aimed to select materials that represent overarching perspectives and approaches to climate change. While selecting a wider range of UNHCR and UNDP projects would provide a more in-depth analysis on how climate change influences the practices of these agencies, it is not necessary to do so in order to fulfill the aim of this research. Looking at the broader documents still allows making inferences about how climate change as a security issue affects these policy fields and whether securitization or climatization is most evident. Moreover, since this thesis focuses on UN agencies, it does not take a closer look at the understandings as well as practices of other important international actors within the field of migration and development, such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM) or the World Bank.

8. Analysis
This chapter covers the analysis of the collected materials. The different sections discuss their respective empirical findings and also provide comparisons across the different materials. The main empirical findings and results of the analysis are summarized in the next chapter, under ‘Discussion of Findings’.

8.1 The IPCC and Climate Change
The various assessment reports by the IPCC are produced by multiple scholars, experts and scientists. From 1990 until 2014 a total of five reports has been published, each building on the previous one, while improving and refining knowledge as well as presenting new findings regarding climate change. All reports have been divided into three major sections, each written by a working group focusing on a specific topic. Working Group I looks at the scientific basis of climate change, and Working Group III has commonly investigated the technological and economic aspects of mitigation. Working Group II (WGII), whose Summary for Policymakers (SPM) is analyzed here, focuses more on the social aspects of climate change as it looks at impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability (IPCC 2014).

The following analysis is structured according to the different themes that were identified during the coding process, which are: climate change mainly impacts human security,
increased vulnerability for poor populations, climate-resilient pathways as an important approach, and increasing challenges for the fields of migration and development.

8.1.1 Climate Change, Human Security and Human Well-being

In the first sentence of the document it is stated that “[h]uman interference with the climate system is occurring, and climate change poses risks for human and natural systems” (IPCC 2014: 3). Thus, the connection between climate change and human systems at risk is established right away. The first identified theme is about the link between climate change and human security. This theme seems to structure all other ones, as climate change’s impacts and risks are dominantly understood in a human security framework. Human security is not defined in the document; however, a rather broad understanding of human security seems to be applied as it is argued that climate change has “consequences for mental health and human well-being” by increasing risks of hunger and malnutrition, disease, environmental degradation and more (IPCC 2014: 7). Thus, the human security understanding appears to be in line with the broad definition and the 1994 Human Development Report of the UNDP (see Kerr 2013: 106; Elbe 2013: 335).

Furthermore, with ‘high confidence’ (on a scale of very low, medium, high, and very high) it is argued that climate change poses risks to human security and livelihoods directly as well as indirectly. Direct impacts include, for example, climate-related hazards or decreasing crop yields. Examples for indirect impacts are increased food prices and overall food insecurity (IPCC 2014: 8). Food security in particular represents a strong concern in the report for human health and well-being. Even though some regions might experience increased crop yields due to a changing climate, more regions are likely to have decreased crop yields. It is expressed that “negative impacts of climate change on crop yields have been more common than positive impacts”, which is especially problematic for poorer populations and because the global demand for food is rising (IPCC 2014: 7). In line with this understanding, climate change is generally seen to exacerbate already existing risks to human well-being, which to some extent resembles the ‘threat multiplier’ understanding. With ‘very high confidence’ it is argued that until mid-century “climate change will impact human health mainly by exacerbating health problems that already exist”, especially among poorer populations (IPCC 2014: 20). Moreover, impacts of climate change “are expected to exacerbate poverty in most developing countries”, increasing already existing issues connected to poverty, such as undernutrition, disease, and risks from food- as well as water-borne diseases (IPCC 2014: 20-21; see also the appendix for a map on global climate change impacts by the IPCC). A human
security understanding also becomes evident when it is urged to reduce human vulnerability by improving basic health measures, child health services, provision of clean water, sanitation and the overall alleviation of poverty (IPCC 2014: 20). A focus on human vulnerability generally is understood to reflect a human security approach (see Detraz and Betsill 2009; Oels 2012).

The dominance of the human security rhetoric becomes even clearer when compared to the low frequency of national security mentions. With ‘medium evidence’ and ‘medium agreement’ (on a scale of limited, medium, or robust evidence and low, medium, or high agreement) only two references to national security are made throughout the document. The first one refers to expected changes in national security policies regarding climate change’s impact on infrastructure as well as territorial integrity. The second one refers to certain transboundary impacts of climate change, e.g., “changes in sea ice, shared water resources, and pelagic fish stocks” (IPCC 2014: 20-21). These impacts are seen to potentially lead to increased rivalry among states. However, the possibility of rivalry among states is quickly dismissed as such issues are considered well manageable through intergovernmental institutions and cooperation (IPCC 2014: 21). Moreover, there is no mention of possible interstate conflict or war. A connection between climate change and violent conflict only is established once and with ‘medium confidence’. Climate change is seen to “indirectly increase risks of violent conflicts in the form of civil war and inter-group violence by amplifying well-documented drivers of these conflicts such as poverty and economic shocks” (IPCC 2014: 20). This connection between climate change and violent conflict resembles the understanding of climate change as a ‘threat multiplier’, rather than a key determinant of violent conflict (see Barnett 2013). Additionally, the report holds that “violent conflict increases vulnerability to climate change” as conflicts reduce adaptation capacity, e.g., by harming infrastructure and social capital. This argumentation reflects an understanding of the reversed causality between climate change and conflict, mentioned in the literature review.

Throughout the document, climate change and its implications are ascribed very complex, multidimensional and cross-sectoral characteristics, which vary across time and regions. At some points, its description bears a certain resemblance to descriptions of globalizations, perhaps due to the sameness in scale (see Held and McGrew 2007). Furthermore, it should also be noted that there are evidences for an ecological security perspective. A theme can be identified within the document which relates to an ecological security understanding. The IPCC (2014) argues that risks to natural systems can already occur in multiple ways below the
set mark of global temperature increase of 2°C compared to preindustrial levels. Climate change is seen to decrease the health of many natural ecosystems, which also can severely impact biodiversity (IPCC 2014). Therefore, the IPCC recognizes a need for ‘alternative’ approaches which give agency to actors other than states and also considers the environment as a referent object that requires protection.

8.1.2 Poor Populations and Climate Change

Another reoccurring theme within the report is that especially poor populations are likely to experience heightened risks since non-climatic factors seen to create differences in vulnerability and exposure to climate change. Also, “multidimensional inequalities often produced by uneven development processes” are considered to be a root cause of people’s vulnerability to climate change (IPCC 2014: 7). Furthermore, the report states that the least developed countries and poor communities are especially challenged due to their limited ability to cope (IPCC 2014: 12). Again, this type of argumentation indicates that with increased ability to cope comes less vulnerability to climate change, meaning that climate change does not bring about a whole range of unknown threats and risks, but rather exacerbates challenges that already need to be dealt with, even in the absence of climate change. Thus, dealing with fundamental social and economic challenges is considered an essential approach to climate change and adaptation.

Consequently, I argue that the understanding of already existing risks being exacerbated by climate change reflects the dominant link that is established between climate change and security. This portrayal also shows how climate change is produced as a security issue, since it is continuously described to exacerbate risks to human security. Therefore, it can be argued that the dominant security understanding of climate change is as a ‘risk exacerbator’ in the context of human security. I use the term ‘risk exacerbator’ as it sounds more neutral compared to ‘threat multiplier’ which connotes more of a narrow threat/security understanding. Furthermore, ‘risk exacerbator’ actually is more accurate as already existing risks for human well-being are exacerbated by climate change, rather than threats being multiplied.

8.1.3 Mitigation, Adaptation, and Climate-Resilient Pathways

The dominant practical approaches and policy suggestions are mitigation and adaptation, complemented with various sub-national approaches, forming so called ‘climate resilient pathways’. A reoccurring theme is the great synergy between mitigation and adaptation.
Mitigation is considered to be of fundamental importance as “the overall risk of climate change impacts can be reduced by limiting the rate and magnitude of climate change” (IPCC 2014: 14). Mitigation is not only seen to considerably lower adaptation costs but also to provide more time for effective adaptation. Furthermore, mitigation enables climate-resilient pathways to be more successful. Climate resilient-pathways are “trajectories that combine adaptation and mitigation to reduce climate change and its impacts”, and this approach is considered to be the ‘right’ way forward (IPCC 2014: 25). It is presented that climate-resilient pathways lead to a future with high climate-resilience and low risk. Pathways that lower resilience, however, lead to a future with high risk and low resilience. In the context of human security this means that decisions leading to pathways that lower resilience can have severe negative implications for poor populations and should therefore be avoided by increasing mitigation as well as adaptation efforts. The theme of human security is also evident in the IPCC’s suggestions to achieve climate-resilience because “reducing vulnerability and exposure to present climate variability” is suggested as a first step towards adaptation (IPCC 2014: 23). Increasing resilience and reducing vulnerability is argued to “improve human health, livelihoods, social and economic well-being, and environmental quality” (IPCC 2014: 23). However, it is stated that despite mitigation and adaptation efforts, certain adverse impacts of climate change are likely to remain. Thus, adverse impacts of climate change are portrayed in a rather deterministic way. Consequently, disaster and risk management are seen to be important already existing responses to climate change. Moreover, a reoccurring reminder is that the more global temperature rises, the more severe and widespread are the impacts of climate change, creating more physical constraints for humans and ecosystem through heat waves and natural hazards etc., or through reducing natural resources. To avoid an exponential increase in adverse impacts, the temperature increase should be kept as low as possible through mitigation (IPCC 2014). Moreover, the IPCC (2014: 23) critiques current adaptation practices and suggests that more grassroots and sub-national approaches are needed because “complementary actions across levels, from individuals to governments” are seen to enhance adaptation planning and implementation. Additionally, the document holds that:

Indigenous, local, and traditional knowledge systems and practices, including indigenous peoples’ holistic view of community and environment, are a major resource for adapting to climate change, but these have not been used consistently in existing adaptation efforts.

(IPCC 2014: 23)
Thus, combining these forms of knowledge with existing practices is seen to increase the effectiveness of adaptation.

### 8.1.4 Migration and Development

The report assesses that human displacement and increased difficulties for development are effects of a changing climate. Thus, a connection to the fields of migration and development clearly is established by the IPCC (2014). Despite ‘medium evidence’ it is expressed with ‘high agreement’ that climate change “is projected to increase displacement of people” (IPCC 2014: 20). Human displacement is connected back to the themes of human security and increased vulnerability for poor populations as “displacement risk increases when populations that lack the resources for planned migration experience higher exposure to extreme weather events” (IPCC 2014: 20). Consequently, vulnerability for such populations can be reduced by expanding migration opportunities. It is noteworthy, that there is no mention of mass migration waves posing risks to national security.

The field of development is expected to experience increased difficulties, especially as the eradication of poverty is seen to become more complicated. Poverty is considered to be a key underlying problem as climate change has the potential to “slow down economic growth, make poverty reduction more difficult, further erode food security, and prolong existing and create new poverty traps” especially in urban areas and emerging ‘hotspots of hunger’ (IPCC 2014: 20).

Considering global structures of inequality, one certainly should remain wary of a discourse that portrays some people ‘weaker’ or more vulnerable than others. However, as the IPCC generally calls for more equal development, more effective poverty eradication, and grassroot approaches with the inclusion of local populations, it could be argued that their rhetoric does not add to the marginalization of the global poor. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that heightened vulnerabilities are “the product of intersecting social processes that result in inequalities in socioeconomic status and income” (IPCC 2014: 7). Marginalization and discrimination, e.g., on the basis of gender, class ethnicity, age and (dis)ability, directly are considered to be such ‘harmful’ social processes (IPCC 2014: 7). Nevertheless, the IPCC’s findings might create the incentive for other actors to distort the findings and revert to a marginalizing discourse (see Heugh 2011).
8.2 The UNHCR and Climate Change

For the most part, the UNHCR has a similar understanding of climate change and its impacts on security like the IPCC. Consequently, some of the aforementioned themes were identified in this document as well. However, a few noteworthy differences in the way climate change is portrayed remain. This section assesses how climate change is understood and produced as a security issue by the UNHCR, how themes within the document relate to or deviate from the themes identified in the IPCC’s discourse, and which approaches to climate change the UNHCR considers necessary.

Unsurprisingly, the UNHCR sees its role regarding climate change according to its mandate and therefore, in the area of ‘forced displacement’. Thus, the UNHCR primarily is concerned about the ways that climate change can directly or indirectly cause migration (UNHCR 2009). Regarding the “empirical evidence relating to the issue of climate change”, it is referred back to the reports of the IPCC (UNHCR 2009: 2).

8.2.1 Climate Change, Migration, and Security

The UNHCR recognizes a multiplicity of possible ways in which people might be displaced due to climate change, including scenarios of natural hazards, ‘sinking islands’ or violent conflict. Similar to the IPCC’s assessment, climate change is seen to complicate migration, as climate change is considered to “in all certainty add to the scale and complexity of human mobility and displacement”, and thus, climate change is of great concern to humanitarian agencies such as the UNHCR (UNHCR 2009: 1). Furthermore, a direct link between migration and human security is established as it is argued that migration is a survival strategy that is employed by populations experiencing threats to their human security (UNHCR 2009: 10). Additionally, the UNHCR explains that people’s “physical security and their ability to sustain adequate livelihoods” needs to be ensured (UNHCR 2009: 10). Also, with climate change-induced migration, urban populations are seen to increase which leaves “people particularly vulnerable to health risks” and is regarded to complicate UNHCR missions (UNHCR 2009: 11). However, even though a connection between climate change, migration, and human security thereby is established, the theme of climate change affecting human security, e.g., negative impacts for human health, mental health, and well-being, is a lot less striking compared to the IPCC’s discourse. Yet, the human security understanding still appears to be the dominant underlying security understanding. For example, it is stated that loss of territory, due to rising sea-levels, could mean that certain states cease to exist which is considered especially problematic as this might render people stateless, leaving them in a
unique legally *vulnerable* position (UNHCR 2009: 5). The UNHCR foresees new and unique legal challenges for the field of migration, as the legal status of some environmental migrations is unclear. For example, the term ‘environmental refugee’ is not compliant with existing understandings of the term ‘refugee’. Therefore, the UNHCR considers reviewing and adapting the legal mechanics as a core component of the wider policy approaches to climate change (UNHCR 2009: 11). This policy suggestion strongly hints at climatization, as the UNHCR considers climate change as an issue that requires the adaptation of existing legal frameworks.

### 8.2.2 A Driver for Social Outcomes

A rather interesting difference to the IPCC’s discourse is that the UNHCR expresses in a much more deterministic way that climate change is a driver for various social outcomes. An example for this more deterministic depiction is the UNHCR’s assessment that “a scenario of human displacement is a decrease in vital resources […] attributable to climate change, which triggers armed conflict and violence” (UNHCR 2009: 5). Here, the likelihood of armed conflict is portrayed to be rather high and probable once vital resources decrease, despite the IPCC’s medium confidence regarding such claims. The portrayal of climate change as a “common driver for conflicts” is reoccurring throughout the document (UNHCR 2009: 6). However, it could be argued that the UNHCR’s increased focus on armed conflict is due to the fact that displacement as a result of armed conflict clearly falls within the mandate given to the UNHCR, without developing new legal frameworks. Yet, establishing links between climate change and security by depicting climate change as a common driver for conflicts certainly can add to the securitization of climate change and neglects the understanding of climate change as a complex ‘risk exacerbator’. Nonetheless, the UNHCR does point out at one instance that although social tension and political conflict is likely, “it may remain difficult to trace the origins of such tensions to climate change”, which possibly reflects an understanding of climate change as a ‘risk exacerbator’ or ‘threat multiplier’ (UNHCR 2009: 3). Still, in comparison to the IPCC’s dominant portrayal of climate change as a ‘risk exacerbator’, the UNHCR points out much less that already existing social problems require increased attention.

Furthermore, in the ‘displacement scenarios’ there is no reference to migration as a result of exacerbated risks. However, people might decide to migrate in order to escape ‘poverty traps’ or ‘hunger hot spots’, and not just due to environmental degradation, loss of territory, or possible violent conflict (see IPCC 2014). Moreover, even though the UNHCR connects
climate change to human security, it portrays climate change as a more direct threat to states and people. Consequently, there appears to be less recognition of the problem of already existing risks to human security being exacerbated by a changing climate. Therefore, climate change is produced as a more direct threat to (human) security and as a key driver for social outcomes such as social tension, political conflict, and forced displacement. However, the UNHCR does recognize climate change in connection to other risks at one instance, when assessing that climate change can influence “the delivery of operations” by adversely affecting water resources, sanitation, agriculture, environmental protection and health (UNHCR 2009: 8).

In contrast to exaggerated ‘fears’ about climate-induced mass migration, the UNHCR recognizes that climate-induced migration takes place “over longer periods of time and in more diverse directions” (UNHCR 2009: 3). Also, compared to a ‘political refugee’, climate-induced migrants might be able to choose to move to another area within their own state. Thus, the UNHCR does not follow a securitization move towards climate change or migration, but rather calls for more cooperation among humanitarian actors to provide assistance to refugees and internally displaced persons.

8.2.3 Climatization of Migration

Despite the realization that climate change holds challenges for the field of migration, which can even include the overhaul of existing legal frameworks, the UNHCR (2009) has recognized that its practical approaches and operations need to be located in a context of adaptation and mitigation. At the same time, migration is seen to be an integral part of dealing with climate change. Furthermore, as resource scarcity poses serious risks for humans, the UNHCR argues that their operations need to be “as environmentally sustainable as possible” (UNHCR 2009: 13). This means, that UNHCR practices need to include elements of mitigation and adaptation as well as environmental education. Thus UNHCR environmentally projects include the use of environmentally-friendly sources of fuel, a greater reliance on solar energy, and environmentally-friendly shelter-construction. Moreover, the UNHCR promotes “sustainable forms of agriculture in refugee camps” confronted with environmental degradation, and also factors in peoples vulnerability to climate change “when assessing the needs of populations of concern” (UNHCR 2009: 13-14). Therefore, climate change has become a central concern for the UNHCR and strongly impacts how operations are conducted. This development very much hints at a climatization of the field of the migration,
especially as there is no evidence for any extraordinary measures within the UNHCR’s practices or policy suggestions.

8.3 The UNDP and Climate Change

The UNDP’s employed understanding and portrayal of climate change is very close to the IPCC’s. In comparison to the UNHCR, the UNDP places more emphasis on the human security context, the complex nature of climate change and its connection to existing risks. The UNDP also recognizes the increased difficulties for the field of development posed by climate change. Climate change is considered an “inescapable reality” that severely affects the health of the planet on which the success of sustainable development depends (UNDP 2011: 12). Another clear evidence for the climatization of development is the UNDP’s approach to integrate “climate change into UN development assistance at the national, regional and global levels” in order to address existing and future challenges (UNDP 2011: 24).

8.3.1 Human Security and Vulnerabilities

Similar to the IPCC, the UNDP depicts climate change as a complex and cross-sectoral process which links to the field of development in multiple ways and therefore, requires a holistic approach (UNDP 2011: 14). Climate change is seen to particularly influence development by posing multiple challenges to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Especially “goals related to food security and poverty, gender equality and environmental sustainability” are considered to become more difficult to achieve (UNDP 2011: 18). Overall, the field of development needs to take climate change into account, due to its impacts on resource availability, infrastructure, disease, and development costs.

Throughout the report, the UNDP shows a strong focus on the security of people and climate change’s “severe ramifications for human wellbeing” (UNDP 2011: 21). Human security, human health and vulnerabilities are a common theme throughout the entire document. The direct and indirect implications of climate change also are acknowledged as it is assessed that climate change can affect people through natural hazards, environmental degradation, and sea-level rise, but also through adverse impacts on food productivity/security, health, and sustainable livelihoods. Furthermore, in contrast to the UNHCR, the UNDP strongly emphasizes the heightened vulnerability for poorer communities and the various risks climate change bears for these communities. Similar to the IPCC’s discourse, the UNDP understands the increased vulnerability for poor populations in a human security context. The UNDP recognizes that, despite of contributing the least to global climate
Climate change, the world’s poorest regions experience the greatest amount of vulnerability to climate change’s consequences, due to socio-economic factors. Furthermore, other already existing issues of resource scarcity will also be felt even more dramatically under the increasing influence of climate change. Thus, more policies and strategies should focus on “needs of poor and vulnerable populations” in order to achieve more climate-resilience for these communities (UNDP 2011: 14). Accordingly, development strategies need to address the increased vulnerabilities to climate change for poorer populations, which includes addressing existing social pressures, such as poverty, to reduce “immediate and long-term vulnerabilities” (UNDP 2011: 12). Climate change is, therefore, portrayed as a security concern in a similar way to the IPCC’s portrayal. With a changing climate, existing risks are seen to be the main source of insecurity for humans. Certainly, the direct implications of climate change, such as natural hazards (storms, floods etc.), pose threats to many communities in the world as well. Yet, adaptation is considered a useful approach to reduce the vulnerability against these impacts. Existing risks being exacerbated by climate change, however, provide a different kind of complex and challenging problems for human communities, especially poorer ones, but also for achieving goals within the field of development, e.g., MDGs.

In addition to the emphasis of poorer populations experiencing increased vulnerability to climate change, the UNDP also points out that “women are disproportionately affected by climate change” (UNDP 2014: 21; see also Detraz 2012). Due to health-related burdens and inequalities for women in certain countries, they are particularly vulnerable to climate change. Thus, another underlying theme can be identified for the documents of the IPCC and UNDP that depicts climate change as increasing structural inequalities for the global poor and in certain situations also women. This theme is in line with the understanding of climate change as a ‘risk exacerbator’, as inequalities can pose risks to the health and well-being of humans.

Moreover, the UNDP refers to the health of ecosystems being threatened as climate change is expected to “impact terrestrial and marine ecosystems [...], causing potential loss of biodiversity and irreparable damages to ecosystems” (UNDP 2011: 23). Such a development is considered rather troubling as the stability of the biosphere depends on the health of all component ecosystems. Additionally, plants and coral reefs provide natural ‘carbon sinks’ that considerably contribute to mitigation. Furthermore, decreasing health of ecosystems affects humans as well. For example, “oceanic acidification and increased surface water temperatures are expected to affect fish stock” which can lead to further food insecurity.
Thus, climate change in all its complexity requires cross-sectoral approaches with multiple stakeholders, building on the synergies between mitigation and adaptation (UNDP 2011). Moreover, ecosystem-based approaches are necessary in order to “conserve biodiversity and make ecosystems more resilient to climate change so that they can continue to provide services that support” sustainable development (UNDP 2011: 39).

**8.3.2 Climatization of Development**

The UNDP’s recognition of climate change as a complex and multilayered process has led the agency to integrate climate change into existing practices, but also to devise new climate-oriented strategies that aim for sustainability. Oels (2012) generally is right in her assessment that adaptation has become a central goal of development policy as resilience building and risk management are becoming essential parts of development strategies. However, the UNDP (2011) certainly considers mitigation equally important, as it assesses that mitigation and adaptation synergize. Whether mitigation receives enough effort remains to be seen. Yet, effective adaptation heavily depends on successful mitigation efforts. Thus, the UNDP’s dominant policy and practical approach to climate change is through low-emission climate-resilient development strategies (LECRDS). Note the evidence for climatization here, as low-emission (mitigation) and climate-resilient (adaptation) approaches are being connected to development strategies, strongly indicating the UNDP’s perspective of existing reciprocity between climate-related practices and development strategies. LECRDS are presented as ‘the way forward’ because they contribute to mitigation and build resilience for people. Furthermore, the agency aims to revise existing practices and policies to “incorporate climate risks and opportunities” (UNDP 2011: 44). In accordance with the IPCC, the UNDP also realizes that policy decisions and responses to climate change need to include multiple stakeholders, which includes indigenous populations, individuals, local governments, NGOs and more (UNDP 2011).

**9. Conclusion**

This chapter summarizes and discusses the main findings of the research and ties it back to the previously posed research question. Furthermore, strength and weaknesses of this thesis shortly are considered and suggestions for further research are given.
9.1 Discussion of Findings

The thesis asked how climate change is produced as a security issue in discourse and how the fields of migration as well as development are affected by climate change as a security issue. A fundamental finding regarding the production of climate change as a security issue is the portrayal of climate change as a ‘risk exacerbator’. There is a clear understanding that climate change does not only affect (human) security through direct impacts, despite the multitude of possible environment-related risks and natural hazards. Rather, the dominant understanding of climate change as an exacerbator of already existing social pressures (poverty, food security etc.), produces climate change as a complex security issue with various dimensions, that poses a threat to many populations around the world. Thus, climate change is produced as a security issue that is more than an environmental concern and that requires holistic long-term strategies that effectively address environmental concerns, but also deal with social problems of inequality, underdevelopment, sustainability and more (see Amstutz 2013). Furthermore, climate change, its impacts, and the risks that it exacerbates are located within a human security context, which means that a broader conceptualization of security is employed, focusing on the well-being and health of people. The IPCC (2014) even goes as far as to include mental health, which indicates a very broad human security understanding (see Kerr 2013).

The research on discourse and practice has found very little evidence for the Copenhagen School’s securitization. On the contrary, especially the IPCC and UNDP call for more equal development, the involvement of indigenous people, more sustainable development, and to reduce constraints on human well-being. These suggestions could generally be linked to norms of global justice, not to extraordinary means that are outside of ‘normal’ politics (Herring 2013: 43-44; Rachels and Rachels 2012). Neither was any evidence found for exceptional means to prevent climate change. It generally is accepted that climate change will have impacts with which we need to live. Consequently, climate change strongly influences the way the field of migration and development operate. The UNHCR (2009) and the UNDP (2011) have recognized that climate change poses various difficulties for their respective fields, in terms of achieving certain goals (MDGs) or meeting the needs of certain populations. The research found that both agencies are trying to adapt their practices to the new challenges. This process very much indicates a climatization of migration and development, as the respective practices of both fields are becoming part of dealing with climate change, and climate change is becoming part of their respective practices.
9.2 Evaluation

This thesis’ strength lies in its theoretical approach, as it moves beyond one theoretical framework (Copenhagen School) and contributes more specific knowledge to another (Paris School). Thus, the research was able to provide a thick description of the security issue at hand, while at the same time engaging in theory testing as well as confirming. Furthermore, as this thesis deals with a rather specific and emerging topic, it is able to contribute up to date knowledge about climate change and security to the field of environmental security as well as critical security studies.

This research could have benefitted from comparing the international fields of migration and development with the national ones, in regards to climate change and security. Even though previous research did not find a lot of evidence for traditional security approaches to climate change, this might change over time. Thus, research on climate change and security might benefit from including various levels of analysis. Further, this thesis would benefit from a greater focus of UNHCR and UNDP projects to make more inferences about the ‘everyday practices’ of professionals within the respective fields (see Oels 2012).

9.3 Further Research

Further research could engage with the research question that was not addressed here, namely why climate change is produced as a security issue and who might benefit from it. This question should perhaps mainly engage with constructions of climate change as a direct threat which requires more traditional security responses. Further, more research can be done on the extent of climatization of defense, migration and development. It might be interesting to consider more actors across different levels of analysis. More research can also be done on why the current mitigation regime is not doing so well and why states remain rather reluctant to effective climate mitigation. A starting point for such research could be Bernstein’s (2000) concept of ‘Liberal Environmentalism’.
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Appendix 1, Figure 1: Map of observed impacts attributed to climate change