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Abstract:
The issue of climate migration has long been struggling to make its way onto the international agenda. This study therefore set out to shed a light on eleven strategies for handling climate migration. The study builds on the work by Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015) where they allocate actors to four different frames depending on how the actor in question view the environmental migrant, either as; a victim; a security threat; an adaptive agent or; a political subject. This makes out an important comparative basis for the analysis done in this study. It also provides a background on problem definition and framing and the role it plays in policy making. This study then takes the step to also present solutions to the problem defined by presenting concrete strategies which can all be allocated to one of the four frames. The core ideas of the strategies and the solutions they provide are presented using a content analysis. In addition, the question of responsibility for climate migrants is discussed using three normative theories: contribution to the problem, ability to pay and beneficiary pays. The study concludes that there is a consensus among most actors that there is a need for global cooperation and shared responsibility for climate migration and climate migrants. It also concludes that the way a problem is defined or framed plays a highly important role.
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Summary:
Climate change is threatening to redraw the map of the world. Sea levels are rising, ecosystems are changing, and food and water supplies are declining. This is causing population movements across the world and it is proclaimed how climate migration is becoming one of the largest challenges of the 21st century. This study therefore sets out to present eleven strategies for handling climate migration. The study builds on the work by Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015) where they allocate actors to four different frames depending on how the actor in question view the environmental migrant, either as; a victim; a security threat; an adaptive agent or; a political subject. This make out an important comparative basis for the analysis done in this study. It also provides a background on problem definition and framing and the role it plays in policy making. This study then takes the step to also present solutions to the problem defined by presenting concrete strategies which can all be allocated to one of the four frames. The core ideas of the strategies and the solutions they provide are presented using a content analysis. In addition, the question of responsibility for climate migrants is discussed using three normative theories: contribution to the problem, ability to pay and beneficiary pays. The study concludes that there is a consensus among most actors that there is a need for global cooperation and shared responsibility for climate migration and climate migrants. It also concludes that the way a problem is defined or framed plays a highly important role.
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1. Introduction

“As we embark on this great collective journey, we pledge that no one will be left behind.”
(UN General Assembly 2015:3)

Global warming from human caused emissions will continue to cause long-term changes to the earth’s systems for centuries to come. It will continue to cause sea levels to rise and changes in ecosystems both on land and in our oceans (IPCC, 2018). The most vulnerable and at highest risk of the most serious impacts of climate change are poorer states. This is because these states are more likely to have a larger proportion of their economy in agricultural sectors which are more sensitive to climate change. They also often suffer geographical disadvantages due to them being located in regions with an already warmer climate, causing thresholds for critical temperatures to come faster. These states also have less ability for adaptation and mitigation due to limited resources, in conclusion making them less resilient to climate change (Stern, 2007).

Norman Myers article from 2005 declares how a new phenomenon is on the rise: environmental refugees. He explains how people who no longer can sustain a livelihood in their home country due to climate change will have no other alternative than to seek residence somewhere else. He goes on to state that migration due to climate change will become one of the most substantial crises of our time (Myers, 2005:1f). The International Organization for Migration [IOM] describes how it is difficult to find certain estimates on how many people that will have to leave their homes because of climate change. Nevertheless, it is already clear how changes in our environment are causing movements among populations (IOM, 2008:11). There are however estimates stating that between 2008 and 2015, people displaced due to disaster were 26 million each year (IDMC, 2015).

In her article, Warner (2009) poses the question of how well equipped current institutional arrangements are to be able to manage climate change induced migration and if there is a need for new governance methods (Warner, 2009:1). Building on Warner’s question, the aim of this study is therefore to shed light on strategies for handling climate migration. By studying various actors, the hope is to be able to present a systematic overview of different types of strategies that stem from various points of views and problem definitions. This would provide insights into what strategies that could be complements to the current institutional arrangements that Warner (2009) is questioning. In addition, it could also contribute to a chance for different actors be able to better understand each other and possibly also build on each other’s ideas. Something which in turn could provide new solutions to the issue of climate migration.

It is richer, more developed states, that have contributed most to greenhouse gas emissions and are also the ones that have benefited the most (Bell, 2004:139). Ödalen (2011) therefore argues that the situation of climate migration calls for an important question. What is the richer states responsibility towards the poorer states? If it is the richer states that have created the most extensive greenhouse gas emission, does that not make them primarily responsible for the effects that it has on the people of poorer states? (Ödalen, 2011:140). Another aim of this study is therefore to explore how the suggested strategies relate to the questions of responsibility for climate migrants. In order to do this the study will make use of three theories that are used for analysing the responsibility for climate change. The theories include contribution to the problem, ability to pay and beneficiary pays (Page, 2008). By applying these the aim is to contribute to an understanding of the view of responsibility among different actors and their suggested strategies for handling climate migration.

1.1. Purpose and Research questions

The purpose of this study is to investigate what different actors suggest as strategies for handling climate migration. Additionally, different normative perspectives will be applied in order to further understand how these strategies relate to the question of responsibility for dealing with climate migration.

- What do different types of actors suggest as strategies for handling climate migration?
- How do these strategies relate to the question of responsibility for climate migrants?
1.2. General outline of the study

In the following chapter a general background on climate change and its relation to population movements will be presented. It will also provide an overview of the concept and issue of climate migration over time.

Following the background chapter, the choice of method and material will be presented. This chapter will also present the different actors as well as the steps which the study will take in order to answer to its purpose and research questions. The limitations of the study will also be described.

The continuing chapter will present the theory of problem definition and the theory of framing and show how these relate to one another as well as their purpose in this study.

Following these three chapters, the strategies for handling climate migration will be presented using a content analysis where three categories have been used in order to bring forward the core ideas of the strategy; goals, methods and actors.

After the strategies have been presented a chapter on three theories of responsibility will be presented. These theories will then be applied to the strategies in order to explain how they relate to the question of responsibility.

Lastly, a discussion chapter will tie together and summarise the analysis. It will highlight important parts as well as suggest future research on the subject of strategies for handling climate migration.

2. Background

The aim of this section is to provide a background on the topic of climate change and the effects it will have on human migration. It will also provide an overview of how climate migration as a concept and policy issue has changed from its introduction in the early 1990s up until today. This is to be able to create an understanding of why this study finds it important to shed light on strategies for handling climate migration.

2.1. Climate change and migration

Rising temperatures have already altered both human and natural systems. Human behaviour is changing the planet, pushing the world into a new geological era. The fairly stable period of the Holocene is moving on to become something that is often entitled the Anthropocene. The Anthropocene is presented as a way of understanding the historical and present relation between humans and the environment. It also provides possibilities to understand how it will affect the future and how to avoid pitfalls (Allen et al., 2018:53f).

The Anthropocene has turned climate change into a concern for every state of the world. Something which is also clearly stated in The United Nations Sustainable Development goal 13 – “take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts”. Climate patterns are changing and causing more extreme weather. Meanwhile the greenhouse gas emissions are hitting an all-time high and have increased by nearly 50 percent since the beginning of the 1990s (UN, 2018). Although climate change is bound to affect the whole world, it is states which are poorer and less developed that will experience the most severe impacts. These states are often more vulnerable due to the fact that their economies are more dependent on sectors which are more sensitive to climate change. Their adaptive level is also lower due to limited resources (IOM, 2009:15f).

Greenhouse gas emissions are historically something for which richer states have been mostly, if not nearly completely, responsible. The technology that produced the emissions has contributed to economic benefits for both past and present generations in these states. At the same time, it is not the people of richer states that will have to pay the highest price in the form of consequences of climate change (Bell, 2004:139). Poorer states have contributed least to greenhouse gas emissions, however, will suffer the
most. For richer states, climate change will mostly cause them to have to adapt, while for poorer states, it will become a question of survival (Ödalen, 2010:140f).

Throughout history people have been forced to leave their homes in search of new residence due to civil wars, poverty and political instability. During the past years however, an increasing number of people have had to do the same because of extreme weather events which are linked to climate change. As previously stated, the average number of people displaced due to disaster, between 2008 and 2015 were 26 million, numbers which are expected to increase over the upcoming years (IDMC, 2015).

Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme Erik Solheim and the Director General of the United Nations Migration Agency, William Lacy Swing, stated that climate change is redrawing the map of the world. Food and water supplies are declining, droughts and heat waves are becoming more frequent and storms and floods are becoming the new normal state of certain regions. This is having significant implications for where people are able to sustain themselves and migration might become the only option (UNFCCC, 2018).

Already in 1990, IPCC raised a warning sign saying that among the several impacts climate change will have on the world, human migration might be the largest one. Because of the impacts climate change has, and will have, on the movement of populations, the research community and other experts need to provide policy makers with guidance (IOM, 2009:9ff).

“Large numbers of people are moving as a result of environmental degradation that has increased dramatically in recent years. The number of such migrants could rise substantially as larger areas of the earth become uninhabitable as a result of climate change.” (IOM, 2009:13)

### 2.2. Dealing with climate migration

The issue of climate induced migration has been on the agenda since the early 1990s and was already from the start claimed to possibly be one of the most severe effects of climate change. During the upcoming century the connections between climate change and population movements was subject for discussion within international institutions as well as within the research society. Predictions stated that up to 200 million people were at the risk of being displaced due to climate change by 2050. Stepping in to the 2000s, climate migration became known to a larger sphere which resulted in several statements and reports. Climate change and climate migration became part of security agendas as well as putting a human face on climate change. In the 2010s climate migration was found within UNFCC negotiations and it became clear that climate migration would become a substantial as well as difficult issue to address (Jakobsson, 2018:140f).

In their article from 2010 Biermann and Boas state that the numbers of people having to migrate due to climate change are difficult to forecast, there are nevertheless indications that climate migration most presumably will exceed all earlier migration crisis in terms of numbers of people affected. They consequently pose the question how the systems of global governance will be able to manage the impacts of climate change and what institutions need to be redesigned. They claim that the current governance mechanisms are insufficient and not equipped for coping with what they refer to as the looming crisis. It is declared that there is a need for new governance (Biermann & Boas, 2010:60f;83).

During the UNHCR Excom in 2011 it became especially prominent that the issue of climate migration would be difficult to address. The majority of the member states stated how they will not take on further responsibilities for people displaced by disaster or develop protection frameworks. Yet, four years later, during COP21 in Paris, the question of climate induced migration was acknowledged. This however did not result in new protection frameworks nor of concrete action to tackle the issue (Jakobsson, 2018:140f).

The same year, the Nansen Initiative confirms once again that forced displacement due to climate change is one of the most substantial challenges of the 21st century. It calls for action from both states and the international community. There is a consensus among scientists that climate change, together with other factors, will cause increasing displacement over the upcoming years (The Nansen Initiative, 2015:6). Just like Biermann and Boas (2011) the Nansen Initiative poses questions regarding current governance
mechanisms. It is claimed that there is an absence of clear conditions in international law concerning under what circumstances people displaced by disaster are to be admitted to another state. There is also missing what rights these people have during their stay and under what conditions they might be sent back to return to their home country. Due to this, some states have decided to develop several tools which constitute temporary humanitarian protection, allowing them to admit or not return people displaced by disaster. These measures to protect displaced people are often based on regular immigration law, exceptional immigration categories or provisions related to the protection of refugees of similar human right laws (The Nansen Initiative, 2015:8).

In a report of the Secretary-General, submitted to The United Nations General Assembly in 2016, the issue of large movement of refugees and migrants is addressed. The aim of the report is to provide background and recommendations for an upcoming high-level plenary meeting which was held later the same year. It is declared in the report, that there are major challenges in migration policy and practice. For example, the notion of refugee status is brought up and how there are people who might not be able to claim it but nevertheless are in need of protection. Meanwhile receiving states are more than rarely left on their own in having to respond to an increased inflow of people to their country. It is therefore a request for action where the responsibility is shared on a regional level. It is declared that international cooperation has not been able to provide sufficient support to receiving states. (UN General Assembly, 2016:9ff)

Further the report proclaims a growing concern for the trend of Member States responses to refugees and migrants where they establish fences and walls at their borders. It is claimed to reinforce xenophobia and can become counterproductive in trying to foster integration and cooperation. There is a need for a dignified approach to human mobility which will not be the case with closed borders (UN General Assembly, 2016:9-13).

Based on this background of climate migration and its difficulty to make its way into action-based policy frameworks, this study finds it important to shed light on strategies for handling climate migration. The study will present strategies which stem from different point of views as well as from different problem definitions, something which is viewed as fruitful for the debate and the continuing work to create policies for climate migration. By creating a systematic overview of existing strategies for handling climate migration it is possible to provide insights which could help making climate migration a high priority on the international agenda and a needed step towards dealing with a potential global crisis.

3. Methodology

Below a description and motivation of the choice of method and material will follow. This section will also introduce the different actors and the documents which they provide. There will also be a description of the different steps which the analysis will take in order to answer to the purpose and research questions of the study. Finally, the limitations of the study will be described.

3.1. Choice of method and material

This study sets out to answer two questions which in the first step demand two separate analyses. The first question focuses on finding out what different actors suggest as strategies for handling climate migration whilst the second question focuses on applying different normative perspectives in order to relate the strategies to the question of responsibility towards climate migrants. To be able to answer to the first of the two, a content analysis will be carried out. This will constitute the first part of the study. The second part will then be to apply the normative perspectives on the results from the content analysis. These normative perspectives will be further presented under 6. Theories on responsibility. Below, the content analysis will be explained.

The belief is that the content analysis will provide answers to the question to which it has been applied. In other words, the question of what you want to find out determines the choice of data (Robson, 2011:352ff). Therefore, it is suggested to initiate the content analysis with a research question. The
research question which this content analysis will build on is therefore: What do different types of actors suggest as strategies for handling climate migration?

The next step is to reduce the data to a manageable level for analysis. This is usually referred to as sampling from the population. Since it can be difficult to deal with the whole population of interest, a selection must be made. The selection or sampling will highly influence the research and is therefore an important aspect (Robson, 2011:252:270). Since this study sets out to create an overview of existing strategies for handling climate migration using different types of actors, a choice of which material to use had to be made. The selection was made using an article by Ransan-Cooper et al. from 2015. A further development of the sampling was also made in order to reduce the material to an even more manageable level. This will be further explained under 3.2 The different actors.

In their article, Ransan-Cooper et al. systemise actors accordingly to an analysis of how they choose to interpret the environmental migrant. They have focused on the construction of four different frames. These frames are constructed through language, reasoning and metaphors or abstractions. Further they analyse how these elements build different understandings of how the environmental migrant should be viewed. A frame simply organises central ideas of how an issue is defined and produced by a certain actor (Ransan-Cooper et al., 2015:107).

The aim of the analysis by Ransan-Cooper et al. is to show how the frames created rely on beliefs and assumptions made by the actor in question. These are not always obvious and not always something other actors share. The authors argue that to be able to advocate for a standpoint, it is important to have an understanding of how others might view an issue and why they have formed their understanding in a certain way (Ransan-Cooper et al. 2015:109). It is argued that the way a problem is defined is highly important for the understanding of why a policy or strategy has taken the form that it has (Dery, 2000:37). This study views the work by Ransan-Cooper et al. as a good starting point for presenting strategies for handling climate migration. By building on their work it is possible to establish what type of problem definition and framing of the environmental migrant that is underlining the strategy in question. This provides an opportunity to not only present a strategy for handling climate migration, but also to show why it has taken the form that it has.

The four frames used by the authors present the environmental migrant as either a victim, a security threat, an adaptive agent or as a political subject. These four frames have all emerged over time in the environmental migrant policy sphere (Ransan-Cooper et al., 2015:106). They are therefore viewed by this study as four relevant frames to make use of when presenting possible strategies for handling climate migration. These four frames will allow for an important comparative basis in both the content analysis as well as when applying normative perspectives to the results from it. One could say that these frames in a sense constitute a backbone of this study since it will provide a basis for all analyses made.

Ransan-Cooper et al. have built their analysis on the following questions:

- What common metaphors, myths and narratives delineate one frame from another?
- How is the frame produced, legitimised and communicated and by what actors?
- What resources were available to actors in frame promotion?
- What knowledge(s) does the frame tend to include or exclude?
- For which groups does the frame have cultural resonance and what are the implications in terms of excluding particular voices?
- How has the frame been critiqued, and by who?

(Ransan-Cooper et al., 2015: 109).
Table 1. Systematisation of actors (Ransan-Cooper et al., 2015:108).

Once the sampling has been made it is important to construct categories for the content analysis. It is emphasised that sorting out the categories is a crucial part of the content analysis. It is explained how the categories is what contains the core of the investigation and that the content analysis is never better than its system of categories (Robson, 2011:354).

Robson (2011) continues with suggesting what the different categories could include:

Subject matter – what is it about?
Direction – how is it treated, e.g. favourably or not?
Values – what values are revealed?
Goals – what goals or intentions are revealed?
Methods – what methods are used to achieve these intentions?
Traits – what are the characteristics used in describing people?
Actors – who is represented as carrying out the actions referred to?
Authority – in whose name are the statements made?
Location – where does the action take place?
Conflict – what are the sources and levels of conflict?
Endings – in what way are conflicts resolved (e.g. happily?)

(Robson, 2011: 354).

Since the research question that will serve as the base for the content analysis concerns itself with strategies for handling climate migration, the categories of most value for accomplishing this are viewed to be goals, methods and actors. These categories are viewed as being able to provide the needed information in order to present the core ideas of the strategies.
**Goals** – what the actors view as the goal of their suggested strategy for climate migration.

**Methods** – how their suggested strategy plans to reach the goal they have set.

**Actors** – who is suggested as the main actor responsible for carrying out the strategy.

Eleven content analyses, on eleven different documents will be carried out. This means that it is of importance to ensure that all eleven of them are performed in the same way, using the same systematisation. By using these three categories it is possible to limit the analysis to only these categories, something which will help ensuring that the documents are interpreted and analysed in the same manner. To be able to analyse and systemise the documents a colour coding is adopted which represents the different categories. This allows for a simplified overview of all documents. At times the different categories are clearly expressed, other times there is a need for more interpretation and analysis of the whole text in order to answer to the question of the category. When presenting the content analysis under 5. Strategies for handling climate migration it will be done using the categories. This is in order to clearly show how the content analysis have been performed in the same way on all documents as well as presenting the result in a systemised way.

Relating the questions that made up the analysis of Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015) to the questions posed by Robson (2011) it is possible to draw the conclusion that the questions posed by Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015) relate more so to the categories regarding values and traits. Therefore, these are not included in the content analysis performed in this study. However, the categories of values and traits will still be included through the incorporation of the frames as a comparative basis.

The analysis by Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015) presents how different actors view the environmental migrant. Their analysis focuses on how a problem is represented and produced within a policy. Their work does therefore not provide concrete strategies for how the problem should be handled. The content analysis performed in this study will therefore focus more comprehensively on what the solution to the problem should be and present concrete strategies. This study will allow for the analysis by Ransan-Cooper et al. to provide an understanding of the importance of problem definition and the meanings of the problem produced within the policy. However, the focus of the content analysis performed is to present what the actor in question suggests as a strategy for handling the problem. It is therefore important to clarify that the framing done by Ransan-Cooper et al. is used for making the selection of material as well as providing an understanding of how the problem is defined and reproduced by a certain actor, constituting an important comparative basis. The content analysis performed in this study then focuses on solutions rather than the definition of the problem.

This table explains how this study is building on the work by Ransan-Cooper et al. in that it uses their systematisation of actors accordingly to the four different frames. This study then uses a content analysis in order to present eleven different strategies which can be found within these frames. Finally, three theories on responsibility are applied to the strategies. This allows to connect frames, strategies and responsibility in a concluding analysis and thereby answering the research questions of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Strategies and Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>• In the face of looming catastrophe: A convention for climate change displaced persons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental refugees: The case for recognition.</td>
<td>• Contribution to the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No place like home: Where next for climate refugees?</td>
<td>• Ability to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security threats</td>
<td>• Environmental refugees: an emergent security issue.</td>
<td>• Beneficiary pays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive agents</td>
<td>• Climate change and national security – an agenda for action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political subjects</td>
<td>• Climate change and international security.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Migration as adaptation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control, adapt or flee? How to face environmental migration?
Climate Change and migration: improving methodologies to estimate flows.
Climate-Induced Community Relocations: Creating an Adaptive Governance Framework Based in Human Rights Doctrine.
Climate change displaced persons and housing, land and property rights. Preliminary strategies for rights-based planning and programming to resolve climate-induced displacement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ransan-Cooper et al.</th>
<th>This study</th>
<th>This study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 2. Building the study.

There are, as always with different methods to research, advantages and disadvantages. Robson (2011) argues that the advantages of content analysis include the fact that you as a researcher are unnoticeable. Meaning, that by using existing documents there is no chance that you as a researcher is also being observed as when making a first-hand data collecting through interviews or observations. It is also explained that the data being used comes in a permanent form and it is therefore possible to perform re-analysis which allows for reliability checks and replication studies. The disadvantages in turn, are argued to be that the documents might be limited, and it might have been written for other purposes than for research which introduces biases or distortions (Robson, 2011:356). It is important to acknowledge that the documents used for the content analysis are read and interpreted from the point of view of the researcher. This could have implications for the result and one person might read a document differently compared to someone else. However, it is believed that by using the categories goals, methods and actors, the interpretation is limited to answering just those questions and therefore ensuring that it is possible for someone else to also apply these categories and ending up with the same result.

### 3.2. The different actors

The actors which will be represented all stem from the article by Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015). However, not all of the actors used in their article will be part of this study. The main focus has been on actors from the research field, think-tanks and international environmental organisations and international humanitarian or development organisations. These actors are viewed as being able to provide a variety of strategies. They are also viewed as being important voices in the ongoing international debate around climate migration as well as playing an important role in setting the global agenda. It would have been of interest to also include individual governments, however a limitation had to be made. Perhaps a future study of this kind could include the perspective of governments as well.

By having a variety of actors from these different fields the aim was to be able to present different types of strategies. The aim was to have one actor from each field within every frame, this was however not always possible. Some actors provided documents which did not answer to the questions of the content analysis and some actors were not represented at all within a frame. Therefore, some frames do not have all categories of actors represented and a frame might also have another type of actor represented since the strategy provided was viewed as valuable and a good complement to the actor missing. The strategies provided by the actors also differ in length and depth. Some actors provide strategies which are well-detailed while others provide strategies with less details. This in turn have implications for the result presented, and some sections are therefore sometimes considerably longer than others. This should not
be viewed as a way of trying to promote a certain strategy, it is simply a reflection of the document provided by the actor.

It is also important to acknowledge that the documents stem from a period between 2003 and 2013. This means that a leading actor in 2003 might have been replaced by other actors which are viewed as more influential today. It is also possible that an actor has provided new strategies since then. The strategies provided are however viewed as still being valuable and providing insights which are of importance for the ongoing work with climate migration. It is also important to understand that a large part of this study also sets out to provide different types of strategies. This means that it could be positive to also have strategies from other time periods since these might put forward ideas which actors of today might not. The choice to exclusively use documents from Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015) was made based on the fact that this ensured that a framing analysis had been performed since this make out an important comparative basis for the study.

The following actors will be represented in the study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victims framing</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Think-Tank</th>
<th>International Environmental Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 3. Actors within the victims framing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security threats framing</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Think-Tank</th>
<th>Intergovernmental organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 4. Actors within the security threats framing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptive agents framing</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Think-Tank</th>
<th>International Humanitarian Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 5. Actors within the adaptive agents framing.
It is possible to critique Ransan-Cooper et al. for not incorporating certain actors which can be viewed as important ones within this subject. One example of this is the UNHCR which is one of the major actors within migration and refugees. This study could have incorporated UNHCR, however the choice was made to only use those which were also used by Ransan-Cooper et al. since a major part of the analysis in this study build on the fact that a framing analysis has been performed on the document in question. It is however important to acknowledge that there are other strategies and actors which could provide important insights into the issue of climate migration which are not included in this study.

### 3.3. Building the result

This study aims to present what different actors suggest as strategies for handling climate migration. It also aims to present how these strategies relate to the question of responsibility for climate migration. To be able to do this, the study will take the approach of different steps. Below these steps will be explained.

1. Provide a chapter on the theory of problem definition and the theory of framing. This will constitute the background to the first part of the result.

2. Carry out the content analysis of the chosen documents. The actors and their suggested strategies will be presented accordingly to the four frames. This is in order for the study to be able to clearly show how the framing is underlining the suggested strategy. Each framing will be followed by a short summarising analysis of the strategies and actors within that frame.

3. Apply the normative perspectives in order to answer the research question regarding moral responsibility. This will begin with a presentation of the three different theories which will be used. The aim is to then be able to make connections between the framings, strategies and theories of responsibility.

4. Provide a summarising discussion which ties everything together and highlights important aspects.

### 3.4. Limitations

The study is foremost limited in how the material has been chosen. The documents which contain the strategies all stem from the work by Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015). This means that other strategies that are available, and which might be viewed as important, will not be part of the study. The same goes with the chosen actors. Certain actors who might be viewed as important for a study of this kind will be left out.
The chosen strategy documents are also limited in that they are from the time period 2003 to 2013. This means that there are documents both before as well as after this period, which could be viewed as important and would surely provide insights which could be important.

4. Problem definition and framing

In the following, the theory of problem definition as well as the theory of framing will be explained. It will be described how these two relate to each other and their importance to the study. This will constitute a background for the continuing chapter where the results of the content analysis will be presented.

In the wake of globalisation, many policy decisions and problems of today are in need of addressing on a global level. This is in turn causing a decline in national policy and the policy decisions on global level will therefore have significant impact on the national level. Climate change and the effects it will have on population movements is one of these policy problems that have gained increased attention during the past years (Jakobsson, 2010:6).

When making policy decisions and setting the agenda the way a problem is defined is crucial. There are always interpretations of a problem and different worldviews underlying them that are bound to compete with one another (Dery, 2000:37). Weiss (1989) emphasises that a problem definition lays out the groundwork for the construction of a policy. A problem definition is therefore fundamental in that it will shed light on certain aspects and put other aspects at the side line. It will decide the direction of the policy to pursue certain solutions while disregarding others (Weiss, 1989:97). A problem definition is thus not a neutral definition (Jakobsson, 2010:11).

In their article Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015) use the concept of framing in order to understand how different actors choose to interpret the concept of environmental migration and how it is contested. The frames also provide an overview for all actors to engage with the issue from several perspectives. The four frames that are being used for constituting the different views have all emerged in the environmental migration policy sphere during the past years, namely the environmental migrant as: victim, security threat, adaptive agent or political subject. It is however emphasised that these are non-static entities and are to be seen as filters for making sense of what different views on environmental migration that exist (Ransan-Cooper, 2015:106).

There is also an emphasis on the importance to understand how these conceptualisations are being used. By whom, how and to what end? The difference from doing so on a broader discursive level is that a framing approach allows for the analysis to be more practice-based and able to explore language and metaphors more detailed and in specific situations. In short, by using frames one allows for central ideas of a complex issue to be organised. It is possible to clarify in what ways different actors define an issue, both intentionally and unconsciously. The framing approach also allows for analysing the process which leads up to how something is being problematised and how it in turn eventually can become the basis for decision-making (Ransan-Cooper, 2015:107).

The connection between problem definition and framing is described by Bacchi (2015) where the difference between interpretivism and poststructuralism in policy theory is described as interpretivism being ways of understanding a problem, whilst poststructuralism is the way in which a problem is produced and represented (Bacchi, 2015:1). In a later article by Bacchi (2016) it is further explained how an interpretivist aim describes how certain actors give a specific meaning to a problem. How a problem is constituted within the policy is however not something which is given much attention. Instead framing, or a poststructuralist approach, is often used in order to describe the meanings which are produced within a policy (Bacchi, 2016:5).

For this study, the actors represented have begun formulating a problem definition – the way in which they understand the problem. They give their specific meaning to the problem and this in turn have implications for how their strategy on handling climate migration takes form. These strategy documents have in turn been analysed by Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015) using a framing approach. Which, in the words of this study, has been done using a poststructuralist approach in order to understand how the
problem defined by the actor, is being constituted within the policy. In this case, showing how the different actors chose to describe the climate migrant; as victim, as a security threat, as an adaptive agent or as a political subject.

It is believed that creating an understanding of problem definition and the implications it will have on a policy or strategy is important when performing a policy analysis. For this study it is in addition also important to also understand the concept of framing since the four different frames make out an important comparative basis for the analysis.

5. Strategies for handling climate migration

This section will present the result of the content analysis of the different strategy documents. First the relevant frame will be presented, followed by the different actors and their strategy for handling climate migration. Each frame will finish off with a short summarising analysis.

5.1. Victims

Being several decades old, the framing of the environmental migrant as a victim takes the form of the earliest framing. The victims framing has often been emphasised by international NGOs and focuses on the suffer inflicted upon the environmental migrant. The framing proclaims helplessness and passivity of those affected by climate change and stresses the need for saving these people. This would be done by financial assistance or asylum provided by foreign states. The Global North is described as the saviour of the Global South and the North is a place where the helpless victims of climate change can seek protection (Ransan-Cooper et al. 2015:109f).

This framing has a tendency to overlook the understanding of how the people of the Global South experience the problem. The emphasis on external humanitarian, legal and financial assistance tend to provide solutions that often neglect the agency and capacity of the environmental migrant as well as local mitigation strategies. Nevertheless, the idea of compassion and care, which is also a part of the victim framing, is expressed as something that could be useful elements (Ransan-Cooper et al. 2015:109f).

5.1.1. Research: Hodgkinson & Young

In the face of looming catastrophe: A convention for climate change displaced persons (2013)

Lucy Young is a lawyer as well as political advisor. David Hodgkinson is executive director of the non-profit association Eco Carbon as well as associate Professor at the Law School at the University of Western Australia (The University of Western Australia, 2008; The Hodgkinson Group, 2011)

Goals

The goal is to provide a comprehensive, global approach to the problem of climate change displacement persons (CCDPs) in the form of a single, multilateral and stand-alone convention. The main aim is to provide a framework for CCDPs assistance which will also address the gaps in existing protections and humanitarian assistance (Hodgkinson & Young, 2013:6f).

Methods

It is described how current international laws does not provide protection for people that are likely to become displaced due to climate change. The Geneva Convention, which addresses the status of refugees, does not include CCDPs since it provides a restrictive definition of ‘the refugee’. A refugee must be a person who has “a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reason of race, religion or nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion and who is outside of the country of his nationality”. To claim that a person displaced by climate change has been persecuted is therefore explained as a difficult thing to do (Hodgkinson & Young, 2013:4).
It is further expressed how a “coherent multilateral governance framework” for environmental migration is currently missing. It is also claimed that there have not been any coordinated responses from governments to address CCDPs and that it should be of interest to address the problem of displacement in a coordinated way. This should be done by providing non-discriminatory framework for the protection of CCDPs as well as develop principles for the resettlement of people of island states which are at risk of becoming uninhabitable (Hodgkinson & Young, 2013:7).

The suggested convention is a stand-alone tool which draws upon provisions of other instruments in order to assist and protect CCDPs and takes the form of multifaceted and cooperative international approach. The states in most need of assistance from the convention are those with economies which depend upon the natural environment and who are lacking the resources in order to mitigate and adapt. The convention will also address both permanent and temporary relocation (Hodgkinson & Young, 2013:8).

It is emphasised that it is difficult to determine to what extent climate change is giving rise to displacement, however it is explained how the IPCC provides certain trends and phenomena’s that are consistent with climate change. This includes (a) increasing sea levels; (b) increasing tropical cyclone activities; (c) increasing areas which are affected by droughts. These trends are all identified as “likely” by the IPCC, meaning that the probability is more than 66 percent. The suggested convention would establish a “very likely” standard which means a 90 percent probability to determining phenomena and trends. It is explained how the convention would adopt an objective approach which would operate prospectively. This means that if the environment is assessed as likely to become uninhabitable due to human induced climate change leading to the need of displacement, the convention would provide assistance to the affected people. It is also explained that displacement is viewed as a form of adaptation which demand that the international community collaborates and provided assistance and protection to the CCDPs (Hodgkinson & Young, 2013:9f).

It is expressed how a core question will be when migration caused by slow-onset climate change can be seen as forced and not voluntary. It is therefore explained that the standpoint in the suggested convention will be that population movements that occurs because of the effects of climate change which makes an area uninhabitable, is viewed as ‘forced’. This then turns the important question into an institutional one rather than definitional. Turning the focus to creating institutional administration in order to assist a set of processes which will establish the likeliness that climate change will contribute to population movements. This would take the shape of a collection of designations of the status of CCDPs rather than trying to assign rights and protection on individual definition-based criteria. It would be done through a process by states and Convention institutions (Hodgkinson & Young, 2013:10f).

The suggested definition of CCDP would therefore be:

“CCDPs are groups of people whose habitual homes have or will become temporarily or permanently uninhabitable as a consequence of a climate change event”. Furthermore, “a climate change event” is defined as “sudden or gradual environmental disruption that is consistent with climate change and to which humans very likely contributed” (Hodgkinson & Young, 2013:11).

**Actors**

The conventions would require the creation of a Climate Change Displacement Organisation (CCDO) which would consist of an Assembly, a Council, a Climate Change Displacement Fund and a Climate Change Displacement Environment and Science Organisation. There would also be Climate Change Displacement Implementations Groups in order to facilitate resettlement. States which provides funding and those receiving it would be parties to the conventions. It will only be ‘developing states’ that will be able to request assistance from the convention. State parties would be obligated to collect data on climate change displacement, plan for future protection and assistance to CCDPs as well as consulting with existing or potential CCDPs when collecting data, constructing policies and implementing these. It is stated that the assistance would be based on a bottom-up/top-down assessment since this is viewed as the most successful way to adapt to climate change. It would furthermore be possible to also offer assistance to ‘developing states’ even though no official request has been submitted from those parties. (Hodgkinson & Young, 2013:12ff).
It is explained how there would be a need to establish regional committees that would be connected to the CCDO and provide information on the specific situation of that region. This would help address the situation through bilateral agreement of home and host states. The financial funding from ‘developed states’ should be based on the principle of “common by differentiated responsibilities”. Meaning that states parties should provide funding from the recognition of historical differences in the contribution of environmental problems as well as the economic and technical capacity to handle these problems. This principle makes out an important base for the obligations of state parties to the Convention (Hodgkinson & Young, 2013:12ff).

5.1.2. Think-tank: New Economic Foundation


New Economic Foundation is an independent think-tank working for the development of a more sustainable and fairer economy (New Economic Foundation, 2003:45).

Goals
The goal is to expand the Geneva Convention to also include a category of environmental persecution. There is also a need for the international community to accept that they have obligations. This will be done by providing new legal responsibilities towards climate refugees (New Economic Foundation, 2003:26ff).

Methods
There is a strong emphasis on the obligations of the international community to assist environmental refugees. It is described how western Europe and the US need to understand and face up to the impact they are having on the global environment. Building on this it is explained that there is a need to redefine the term ‘refugee’. The current definition does not include environmental reasons for granting the status of refugee (New Economic Foundation, 2003:25f).

It is expressed how populations which are displaced internally should be able to appeal to the government of their own state and only if the government fails to help its citizens should an international intervention take place. It is stated by the UNHCR that people will be able to move within their home countries, this is however claimed to overlook two facts. The first one being that the governments of that specific state might be part of the cause of the displacement in first place and therefore a poor source of protection. Secondly, states might completely or partly disappear or become uninhabitable. There are several island states at risk of disappearing, which rises complex questions of citizenship and economic rights. It is further emphasised how the arguments against recognising environmental displaced persons as refugees ignores both causes and solutions from the international community. There is a need to recognise the responsibility of the polluters, both morally and economically. It is explained how fossil fuels account for a large proportion of the global economic activity which allow for wealthier states to enjoy a certain level of lifestyle as well as contributing to global warming. Wealthier states should therefore be expected to pay for their enjoyment of fossil fuels and the benefits which it brings (New Economic Foundation, 2003:26ff).

This therefore constitute the basis for including people displaced by environmental degradation into the Geneva Convention. The environment can in this sense be viewed as an instrument of harm. The expansion of the convention would also include the fact that the current global system allows for parts of the world to pollute and consume without having to clean up the mess. It is further explained how harm is intentional when policies are carried through even though there is full awareness of the damaging consequences. It is claimed that the consequences of climate change are knowledge which is sufficiently understood and to overlook this or fail to respond, therefore need to be viewed as intentional behaviour (New Economic Foundation, 2003:30f).

An example made is United States energy plans. Plans which would increase the greenhouse gas emissions of America by 25 percent in a few years’ time. It is claimed that this kind of ‘intentional behaviour’ will lead to environmental refugees and it is therefore possible to claim this as environmental persecution. The Geneva Conventions definition of a refugee argues that there is a need for well-founded fear of persecution in a religious, political or “other” context. It is hence argued that “a well-founded
fear” of starvation or drowning constitutes a reason for needing to flee (New Economic Foundation, 2003:30f).

In addition, there is also a need for the global community to recognise the case of ecological debt. This is defined as when the citizens of one state take more than what is fair of the global environmental ‘common’. Meanwhile citizens of states which get much less of the share are victims of the burdens from the wealthier states’ emissions. There is a need for an international measurement of ecological debt which allow for clarification of the financial and environmental obligations of countries. This could for example include a sustainable per capita level of fossil fuel consumption (New Economic Foundation, 2003:32f).

**Actors**

Currently the burden of environmental refugees mostly ends up on the shoulders of poorer states. States with governments that might already be struggling with meeting the basic need of its people. Even though it is upon the states to have the ultimate responsibility for its citizens the world has gone through considerable changes since the implementation of the Geneva Convention. Through globalisation the powers of the state has been partly undermined, including those of the ability to support its own citizens. To then expect the state to respond to environmental events which are not of their own making is therefore unfair (New Economic Foundation, 2003:31f).

To be able to deal with environmental displacement there is a need for a global agreement which shifts resources from North to South. Something which will allow for the recognition of the disproportionate responsibility for climate change problems and how this need to reflect the obligations expected by the different nations. In order to create such an agreement, it is suggested that there is a need for a global UN Commission which would report to the UN Security Council as well as the General Assembly. The Commission would report on legal, economic, political and social implications associated with the increasing number of environmental refugees (New Economic Foundation, 2003:31f).

### 5.1.3. International environmental organisation: Environmental Justice Foundation

**No place like home: Where next for climate refugees?** (2009)

The Environmental Justice Foundation is an NGO based in the UK working internationally for the protection of the natural environment and human rights (Environmental Justice Foundation, 2009:2).

**Goals**

The goal is to develop an international instrument for climate refugees that is legally-binding. This is needed in order to be able to address the issue in a consistent way which fosters successful collective humanitarian response. The international community also needs to recognise that it is a fundamental human right to have access to a secure environment (Environmental Justice Foundation, 2009:24ff)

**Methods**

The suggestion is to add a new category definition of refugees. It is explained how the environmental displaced person deserves the same level of protection and assistance as other refugees under the Geneva Convention. This requires a new legal framework which will establish the assistance and commitments of states. It is crucial that it also addresses the people who will be internally displaced. It is stated that climate change is presenting a threat to the support systems of the world and demand for ‘developed states’ to take their responsibility to act and assist the poorer states which will be the ones mostly affected. It is stated that the right to a secure environment is a fundamental human right. A right which is being undermined by actions from the ones emitting the largest amount of greenhouse gas emissions. (Environmental Justice Foundation, 2009:7;24)

> “Unlike some people displaced by conflict or persecution who may one day return home, those displaced by the chronic impacts of climate change will require permanent resettlement”

(Environmental Justice Foundation, 2009:15)

Although the awareness of the impact climate change has, and will have, on migration is growing, there is currently no internationally recognised legal term for people displaced because of environmental
degradation. The term environmental refugee or climate refugee therefore has no basis in international law. It is therefore explained that there is a need for a new legal agreement which also targets the international community to take responsibility for their greenhouse gas emissions and the harm which it has caused. The suggestion builds on the ideas of Docherty and Giannini of Harvard Law School as well as the ones of Biermann and Boas of Vrije University which suggests new legal instruments in the shape of either a protocol under the UN Framework Convention of Climate Change (UNFCCC) or a stand-alone convention (Environmental Justice Foundation, 2009:24f).

The suggestion by Biermann and Boas to have a protocol under the UNFCCC is further explained as being built on five principles:

1. In contrary to an emergency relief response, there would be planned and voluntary resettlements and reintegration.
2. The treatment of climate refugees should be the same as for permanent immigrants since they cannot return to their home.
3. The protocol needs to be designed for entire groups as well as states.
4. There needs to be support to local governments in order for them to protect their own citizens.
5. Climate refugees need to be viewed as a global problem and responsibility. (Environmental Justice Foundation, 2009:24f).

It is furthermore stated that the international community needs to recognise the threat of climate change, having major impacts on economic, social and environmental costs (Environmental Justice Foundation, 2009:27).

**Actors**

There is a need for funding in order to address the planned resettlement of millions of people. It is expressed how wealthier states need to take responsibility for action on climate change and the effects of it, since they are the ones emitting the most greenhouse gases. It is stated that it is unfair to put the financial burden upon the poorer states to resettle their population when they are not the ones being the main creator of the problem. States with the highest emissions per capita need to commit to providing financial as well as other essential support to deal with climate refugees (Environmental Justice Foundation, 2009:25f).

5.1.4. Summary of the victims framing

Hodgkinson and Young suggest a completely new convention which recognizes as well as defines CCDPs. The main actor in implementing and working with the convention will be a climate change displacement organization which will work on both international as well as regional level. The New Economic foundation instead suggest an expansion of the already existing Geneva Convention. They emphasise that there is a need for the international community to have legal responsibilities and to intervene if national governments fail to provide protection and assistance to CCDPs. As well as Hodgkinson and Young, they see the need for a legal definition of the concept environmental refugee.

The Environmental Justice Foundation in turn take a position between the two previous suggestions. They suggest either a stand-alone convention or a protocol under the UNFCCC. There is however still the same emphasis on a legally-binding international instrument as well as recognising and defining environmental refugees.

It is possible to draw the conclusion that all three actors represented provide goals which are related to bringing forward legally-binding responses to climate refugees. The emphasis is on there to be globally recognised conventions or instruments which are based in a human rights approach. Something that relates to the victims framing since the goal is to have external humanitarian and legal responses to the issue.
5.2. Security threats

The framing of the environmental migrant as a security threat is frequently used on all levels of society. The solution often provided by this type of framing is to see to the state’s own military for the protection of sovereignty rather than referecing to the problem of environmental migration as something that needs to be dealt with on a global level using foreign policies. There is a belief that environmental migration will lead to conflict over resources which requires military protection of the Global North. The use of this frame is often provided by Northern think-tanks and defence-aligned bodies. However, it is also emerging in the Global South as climate change is intensifying causing migration to escalate (Ransan-Cooper et al. 2015:110).

Vocabulary used is often such as “floods of refugees” which present “a threat to national security” and there is therefore a need for “military leadership” in order to prevent conflicts arising due to “resource scarcity”. There is a division of ‘us’ and ‘them’ permeating the frame (Ransan-Cooper et al. 2015:110).

5.2.1. Research: Myers

Environmental refugees: an emergent security issue (2005)

Norman Myers is a professor at the Green Collage of the University of Oxford working interdisciplinary with, among other things, tropical deforestation, mass extinction and environmental security (The Solutions Journal, 2019).

Goals
The goal is to make sustainable development the foundation for dealing with environmental refugees. There is also a need to respond to the problem and stop ignoring the fact that environmental refugees will become a major issue of our time (Myers, 2005:3ff).

Methods
It is described how environmental refugees could become one of the most significant crises of today and how it could generate several problems that would potentially cause conflict and violence. Nevertheless, the current policy responses are described as insufficient. It is not possible for ‘developed’ states to isolate themselves from the problems and the “floods [of refugees] that will ensure in decades ahead” (Myers, 2005:3ff).

It is expressed that a first step that needs to be taken is to stop ignoring environmental refugees because of the fact that there is no institutional instrument to deal with them. Furthermore, it is important to look to the root causes of environmental refugees. This includes not only environmental causes but also problems regarding security and how these interact with one another. There is a need to consider linkages to population pressures as well as poverty and ethnical tensions and conflicts (Myers, 2005:4).

Based on this there is a need for progress in the context of sustainable development. Meaning that there is a need to ensure people have access to basic human needs in the form of water, food and health. A lack of these basic needs is reason for many people having to migrate. Sustainable development is therefore viewed as the one of the most sufficient ways of tackling the issue of environmental refugees in the long run. Therefore, there is a need for investments which foster sustainable development. Something which will be done through policy emphasis on environmental safeguards as well as strengthening the efforts to deal with associated problems with poverty, population and landlessness (Myers, 2005:4ff).

Actors
It is expressed how ‘developed’ states cannot isolate themselves from the problem. Even so, there are limitation to both the capacity and willingness of potential host countries. It is further explained how states are also restricting immigrant flows. It is explained how these states might not even view it as “their” problem. However, it is not possible to ignore the flows of environmental migrants that will become reality. Even though it is not explicitly stated, it is possible to draw a conclusion that ‘developed’ states need to take responsibility and are viewed as an important actor for being able to respond to the flows of environmental migrants (Myers, 2005:3).
5.2.2. **Think-tank**: The Council on Foreign Relations  
Climate change and national security – an agenda for action (2007)

*The Council on Foreign Relations is an independent think-tank and nonpartisan membership organisation working as a resource to help create better understanding of foreign policy choices facing both the US and other countries (The Council on Foreign Relations, 2007).*

**Goals**  
In the light of the potential security consequences that global warming might bring about, the goal is to provide strategies that address these security consequences for the United States. In order to do so, it is required that the United States support policies which isolate both themselves as well as states of strategic concern from the most severe impacts of climate change. This could also potentially foster the relationships with important states (The Council on Foreign Relations, 2007:2:11).

**Methods**  
It is stated how climate change poses a serious security threat to the United States as well as to other states. On national level the capacity to respond to disasters caused by climate change could potentially be overwhelmed. Internationally it could cause humanitarian crises which could lead to political violence as well as undermine weak governments (The Council on Foreign Relations, 2007:v).

It is further explained how the effects of climate change also affect neighbouring states which could have “spill over” effects on the United States. Haiti and Cuba are at risk at being victims of extreme weather events which could lead to humanitarian crises which in turn could lead to large flows of refugees and state failure. It is also expressed how both Haiti and Cuba have used the threat of migration before in order to extract concessions from the United States and without a plan to address climate change it could potentially happen again. In addition, the potential security threat could also come from farther away. States that might be at risk of severe climate change impacts might make out areas of United States military bases and embassies. They could also be allies or competitors, possess sources of raw material and perhaps also be economic partners. The sites could also be major transportation hubs such as ports (The Council on Foreign Relations, 2007:6ff).

It is therefore suggested that the United States should prioritize so-called no-regrets policies, those that it would not regret having pursued even if the consequences of climate change prove less severe than feared. These would potentially include improvement of building codes, investments in evacuation as well as relocation strategies and water conservation. On an international level so called military-to-military environmental security initiatives are always going to be worthwhile. These include disaster management, emergency response and scarce water resources management. Furthermore, annual regional conferences should be implemented. These would allow for militaries to discuss and prepare for natural disasters and it is expressed as being a cheap investment that the United States government should support (The Council on Foreign Relations, 2007:11f).

Beyond the no-regrets policies the United States should invest in infrastructure and disaster response capacity. There is a need to “climate proof” vulnerable infrastructure. To reduce risks before they happen is more economically beneficial than responding to an already existing hazard. The United States also need to take on a leading role for supporting initiatives on climate change and natural disaster risk reduction. This support should finance adaptation programs for vulnerable governments. It is described how the United States, potentially alongside the IPCC or the World Bank, should evaluate already existing studies of vulnerable coastal areas and climate change. The evaluation should look at which strategies that could generate the lowest cost for damage reduction. This should then be done in the same way for food production as well as for fresh water availability. As well as working with risk reduction there is an important emphasis on reducing greenhouse gas (The Council on Foreign Relations, 2007:12ff).

**Actors**  
There should be a new deputy undersecretary of defence position for environmental security in order to address the what is referred to as insufficient institutionalisation of climate and environmental concerns into decision-making. It is suggested that a staff of around 25 people could be able to provide constant insights and information around the emerging environmental security threats and thereafter present

5.2.3. **Intergovernmental organisation:** High representative and the European Commission

*Climate change and international security* (2008)

The high representative is in charge of coordinating the work of all commissioners in charge of external relations. The European Commission proposes and enforces legislation and implementation of policies as well as the EU budget (European Union, 2019b; European Union, 2019a).

**Goals**

The goal is for Europe to address the impacts climate change could have on international security. This will be done through several interventions at EU level as well as in bilateral relations as at the multilateral level (High representative and the European Commission, 2008:4).

**Methods**

It is expressed how climate change brings about a threat of overburdening already vulnerable states and regions and how this is to be viewed as the core challenge. The threats are not only of humanitarian character but also of political as well as security risks that could have a direct effect on European interests. There are risks of conflict over resources and energy supply, economic and infrastructure damage, territory loss and border disputes and environmental migration. It is suggested that the full range of EU instruments are used alongside mitigation as well as adaptation policies in order to address these threats (High representative and the European Commission, 2008:3ff).

It is described how there is a need for EU to take an active role in international climate change negotiations. EU should also show leadership and advocate the 2°C target as well as presenting extensive climate and energy policies. It is expressed how there is a need to assess the EU’s own capacities to address the impact of climate change on international security and to build knowledge. There also needs to be improvement in response to, as well as prevention of, disaster and conflict (High representative and the European Commission, 2008:13).

The EU should also ensure that there is a global multilateral response to climate change and the challenges it brings about. Mitigation and adaptation action are needed from all countries in order to address climate security. Furthermore, there is a need to foster EU cooperation and political dialogue in order to create good governance, natural resource management as well as trans-boundary cooperation in order to manage crisis (High representative and the European Commission, 2008:13f).

**Actors**

The EU should take on a leading role, however they should not act alone. There is a need for major emitters as well as emerging economies to take part and engage through commitments to global agreements regarding the climate as to the UN framework (High representative and the European Commission, 2008:13).

5.2.4. **Summary of the security threats framing**

Myers suggest that sustainable development should provide the base for solving the issues of climate migration and dealing with climate refugees. By satisfying basic human needs it is possible to target root causes of the issue. Myers also emphasises that ‘developed’ states cannot isolate themselves from the problem. The Council of Foreign Relations provides strategies which focus on the security consequences for the US. There is an emphasis on isolating the US and states of strategic concern from impacts and to implement policies which target potential “spill over” on the US. There is also a strong emphasis on having the military preparing for handling climate related issues. One main actor needs to be a deputy undersecretary of defence for environmental security.

The High representative and the European Commission state how important it is for the EU to provide policies which address humanitarian as well as political impacts of climate change. The goal must be for the EU to take on an active as well as leading role in international negotiations. It is also emphasised
how EU cooperation as well as global responses, are crucial. There is both emphasis on the interests of the EU and Europe as well as of the global community.

The most obvious reflection of the security threat framing is found in the goal of The Council of Foreign Relations, where it is clearly stated how there is a need to protect the own nation, in this case the US. The High Representative and the European Commission in turn represent the interest of the EU, which likewise reflect the frame. However, the interest of the EU is also accompanied by an understanding of a more global interest and response. Myers on the other hand does not provide a strategy which is as explicitly related to the frame. However, there is still an emphasis on the security consequences which climate migration will cause. The solution on the other hand is not represented in a form of national response but rather an understanding of providing global human basic needs.

5.3. Adaptive Agents

The framing of environmental migrants as adaptive agents is a more recently emerging frame. This frame views environmental migration as a positive adaptation response rather than a failure to adapt. This frame also strongly rejects the framing of the environmental migrant as a security threat. It is explained how there is a firm belief that migration is a part of the solution rather than a negative effect of climate change (Ransan-Cooper et al. 2015: 110f).

Giving environmental migration the status of a welcomed solution could however cause the need for local mitigation and adaptation to be overlooked. There is also an encouragement for migrants to assimilate to their host areas and be part of the capitalist markets as labourers (Ransan-Cooper et al. 2015: 110f).

5.3.1. Research: Black et al.

Migration as adaptation (2011)

Richard Black is head of the School of Global Studies at the University of Sussex. Stephen R. G. Bennett is working at the Foresight Programme at the Government Office for Science in London together with Sandy M. Thomas. John R. Beddington is chief scientific adviser to the UK government as well as head of the Government Office for Science (Black et al. 2011:447).

Goals

The goal is for policy-makers to keep prioritising the reduction of climate change and climate migration. However, there is a need to also incorporate migration into the funding of adaptation. Migration needs to be viewed as a way of building resilience (Black et al. 2011:449).

Methods

It is stated that policies which are designed to prevent migration as well as people’s unwillingness or inability to migrate is something which will be a bearer of great risks. Instead it is described how there is a need to prepare for, and enable, population movements. International action and research of negative as well as positive outcomes of environmental migration is needed. It is also emphasised that migration will affect several areas and how an understanding of this is crucial. Cities will evolve, so called ‘poverty-traps’ will occur, and cultures will need to coexist. There is therefore important that policy frameworks take this into account in order to prevent having to deal with displacement under what is referred to as ‘high-risk’ conditions (Black et al. 2011:447).

It is also expressed how environmental change could result in both strengthening the incentives to move as well as limit people to do so. It is claimed that people are likely to not only move away from vulnerable places but also to move to them. Something that has been lacking attention. Migration also leads to increasing pressures on existing infrastructure, especially in low-income areas (Black et al. 2011:448).

Furthermore, it is expressed how migration could be the most effective way for people to obtain a more diversified income and thereby providing opportunities to build resilience where climate change is posing a threat to livelihoods. Therefore, is it explained that it is a necessity to ensure that voluntary migration is possible and available. This means a need to remove restrictions on the possibility of movement as well as a need for basic working infrastructure. On an international level this would require
an extension of the free movement of people, money and goods. For people at risk of being trapped in vulnerable places there is also a need for early-warning systems as well as emergency evacuation plans. Based on this it is therefore necessary that long-term initiatives (e.g. UNFCCC) ensure that the link between environmental change and migration is recognised. These initiatives also need to focus on the resilience of people who are trapped in, or moving to, areas where the vulnerability to environmental change is high, this means in particular low-income areas. (Black et al. 2011:448f).

There is a need to plan for and to provide flood-control, water-management as well as forecasting and warning capacities. Additionally, people who have migrated might experience social exclusion and this need to be given attention. In order to foster benefits of international migration there is a need for policies which link adaptive advantages to demographic as well as labour shortages within host nations. One suggestion is circular migration where people in environmentally vulnerable areas are allowed seasonal or temporary work in states where there is a need for their skills. Lastly, it is emphasised that whole populations should avoid abandoning their homes. Some individuals who migrate could by sending back money and goods, help communities to remain viable and resilient for a long time (Black et al. 2011:449).

**Actors**

It is stated that researchers within development, climate and environmental science as well as climate adaptation need to prioritise research on migration. There is a need to create a better understanding of how environmental migration influences vulnerability and resilience. This is needed for providing adequate policies and responses to the impact climate change will have on communities all over the globe (Black et al. 2011:449).

### 5.3.2. Think-tank: UNU-EHS

Control, adapt or flee? How to face environmental migration? (2007)

*The United Nations University is the academic part of the United Nations and is to be viewed as a global think-tank. The Institute of Environmental and Human security focus on research regarding risks and adaption in relation to environmental hazards and climate change (United Nations University, 2018).*

**Goals**

The goal is to promote reflection over the correlations between environmental degradation and migration, especially the forced kind. This will be done through five policy recommendations and will help prepare for what is predicted as a future large-scale environmental migration (UNU-EHS, 2007:10)

**Methods**

In order to be able to address forced migration because of environmental change the suggestion is to apply a precautionary principle. This will serve as a basis for a policy approach in five parts. These five parts should be implemented alongside continued efforts to limit environmental degradation as well as reduce poverty (UNU-EHS, 2007:32f).

Firstly, there is a need for a strong scientific basis. This will be provided through programmes which will focus on understanding cause-effect relationships between environmental degradation and forced migration. Additionally, there needs to be clear definitions of environmental migrants/refuges as well as environmentally motivated and forced migration. In order to achieve this, it is necessary that there is political recognition of the importance of the problem to ensure that there is long-term funding available (UNU-EHS, 2007:33).

Secondly, it is of importance to increase awareness about all the different dimensions of the issue of environmental migration, both publicly as well as politically. Debates regarding migration issues in a more general matter, need to always also include environmentally forced migration (UNU-EHS, 2007:33).

Thirdly, there is also a need to improve legislation regarding the recognition of environmental migrants/refugee. This can be done either through a separate convention or included in Intergovernmental Environmental Treaties. It is emphasised that this does not suggest a change in the
1951 Geneva Convention to also include environmental refugees. This is believed to possibly weaken the case for those traditionally covered by the convention (UNU-EHS, 2007:34).

The fourth part of the policy approach emphasises the need to provide the means for an adequate humanitarian aid. Environmental refugees/migrants need to be provided with assistance, especially when entire communities are being displaced (UNU-EHS, 2007:34).

Finally, there is a need to strengthen institutions and policies. Institutions need to be formed or reinforced in order to provide assistance to the flows of forced migration both on national as well as international level (UNU-EHS, 2007:35).

**Actors**

It is suggested that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change as well as the International Panel on Land Degradation incorporates the issue of environmental migration into their work. It is also needed for relevant parts of the United Nations system as well as other organisations to be empowered in order for them to be able to provide aid. On a national level it is also necessary to promote different parts of the government to work together in order to provide a multi-dimensional approach to the issue (UNU-EHS, 2007:30ff).

### 5.3.3. International humanitarian organisation: IOM

**Climate Change and migration: improving methodologies to estimate flows (2008)**

*IOM is an organisation working with the challenges of migration and the understanding of migration issues. They encourage social and economic development through migration (IOM, 2008:2)*

**Goals**

IOM states that a goal should be to study the impact of climate change through several perspectives and disciplines, this includes sociology, development studies, economics, geography, informatics and climate science. There is also a need to understand development processes on different levels, from local to global. This is viewed as the only way to understand the relationship between climate and migration. IOM provides two approaches to be able to build this understanding (IOM, 2008:37;57).

**Methods**

There are two different approaches presented which both aim to understand the linkages between climate change and migration. The first one is Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA) and the second one is the New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM). The SLA approach aims to explain how households respond to external impacts, in this case climate change. Climate change can be viewed as something that will change the level of vulnerability of households and migration in turn can be viewed as a strategy for responding to this. SLA builds on the idea that people will act in order to maintain a both socially and environmentally sustainable livelihood (IOM, 2008:37f).

"A livelihood is environmentally sustainable when it maintains or enhances the local and global assets on which livelihoods depend and has net beneficial effects on other livelihoods. A socially sustainable environment can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and provide for future generations” (IOM, 2008:38).

Essentially, SLA aims to create an understanding of people’s livelihoods in order for development assistance to be able to better meet the needs of the people. This builds on the belief that people, or families, possess assets. These come in the form of natural, physical, finical, human and social ones and they are all being used in order to obtain the family’s livelihood. If one asset is lost, it is possible to compensate for it by making use of another. This is referred to as an ‘asset-pentagon’ (IOM, 2008:37f)

The NELM approach also addresses migration in the context of household decision-making but focuses more directly on why individuals chose to migrate. It essentially builds on the notion that the decision to migrate is often made by the migrant together with a group of non-migrants. This is usually something that occurs within a family and the members of the family often expect the migrating family member to send money back to the family after he or she has migrated. This means that migration is not viewed
only as a strategy for maximizing an individual income but rather as a way of diversifying sources of income for the whole family. The result will be that if a local market fails, it is possible to compensate this by having one or several family members earning money on another market which is not being affected by a local failure (IOM, 2008:37ff)

Both approaches aim to provide an understanding of the responses to climate change or climate shocks on household level and how migration is part of the response. This requires information and knowledge from the perspective of families, both who sent family members to migrate as well as those who has not. It also requires an understanding of how the community in question interact with institutions as well as how the social structures are made up. The essential information needs concern how people perceive the impact of climate change, what is being done to maintain their livelihoods, the assets which they possess as well as their view of the future and past. In addition, information about who is chosen to migrate and why, which destinations are preferred and how long the migrant is planned to stay are important for the understanding (IOM, 2008:39f).

Actors
There is an emphasis on involving several disciplines when studying the effects climate change will have on migration. It is equally important to look at processes on all levels; from local to global. It is stated that a first step is to strengthen local communities and their possibility to adapt to climate change. The role of the individual is important and a key to be able to have effective management and creating solid policies. It is further expressed how bilateral and regional cooperation is important as well as involving actors from both the public and private sector as well as non-governmental and inter-governmental organisations (IOM, 2008:57f).

5.3.4. Summary of the adaptive agents framing
Black et al. state that to prevent migration as a response to climate change is the worst thing one can do. There is instead a need for policies which enables populations movements. Migration needs to be viewed as an adaptive response rather than a failure. It is a way for individuals and families to build resilience and to diversify one’s income. The UNU-EHS provide five policy recommendations which emphasise knowledge of the dimensions of the issue as well as recognition of the importance of it. Institutions, policies and legislation need to be strengthened and recognise the environmental refugee.

The IOM emphasises the need to understand climate change and its impacts through different perspectives and on different levels as well as the relationships between these. They provide strategies which value the understanding of response to climate change impacts on the household level. This understanding is believed to help build assistance and response which will better meet the needs of those affected.

All three actors put emphasis on understanding relationships between climate, migration and how people chose to respond to it. Understanding the relationship between these factors is viewed as crucial. There is an underlying belief in preparing for what the future will bring and migration is promoted as a way of building resilience. Something which relates to the frame in that it does not view migration as a failure, but just one of many responses people might have to climate change.

5.4. Political Subjects
To illustrate the frame of environmental migrants as political subjects one can look to the message from the 350 Pacific’s Pacific Climate Warriors campaign:” We are not drowning, we are fighting”. This frame is still emerging and has not received the same amount of attention as the three previous frames. The frame builds on the belief that people are constrained by unequal power relations which affect their capacity to make a choice to stay or leave. Nevertheless, these people are believed to be able to challenge fundamental socio-economic systems as well as the current institutions and polices. This frame questions external engagement and instead emphasises the community based and driven solutions to environmental migration as important. It is for example claimed that when outside actors take on the negotiation, vulnerability increases (Ransan-Cooper et al. 2015:111f).
The actors most prominent within this frame are researchers who are influenced by the disciplines of political ecology as well as critical political economy and post-colonial theory. However, NGOs and community groups which focus on justice and fairness in migration policies also concern themselves with the framing of environmental migrants as political subjects (Ransan-Cooper et al. 2015:111f).

5.4.1 Research: Bronen
Climate-Induced Community Relocations: Creating an Adaptive Governance Framework Based in Human Rights Doctrine (2011)

Robin Bronen is a human rights attorney who have been researching on community relocations since 2006. Bronen is the Director of the Alaska Immigration Justice Project (Bronen, 2011:357).

Goals
The goal is to provide an adaptive governance relocation framework which is based in the human rights doctrine. The article focuses on the indigenous community of Newtok located in Alaska and the efforts made trying to relocate the community because of climate change impacts (Bronen, 2011:361).

Methods
There is a need for federal and state statutes to provide an adaptive governance framework in response to the need for communities to relocate because of climate change. In this case the community of Newtok. The relocation framework must be statutory and create two essential organizational instruments: a relocation policy framework as well as an adaptive governance structure. The policy framework will provide the objectives and principles which are necessary in order to have an effective adaptive governance structure. It is also necessary to have multi-level as well as multi-disciplinary relationships where actors across all levels cooperate. This means that the policy framework also needs to provide an outline of roles and responsibility among the concerned actors: governmental and non-governmental agencies and the mechanisms which will provide funding as well as technical assistance (Bronen, 2011:293f)

The relocation policy framework needs to determine:
1. when a relocation is put in place as a response to protect the lives and well-being of people within the community
2. the steps that needs to be taken from governmental and non-governmental agencies in order to implement the relocation process
3. how multi-disciplinary governmental and non-governmental agencies organisational arrangements are put in place
4. the mechanisms for funding the relocation (Bronen, 2011:392f).

It is furthermore essential that human rights principles are incorporated in the relocation policy framework. The communities suffering severe impacts from climate change and relocation might also suffer economic, social and environmental consequences which threatens to weaken institutions as well as social networks and economic systems. It could also potentially pose a threat to cultural identity and traditional kinships within a community. By incorporating human rights principles, it is possible to avoid these impacts and ensure resilience for the community after its relocation (Bronen, 2011:393ff).

The human rights principles would include the right to relocation of the whole community as well as the rights to make collective decisions about where and how the relocation will occur. Additionally, the policy framework also needs to include a set of “Guiding Principles of Climigration” (Bronen concept for climate migration). These would include the rights to relocation when climate change threatens the lives of people within a community and the methods for protection is no longer possible. It would also include the right to self-determination in order to empower communities during the process of relocation as well as ensure that the process is community-based and community-guided. It is the community in question that needs to be the key leader in the process (Bronen, 2011:396f)

Actors
It is described how the UN need to establish a working group which will develop the “Guiding Principles
The working group need experts of human rights and humanitarian aid as well as disaster risk reduction and internal displacement issues. Both UN agencies and NGOs need to be represented. It is also expressed how there is a need for tools and technology in order to be able to respond to climate migration. It is therefore necessary for the international community to assist local governments in order for them to be able to build their response capacity (Bronen, 2011:393ff).

It is furthermore emphasised how the government of the community that is in need of relocation must be given authority to be the key leader as well as decision-maker. It is therefore important that the relocation process framework provides clear steps that the government needs to take during the process (Bronen, 2011:401f).

The relocation process framework therefore needs to include the following steps:

1. key stakeholders need to be identified
2. coordination between stakeholders needs to be established
3. the role of the local government needs to be defined
4. a process regarding land acquisition needs to be developed
5. responsibilities and procedures need to be defined
6. regulatory as well as permitting requirements and how these will be met need to be established as well as a mechanism for making modifications to the relocation plan during its implementation needs to be identified.

(Bronen, 2011:401f).

5.4.2. **International humanitarian organisation:** Displacement solutions

Climate change displaced persons and housing, land and property rights. Preliminary strategies for rights-based planning and programming to resolve climate-induced displacement (2009)

*Displacement Solutions is a non-profit organisation working with climate displaced persons, communities, governments as well as the UN to help find rights-based land solutions to climate displacement (Displacement Solutions, 2019).*

**Goals**

The goal is to assist both current and potential climate change displaced persons as well as organisations supporting these people. The aim is for both people and organisations to better be able to formulate their rights to housing, land and property in terms of human rights. It is also expressed how policy-makers hopefully can make use of the report provided. Finally, a goal is also for the report to support both local and national governments as well as the global community in understanding and responding to climate change and the potential displacement it might cause (Displacement solutions, 2009:6f).

**Methods**

It is expressed how human right implications of climate change is something which is found far down on the global political agenda and even further down one can find the question regarding human displacement because of climate change. By then providing a human rights approach to the issue of displacement it is possible to provide clear human rights-based solutions with globally applicable means. Given the principle of the inherent dignity of the human person it is implied that all people forced, against their own will, to leave their homes must be provided with assistance (Displacement solutions, 2009:8).

Further, it is explained how human right laws state that everyone possesses housing, land and property rights (HLP-rights) and that governments in every state are responsible and obligated to protect and enforce these rights. In other words, this means that everyone has a right to live safely on a piece of land, in an affordable home, with access to basic services while also knowing that these attributes are fully respected, protected and fulfilled. Given this, people displaced by climate change who have lost access to housing, land and property have clear rights to be assisted with reparation and restitution (Displacement solutions, 2009:10f).
To be able to ensure this, states where people will migrate from, as well as states where people will migrate to, need to adopt a series of steps. These include legal, policy and programmatic measures which are already based in existing laws and values (Displacement solutions, 2009:24).

**Promote major, rights-based improvements in HLP law and policy**

It is explained how housing laws could be re-written in order to also acknowledge that new land needs to be provided to be able to relocate climate change displaced persons. It could also mean that insurance agreements are expanded to also incorporate losses due to climate change (Displacement solutions, 2009:24f).

**Ensure full and genuine consultation with and participation by affected communities, their organisations and eventual host communities**

There is a need to develop mechanisms which will ensure consultations and participation on all levels. This will enable a more successful planning as well as responsive process (Displacement solutions, 2009:24f).

**Carry out high quality, long-term and rights-based HLP planning**

In order to ensure the HLP rights of climate change displaced persons there is a need for well executed planning, well formulated institutional frameworks as well as working laws and policies (Displacement solutions, 2009:24).

**Encourage land purchase, acquisition and set-aside programmes**

These programmes can ensure that families as well as communities have future secured land properties (Displacement solutions, 2009:24f).

**Promote community land trusts**

In order to ensure the utilisation of land for climate change displaced persons, there is a need to ensure that land is placed within community land trusts (Displacement solutions, 2009:27).

**Prevent the dangers of poor resettlement and strive for best practice outcomes**

As of now there are many experiences across the world regarding poor resettlement, something necessary to learn from. There is a need for sustainable resettlement and not just building new houses (Displacement solutions, 2009:27f).

**Mobilise national financial resources for HLP rights now**

In order to successfully allocate financial resources, there is a need to mobilise national resources now (Displacement solutions, 2009:29).

**Strengthen the capacity of the UN adaptation fund**

Since the largest burden of displacement most likely will fall on the poorest communities it is necessary for the wealthier nations to ensure the strengthening of the Global Adaptation Fund (Displacement solutions, 2009:29).

**Expand regional migration and labour programmes**

In order to be able to face what is expected to be a large-scale population movement there is a need for expanding existing programmes as well as undertaking new ones in areas where it is missing (Displacement solutions, 2009:29).

**Establish a pacific region forced displacement solutions initiative**

There is a need for a regional institutional framework in the pacific region which support Pacific Island nations (Displacement solutions, 2009:30).

**Litigate strategically and carefully**

In response to their displacement, victims of forced migration could pursue litigation to try to claim remedial action, on both national and regional as well as international level (Displacement solutions, 2009:30f).

**Actors**

The report provided by Displacement Solution aims to provide understanding and knowledge around climate change and migration. There is a need for local and national governments to see their
responsibility to provide HLP-rights to CCDPs. This requires that both CCDPs as well as organisations supporting them know about and are able to formulate these rights. It is also emphasised that countries around the globe create solid policies that provide adequate responses to displacement. The international community needs to support national and local strategies through international cooperation based in the human rights doctrine (Displacement solutions, 2009:7).

5.4.3. Summary of the political subjects framing

Bronen states that there is a need for an adaptive governance relocation framework which is based in human rights. The framework should be targeting all levels of the community as well as all dimensions of the issue of relocation. There is a need for cooperation between all concerned actors, however emphasised that the affected community is the key leader. In addition to being based in human rights, it is strongly emphasised that the relocation framework needs to promote community-based as well as community-guided processes. Displacement solution also provides a strong focus on human rights, however more specifically on rights to housing, land and property. The emphasis is on providing assistance for CCDPs as well as organisations working for CCDPs to better be able to both understand as well as formulate their rights.

The goals of both the strategies suggested are based in human rights and the belief that people need to both know and be able to formulate their rights. Something that is very clearly connected to the frame of political subjects in that it wants to remove any constraints people might have that takes away the possibility to make their own decisions.

6. Theories on responsibility

This section will provide an introduction on how climate change has evoked questions of responsibility and justice. Following that, three of the most prominent theories which address who should bear the cost of climate change, will be presented. Lastly, these theories will be applied to the strategies suggested by the different actors.

6.1. Responsibility and justice

Page (2008) describes how it is easy to assign responsibility for climate change to the present generation since they are the only agents who are able to act now. The over exceeding use of carbon and other greenhouse gases by past generations is an important part of today’s problem connected to climate change. However, these generations of people are not alive today. This leaves the problem and the quest for solutions to future generations, something which can be viewed as unfair. Page (2008) argues that to allocate the responsibility to the present generation is abstract and fails to address more concretely how the responsibility should be divided between agents. There are a number of agents that can be ascribed with the responsibilities of justice; countries, corporations, international institutions and the present generation as a whole. It is therefore described how climate change opens up for analysis of burden allocation (Page, 2008: 556f).

Caney (2005) poses several questions on who should bear the responsibility for the cost of climate migration. Is it a question for those who caused the problem? Or for those who are in a position to best be able to handle it? Or is it someone else? The issue is described as global environmental justice and centres around how environmental benefits and burdens are spread across the world. It is further explained that global environmental justices pose questions on intergenerational justice, which is highly central when it comes to climate change (Caney, 2005: 474ff).

Shue (1999) goes on to state that the relationship between poor and rich states have since long been built on unequal terms. An unequal relationship that so far has been relatively easy for the richer states. However, they are now confronted with the fact that the activities of industries which have contributed to their development has been the largest contributor to also global warming. This is causing changes in the relationship between poorer and richer states. Richer states now want poorer states to stop pursuing the same industrialisation which they themselves have gone through. It is clear that this form of
industrialisation, which have had no regard for the environment, is bound to have severe negative effects on everyone if it is carried on. It is therefore becoming of interest for richer states to consider building the relationship on cooperative and equitable terms. It is declared that if the aim is to have equitable cooperation there is a need to have a consensus on what equity means. There is therefore a need to define equity in a concrete and specific form, which will ensure both the economic development of the poorer states as well as to the state of the environment (Shue, 1999:531f).

6.1.1. Contribution to the problem

The concept of contribution to the problem is simply that a state should contribute to the management of climate change in proportion to how much greenhouse gas emissions they have caused. The ethical responsibility of richer states then becomes a reflection of their emissions. It is further explained how states need to first compensate victims of their, both past and present, emissions. Thereafter there is a need for these states to reduce and eventually stop the activities causing climate change. Last, they need to find ways in which to reduce the human costs of climate change which they have caused (Page, 2008:557f).

Shue (1999) explains contribution to the problem as the idea that the one who is creating a mess is not allowed, and knows he is not allowed, to simply walk away from it without cleaning it up. This creates an incentive to not create messes where the cost outweighs the benefit. To use the language of economists, this is called internalising an externality. You make sure that the price of a product also includes the costs of cleaning up whatever mess it might have caused during the production process (Shue, 1999:533f).

If this cost is instead, externalised, it is simply dumped on another party. This creates an unfair situation where one party, who both receives the benefits and does not clean up the mess, is causing costs upon another party without their consent. This is creating a growing inequality where one party is better off, and others are worse off. This means that the inequality has been created one-sided and it is therefore possible to reverse it by enforcing burdens upon the one creating it. It is justified to assign burdens on the party creating the problem and the burdens assigned as compensation is enough to correct the inequality that was imposed. It is therefore important, in order to attain the goal, that the burden must be, at the very least, equal to the disadvantage that was caused (Shue, 1999:533f).

6.1.2. Ability to pay

The idea of ability to pay is that a state should contribute to the cost of managing climate change in relation to their income or wealth. It is simply the capacity of a state to pay that will determine how much they will contribute with. In contrast to the principle of contribution to the problem, the ability to pay approach finds it irrelevant that states need to be assigned responsibility in proportion to their part in the emergence of climate related problems. The idea focuses on the fact that every party should contribute, and the ones with the most resources should do so the most (Page, 2008:561).

One could further explain the concept of ability to pay as a progressive rate of payment. Simply put, the assets of a party control the rate at which they should contribute. It can be strictly proportional as in those having the double the base amount of assets will contribute at twice the rate as the ones with the base amount, and those with triple the assets contribute at three times the rate as those with the base amount assets and so on. It is, however, more common that it is not this strictly proportional. The greater the asset the higher the rate, however the rate usually does not increase in strict proportion to the increase of assets (Shue, 1999: 537).

Shue (1999) further explains that the easiest way to understand ability to pay as a principle of fairness is to contrast it with the concept of a flat rate contribution. This means that every party contributes at the same rate, regardless of the amount of assets, which seems fair. However, it is misleading and does not take the full story in to account and might even ignore how things end up. The one with greater assets will also be left with more in the end even if they in fact have contributed more in actual numbers. The one with least assets will contribute with the same proportion of her assets and will therefore be left with less (Shue, 1999: 538).
6.1.3. Beneficiary pays

Beneficiary pays builds on the idea that the ones who have benefited the most from activities which have caused greenhouse gas emissions should be the ones to carry the greatest responsibility for the negative effects. Without the activities which caused the emissions these states would have been worse off today and almost every measurement of well-being would show this. In contrast to the previous two concepts this one does not believe that a state should be held responsible strictly because they are liable for causing climate change but because the benefits which they received came with negative externalities. It is different from ability to pay in the sense that “beneficiary pays” puts weight on how a state’s wealth arose. It is in turn different from contribution to the problem in that it focuses on the effects, rather than the causes of the activities causing climate change (Page, 2008: 562).

6.2. Applying theories of responsibility on climate migration

In addition to presenting the various strategies for handling climate migration, another aim of this study is to furthermore apply normative perspectives to these strategies. This will enable an understanding of how they relate to the question of responsibility towards climate migrants. The three theories presented are all theories of justice and responsibility in the context of climate change. The basic question which these theories build on is “How should the cost of climate mitigation and adaptation be spread across countries and generations?” (Page, 2008: 556).

For this study the idea is to apply these theories on climate migration. The analysis will be built on the same type of argument, turning the question into “How should the cost of climate migration be spread across countries?”. To be able to relate both the strategy, and the framing to which it is allocated, to the theories of responsibility, the analysis will be done frame by frame. This will then be followed by a concluding analysis which further compares the entirety of the frames to each other.

6.2.1. Victims

The victims framing claims that climate migrants need to be saved. The responsibility is that of richer states and external humanitarian, legal and financial assistance are major parts of the solution. This would indicate that the frame itself could use any of the three theories of responsibility since all three puts responsibility on richer states. However, the framing does not indicate that historical emissions or benefits are significant for if a state should provide assistance. Therefore, the “ability to pay theory” could be argued to be a prerequisite for the victims framing, since it simply puts the responsibility on the states which have the capacity to contribute the most.

Hodgkinson and Young describes how it is important to recognise historical differences, both in emissions as well as in benefits, which were generated from these emissions. Additionally, it is stated that the capacity to deal with climate change and climate migration needs to be taken into concern. This is described as the principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities” and should make out the base for financial funding. Thereby richer states have obligations to the convention to assist affected states. The strategy by Hodgkinson and Young takes all three theories into account but perhaps the most prominent one is contribution to the problem, since they put a lot of emphasis on historical differences and how this is highly important to recognise. There is however not much mentions of reducing activities that causes emissions. The theory of contribution to the problem does put emphasis on this fact as well as the historical one. There is also emphasis on the benefits which have been received through the emissions causes, something which reflects the theory of beneficiary pays.

The New Economic Foundation puts strong emphasis on the responsibility of polluters, both morally as well as economically. It is described how it is expected that wealthy states pay for the benefits they have received from fossil fuels. It is stated how this also makes out the base for including environmental refugees into the Geneva Convention since the environment, in this sense, can be viewed as an instrument of intentional harm and therefore the notion of environmental persecution becomes reality. It is possible to draw the conclusion that the New Economic Foundation views contribution to the problem as a base for their arguments. They also mention how there is a need to pay for the benefits received which implies that beneficiary pays is also influencing the strategy.
The New Economic Foundation further explain how the current global system allows for parts of the world to take more than what is fair of the global environmental common and how pollution and consumption can be carried through without having to be cleaned up. It is therefore suggested that resources need to shift from North to South because the North has an ecological debt to pay to the South. To describe it as an ecological debt confirms once again how important the historical emissions as well as benefits are for the arguments made by this strategy.

The Environmental Justice Foundation clearly states that the major emitters are undermining human rights and that richer states need to take their responsibility to act and assist poorer states. It is stated how the burden put on poorer states is unfair since they are not the ones who have contributed the most to the problem. It is instead suggested that the states with the highest emissions per capita need to commit to providing funding. The Environmental Justice Foundation is perhaps the actor with the most explicit connection to the contribution to the problem since their argument is to compare emissions per capita to how much a country should pay in funding.

All three actors within the victims framing acknowledge the uneven distribution of emissions, benefits and burdens. Therefore, the international community makes out an important part of the solution within these strategies. It is especially prominent in the strategy provided by the New Economic Foundation where they state how wealthy states need to recognise and face up to the pollution which they have caused and continue causing. Richer states are expected to pay for their pollution, and it is viewed as an ecological debt.

All three actors also emphasise that not only are richer states the ones emitting most but they are also the ones having benefited the most and thereby possessing the best capacity to also deal with the issue. Even though the frame itself can be viewed as promoting the ability to pay theory it is clear that all three actors represented within the victims framing does put a lot of emphasis on historical emissions as well as benefits received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victims</th>
<th>Contribution to the problem</th>
<th>Ability to pay</th>
<th>Beneficiary pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hodgkinson &amp; Young</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Economic Foundation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice Foundation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Actors within the victims framing and the allocated theories of responsibility.

6.2.2. Security threats

The framing of environmental migrants as security threats believes that it should be dealt with on a national level where the protection of the own state is crucial. It is often possible to see a division of ‘us’ and ‘them’. The responsibility for climate migrants therefore falls upon the own state and there is no indication of shared responsibility or that some states should be more responsible than others. This view makes it more difficult to allocate one of the three theories of responsibility to the framing. It is however possible to allocate theories to the strategies within the frame.

Myers emphasise that richer states cannot isolate themselves from the problem but instead needs to provide assistance and investments in addressing the root causes of the issues. It is described how there might be limitations in capacity and willingness of these states to assist climate migrant and that restricting immigration is not an uncommon policy. This is not viewed as the right way to go; states need to act. There is not much mentioned of a historical perspective nor of benefits received and even though it is not explicitly stated, it is possible to draw a conclusion that ability to pay is implied. The emphasis on the need for richer states to act would indicate that they are the ones who have the ability to do so.

The Council of Foreign Relations instead suggests that policies which do isolate the own state from the impacts of climate change and climate migration are to be promoted. A lot of effort is put on “climate
“proofing” the own state in different ways. On an international level, militaries are promoted to work together in sharing knowledge and to discuss how to prepare for the different impacts that might be expected. There is no mention of an uneven distribution of benefits and burdens and no implication that the US should bear a responsibility larger than anyone else. Since this strategy does not acknowledge that there is any responsibility beyond protecting the own state it is difficult to allocate one of the three theories to it since they all build on the notion that there is a need for global cooperation.

The High Representative and the European Commission acknowledge that major emitters need to engage in global commitments and how the EU need to take on an active as well as a leading role in international negotiations. This implies that contribution to the problem makes out a base for the arguments.

It is not as prominent as with the previous frame that responsibility makes out an important part of these strategies. Myers does acknowledge the ability to pay theory and The High Representative and European Commission does acknowledge the contribution to the problem. The Council of Foreign Relations, however, does not. This is nevertheless not very surprising since it is the one strategy which is the most obvious reflection of the frame itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security threats</th>
<th>Contribution to the problem</th>
<th>Ability to pay</th>
<th>Beneficiary pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council of Foreign Relations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Representative and the European Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Actors within the security threats framing and the allocated theories of responsibility.

6.2.3. Adaptive agents

The frame builds on the belief that migration should not be viewed as a failure but as a solution. It is in many ways the opposite of the security threat frame and instead sees the possibilities which migration can entail. This suggest that there is a need for cooperation between states where people migrate from and states where people migrate to. The responsibility is therefore something which is shared among the global community. This could indicate that any of the three theories would apply. However, since there is no mention of the reasons behind the responsibility it would be the ability to pay theory which would make out the basic argument for this frame.

Black et al. wants to remove restrictions which unable free movement of populations. They view migration as a form adaption which should not be viewed as a failure. It is therefore possible to draw the conclusion that the responsibility of climate migration falls upon the global community. It is described how it is important to foster the benefits of migration and to provide knowledge and understanding. It is possible to argue that by taking responsibility it is also possible to receive benefits in return. None of the three theories however touches upon this argument. Black et al. indicated that there is a need for global cooperation, and it is therefore possible to argue that this calls for nations with the ability to pay, to also do so.

UNU-EHS emphasise how the understanding of the relationship between climate change and migration is of strong importance and needs to make up the basis for policies and assistance. It is also emphasised that there is a need for creating awareness about the dimensions of environmental migration. This would indicate that the responsibility is regarded as something which needs to be shared globally. The UNU-EHS put a lot of emphasis on the cause-effect relationships which therefore would possibly show that the ones causing most of the emissions and therefore climate change are richer states. Something which in turn could indicate that these are the states which should provide the most assistance. However, as with the previous strategy, it is most adequate to argue that the ability to pay theory would make out the base since there is no explicit mention of the underlying reasons for responsibility but only that there is a need for the global community to step in.
IOM promote the need for understanding responses to climate impacts on a household level in order to be able to create policies which provide assistance in accordance to the needs of the people affected. The emphasis lies on strengthening the local community and this requires cooperation through bilateral agreements and involving actors from several sectors and levels. The IOM describes how understanding responses is a highly important part of solutions to climate migration. Since the strategy does not mention more than that there is a need for global cooperation and for the global community to provide assistance it can be assumed that this indicates that the ability to pay theory is what makes out the base.

All three actors promote the understanding of both relationships and dimensions of the issue as well as for policy-makers to keep prioritising it. Policy-making is therefore an important part of where the responsibility will end up. By acknowledging the relationships and dimensions it is possible to argue that this calls for policies which involves the global community. It is perhaps easier to allocate theories of responsibility to these strategies than to those within the security threat frame. However, it is not as clearly spelled out as it is within the victims framing. The conclusion drawn when there are mentions of global cooperation is that the ability to pay theory is closest as hand since the historical perspective is missing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptive Agents</th>
<th>Contribution to the problem</th>
<th>Ability to pay</th>
<th>Beneficiary pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black et al.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNU-EHS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Actors within the adaptive agents framing and the allocated theories of responsibility.

### 6.2.4. Political subjects

The political subjects frame promotes the importance of people being able to make their own choices. Something which can be constrained through unequal power relations. It is therefore possible to argue that the responsibility of making sure this is possible rests upon those who have created the constrains. This would then imply that the contribution to the problem makes out the foundation for the arguments made by the framing regarding responsibility.

Bronen presents a strategy which is strongly based on the human rights doctrine and emphasises the need for multi-level as well as multi-disciplinary cooperation. It is stated how important it is for the affected community to be the key leader and the strategy is based on the idea of community-lead and community-guided process. The international community therefore needs to make sure that this self-determination and self-empowerment are fulfilled by providing governments with resources. It might not be surprising that the strategy by Bronen focuses on the affected community and not on who is responsible to assist them since the framing of political subjects views the affected community as the most important group. It is however indicated that there is a need for the global community to assist the affected community so that they can be empowered to make the needed changes. This would imply that the ability to pay theory is applied. Bronen focuses significantly on the community and therefore not much of the reasons behind why a nation should help by providing funding or assistance is mentioned and it is therefore difficult to argue for any of the other two theories in this case.

As well as Bronen, Displacement solutions promote human rights, more specifically HLP-rights. Rights which needs to be respected, protected and fulfilled. This requires cooperation from the local, national as well as international community. This, as in the case of Bronen’s strategy, indicates that the global community have a responsibility to assist, but without specifying the reason. Therefore, it is, again, difficult to argue for any other theory than the ability to pay.

There is an emphasis on building policies which put the CCDPs in first hand and asks for local, national and global response to climate change. The frame itself has a stronger emphasis on the constrains CCDPs might experience due to unequal power relations. These unequal relations are not mentioned within the strategies by Bronen or Displacement solutions and to argue for the contribution to the problem and beneficiary pay theory is therefore difficult.
### 6.3. Concluding analysis

Not surprisingly, the victims framing has the most prominent foundation of responsibility and it was possible to allocate more than one theory to several of the strategies. This could be argued to be the case because the frame itself has a strong distinction of uneven distributions of emissions, benefits and burden. The strategies in turn all reflect the frame in perhaps the most obvious way among all frames and strategies. The strategies within the victims framing all provide the argument for why a nation should provide assistance to climate migrants, which makes it easier to distinguish one theory of responsibility from another.

The frame of environmental migrants as security threats could be described as the opposite of to the victims framing in several ways. The question of responsibility being one. If the victims framing has the most obvious connection to the theories of responsibility, the security threats framing has the least obvious one. A reason for this is the lack of focus on the global community. It is difficult to allocate responsibility to parts of the global community if they are not a part of the strategy. However, it was possible to understand that two out of the three theories do view the global community as a necessary contributor since these takes in a more global approach. The strategy from the Council on Foreign Relations however focuses only on the US in a way that made it difficult to view any of the three theories as a set foundation for the arguments made.

Framing the environmental migrant as an adaptive agent acknowledges the role of the global community and the importance of cooperation. This makes it easier to apply theories of responsibility than to the security threat frame, however it is not as obvious as within the victims framing. It was therefore argued that the ability to pay theory would be what makes out the foundation.

Lastly, the political subjects framing views unequal power relations as an important aspect to acknowledge. This indicates that the historical perspective is important. It was however not prominent within the strategies. It is possible to argue that it plays an important role, even if not explicitly mentioned. However, it was argued that the ability to pay theory is what make out the basis for the strategies within this frame.

The strategies within the different frames either follow the theory which was linked to the frame or does so with modification. This is perhaps most prominent within the security threat frame, where one of the three strategies is a very strong reflection of the frame whilst the other two takes on a more nuanced reflection. In most cases, except for with the victims framing, it is not explicitly stated why a state should provide assistance and/or funding, which makes it difficult to argue for any other than the ability to pay theory.

The strategies do not explicitly argue that nations should be stopping or even reducing activities which cause climate change. Perhaps Myers most obviously touches upon this by stating how “sustainable development is the most important part of the solution”. Perhaps it is also possible to see how it underlines many of the arguments, even though not explicitly stated. The lack of focus on reducing activities which causes climate change could also be because the focus goes further and beyond that. In short, the problem in need of being solved is already happening.

The three responsibility theories which were chosen for the analysis all rely on the notion that the global community is important and that there is a need for shared responsibility among states. As seen with the security threat framing, it was more difficult to allocate the theories to these strategies. Especially, the strategy from the Council on Foreign Relations. In order to further develop the analysis to also include

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Subjects</th>
<th>Contribution to the problem</th>
<th>Ability to pay</th>
<th>Beneficiary pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronen</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement Solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Actors within the political subjects framing and the allocated theories of responsibility.
this type of standpoint, it would have been of interest to have a theory of responsibility which does not
view the global community as one of the foremost important actors.

Beck (2001) explains the different views on globalisation. It can be viewed as international politics
having moved into a new phase of post-international politics. In this phase the state is required to also
share the arena with international organisations as well as transnational social and political movements.
In a way, globalisation in this view, assumes a silent consent from the states (Beck, 2001:55ff). Another
view on globalisation is that which stems from a realistic or pragmatic perspective. Such views
emphasise the state’s sovereignty. International organisations at the utmost can function as an advisory
organ, however, realists view the state as the main actor. The principle of sovereignty makes out the
basis and others need not to intervene with state’s business. Foreign politics are shaped by geopolitical
as well as power interests rather than moral considerations. The first concern will and should always be
the benefit which the state will receive (Beck, 2001:124)

It is clear that the theories used for this analysis are all found within the first view of globalisation. It is
therefore possible to further explain why it is more difficult to allocate theories to the security threat
framing since the view of actors within this frame lean more towards the second one described by Beck
(2001), especially the strategy from the Council of Foreign Relations. To be further able to analyse
responsibility within this frame it would have been beneficial to also include a theory of responsibility
from the realistic perspective.

7. Summarising discussion and conclusion

This study set out to investigate what different actors suggest as strategies for handling climate
migration. It also set out to apply normative perspectives in order to understand how these strategies
relate to the question of moral responsibility towards climate migrants. The research questions to be
answered were:

- What do different types of actors suggest as strategies for handling climate migration?
- How do these strategies relate to the question of responsibility for climate migration?

The first question was answered by performing a content analysis on eleven different documents from
eleven different actors. These actors could in turn be allocated to four different frames depending on
how the actor in question view the environmental migrant. This was believed to help shed lights on
different types of strategies which stem from different points of views. Based on the theory of problem
definition and theory of framing it was also viewed as important and fruitful in order to provide an
understanding of what was underlining the suggested strategy.

The strategies provided by actors from the victims framing all provided goals which related to bringing
forward legally-binding responses to climate refugees. There was an emphasis on global recognized
conventions or instruments which are based in a human rights approach.

The security threats framing in turn provided strategies which are all focused on security agendas.
However, the reflection of the frame itself was most prominent in the strategy presented by the Council
on Foreign Relations, which was the only one with a strict focus on protecting the own state. The most
significant difference from the victims framing is what the role of the global community should be.
Whilst the victims framing promote global cooperation as the solution, the security threat framing
instead turned the focus more toward the protection of the own state. Two out of three strategies from
the security threat framing does however acknowledge the role of the global community as well as the
own state.

The actors within the adaptive agents framing provide strategies which are based on the notion that
migration is not a failure. Migration is one of many responses to climate change and a way of building
resilience and should therefore not be prevented. There is instead a need to enable population
movements. All three strategies emphasise the need to understand relationships between climate,
migration and how people chose to respond to it.
Lastly, the political subjects framing provided strategies which are based in human rights and the belief that people need to know as well as be able to formulate these rights. There is an emphasis on removing constraints which unable people to make their own decisions.

It is therefore possible to draw the conclusion that all actors within the same frame provided similar strategies for handling climate migration. This means that it did not matter if the actor in question was from the research field, think-tank or humanitarian or environmental organisation. The strategies were more linked to the frame than to the form of the actor itself. This therefore shows that common problem definitions and framings might possibly matter more than the difference between actors.

The second research question was answered by applying three theories of responsibility to the different strategies. It was possible to draw a conclusion that all three of the theories stems from a belief that the global community is important and that there is a need to share the responsibility among states. All frames but the security threat framing, shares this view of the global community and it was possible to allocate the theories to all strategies within these frames. It was at times possible to allocate more than one theory to a strategy, something which the tables in the earlier section clearly show. When it was possible to make a distinction between the theories this was based on if there was an argument behind why a state should provide assistance. The theory of contribution to the problem indicates that there is a need to acknowledge the historical emission when deciding a nations responsibility. Meanwhile the ability to pay theory finds this irrelevant and instead focuses on that the nation with the most resources should be the one to bear the most responsibility. Lastly, the beneficiary pays theory turns to the nations which have benefitted the most form CO2-emission and therefore state that these are the ones most responsible.

The strategies within the victims framing has a strong foundation of shared responsibility and they all provide a reason behind why a nation should be providing assistance to climate migrant. The strategies within the security threat framing in turn does not provide the same strong foundation of shared responsibility and it could be of benefit to also apply a theory of responsibility that provides a different view of the global community in order to further analyse the question of responsibility within this frame.

The adaptive agents framing does not provide as clear reasons behind why a nation should take on responsibility like the victims framing does. It its however clear that the global community needs to cooperate and that the ability to pay makes out a foundation for it. The political subjects framing itself acknowledge unequal power relations and therefore provide an indication that the historical perspective is important. This is however not as prominent within the presented strategies and the ability to pay theory is therefore argued as the basis for the arguments within them.

By answering the research questions of this study, it was possible to shed light on different strategies for handling climate migration as well as how they view the role of responsibility. By using the systematization of framing it was possible to also show how different actors view the environmental migrant and how they chose to view the problem of climate migration, something which is in turn providing an understanding of why a strategy has taken the form that it has.

The strategies for handling climate migration suggested either legally binding global conventions or instruments, having climate migrants be a part of a national security agendas, enable populations movements and promote migration as a way of building resilience, and finally, ensuring that climate migrants are aware of their rights and being able to make their own decisions. Almost all strategies agree upon the need for global cooperation and global shared responsibility accordingly to the theories on responsibility.

In further development of this study it would be of interest to also include strategies beyond those presented by Ransan-Cooper et al. (2015.). As mentioned in the methodology chapter it would be particularly interesting to include governments. It would also be interesting to further investigate how strategies for handling climate migration is affected by which geographical areas they stem from. Something which would be a good complementing analytical tool to the framing. Lastly, it would also be of interest to investigate how strategies provide a gender perspective to the question of climate migration.
As mentioned in the beginning of this study, global warming is bound to cause long-term changes to the earth’s systems for years and years to come. This will cause major population movements and possibly redraw the map of the world. Warning signs of human migration as one of the most severe effects of climate change were raised already in the 1990s and it is clear that it has been struggling to become a high priority issue. There is a need for climate migration to make its way into international policy and become high priority. This study has shed a light on eleven suggestions for handling climate migration and it entails a clear message; this is a great collective journey, and no one should be left behind.
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