Securitizing the Environment?

A discourse analysis of key United Nations documents on climate change

Author: Georgios Koukos

Supervisor: Annika Bergman Rosamond

Abstract

Over the course of the last few years climate change has been increasingly framed in terms of security, frequently featuring in discussions and publications of various security actors and institutions. This development generated a vigorous debate within academia as to whether a securitization of climate change in global politics has occurred. By drawing upon Copenhagen School's Securitization Theory, this thesis aspires to further contribute to that debate by investigating to what extent institutions with a far-reaching role in global climate governance, but with no explicit ties to security, also advance a securitization of climate change through their specific discursive constructions of the issue. More specifically, this study is concerned with institutions within the United Nations system, which include bodies and agencies such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. In order to address the above question, the study employs the method of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and conducts a discursive analysis of selected influential documents published by the aforementioned bodies and agencies in the period between 2014 and 2019. Furthermore, through the utilization of the CDA three-dimensional analytical model, it scrutinizes the interplay between the diverse discourses of environmental security that feature in the texts' framings of climate change and discusses the potential policy implications that those articulations encompass.

Key Words: Securitization, Climate Change, Environmental Security, Copenhagen School, Critical Discourse Analysis, United Nations

Word Count: 20.000

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I wish to present my special thanks to my supervisor, Annika Bergman Rosamond for her guidance and her constructive feedback on my work. Her support and encouragement have been vital for the completion of this thesis. In addition, I would like to pay my regards to my group-seminar peers, Xenia, Rocío and Semra for evaluating my research and providing me with invaluable comments. I would also like to show my gratitude to all my friends, both in Greece and Sweden, who supported me in every step of my studies and made those two years a fascinating and unforgettable experience. Last but not least, a big thank you to my amazing parents, Stella and Dimitris. Without their endless emotional and unconditional financial support, none of this would have been possible.

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my beloved grandmother.

List of Abbreviations

CDA   Critical Discourse Analysis

CS   Copenhagen School

CSS   Critical Security Studies

IGO   International Governmental Organization

IPCC   Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

NGO   Non-governmental Organization

SDG   Sustainable Development Goal

UN   United Nations

UNCHE   United Nations Conference on the Human Environment

UNDP   United Nations Development Programme

UNEP   United Nations Environment Programme

UNFCCC   United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

UNGA   United Nations General Assembly

UNSC   United Nations Security Council

US   United States

WCED   World Commission on the Environment and Development

1. Introduction

The objective of this thesis is to investigate the discursive constructions of climate change as a security issue within certain bodies and agencies of the United Nations and scrutinize the potential policy implications that such articulations entail. The signing of the Paris Agreement[1] in late 2015 by all Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) corroborated the premise that climate change constitutes one of the most pressing issues of our times. Climate change is defined by the UNFCCC (1992) as "a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods" (Article 1.2). This alteration is ascribed to a large extent to a high concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, which is primarily a result of industrial practices, fossil fuel combustion and changes in land use. In a rather simplistic explanation of the process, while naturally the heat of the sun is both absorbed by the earth and radiated back towards the atmosphere, greenhouse gases act like a buffer and prevent the heat that once penetrated the earth's atmosphere from escaping it, leading to increased heating of the air, land, and seas (Barnett, 2007; Campbell, MacKinnon, & Stevens, 2010).

Experts have argued that among the natural consequences expected to be brought about by climate change, several will potentially have important security implications. Buhaug, Gleditsch, and Theisen (2008) for instance categorize as such the increasing scarcity and variability of renewable resources, the rising of sea-levels and the intensification of natural disasters, such as floods and droughts. Under certain sociopolitical circumstances, they argue, such events retain the potential to increase the risk of conflict and instability through heightened

---

[1] The Paris Agreement is a legally binding treaty that requires all countries to undertake efforts in order to combat climate change by committing to keep the global temperature rise well below 2°C and as close as possible to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. The Agreement, which entered into force in 2016, effectively replaced the 1997 Kyoto Protocol

competition for dwindling natural resources, loss of livelihoods, population displacement and migration.

Since the mid-2000s climate change has been increasingly framed in terms of security (Gleditsch & Nordås, 2009). This linkage though did not emerge out of the blue but can be seen as a revitalization of the environmental security discussions originating already from the late Cold War years (Floyd, 2008). The increased interest in the security implications of climate change also corresponds to the growing awareness that emerged as a consequence of the 4th Assessment Report published by the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (2007). Such scientific research showcased that climate systems are not linear and suggested that abrupt change with unpredictable impacts might occur, contributing thus to an increased interest from policymakers and security actors (Trombetta, 2012). In 2007, the IPCC received together with Al Gore the Nobel Peace Prize, while the same year marked the first time that climate change was addressed in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), followed by two more occasions in 2011 and 2018. In parallel, a number of reports investigating the links between climate change and security have been published by a variety of actors, including the US Department of Defense, military think tanks and NGOs (CNA, 2007; Smith & Vivekananda, 2009; Schwartz & Randall, 2003).

Against this backdrop, scholars have engaged in a vigorous discussion seeking to determine whether these developments have signaled a securitization of climate change. Securitization refers to the Copenhagen School (CS) (Buzan, Wæver, & de Wilde, 1998) theory of security studies, whereby an issue is thought to be securitized when successfully being portrayed in speech acts as an existential threat to a valued referent object by securitizing actors. As such, the issue is elevated above normal politics and transferred into the realm of security, rather than simply being politicized. This in turn allows for the adoption of exceptional policy measures in order to handle it. While a strict reading of the CS framework would suggest that climate change has not been successfully securitized to date as emergency measures have not been adopted, some scholars argue that it is still

plausible to speak of an existing securitization (Brauch, 2009; Trombetta, 2012). Climate change, according to such arguments, currently figures prominently in security discussions and practices, and it is to some extent because of that that certain policies in the field have been adopted. The present study locates itself within this ongoing debate and aspires to provide a further contribution to it.

By drawing extensively on securitization theory, my thesis seeks to scrutinize the potential role of the UN as a securitizing actor, or, in other words, to investigate whether the UN contributes to the elevation of climate change into the realm of security through its specific framings of the issue. Even though a multiplicity of actors is involved in global climate governance, the UN is indisputably one of the most important and influential stakeholders (Floyd, 2015). Nevertheless, the UN is by no means a unitary actor, but one that encompasses a variety of bodies and agencies which take an interest in climate change, such as the UNFCCC[2], the Security Council, the UN Development Programme (UNDP) and the UN Environment Programme (UNEP). While several studies examining the securitization of climate change within the UN place their analytical focus primarily on the Security Council or the General Assembly (Peters, 2018; Scott, 2012), the present study focuses on UN bodies which are not explicitly concerned with security but are nevertheless deeply involved in climate governance. Those include the UNFCCC, the UNEP and the IPCC. This line of inquiry could substantially contribute to the debate on the securitization of climate change by showing that actors not necessarily closely tied with security practices may also bolster securitization, especially when they retain high institutional positions and considerable influence.

The investigation of securitization of climate change is a far-reaching task since processes of securitization have critical implications for the ways in which the issue is framed, prioritized, but also on how it is addressed in the policy level

---

[2] UNFCCC does not simply refer to the treaty. It encompasses the Conference of Parties (COP), the highest decision-making body of the UNFCCC, but also refers to the secretariat (UN Climate Change), located in Bonn, Germany

(Peters, 2018). Researching the potential and diverse effects of securitization on policymaking is of crucial importance, especially when taking into account the fact that climate change is not going to affect every part of the world in similar ways. The degree of vulnerability to its impacts is determined both by geographical exposure to climate-related events and the levels of adaptive capacity that the community in question possesses. Adaptive capacity refers to a juxtaposition of access to economic resources, infrastructure, information and technology and good governance (Buhaug, et al., 2008). Societies with low adaptive capacity, mainly located in the so-called Global South, are typically more vulnerable compared to the prosperous societies of the North, even though they are the ones less responsible, when taking into account their historical levels of greenhouse emissions (Barnett, 2007; Dalby, 2013).

Following von Lucke, Wellmann and Diez (2014) this study builds on the argument that there exist different kinds of securitization, encompassing different discourses and suggesting different policy responses. The discussion of environmental security, and by extension, climate security, is characterized by a multiplicity of approaches and discourses (Floyd, 2008). However, there are arguably two dominant approaches, which in this thesis are labeled as the environmental conflict and the human-centered approaches to environmental security (Detraz & Betsill, 2009; von Lucke, et al., 2014). Those two approaches share different referent objects, or thoughts on who or what ought to be secured, consequently conveying different policy ramifications. All the themes mentioned in these introductory notes will be revisited in greater detail later in the thesis.

In what follows I account for the aim and research questions of the study and having done so I review some valuable findings of the research on the securitization of climate change. In chapter 2 I will discuss the key concept of environmental security and provide the two dominant discourses that surround it, followed by a detailed review of the principal premises of securitization theory and its analytical relevance for the enquiry of environmental issues. In chapter 3 I discuss the methodological framework of the thesis and in so doing, explain the

methodological choices and describe the tools that I have utilized for the analysis. In the 4th chapter I will present the main findings of the analysis and briefly engage in a normative discussion on the desirability of securitization of climate change.

1.1. Aim and Research Questions

The aim of this study is to investigate whether certain bodies and agencies within the UN with an expertise in environmental issues but with no explicit ties to security practices, such as the UNFCCC, the UNEP, and the IPCC, contribute to the securitization of climate change. As the study draws heavily upon securitization theory of the Copenhagen School, applying terminology in line with that school is important. More specifically, my aim is to examine to what extent the above bodies and agencies function as securitizing actors performing a securitizing move through their specific framings of climate change. In order to meet this aim, I will conduct a discourse analysis of recently published material by those bodies, such as reports and other key documents, which will enable me to uncover discursive framings of climate change as existential threats – threats that require exceptional responses. Furthermore, I will discern the different discourses that figure in the documents under investigation, including those pertaining to the environmental conflict or the human-centered discourses of environmental security. That involves identifying the policy responses which each of those discourses assumes. The study is informed by one main research question, which is then supplemented by two sub-questions. The main research question is the following:

- *To what extent and how do UN climate change-specialized bodies contribute through their discourse to the securitization of climate change?*

The supplementary sub-questions are:

- *Do UN bodies such as the UNFCCC, UNEP, and IPCC frame climate change as an existential threat, and if so, in what ways?*

5

– Are these UN bodies' articulations of security vis-à-vis climate change more consistent with the environmental conflict or the human-centered approach to environmental security and what are the related policy implications?

At this point, it needs to be clarified that this piece does not aspire to examine whether a successful securitization of climate change in world politics is indeed in place, but to identify an occurrence of a securitizing move within those UN bodies and agencies described above. Moreover, departing from constructivist/interpretivist ontological and epistemological assumptions, this thesis does not present any claims for generalizability of the results outside the mentioned UN bodies. The focus is on the extent to which and how those specific bodies contribute to the securitization of climate change. This is, however, by no means a negligible research task, given the institutional position they retain and their ability to influence policymaking.

1.2. Previous Research

The question of whether climate change has been the subject of securitization in world politics has generated vibrant debate within academia. Researchers engaged in the task of investigating the framings of climate change as a security issue have been particularly interested in tracing and uncovering the distinctive discourses employed in securitizing moves and scrutinizing the policy implications which each of them implies (Brauch, 2009; Brzoska, 2012; Detraz & Betsill, 2009; Scott, 2012; Trombetta, 2008). In order to provide a general overview of the field, this section will review a number of relevant studies and discuss their key findings.

Scott (2012) argues that although a politicization of climate change, meaning that the issue figures in the international policy agenda, has been evident for some decades, more recently climate change has been increasingly framed as a

security issue. Drawing upon securitization theory, she seeks to answer questions such as how close the world has come to the full securitization of climate change at a global level and what could that possibly mean. By applying a CS framework, which suggests that securitization is successful when the issue is elevated above normal politics, she argues that at the global level this would mean that climate governance would have to be placed under the responsibility of the Security Council. After identifying and investigating several key securitizing moves, such as the discussions of the issue in the UNSC and the UN General Assembly, as well as developments within national and regional security institutions, she concludes that despite the widespread security rhetoric considerable parts of the wider audience remain generally unconvinced by the securitizing moves. Although one can argue that climate change has been securitized to the extent that is now frequently prevalent in security discussions, when applying a strict CS reading, a full securitization of climate change does not seem very likely in the near future, mainly as a result of political disagreements (Scott, 2012).

On the contrary, other scholars (Brauch, 2009; Trombetta, 2008) maintain that a securitization of climate change has in fact occurred and that discarding securitizing moves as failed securitizations because of the absence of exceptional measures is misleading. Brauch (2009) argues that the year of 2007, which was marked by the publication of the 4th IPCC Assessment Report and the first address of climate change in the UNSC, was a tipping point for the securitization of climate change. In his study, he conducts a conceptual mapping (Brauch, 2009) of speech acts, such as speeches and reports, which framed climate change as a threat to international, national, and human security, and argues that those have been to a large extent successful in convincing a broad audience that climate change is a legitimate security threat requiring urgent responses. An important contribution of that study – an argument that largely inspired this thesis − is the identification of IPCC as a potential indirect securitizing actor due to its high scientific and political reputation and the instant and global coverage of its reports. Nonetheless, even though Brauch (2009) provides a very detailed analysis of securitizing moves, he does not comment in depth on the absence of exceptional measures in global climate

governance, an essential element of the CS framework. On the other hand, in her analysis of the emergence, evolution, and transformation of the discourses of environmental and climate security, Trombetta (2008) investigates extensively why the absence of exceptional measures should not be treated as failed securitization. In her thorough critique of the CS she contends that despite the lack of exceptional measures, security practices are in fact being challenged by the framing of environmental issues as security issues, as different, preventive and non-confrontational measures are being adopted. This critique, which will be further elaborated in the following chapter, is considered invaluable for the examination of the securitization of climate change and is thus regularly utilized throughout this thesis.

In a slightly different line of enquiry, certain studies do not investigate the securitization of climate change per se but place their analytical focus on the current discourses surrounding climate change and security and seek to shed light on the ongoing discursive struggle. In a widely cited study, Detraz and Betsill (2009) identify the existence of two distinct prevalent discourses in the environmental and climate security debate, which they label *environmental conflict* and *environmental security.* In their framework the environmental conflict discourse is described to be more closely associated with traditional and national security concerns, while the environmental security discourse with human security considerations. The categorization of the two discourses on which this thesis focuses − a subject to be elaborated in the next chapter − is largely inspired by Detraz and Betsill's (2009) framework. After discussing the distinctive features of each discourse, the authors go on to investigate which one of them has historically informed the debate, as well as whether the discussion of climate change in the UNSC has signaled a discursive shift. Their discourse analysis of various UN documents and other reports reveals that the environmental security discourse is the one that has historically dominated the debate and they contend that this domination has not been challenged by the addressing of climate change in the UNSC.

Detraz and Betsill's (2009) findings are consistent with those of Brzoska (2012) in his analysis of national security strategy and defense planning documents of several countries. Brzoska finds that even though the threat perception of climate change varies among countries, the environmental security discourse is generally dominant in the documents. For that reason, he explains, the scope of action for security actors, such as the armed forces, is limited, focusing mainly on disaster management. Moreover, he concludes that despite several securitizing moves and attempts, especially from major powers, to frame climate change as a driver of violent conflict, the practical effects on actual defense planning strategies has thus far been negligible.

All the studies reviewed above have been instrumental in providing invaluable insights into the processes of securitization of climate change. In addition, they have contributed substantially to uncovering and scrutinizing the different discourses that pertain the field of environmental and climate security. However, a common characteristic among them is that they place their main focus on institutions and agencies that are tied in one way or another with security practices. This is of course a reasonable analytical choice when investigating securitization. Nonetheless, as mentioned above, the present thesis aspires to contribute further to this existing literature by focusing solely on institutions not explicitly involved with security practices and examining their potential role as securitizing actors. This task is either partially addressed, or totally overlooked in the above studies. Nevertheless, this thesis builds upon those studies and, as it will be demonstrated throughout the piece, incorporates several of their key findings.

Hopefully the introduction and the literature review have already provided a broad idea of the central concepts and the theoretical framework that inform this study. However, in order to engage in a vigorous investigation of the research questions, a more thorough discussion of those is deemed essential. That discussion is the subject of the following chapter.

2. Key Concepts and Theoretical Framework

The present chapter will scrutinize various key concepts utilized in the study and will engage in a discussion of the theory of securitization and its analytical relevance for the inquiry of environmental matters. The central concept that requires consideration is that of environmental security. Despite its increasing popularity in the post-Cold War years, the concept has no clear definition or meaning (Barnett, 2001). When discussing environmental security, different discourses and understandings are present. For instance, some view the relationship between the environment and security in more narrow terms of threats of mass migration and conflict as a result of environmental degradation, while others adopt an approach more closely associated with human security, emphasizing vulnerability and sustainable development (Detraz & Betsill, 2009). The above distinction raises the paramount question of what ought to be the referent object of security, or, in other words, who or what is to be secured? An equally important question concerns the exact nature of the threat. The following sections will attempt to address such questions by tracing the emergence of the concept of environmental security and discussing the different discourses that surround it.

2.1. Rethinking Security? The Concept of Environmental Security

The concept of security has no fixed definition; its specific articulations are dependent on context and it has throughout history been invested with various meanings (Brauch, 2008; Rothschild, 1995). During the Cold War security was primarily understood through the lens of 'national security', focusing on the protection of the state's sovereignty by external military threats (Buzan, 2008; Dannreuther, 2013). However, the increasing dissatisfaction with this intense narrowing of the field of security gradually led to the emergence of a debate between 'traditionalists' and 'wideners' originating already from the 1970s (Buzan,

et al., 1998). Contrary to traditionalists who defended the state-centric focus of security and emphasized the primacy of the military sector, wideners advocated the inclusion of economic and environmental dimensions into security studies. Despite traditionalist objections, the end of the Cold War and its bipolar militarized structure called for a broader and more inclusive security agenda (Dannreuther, 2013). In its aftermath, the remit of security became concerned with new threats which include unintentional changes that may disrupt societies and states and has come to recognize that individuals, apart from states, can also be insecure (Rothschild, 1995). This development is reflected by the increasing prominence of the concept of human security, which implies a broadening of security where the security of individuals rather than states occupies the central place and suggests a movement beyond conventional military concerns (Duffield & Waddell, 2006). The evolution of the concept of environmental security needs to be understood within the context of this reconceptualization of security.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s the world witnessed the emergence of an international environmental movement concerned with rapid population growth and growing resource scarcities (Dannreuther, 2013). This fear of living beyond earth's capabilities was reflected in texts like Ehrilch's *The Population Bomb* and the 1972 report *Limits to Growth* (in Dalby, 2009). Environmental concerns officially entered the international political agenda with the organization of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (UNCHE) in Stockholm in 1972 and the subsequent establishment of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

Against this backdrop, calls for a widening and redefinition of security increased. A prominent example is Ullman's (1983) *Redefining Security*, where he called for a broader security agenda and pointed directly to the deterioration of the environmental quality as a threat to US national security. The World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) 1987 *Our Common Future* report mentioned environmental stress both as a cause and effect of political tensions and military conflict and argued that conflicts are likely to increase as a result of

growing resource scarcity (Dalby, 2002). Moreover, the WCED report was the first to explicitly use the term environmental security (Barnett, 2001). As the Cold War came to an end, the environmental security literature expanded significantly, as various authors explicitly called for a redefinition of security in broader terms which incorporates environmental factors (Mathews, 1989; Myers, 1989). Ever since the concept of environmental security has been highly contested. Apart from the traditionalist opposition, certain critics have argued that the linkage of environment and (national) security may even have counter-productive effects for environmental issues by leading to wrong responses and an undesirable militarization of the environment (Deudney, 1990; Levy, 1995).

One of the most prominent attempts to popularize the notion of the environment as a national security threat was Robert Kaplan's (1994) journalistic article *The Coming Anarchy* published in the *Atlantic*. Kaplan (1994) described the future world as characterized by "disease, overpopulation, unprovoked crime, scarcity of resources, refugee migrations, the increasing erosion of nation-states and international borders, and the empowerment of private armies, security firms, and international drug cartels" (p. 48) and argued that "it's time to understand the environment for what it is: *the* national security issue of the early twenty-first century" (p.58). Although Kaplan's neo-Malthusian deterministic account has been thoroughly criticized (Dalby, 2002), it has nevertheless contributed to bringing environmental security to the attention of a wider public and policy sections (Barnett, 2001). Throughout the 1990s the interest for the security implications of environmental degradation increased substantially and various research projects were established in order to investigate the possible linkages between the environmental change and violent conflict.

Even though in the early 2000s environmental matters were temporarily marginalized from the international security agenda due to the 'war on terror' (Floyd, 2008), they returned towards the end of the decade, this time with an increased focus on climate change, which was not a prime concern for the environment-conflict debates of the 1990s. As mentioned above, this development

needs to be understood in connection with the growing consensus that emerged with the 4th IPCC Assessment Report (2007), which showed that climate systems are not linear and that there exists a possibility of abrupt changes, thus contributing to its representation as an urgent threat (Trombetta, 2012). An indicative fact is that the Working Group II of the IPCC 5th Assessment Report (2014) included a chapter on human security for the first time.

2.2. The Environment and Violent Conflict

The idea that environmental degradation will lead to violent conflict is central to many interpretations of environmental security. A standard argument of the environmental conflict discourse is that population growth will result to increasing resource scarcities, leading to deprivation and then presumably to conflict, either directly through competition for resources, or indirectly through the generation of environmental refugees (Barnett, 2001; Hartmann, 2010). One of the most ambitious research projects aiming to empirically investigate this link was established by Thomas Homer-Dixon (1991, 1994) and the so-called Toronto Group. After a decade of research, Homer-Dixon (1999) concluded that environmental scarcity, defined as a combination of renewable resource depletion and degradation, population growth and increased per-capita consumption and unequal distribution, can contribute to civil violence, including insurgencies and ethnic clashes. Moreover, he argued that such violence is likely to increase as scarcities of cropland, freshwater, and forests worsen in the developing world. Nevertheless, he acknowledged that the role of scarcity in the outbreak of violence is often vague and indirect, always interacting with political, economic, and other social factors and that conflict is more likely to be low-intensity and within state borders. A specific renewable resource that received increased attention at the time for its potential to generate conflict is water. However, 'water wars' (Gleick, 1994) did not only fail to materialize, but in many cases conflicts over water eventually led to cooperation (Buhaug, et al., 2008; Dannreuther, 2013). Furthermore, the

scarcity thesis was additionally challenged by a rival thesis suggesting that resource abundance rather than resource scarcity constitutes a prominent driver of armed conflict (Collier, 2000; de Soysa, 2002, 2008; Le Billon, 2005).

The growing awareness of the potential impacts of climate change led to new concerns about its security implications and its possible linkage to violent conflict. This was initially reflected in a number of government and IGO reports. While such reports were criticized for being speculative and lacking empirical backing (Gleditsch & Nordås, 2009), scholarship on the issue also developed substantially. There, the various effects of climate change are believed to induce loss of livelihood, contributing therefore to increased insecurity directly or through forced migration. This, in combination with other socio-political factors, is thought to contribute to political instability and reduced state capacity, economic decline and social fragmentation, hence increasing the likelihood of violence and providing improved opportunities for mobilization (Theisen, Gleditsch, & Buhaug, 2013). Nevertheless, despite the large amount of research on climate change-conflict linkages, as the systematic review by Sakaguchi, Varughese and Auld (2017) illustrates, empirical findings are mixed, thus challenging the assumption of climate change as an important driver of armed conflict.

2.3. The Environment and Human Security in the Anthropocene era

Despite its influence, the environmental conflict approach to environmental security has been heavily criticized by various critical theorists who advocate an alternative understanding, focusing on vulnerable individuals rather than state entities. Such theorists criticize the environmental conflict approach for its predominant consideration of Northern concerns and accuse it for being ethnocentric, portraying Southern populations as barbaric Others who will inevitably resort to violence, while neglecting the root causes of environmental degradation (Barnett, 2001, p.67; Dalby, 2002, 2009; Hartmann, 2010). Although

it is not outrightly denied that environmental stress may contribute to conflict under certain circumstances (Barnett & Adger, 2007), different responses are emphasized. By drawing upon global political economy and political ecology, this critical human-centered approach focuses on issues like ecological interdependence, the impacts of colonization and globalization on environmental degradation and the effects of Northern consumption patterns in the South (Dalby, 2002, 2008, 2009). Environmental changes are understood as 'global' not in the sense of a shared global responsibility or universal impacts, but because of their interlinkages with consequences for distant places and people (Barnett, Matthew, & O'Brien, 2008).

Contrary to the environmental conflict approach, here environmental science receives increased attention. Various earth system scientists propose that the world has entered a new geological epoch named Anthropocene, whereby humans are actively remaking the biosphere, primarily as a result of wide-scale fossil-fuel consumption (Dalby, 2009). An understanding informed by the distinct features of the Anthropocene, the complex ecological interconnections and the global environmental problems which emerged with unsustainable development practices, suggests that environmental security cannot be understood in terms of separate sovereign entities and their accompanying 'us versus them' mentalities (Brauch, 2009; Dalby, 2002, 2009; Floyd, 2015). Environmental insecurity has nothing to do with states but is instead described as "the vulnerability of people to the effects of environmental degradation; it includes the way this degradation affects the welfare of human beings" (Barnett, 2001, p.17). The referent object of security, then, is no longer the state but individual human beings in the same vein as in the UNDP's (1994) articulation of human security, which is addressed as "safety from chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression" and "protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily lives" (p.23).

Therefore, this widened and human-centered approach is not interested in traditional security concerns and its associated institutions, like the military, which on the contrary considers an important part of the problem because of its heavily polluting strategies (Barnett, 2001; Floyd, 2015). Instead, it is concerned with

primarily addressing the root causes of vulnerabilities which countless people in the rural areas and urban slums of the South face. Those vulnerabilities are seen not only in geological and geographical terms, but also as a juxtaposition of economic, social and political factors and the rapid changes of globalization (Dalby, 2009). Thus, this approach prioritizes sustainable development, building capacity and enhancing resilience (Oswald Spring, Brauch, & Dalby, 2009). Sustainable development may be defined as "development that satisfies the 'triple bottom line' of providing economic benefit, while also enhancing environment and society, in terms of social and cultural systems (or at least not degrading either)" (Brown, 2008, p.142). Resilience refers to the reduced susceptibility to damage from short-term and long-term changes, but also to the capacity to recover from such changes (Barnett, 2001). When the specific issue of climate change is concerned, both mitigation and adaptation are considered crucial, but the point that adaptation planning needs to also contribute to emissions reduction is central (Dalby, 2009). Barnett's (2001) definition, whereby he refers to environmental security as "the process of peacefully reducing human vulnerability to human-induced environmental degradation by addressing the root causes of environmental degradation and human insecurity" (p.129) sums up nicely the essence of this human-centered approach.

2.4. Securitization Theory

Having reviewed the emergence of the concept of environmental security and the different understandings and discourses that surround it, this section moves on to discuss the theoretical framework on which this thesis is premised, which is the theory of securitization. First, it will engage with the arguments and main concepts of the original securitization theory, and second, it will briefly look into various useful criticisms and contributions to the original conceptualization.

Securitization theory, which was initially developed by Ole Wæver (1995) and further elaborated by the Copenhagen School (Buzan, et al., 1998), is a

constructivist theory of security studies heavily influenced by the speech act linguistic philosophy. The core argument of the theory resolves around the logic that objective threats do not exist, but instead political communities transform issues into security issues through successful speech acts and this transformation has consequences on the way in which those issues are dealt with. Before examining this process in more detail, it is important to briefly refer to the units of security analysis as identified by the CS. These units include the referent objects, the securitizing actors and the functional actors. A referent object is something or someone considered to be under an existential threat and having a legitimate claim to survive (e.g. the state, identity, or humankind). An existential threat is a threat so pressing, that if not challenged immediately, will have catastrophic consequences and all other problems will become irrelevant. A securitizing actor is an actor who declares a specific referent object to be existentially threatened (e.g. political leaders, governments, and pressure groups). Finally, a functional actor is an actor that retains the ability to influence decisions and policy in a particular security sector (e.g. the arms industry in the military sector) (Buzan, at al., 1998).

For the CS security is about survival; "it is when an issue is presented as posing an existential threat to a designated referent object" and is precisely "that special nature of security threats [which] justifies extraordinary measures to handle them" (Buzan, et al., 1998, p.21). Buzan et al. (1998) maintain that any public issue can be found on a spectrum from nonpoliticized, whereby the state does not deal with it and is not a part of the public debate, through politicized, meaning that it is a part of public policy and requires government decision and resource allocation, to securitized, where it is "presented as an existential threat, requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedure" (p.23-24). What distinguishes securitization from politicization is the articulation of existential threats and the explicit sense of urgency that provides actors with the right to operate outside normal politics and established rules (Buzan, et al., 1998; Wæver, 1995). A certain issue, however, becomes a security issue not necessarily because the existential threat is real, but because it is presented as such by securitizing actors, meaning that security is understood as a "self-referential

practice" (Buzan, et al., 1998, p.24). Consequently, a case of securitization emerges when a securitizing actor articulates an issue as an existential threat, elevating it above normal politics. The CS thus views the process of securitization as a speech act. Accordingly: "It is not interesting as a sign referring to something more real; it is the utterance itself that is the act. By saying the words, something is done" (Buzan, et al. 1998, p.26).

At this point, it is useful to briefly look into John L. Austin's speech act theory, upon which the theory of securitization heavily draws. According to that theory, certain statements do not just describe a given reality but realize a specific action; they are able to 'do' things, having thus a performative character (Austin, in Balzacq, 2005). Austin distinguishes between three kinds of acts: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. The CS's understanding of security as a self-referential practice corresponds to the illocutionary speech act which captures the performative class of utterances (Balzacq, 2005). For Austin, performative utterances are not subject to truth/false tests but have 'felicity conditions', which if met, enable the speech act to happen even though it may not be 'true' (in Stritzel, 2007). By viewing security as an illocutionary speech act, the CS places the focus on what the speech act does, in contrast to the traditional security threat-reality nexus (Stritzel, 2007).

As the CS is heavily influenced by the speech act theory, it reasonably suggests that the proper way to investigate securitization is through the study of discourse. Nevertheless, it should be noted that for the CS a discourse that constructs an issue in terms of an existential threat is not sufficient for securitization; this is only what is described as a securitizing move. An issue becomes successfully securitized only if a significant audience accepts it as such (Buzan, et al., 1998). Although the audience does not receive much attention in early works on securitization (Wæver, 1995), in *Security: a new framework for analysis*, Buzan et al. (1998) describe securitization, like politicization, as an intersubjective process where the representation and interpretation of a specific threat is somehow negotiated between the securitizing actors and the relevant

audience (Stritzel, 2007). Threats are understood as neither objective nor subjective, but rather as relational, meaning that they need to be accepted as such. Whether securitization is deemed successful ultimately depends on the audience's acceptance of the existence of an existential threat for a specific referent object, which is regarded by the audience in need of securing. For the CS, this "is a social quality, a part of a discursive, socially constituted, intersubjective realm" (Buzan, et al., 1998, p.31).

For the security speech act to be successful, Buzan et al. (1998) identify a set of facilitating conditions; one internal and two external: The internal facilitating condition corresponds to the grammatic and linguistic features of the speech act, such as the grammar of security, the existential threat rhetoric and the sense of urgency. The articulation of an existential threat requiring emergency measures is highly important. The single mention of the word 'security' is not regarded sufficient. The external conditions include: 1) the social capital and the position of authority of the securitizing actor and 2) the nature of the alleged threat. Therefore, following this framework, a speech act is more likely to be successful when a securitizing actor who enjoys a position of authority (e.g. head of state) articulates a specific issue as an existential threat, while that specific threat has an increased potential to be considered legitimate by the audience. It is important, however, to note that even though it is acknowledged that certain securitizing actors enjoy privileged positions in the security field, "the power to define security…is never absolute" (Buzan, et al., 1998, p.31). Furthermore, central to the CS argumentation is that whether or not an actor opts for securitization or whether an audience accepts the securitization is an inherently political choice which has certain implications. Treating an issue as a security issue carries certain negative connotations, such as the logic of necessity and threat, defense, less available options and empowerment of certain elites (Wæver, 1995, 2011).

The CS recognizes that under certain circumstances securitization may seem an attractive option on tactical grounds, because when an issue is treated as a security issue is generally prioritized and attracts more attention and can mobilize

resources. The case of environmental issues, for example, is indicative. However, in general, more security is not seen as a positive development but rather as "a failure to deal with issues as normal politics" (Buzan, et al., 1998, p.29). Although in certain situations securitization may be desirable, in the abstract level desecuritization is considered the preferred long-term option (Hansen, 2012; Wæver, 1995, 2011). Desecuritization is "the shifting of issues out of emergency mode and into the normal bargaining process of the political sphere" (Buzan, at al., 1998, p.4), or, in other words, the movement along the spectrum described above from the securitized to the politicized. It is therefore believed that issues are best dealt with through normal political procedures and deliberations. Even though securitization is viewed by Buzan et al. (1998) as "a more extreme version of politicization" (p.23), it is at the same time believed to be its opposite, on the grounds that contrary to securitization, politicization means openness, choice, deliberation and responsibility. Whereas this preference for desecuritization is rather explicit in the CS (Hansen, 2012), in more recent accounts (Wæver, 2011), it has been expressed cautiously, as it is recognized that desecuritization does not necessarily lead to politicization but could also lead to depoliticization. For instance, an issue may completely disappear from the agenda potentially marginalizing insecure subjects (Floyd, 2008; Hansen, 2012), or fall into the domain of technocratic risk-management systems which entail little politics (Aradau & Van Munster, 2007). Even if this is not axiomatically bad, for certain issues like climate change, their movement to the nonpoliticized end of the spectrum could potentially have disastrous consequences.

In spite of the fact that securitization theory is widely acknowledged as one of the most influential theories of security studies, having contributed substantially to the widening of security in the post-Cold War era (Hansen, 2012), it has nevertheless been subjected to various criticisms. Some of those for instance concern its Eurocentric focus (Dannreuther, 2013), its insistence on extraordinary measures as a condition for successful securitization (Abrahamsen, 2005; Floyd, 2016; Huysmans, 2011) and its inability to adopt a clear normative stance between securitization and desecuritization (Aradau, 2004). Albeit all those criticisms are

valid and interesting, here the focus will be placed on contributions considered valuable for this particular study.

A body of such contributions stems from the so-called sociological strand of securitization theory, mainly associated with the works of Balzacq (2005) and Stritzel (2007). What is common in the two theorists is the belief that in CS's framework of securitization the emphasis is mainly placed on the speech act and its performative action (Balzacq, 2005), while the audience and contextual factors are either overlooked or undertheorized. Although he does not reject the linguistic and discursive focus advanced by the CS, Balzacq (2005) retains the idea that audience, political agency and context are essential facets of securitization and "should guide the analysis of the linguistic manufacture of threats in world politics" (p.173). Balzacq (2005) identifies an inherent contradiction in the CS framework between the alleged self-referentiality of security and the description of securitization as an intersubjective process. In a similar fashion, Stritzel (2007) argues that two distinct readings of securitization are present in the CS. The first one is concerned with the speech act as a performative event and corresponds to a poststructuralist internalist reading of securitization, while the second is concerned the with the process of securitization and corresponds to an externalist constructivist reading. Stritzel (2007) advocates an emphasis to the externalist reading and contends that "security articulations need to be related to their broader discursive contexts from which both the securitizing actor and the performative force of the articulated speech act/text gain their power" (p.360). This approach, thus, is more associated with the premises of critical discourse analysis (Stritzel, 2007), which views discourse as both socially constitutive and constituted (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).

The CS is also challenged on normative grounds by a broad critical approach to security studies, which also seeks to question the rationalist paradigms of security (Krause, 1998). A prominent advocate of that approach is the Welsh School, also known as the school of Critical Security Studies (CSS). The negative view of security in the CS is largely at odds with the CSS understanding of the concept. For CSS theorists, who are heavily influenced by thinkers such as Gramsci

and the Frankfurt School critical theorists, security is better understood as emancipation (Booth, 1991, 1997). Booth (1997) contends that "emancipation means freeing people, as individuals and groups, from the social, physical, economic, political, and other constraints that stop them from carrying out what they would freely choose to do" (p.110). It is not therefore power or order that produces true and stable security, but emancipation (Booth, 1991). This reading of security reveals an evident contradiction between the CS which views it as negative and CSS which advocates its maximization. Booth (2007) criticizes the CS securitization theory for being state-centric, elitist and conservative and argues that even though concepts such as securitization and desecuritization are interesting, they are at the same time deeply flawed and "do not advance the cause of a more progressive security studies" (p.169). The idea of security as emancipation shares many assumptions and is quite close to the human security approach, as it also places the individual as the ultimate referent object.

A further noteworthy criticism emanating from the broader critical approach stems from feminist security studies scholars who place their focus on women's narratives and experiences (Bergman Rosamond & Kronsell, 2018). Lene Hansen (2000) has convincingly argued that the CS surprisingly fails to include the aspect of gendered security in its framework, even though gender is central to analyses of many critical approaches to security studies. As feminist scholars have illustrated, security is profoundly gendered (Wibben, 2018). Notably, Cynthia Enloe has shown how certain security policies and practices have specific impacts on women, entrapping them in a net of violence, subordination and insecurity (in Krause, 1998). Runyan and Peterson (2014) depict how gendered insecurity is particularly manifest in situations of conflict and war, while other scholars incorporate the gendered aspect in notions of human and environmental security (Oswald Spring, et al., 2009). All these suggest that the failure to incorporate the gendered aspect constitutes an important omission of the CS framework.

2.5. Securitization, the Environment and Climate Change

As the analysis in *Security: a new framework for analysis* (Buzan, et al., 1998) suggests, the environmental sector is rather complex, as it is characterized by the existence of two overlapping agendas, a scientific and a political, and a multiplicity of actors, be them securitizing (e.g. governments, IGOs and NGOs) or functional (e.g. polluting corporations and lobbies). The present study, as mentioned above, is concerned with the potential role of certain UN bodies and agencies, such as the UNFCCC, the UNEP and the IPCC as securitizing actors performing a securitizing move. The threat is hypothesized to be climate change and the impacts it will have, although the analysis of the documents will reveal a clearer picture of its distinct articulations. As far as the audience is concerned, a puzzling issue for many empirical studies of securitization, as long as the UN is examined as a securitizing actor, it makes sense to consider an international community of states and their respective governments as a relevant audience, in line with Oels's (2012) suggestion. The discussion, however, becomes more complicated when the referent objects of environmental security are considered. Although the environment itself figures prominently in most environmental security discourses (de Wilde, 2008), as the previous sections have illustrated, the referent objects vary considerably in the environmental conflict and the human-centered discourses of environmental security. An important analytical constraint of the CS framework is that it does not recognize that the different articulations of climate change as an issue of human security or as one of national security have significant policy implications. This constraint stems the CS's fixed (realist) interpretation of security associated with urgency and emergency measures (Floyd, 2016; Oels, 2012; Trombetta; 2011). As Buzan et al. state, "a successful securitization thus has three components (or steps): existential threats, emergency action, and effects on interunit relations by breaking free of rules" (p.26). In this light, it does not make any difference whether security is understood like in the environmental conflict or in the human-centered discourse, as the outcomes, according to the CS, would be identical.

A further analytical obstacle is that when adhering to a strict reading of the CS framework which suggests that an issue becomes successfully securitized only when it passes a critical threshold of exceptionality (Oels, 2012), it follows that all the securitizing moves which have attempted to frame climate change as an issue of security must be regarded as failed securitizations (Buzan, et al., 1998; Trombetta, 2008). However, as Trombetta (2008, 2011) illustrates, the CS's Schmittian understanding of security (Wæver, 2011) in terms of exception and emergency is highly problematic when analyzing climate change and environmental issues. Whilst attempted securitizing moves have not so far brought about exceptional measures, they should not be simply discarded as failed securitizations, as in several cases they have led to the adoption of policies and measures that would otherwise probably not have been adopted (Trombetta, 2011). This development is troubling for the CS because it suggests that in the case of climate change securitizing moves have actually led to an intensified politicization of the issue (Trombetta 2008, 2011), despite the School's claim that "transcending a security problem by politicizing it cannot happen through thematization in security terms, only away from such terms" (Wæver, 1995, p.56). By neglecting non-exceptional responses, adopting a narrow and confrontational logic of security, and focusing mainly on the performativity of the speech act, the CS has often overlooked the transformation of security practices prompted by nontraditional issues, such as the environment (Huysmans, 2011; Oels, 2012; Trombetta, 2011).

This is not to say that securitization theory is not analytically relevant for the issue of climate change and other environmental issues. Quite the contrary; its discursive focus provides invaluable tools for the investigation of transformation of the environmental issues into security issues. What is problematic though is its insistence on the de-contextualized performative action of the speech act and the fixity of the practices of security (Oels, 2012; Trombetta, 2011). However, there is a possibility to overcome this shortcoming by taking onboard contributions from the sociological strand of securitization (Balzacq, 2005; Stritzel, 2007). As Trombetta (2012) suggests, since threats are considered by the CS to be socially constructed, the ways to deal with them should be viewed in the same way. This

implies an increased attention to the structures and dynamics of society, the contextual factors, or what Stritzel (2007) refers to as the externalist reading of securitization.

The present chapter has provided a detailed investigation of the central concepts and theoretical premises, as well as valuable criticisms and contributions considered critical for the analysis. The following chapter turns to the methodological aspects of the study, discussing both some central ontological and epistemological assumptions and analytical tools of discourse analysis.

3. Methodological Framework: Analyzing the Discourse

The purpose of the present chapter is to provide a detailed discussion of the methodological framework of my study and explain why discourse analysis is a suitable method for the examination of the research questions under investigation. At this point, it should be noted that the term 'discourse' is rather vague and is frequently used in different contexts evoking varying meanings. Discourse analysis, consequently, is by no means a unified methodological tradition, but rather characterized by a plethora of approaches stemming from different disciplines and sharing diverse theoretical premises (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, & Vetter, 2000; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). The approach that will be employed in this study is that of Norman Fairclough (1992, 1995, 2003), which is also known as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)[3]. The chapter will first discuss the utility of discourse analysis for the study of securitization and I will argue that CDA in particular offers a useful analytical framework. Then, the main theoretical assumptions and key concepts of CDA will be reviewed, followed by a presentation of Fairclough's

---

[3] Critical discourse analysis is a broad body of theory/method within discourse analysis and Fairclough's approach represents only a particular strand of it. However, in this paper the term CDA points out specifically to Fairclough's work

three-dimensional analytical model and relevant methodological tools. The last section will deal with the selected material and its operationalization.

3.1. Discourse Analysis and Securitization

It should be clear by now that the theory of securitization places great emphasis on language and the social effects it produces (Buzan, et al., 1998; Wæver, 1995). As shown above, the CS views security and securitization as speech acts, and more specifically as illocutionary speech acts (Balzacq, 2005), stressing the performativity of language. Thus, "Security is not of interest as a sign that refers to something more real; the utterance *itself* is the act. By saying it, something is done" (Wæver, 1995, p.51). This view of language in the CS corresponds to the assumptions of several approaches to discourse analysis, which contend that language and specific ways of talking are not mere reflections of the world, social relations and identities, but on the contrary they actively create and change them (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Such approaches, CDA amongst them, share with securitization theory similar constructivist ontological and epistemological assumptions, which view language as maintaining the capacity to shape and change social reality rather than simply represent it (Buzan, et al., 1998; Titscher, et al., 2000). This affinity between the theoretical and methodological framework is considered essential, because discourse analysis should be used as a 'complete package', a 'theoretical and methodological whole', and not just as a single method of data analysis detached from its theoretical and methodological foundations (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p.3).

The view that discourse analysis constitutes the most appropriate method for the study of securitization is also shared by CS theorists (Buzan, et al., 1998). The analysis of securitizing actors' discourses allows for the investigation of framings of certain issues as existential threats, and subsequently, for the uncovering of attempted securitizing moves. As the CS framework suggests, it is through language that actors endeavor to elevate issues above normal politics and

move them into the realm of security. In this particular study, discourse analysis is utilized in order to examine whether the aforementioned UN bodies and agencies perform a securitizing move by constructing the issue of climate change as an existential threat in key documents. Furthermore, it allows to investigate if the employed discourses are more closely associated with the environmental conflict or the human-centered approach to environmental security.

Although approaches to discourse analysis, such as the Foucauldian approach (Foucault, 1979) or Laclau and Mouffe's (1985) poststructuralist approach could provide invaluable insights, this study applies the CDA approach, and there is a number of reasons for this particular methodological choice. Contrary to other approaches, which view discourse in a more abstract way and do not specifically engage with analysis of texts, in the textually-oriented CDA approach (Fairclough, 1992, 1995) linguistic analysis plays a key role. A close linguistic examination of the UN documents allows for the identification of the construction of climate change as an existential threat. The inquiry though is not reduced to that, but also includes analysis of the processes of text production and interpretation, as well as analysis of the connection of the discursive event to wider social practices. In this study, for instance, increased attention is given to the institutional position and influence of the UN as text producer. Moreover, it is of interest how text production is shaped by current global climate governance structures, but also how the employed discourses in the discursive events under investigation potentially affect and shape them. In CDA, language is viewed both as form of action through which people can change the world, in a similar way to Austin's speech act theory, and as a historically situated form of action in a dialectical relationship with other (non-discursive) aspects of the social (Fairclough 1992; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). This view of discourse is consistent with the original CS framework which views security as a speech act, but at the same time corresponds to the – frequently utilized throughout the analysis − contributions stemming from the sociological strand of securitization (Balzacq, 2005; Stritzel, 2007), which call for an increased attention to political agency and contextual factors. Furthermore, there is also an ontological argument, which relates to the CDA's assertion that the character of

social processes and structures is only partly discursive and consequently some societal phenomena are not discursive/linguistic (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). This study accepts the poststructuralist claim that climate change is as a part of a discursive struggle, where competing discourses strive to fix its meaning (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985). However, at the same time, it retains the position that climate change is also located beyond the discursive realm, as its effects are already affecting the lives and livelihoods of a considerable part of the world population.

3.2. Critical Discourse Analysis: Theoretical Premises and Key Concepts

Although some key premises of CDA have already been illustrated, this section will provide a more systematic discussion of the main theoretical assumptions and central concepts of the approach. This discussion draws primarily upon *Discourse and Social Change* (1992) and *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (1995), which correspond to Fairclough's earlier work.

Fairclough (1992) describes his framework as an attempt to bridge linguistic analysis and a socio-theoretical approach to discourse influenced to a large extent by the work of Foucault. 'Discourse' here is understood in terms of language use as a form of social practice and discourse analysis is the "analysis of how texts work within sociocultural practice" (Fairclough, 1995, p.7). In CDA, discourse is seen as positioned in a dialectical relationship with social structure, and as such, both shaping and constructing it and the same time being shaped and constrained by it. In other words, discourse is seen as both socially constitutive and constituted (Fairclough, 1992, 1995). The constitutive aspects of discourse include the construction of social identities (identity function), social relations (relational function) and systems of knowledge and belief (ideational function). Discourse can be constitutive both in conventional ways, meaning that it reproduces society, and in creative ways, in the sense that it can also actively transform it. As social change constitutes a principal concern for CDA, analysis of ideology is considered

imperative. Discourses are believed to function ideologically to the extent that they sustain or restructure power relations in society (Fairclough, 2003). Discursive events retain the ability to both reproduce or challenge existing ideologies.

Having briefly presented some fundamental views on discourse in the CDA framework, it is essential to discuss a few key concepts, which will be translated into concrete methodological tools in the following section. First, two focal points of analysis should be mentioned: the discursive event and the order of discourse. A discursive event is any instance of language use, such as a political speech, or a newspaper article (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). The order of discourse refers to the configuration of all discourse types used within a social institution, or within society as a whole (Fairclough, 1992). Discourse types are combinations of elements such as genres and discourses[4] which refer to particular types of conventions used in specific social contexts (Fairclough, 1992, p.125). Relevant examples here are the genres of scientific or policy reports, or the ecological, human, or national security discourses.

In CDA every discursive event is described as having three dimensions: a 'text' dimension, a 'discursive practice' dimension and a 'social practice' dimension. Therefore, analysis takes place at these three distinct – though sometimes overlapping – levels (Fairclough, 1992, 1995). Text analysis is the linguistic analysis of the form and organization of texts, where genres and discourses are realized linguistically. Discursive practice involves processes of text production, distribution and consumption. The analysis concentrates on how participants in the discourse produce and interpret texts and it seeks to examine what discursive practices are being drawn upon from the order of discourse and how they are combined. Central concepts used in the analysis of discursive practice are those of intertextuality and interdiscursivity. Intertextuality (Kristeva, in Fairclough, 1992) refers to the property that texts have resulting in their drawing upon previous texts, while interdiscursivity refers to the combination of various

---

[4] The term 'discourse' here is used in a different, more concrete sense than in the abstract conceptualization of discourse as language use as a form of social practice

elements of the order of discourse like genres and discourses in a single discursive event. Even though the concept of interdiscursivity suggests endless creative possibilities via unlimited combinations of discourse types, this is where analysis of the social practice (power and ideology) intervenes. In practice, according to Fairclough (1992, 1995), such creative possibilities are constrained by hegemonic relations and struggles in the society. Influenced by Gramsci, he explains that orders of discourse are never fixed and stable and that their articulation and rearticulation needs to be understood as "one stake in the hegemonic struggle" (Fairclough, 1992, p.93).

3.3. The Three-Dimensional Model of Analysis

This section draws upon the three-dimensional analytical model described above and presents concrete analytical and methodological tools for each distinct level of analysis considered relevant for the present study. Moreover, it illustrates how the securitization of climate change can be fruitfully investigated through the utilization of this model.

TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

Through the linguistic analysis of the characteristics of a text it is possible to examine how discourses are realized textually and how they provide support for specific interpretations (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). The textual analysis of the selected UN documents, which corresponds to the examination of the internal facilitating condition of securitization, allows for the investigation of a possible construction of climate change as an existential threat, which is a necessary condition if we wish to speak of its securitization. As shown above, for the CS the single mention of the word security is not adequate for securitization. An articulation portraying the issue as requiring utmost priority is essential (Buzan, et

al., 1998). The textual analysis of the documents provides important insights into that aspect.

The analytical topics identified by Fairclough (1992) and discussed below correspond mainly to the ideational function of language, or, in other words, to discourse's contribution in "constructing social reality" (Fairclough, 1992, p.169). Those topics are: connectives and argumentation (cohesion), transitivity and modality (grammar), word meaning, and wording (vocabulary). The analysis of cohesion is concerned with the identification of certain types of argumentation and narratives. In this specific study, arguments and narratives on climate change and its construction as a threat in the texts will be explored. In the analysis of transitivity, the focus is upon questions of agency, causality and responsibility (Fairclough, 1992). This is valuable for examining the portrayal of the relationship between human action and climate change in the documents and the ideological effects it entails. The analysis of modality is concerned with the degree of affinity of the expressed statements in a text. A useful point of enquiry is to investigate if the documents present their narratives on climate change as an absolute truth, or if they allow space for competing discourses and interpretations. Finally, the analysis of the vocabulary aspects of the text, allows for a critical investigation of how certain key words are used in the text and what specific meanings do they convey. Moreover, such enquiry seeks to investigate how meanings are worded in comparison with other texts and what intertextual relations they indicate.

THE ANALYSIS OF DISCURSIVE PRACTICE

Discursive practice involves processes of text production, distribution, and consumption. The analysis focuses on the relationship between the text and the order of discourse and aims to address the issue of what discursive practices and conventions are drawn upon and how they are articulated together (Fairclough, 1992, 1995). The analysis of the discursive practice is an important aspect of this study, as it sheds light on the question of which discourses surrounding the

environment, climate change, and security are drawn upon and how are they combined and articulated in the documents.

Relevant tools proposed by Fairclough (1992) for the analysis of the discursive practice include the analysis of intertextuality and interdiscursivity (production), and the analysis of the intertextual chains (distribution). As this study is predominantly interested in the securitizing move, questions of consumption will not be explicitly addressed. Starting with the process of production, analysis of intertextuality is concerned with what previous texts are drawn upon in the text under analysis, and in what ways. Analysis of interdiscursivity scrutinizes what discourse types figure in the text and how are they combined. For instance, a useful point of enquiry here is to investigate the configuration of the different discourses on security and climate change, such as those of national security or those of human security and sustainable development, which in turn respectively indicate links to the environmental conflict and the human-centered discourses of environmental security. In addition, it is of interest to examine what previous texts are explicitly (or implicitly) mentioned in the documents and pinpoint their producers and the institutional positions they hold. Regarding the process of distribution, the concept of intertextual chains describes how types of text are "transformationally related to each other" (Fairclough, 1992, p.130). To make this clearer, an example of an intertextual chain is the transformation of a political speech, for instance, to media texts, reports, academic articles, and so on. Through the transformation process usually different elements are incorporated and form new mixes (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). The analysis of the intertextual chains explores whether and in what ways a text is transformed and if such a transformation is stable or involves tensions and change. As a final remark, it should be noted that when looking into the production and distribution of texts, the institutional position of the text producer is critical. Texts produced, for example, by governments or international organizations are usually more influential, as they are widely distributed, have an extensive readership, and are frequently intertextually incorporated in other texts (Fairclough, 2003). This argument correlates with the CS position that securitizing

actors retain bigger possibilities of success in securitizing an issue when they enjoy social capital and are in positions of authority.

THE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL PRACTICE

This rather elusive analytical level is primarily concerned with questions of ideology and power. The analytical objective can be described as twofold: On the one hand it is to examine how the discursive practice is shaped by the wider social practice and on the other hand it is to scrutinize the effects which it may have on the social practice. The general guidelines provided by Fairclough (1992) suggest looking into the hegemonic relations and (non-discursive) structures in which the discursive practice is embedded and examining whether it reproduces or transforms them, as well as if and how does the discursive practice challenge the existing orders of discourse. A further inquiry involves the ideological and political effects of discourse on the constitution of social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and belief.

It is acknowledged that discourse analysis alone is inadequate to answer such questions. Consequently, other social theories should always be incorporated in the analysis (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). As far as this specific study is concerned, the theory of securitization, in combination with other theories of security like that of CSS, have the potential to illustrate the possible effects which the adoption of different discourses on climate change in an attempted securitizing move may have on the wider social practice (i.e. the actual ways that the issue is being dealt with). This theme will be revisited in the next chapter.

3.4. Material and Operationalization

The material that was analyzed in order to examine the question whether the UN agencies mentioned above perform a securitizing move consists mainly of such

agencies' reports, which provide knowledge on climate change and other pressing environmental issues, draw attention on their potential risks and impacts, and present relevant policy recommendations. Two documents that do not fit that particular typology, but are nevertheless considered relevant for the analysis, are the treaty of the Paris Agreement (UNFCCC, 2015) and the influential 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UNGA, 2015) which sets the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The SDGs include explicit mentions to climate action (Goal 13) and other environmental issues (e.g. Goals 12, 14 & 15). As this study is predominantly interested in examining the contemporary discourse on climate change within the UN and aims to identify recent and current securitizing moves, the selected material consists of documents published in the time period between 2014 and 2019. The year of 2014 is an appropriate choice, as it marks the publication of the latest IPCC Assessment Report which constitutes the most comprehensive and detailed collection of scientific knowledge on climate change to date (Gleditsch & Nordås, 2014). It needs to be noted though that certain documents will be analyzed in their *Summary for Policymakers* form, as the full publications refer extensively to technical issues which are not regarded to be of relevance here. All the analyzed texts are cited on the Appendix.

In order to study the material, two distinct analytical stages were followed. In the first stage, which included a meticulous reading of all the texts, specific relevant and informative excerpts were identified and selected for a more thorough and detailed analysis. Such excerpts were chosen because of their property of portraying climate change as an urgent issue requiring immediate and unprecedented action. In addition, extracts in which discourses of the human-centered or the environmental conflict approach to environmental security were detectable were also selected for further analysis. This selection process was assisted by the identification of certain key words (Fairclough, 2003) which either point to the urgency of the issue of climate change, or to any of the two environmental security discourses that concern this thesis. Such key words included the following: 'threat', 'urgent', 'unprecedented', 'irreversible', 'survival', 'security', 'violence', 'conflict', 'war', 'vulnerable', as well as derivatives,

synonyms, and phrases indicating similar meanings. In the second stage, the selected excerpts were systematically analyzed through the utilization of the three-dimensional model and the methodological tools described above. A comprehensive discussion of the results of the analysis is the subject of the following chapter.

4. Analysis

The present chapter discusses the findings of the analysis following the structure of Fairclough's (1992, 1995) three-dimensional analytical model. The analysis progresses as follows: It starts with a detailed textual analysis of the selected excerpts, which is then followed by an analysis of the discursive practice. Then, it moves on to examine the relationship between the prevalent discourses in the documents and the existing social practice in the field of environmental and climate governance, which has been outlined throughout the thesis. The analysis of social practice is then complemented by a normative discussion on the desirability of securitization of climate change.

The textual analysis, which corresponds to the analysis of the internal facilitating condition of the speech act (Buzan, et al., 1998), showcases how a securitizing move is indeed taking place within the UN bodies and agencies under investigation. This securitizing move is uncovered through the analysis of the discourses in the texts, which portray climate change as an unprecedented challenge facing humanity, a threat for lives and livelihoods, and as an issue requiring urgent and immediate measures and responses. The analysis of the discursive practice locates the two distinct discourses of environmental conflict and human-centered approach to environmental security and reveals that even though environmental conflict discourses are not completely absent, human-centered discourses are dominant, heavily informing the texts. Finally, by drawing upon CS securitization theory, as well as upon the criticisms elaborated above, the last analytical level

discusses how the employment of those specific discourses might potentially affect the existing social practice in the field of climate governance. Although these are three distinct levels of analysis, it needs to be noted that the boundaries between them are not always solid, and, in certain instances, those levels inevitably overlap (Fairclough, 1992).

4.1. Textual Analysis: Locating the 'Grammar' of Security

As it was introduced in the discussion of securitization theory, in the CS framework a speech act has to meet one internal and two external facilitating conditions in order to be successful. This section, but also this thesis in general, is predominantly concerned with the internal facilitating condition. This is because, as it was mentioned above, it is primarily interested in identifying a securitizing move and not necessarily determining whether a successful securitization of climate change has indeed occurred. As Buzan et al. (1998) argue, in order to be met, the internal facilitating condition of securitization requires the employment of the grammar of security, the presence of an existential threat rhetoric, and a general sense of urgency indicating that the outcomes of inaction might be catastrophic and irreversible. The textual analysis of the speech acts under investigation is charged with the task of locating such articulations surrounding the issue of climate change.

By drawing upon Fairclough's (1992) suggested methodological tools, this section first engages with the analysis of cohesion, which is the inquiry of the argumentations and narratives surrounding climate change and its construction as an existential threat. Then, it addresses questions of modality and transitivity. The analysis of modality evaluates the expressed levels of affinity with particular statements and discusses the ideological effects they entail. The analysis of transitivity reviews the possible effects of the specific portrayals of human agency in changing the climate in relation to the potential efficacy of the securitizing move. Finally, the analysis of vocabulary scrutinizes the context in which specific words

such as 'security', 'conflict', and 'war' are used and examines the meanings with which they are invested.

The analysis of cohesion of the texts suggests that there are at least three discernible types of argumentation which reinforce the assertion that the UN bodies and agencies under investigation perform a securitizing move. The first type concerns the discursive construction of climate change as a phenomenon which is being greatly accelerated during the past few years. This discursive construction is facilitated to a large extent by the employment of the discursive tool of comparison, which is utilized in many of the documents. The employment of this specific tool is evident for instance in the following quotes: "Each of the past several decades has been significantly warmer than the previous one. The period 2011-2015 was the hottest on record, and 2015 was the hottest year since modern observations began in the late 1800s" (UNEP, 2016, p.54). Likewise, "About half of cumulative anthropogenic CO_2 emissions between 1750 and 2010 have occurred in the last 40 years (*high confidence*)" (IPCC, 2014b, p.7). This comparison between the contemporary levels of greenhouse gas emissions, and consequently, levels of temperature and those of the last few centuries, constructs climate change as an unprecedented challenge that needs to be urgently addressed. By emphasizing the rapid pace of upsurge in the levels of emissions and temperatures which occurred over such a short period of time, the texts contribute to a formulation of a general sense of urgency and indirectly call for action. This type of argumentation alone though is not sufficient for the fulfillment of the internal facilitating condition of securitization. However, it can be argued that through its contribution to the sense of urgency and unprecedentedness surrounding the issue of climate change, it functions as complementary to the two remaining argumentation types which more clearly fit the typology offered by the CS.

The second identified argumentation type concerns the discursive construction of climate change as a direct threat to various aspects of social life. Apart from its impacts on natural systems, in the vast majority of the analyzed texts, climate change is portrayed as having adverse repercussions and posing significant

risks for human and social systems. Throughout the texts, climate change is claimed to be a substantial threat, among others, for lives and livelihoods, economic growth, sustainable development and human security. For instance, "Climate change alters weather patterns, which in turn has a broad and deep impact on the environment, economics and society, threatening the livelihoods, health, water, food and energy security of populations (*well established*)" (UNEP, 2019c, p. 14). Moreover, in certain texts, links are being drawn between climate change and environmental degradation and population displacement and forced migration. Namely, "Environmental degradation affects where and how people are able to live. It drives human displacement and forced migration by threatening lives and making people's lives untenable, particularly the poorest and most vulnerable" (UNEP, 2017, p.70). Links between the outbreak or exacerbation of violent conflicts and climate change are also occasionally being drawn. "Climate change can indirectly increase risks of violent conflicts in the form of civil war and inter-group violence by amplifying well-documented drivers of these conflicts such as poverty and economic shocks (*medium confidence*)" (IPCC, 2014a, p.20). Although cautiously expressed, such statements undeniably associate climate change with more traditional security concerns, establishing thus a sense of urgency which is typically linked with such concerns.

Notably, in her address to the 2017 UN Climate Change Annual Report (UNFCCC, 2018), the UN Climate Change Executive Secretary, Patricia Espinosa, refers to climate change as "the single biggest threat to life, security and prosperity on Earth" (p.5). In a similar light, in his foreword to the 2017 UN Environment Annual Report (UNEP, 2018c), the UN Secretary-General, António Guterres, states that climate change could potentially affect the security of nations. Furthermore, in particular, though limited, instances, climate change is quite straightforwardly depicted as an existential threat for whole societies (UNEP, 2019b; UNGA, 2015). The following passage by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is rather indicative:

"Climate change is one of the greatest challenges of our time and its adverse impacts undermine the ability of all countries to achieve sustainable development. Increases in global temperature, sea level rise, ocean acidification and other climate change impacts are seriously affecting coastal areas and low-lying coastal countries, including many least developed countries and small island developing States. The survival of many societies, and of the biological support systems of the planet, is at risk" (UNGA, 2015, p.8-9)

The utilization of the word 'survival' in the last sentence of the passage is a powerful discursive tool, as it constructs climate change as the absolute threat, a threat so severe that endangers the continuity of society. Climate change is presented here as an existential threat, in the sense that if it is not addressed immediately and effectively, it may have such catastrophic consequences that everything else will become irrelevant (Buzan, et al., 1998).

The speech acts presented above all indicate an attempted securitizing move, as climate change is discursively constructed as a force disrupting and threatening natural systems and human societies. Even though articulations of the possible impacts of climate change in alarmist tones and direct linkages of climate change and violent conflict are present only in a few texts, warnings of the severe impacts and risks posed by climate change are a common feature of the vast majority of the analyzed discursive events.

The third identified argumentation type is concerned with remarks explicitly expressing the need for compelling and unprecedented action in order to diminish the risks and threats posed by climate change. Such accounts, which can be located in every single of the analyzed texts, typically portray climate change as an extremely pressing and acute issue. Moreover, they imply that if left unaddressed or handled inefficiently, climate change may have severe consequences and irreversible impacts. The following two extracts are rather illustrative:

"Time is running out to prevent irreversible and dangerous impacts of climate change. Unless greenhouse gas emissions are radically reduced, the world is on course to exceed the temperature threshold set out in the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. That makes climate change a global driver of environmental, social, health and economic impact and heightened society-wide risks" (UNEP, 2019c, p.7)

"It comes at a time of mounting evidence on the increase in the number and devastating effects of climate variability and extreme events that we already experience, and where the scientific understanding of what we can expect in the future under different global temperature scenarios underlines the urgency of unprecedented and accelerated mitigation and adaptation ambition and action" (UNEP, 2018a, p.2)

The above extracts clearly indicate that decisive and unprecedented action is urgently needed in order to avert the catastrophic and potentially irreversible impacts of climate change. Throughout the texts, climate change is constructed as an issue which requires increased attention and priority, while calls for immediate action and warnings of the consequences of inaction are rather explicit.

This analysis of cohesion suggests that it is plausible to speak of the existence of a securitizing move in the speech acts under investigation. The three identified argumentation types illustrate how climate change is portrayed as an unprecedented challenge, gravely threatening natural systems and human societies. Moreover, they showcase how climate change is presented as requiring utmost priority and escalated action, because otherwise its impacts can potentially be disastrous and irrevocable. Those articulations of climate change seem to meet the criteria for the internal facilitating condition of securitization identified by the CS, which requires the employment of a grammar of security, threat rhetoric, a generalized sense of urgency and warnings for the irreversibility of effects in case of inaction. Therefore, the construction of climate change as a pivotal challenge which threatens various aspects of social life substantiates the argument of the

existence of an attempted securitization of climate change on behalf of the UN bodies under investigation.

The efficacy of this securitizing move is arguably further boosted through the presence of high degrees of modality in the speech acts. The authors of the analyzed texts generally retain high affinity with their statements, thus presenting them as absolute truths, allowing little space for alternative discourses and interpretations (Fairclough, 1992). This is to a certain extent expected, as several of the analyzed texts belong to the genre of scientific texts and reports, employing scientific discourses and terminologies and providing relative evidence for their claims. However, high degrees of modality are not limited to exclusively scientific reports, such as the IPCC publications, but are also identified in texts which would be probably better categorized as belonging primarily to the genre of policy recommendations or agenda-setting reports. It is, nevertheless, quite frequent that the IPCC reports are intertextually incorporated in the latter category of texts in order to support their arguments.

First of all, as it would probably be expected, high degrees of modality are observed in statements regarding the existence and reality of climate change. Such statements are expressed with high rates of confidence and are usually backed by scientific evidence, allowing thus limited space for contestation by competing discourses. Furthermore, high degrees of modality are located in statements more closely associated with the securitizing move and relating back to the argumentation types discussed above. Those concern the severe risks and impacts expected to be brought about by climate change and the need for urgent and unprecedented action. The following extract taken from the 2018 UN Environment Adaptation Gap Report is indicative of the high degrees of modality present in the statements:

> "Unless adaptation efforts are strengthened considerably, heat and extreme event-related morbidity and mortality will continue to rise. The impacts of heatwaves and extreme events on human health are significant. Current climate variability already threatens vulnerable populations in many regions. Projected increases in heat and

extreme weather events and changing socio-demographic trends will further increase exposure and risks" (UNEP, 2018a, p. xiv)

In the above extract, the argument that climate change will pose significant risks and potentially have serious impacts for human populations, as well as that urgent action is needed, are presented as truth statements. This high affinity with the statement, which is located in the majority of texts, leaves limited space for alternative interpretations, contributing thus to the generalized sense of urgency that is constructed in the texts.

A further common feature of the texts, which derives from the analysis of transitivity, is that human contribution to the changing of climate is presented to be unequivocal. As the Working Group I of the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (2013) notably states, "human influence on the climate system is clear" (p.15). Throughout the texts, humans are described to be to a very large degree responsible for the current levels of environmental degradation and climate change. "We live in an era of unprecedented environmental change. Human activity has reshaped our planet so profoundly that scientists suggest that we have entered a new geological epoch they label "the Anthropocene"" (UNEP, 2017, p.70). The linguistic configuration of excerpts such as the one displayed here does not intend to reduce or hide the agency of humans in changing the climate, but, on the contrary, to highlight it. However, when taking into account the facilitating conditions of securitization identified by Buzan et al. (1998), this particular feature may be problematic for the possibilities of success of the securitizing move. More specifically, the problem is associated with the second external facilitating condition, which concerns the nature of the threat. Even though the external conditions and the ultimate success of the securitizing move is not the primary focus of this thesis, this topic requires a brief consideration here. The second external facilitating condition, according to the CS proposes that in order to retain possibilities of success, the threat articulated in the speech act needs to be considered as legitimate by the relevant audience. What is problematic is that threat discourses are typically associated with the existence of

an external enemy from which a particular community needs to be protected and imply 'us versus them' mentalities (Floyd, 2015; Kester & Sovacool, 2017). In the case of climate change, however, quite paradoxically, the threat is self-imposed (Dalby, 2009). Therefore, it is arguably more difficult to convince an audience to take decisive action against a threat which is self-imposed and in the absence of a clearly-defined external enemy (Kester & Sovacool, 2017). It can be argued thus that the high transitivity in the texts may eventually hinder the potency of the securitizing move. Nevertheless, as the analysis of the discursive practice below will demonstrate, the increased emphasis on the human agency in the UN bodies' articulations is linked to a particular environmental security discourse which those bodies employ, in their effort to promote specific policy measures and responses.

The last part of the textual analysis is concerned with the analysis of vocabulary, which scrutinizes the specific contexts in which words with distinguishing security connotations are used. Such words include for instance the following: 'conflict', 'war', but also the word 'security'. The analysis of vocabulary significantly overlaps with the analysis of the discursive practice which investigates in detail the interplay of the different discourses in the texts and can be thus treated as a prelude to the following section.

The word 'conflict', or 'violent conflict' appears in the texts quite frequently. In some instances, as it was shown above, links are being drawn between environmental degradation, climate change and violent conflict. However, this relationship is portrayed in rather cautious terms avoiding deterministic tones, either by emphasizing the indirect role of climate change as a trigger of violent conflict (IPCC, 2014a), or by expressing the statements with low degrees of modality (UNEP, 2017). In addition, in the majority of occurrences, 'conflict' figures in the texts without indicating any form of causal relationship with climate change. For example, state and non-state conflicts are discussed in their property of impeding sustainable development (UNGA, 2015), hindering adaptation efforts (IPCC, 2014a), or hampering agricultural production, leading to increased food insecurity (UNEP, 2018a). In a similar fashion, even though occurrences of the

word 'war' are extremely rare in the texts, when the word does occur, it is not causally related with climate change. The single exception is the linkage of the increasing resource scarcity and the war that broke out in Darfur in 2003 (UNEP, 2019a).

The word 'security' is also invested with various meanings and used in different contexts. There are indeed certain instances where 'security' bears the connotations of the traditional conceptualization of national security. "Climate change, wildlife crime, micro-plastic pollution and land degradation are just a few examples of environmental ills that affect the health and well-being of communities and economies, global efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals and even the security of nations" (António Guterres, in UNEP, 2018c, p.2). However, the above quote is one of the very few cases where security is invested with that particular meaning. In the vast majority of the occurrences, the word is used to refer to non-traditional conceptualizations of security, which include, among others, livelihood security, food security, water security and energy security. Such conceptualizations clearly point to notions of human security, which refers to safety from chronic threats and protection from harmful disruptions on daily lives (UNDP, 1994; Duffield and Waddell, 2006). As a matter of fact, the term 'human security' is explicitly used in some of the texts (IPCC, 2018; UNEP, 2019c), while the Working Group II of the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC (2014a) devotes a whole section to the investigation of the impacts and risks of climate change for human security. This analysis of the above key words already suggests that human security discourses are more prevalent in the documents compared to discourses of traditional security. This theme will be revisited and examined in more detail in the next section.

To sum up, the first level of analysis demonstrated how the UN bodies and agencies of UNEP, UNFCCC, and IPCC perform a securitizing move through their articulation of climate change as an unprecedented threat requiring urgent and decisive action. Additionally, it suggested that the high degrees of modality in the expressed statements further contribute to the construction of a sense of urgency.

Yet, it argued that the emphasis on human agency causing the changing of climate may potentially hinder the efficacy of the securitizing move. Last but not least, the analysis of vocabulary indicated that the meanings with which certain key words are invested and the contexts within which they are used point to a prevalence of human security discourses in the texts.

4.2. The Analysis of Discursive Practice: The Interplay of the Environmental Security Discourses

This level of analysis is concerned with locating the diverse discourses of environmental security in the texts and examining the interplay between them. Using the relevant CDA terminology, it investigates how the texts under scrutiny are produced, or how they draw from the existing order of discourse (Fairclough, 1992). This thesis, as mentioned earlier, primarily focuses on the two dominant discourses which shape the order of discourse in the field of global climate security governance, which are the environmental conflict and the human-centered approaches to environmental security. As outlined above, the environmental conflict approach is more closely associated with traditional security concerns, and its main narrative resolves around the argument that climate change and environmental degradation can lead to violent conflict as a result of increased resource competition or through the generation of environmental migrants and refugees (Detraz & Betsill, 2009). On the contrary, the human-centered approach emphasizes questions of vulnerability to climate-related events and is deeply concerned with threats to livelihoods and disruptions to everyday-lives, indicating a close link with human security. Additionally, it addresses questions of environmental justice and advocates the eradication of the root causes of climate change and environmental degradation (Floyd, 2008). The two approaches have therefore different referent objects of security. While in the environmental conflict approach the referent object of security is principally the state, in the human-centered approach, it shifts to individuals, and more specifically, to vulnerable

individuals. The analysis of interdiscursivity (Fairclough, 1992) allows for the investigation of how those two discourses are incorporated in the discursive events, or, how the specific articulations in the texts are related to the existing order of discourse. Furthermore, this section briefly engages with questions of distribution of the texts by discussing how the institutional position of the UN as a text producer, or alternatively as a securitizing actor performing a speech act, potentially affects the potency of the attempted securitizing move.

The analysis of interdiscursivity suggests that both discourses can be identified in the texts, but at the same time reveals that human-centered discourses are indisputably dominant. Nonetheless, it is still considered relevant to concisely look into the environmental conflict discourses and the ways in which they figure in the texts. When present, such discourses typically portray climate change as retaining the property to contribute to increasing competition over dwindling natural resources, or to generate migration flows as a result of extreme weather events or slow-onset climate variability. This in turn, according to such narratives, may lead to heightened tensions and instability, multiplying the risks of the outbreak of violent conflict. For instance, the 2017 UN Climate Change Annual Report (UNFCCC, 2018) states that "climate change, together with other megatrends − population growth, rapid urbanization, food insecurity and water scarcity – increases competition for resources and heightens tensions and instability" and continues by claiming that "[a] *peaceful*, healthy and prosperous future requires strong and wide-raging action under the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement" (p. 10, my emphasis). The above discursive construction, which is distinguished by a rather deterministic tone, implies that unless drastic measures are taken in order to averse the impacts of climate change, the future could be characterized by conflicts and wars arising from the increased competition over resources. In a similar fashion, it is elsewhere mentioned that "[c]ompetition over increasingly scarce natural resources – land, water, timber, oil, minerals – can create tensions and ignite conflicts among users. In many cases, tensions can lead to violent conflicts and large-scale forced displacement" (UNEP, 2017, p.73).

The IPCC (2014a) also points out to the potential of increased rivalries among states emanating from the transboundary impacts of climate change on shared resources. It avoids though a deterministic language and argues that such rivalries can be managed and resolved through enhanced institutions and cooperation. Moreover, as shown in the textual analysis, a causal link is drawn by the IPCC (2014a) between climate change and violent conflict. However, this link is expressed in rather cautious terms. It is stressed that the role of climate change is indirect, emphasizing its interaction with other well-documented drivers of armed conflict and accentuating that such conflicts are likely to be limited within state borders, indicating nevertheless some shared points with Homer-Dixon's (1999) scarcity thesis. When the relationship between migration and environmental degradation and climate change is explicitly addressed, the latter are not portrayed as the sole push factors, but rather as functioning in juxtaposition with other political, economic, and social components of vulnerability, such as poverty and lack of opportunity (UNEP, 2017).

Although the articulations described here point to environmental conflict discourses, it needs to be stressed that such discourses figure only in a few texts, while being completely absent from the majority of the analyzed material. Additionally, even in the texts in which they are easily discernible, environmental conflict discourses are always intermixed, and in many cases, overshadowed by human-centered discourses of environmental security. Therefore, the discursive practices in the texts never draw solely upon the discourse types and elements associated with the environmental conflict approach. All the texts in which the potential linkage of climate change with population displacement and armed conflict is discussed, also stress the fact that the impacts of climate change primarily affect the most vulnerable segments of the population and point out to the imminent need to address the multiple vulnerabilities which render people insecure (IPCC, 2014a; UNEP, 2017; UNEP, 2019c; UNFCCC, 2018). Furthermore, as shown in the previous section, in several cases violent conflict is discussed in terms of a threat to human security, impeding sustainable development, disrupting agricultural production, and hindering adaptation efforts.

Contrary to environmental conflict discourses, human-centered discourses of environmental security are prevalent in almost all the analyzed texts[5]. While mentions of threats and impacts of climate change to facets of traditional security are limited and generally expressed in quite cautious terms, the portrayal of climate change as a threat to various aspects of human security is rather common. Events associated with climate change, like sea-level rise and extreme weather events, such as heat waves, droughts, floods and cyclones are portrayed as seriously disrupting everyday lives and negatively affecting the well-being of populations. "Disasters undermine human security and well-being, resulting in loss and damage to ecosystems, property, infrastructure, livelihoods, economies and places of cultural significance, forcing millions of people to flee their homes each year" (UNEP, 2019c, p.14). Similar remarks to the one quoted here, as well as statements pointing to the risks of climate change for health, food and water security, are frequently identified in the analyzed material. The abundance of such statements and remarks, contrary to the sparse elaborations of the relationship between climate change and violent conflict, suggests that the primary concern in the texts is the impacts of climate change on lives and livelihoods of people, rather than the security of states. In other words, the referent object of security in the identified securitizing move performed by the UN bodies and agencies under investigation is clearly not the state, but individual human beings.

Even though it is acknowledged that climate change may potentially affect individuals in every part of the world, there is unequivocal agreement that the posed risks are unequally distributed, disproportionally threatening the most vulnerable sections of the world population. Consistent with the human-centered approach to environmental security, the texts emphasize with high degrees of modality that the impacts of climate change primarily affect populations residing in the developing states of the so-called Global South. As particularly vulnerable are portrayed the poorest parts of the population, people who lack sufficient resources for effective

---

[5] The single exception is the Working Group I of the IPCC 5th Assessment Report (2013) which deals with the physical science basis

adaptation or mobility. Additionally, individuals who live in ecologically marginalized and exposed areas or in poor-quality housing and lack essential infrastructure, as well as people heavily dependent on agricultural and coastal livelihoods (IPCC, 2014a; IPCC, 2018). The gendered aspect is also prevalent in many of the texts' discourses, where women, especially in poor agricultural communities, are illustrated as facing increased levels of vulnerability. Extracts similar to the following are rather commonplace throughout the texts: "[t]he adaptation efforts needed even under the 1.5°C global warming scenario far surpass current levels and are set to affect the poor and vulnerable most, particularly in developing countries" (UNEP, 2018a, p.2). Likewise, "Society-wide risks associated with environmental degradation and climate change effects are generally more profound for people in a disadvantaged situation, particularly women and children in developing countries" (UNEP, 2019c, p.7)

Following such articulations, the policy recommendations proposed by the texts prioritize the enhancement of the adaptive capacity and resilience, especially of the most vulnerable and ecologically marginalized. A focus on sustainable development and an emphasis on the potential synergies between sustainable development practices and climate action, such as mitigation and adaptation efforts, is prominent throughout the texts. Notably, the 5th target of the 1st Sustainable Development Goal states: "By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters" (UNGA, 2015, p.19). The 2030 Agenda and the SGDs (UNGA, 2015) are intertextually incorporated in the bulk of the most recent publications, a fact reinforcing the stated preference of sustainable development as the most appropriate and beneficial policy option. The policy measures indicated in the texts are compatible with those favored by the human-centered approach. On the contrary, policy recommendations advocating for example the enhancement of defense capabilities or expanded military involvement, policies associated with traditional security and the environmental conflict approach, are completely absent from the material. Hence, the analysis of interdiscursivity clearly indicates that

human-centered discourses are largely dominant in the analyzed texts, despite the fact that environmental conflict discourses still shape to a certain extent the existing order of discourse in the field of global climate security governance (Floyd, 2015, Boas & Rothe, 2016).

Even though thus far the analysis suggested that human-centered discourses are undeniably prevailing, there are certain central aspects of those discourses which are not stressed enough, or even silenced in the texts. This is important, as in CDA, the analysis of absences is thought to have the potential to provide useful insights for social analysis (Fairclough, 1995). Such aspects concern the societal root causes of increased vulnerability to climate change impacts and environmental degradation, as well as questions of environmental justice, regarding the different levels of responsibility for historical greenhouse gas emissions between the Global North and the Global South. In the rare occurrences whereby the issue of the root causes of vulnerability is addressed, it is recognized that vulnerability emanates from unequal development processes, structural inequalities and processes of discrimination, but explicit calls to combat those causes are generally absent (IPCC, 2014a). Concerning the question of environmental justice, even though for example in the Paris Agreement (UNFCCC, 2015) it is stated that developed countries ought to take the lead in climate action and support the developing countries in their own efforts, the issue of historical responsibility for current greenhouse gases concentration in the atmosphere is silenced. This is of course expected specifically for the Paris Agreement, as it constitutes a multilateral agreement negotiated by states. Matters of environmental justice though are generally silenced in all the analyzed texts. However, this silencing might be explained with respect to the fact that the UN as an institution aims to promote action through international cooperation, and that is precisely why it avoids those kinds of rhetoric which could potentially lead to tensions and disagreements among states. This is arguably beneficial for the possibilities of success of the attempted securitizing move, which as illustrated in this section, does not frame security in terms of threats stemming from antagonistic political communities but in terms of a common threat facing

humanity, neglecting state borders and requiring cooperative and coordinated responses.

The potential of success of the securitizing move is further reinforced by the institutional position of the UN. As the CS framework suggests in the elaboration of the first external facilitating position of the speech act, a securitizing move is more likely to succeed when the securitizing actor retains a position of authority and high social capital (Buzan, et al., 1998). The authority of the UN as a prominent global actor and the capacity it maintains to affect policymaking are indisputable (Floyd, 2015). The texts produced by the UN are highly influential, as they are widely and rapidly distributed throughout the world and enjoy a diverse and extensive readership, including political actors in key positions. In addition, they are repeatedly intertextually incorporated in other texts, such as academic texts, politicians' speeches and media texts (Fairclough, 2003). In relation to the concept of intertextual chains (Fairclough, 1992), in certain cases, the sense of urgency and imminent threat that is present in the original documents is substantially augmented when those are cited in other texts. The following headlines used to refer to the recent publication of the IPCC 1.5°C Special Report (IPCC, 2018) by media outlets that usually avoid alarmist tones and narratives are illustrative: *We have 12 years to limit climate change catastrophe, warns UN* (The Guardian, 2018) and *Final call to save the world from 'climate catastrophe'* (BBC, 2018).

Thus far, the analysis has demonstrated that the UN bodies and agencies of UNEP, UNFCCC, and IPCC perform a securitizing move framed in terms of human security and heavily informed by human-centered environmental security discourses. Furthermore, it has argued that this securitizing move retains some possibilities of success, owing to UN's institutional position. The last part of the analysis turns to a discussion of what the implications of that securitizing move could be for the social practice in the field of climate governance. Such discussion is imperative, as according to the CDA framework, apart from constituted by, discourse is also constitutive of social practice.

4.3. The Analysis of Social Practice: Towards a Human-Centered Securitization?

The CDA framework suggests that discourses are not decontextualized and separated from the existing social practice. They are to a certain extent shaped by social practice, but at the same time retain the ability to shape it (Fairclough 1992, 1995). In that sense, the discourses identified in the texts should not be analyzed independently of the current social practice in the field of environmental and climate governance. As it has been briefly outlined throughout the thesis, during the last decade or so, climate change has been gradually acknowledged as a legitimate concern and has attracted increased attention from a variety of actors like security institutions, ministries, IGOs, and NGOs. Moreover, it has been framed as a security issue by such actors in national and international, but also in human security terms. The latter articulations are not irrelevant to the increased prominence of the concept of human security in the post-Cold War era (Dannreuther, 2013; Duffield & Waddell, 2006) and the recent growing influence of the concepts of sustainable development and resilience (Methmann & Oels, 2015). However, despite the significance of those concepts, both human-centered and environmental conflict discourses still figure in discursive events on climate change (Floyd, 2015), shaping thus the order of discourse in the field of global climate security governance.

This section primarily focuses on the constitutive aspect of discourse and goes on to discuss how the discourses present in the texts under investigation might influence and shape the current social practice in the field of climate governance. This line of inquiry is considered relevant here because it allows to address the latter part of the second research sub-question which is concerned with the potential policy implications of the employed discourses. As reiterated by Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999), discourse analysis alone is not sufficient for the analysis of social practice and needs to be supplemented by social theory. For that reason, the following discussion utilizes theoretical insights from the original CS theoretical framework, but also from the criticisms and contributions to the CS reviewed

above. Furthermore, it incorporates some thoughts stemming from the Welsh School of Critical Security Studies for the normative discussion on the desirability of securitization of climate change.

It is appropriate to begin with a consideration of the potential effects of the identified securitizing move for the social practice by adopting the original CS conceptualization. As previously mentioned, even though, given its constructivist background, in the CS framework the securitization of an issue is open to debate and negotiation, the practices that engenders are not (Trombetta, 2011). The CS retains a rather fixed and narrow view of security, which is characterized by its insistence on existential threats, extraordinary action, and the "breaking free of rules" (Buzan, et al., 1998, p.26). Regarding the issue of climate change, a successful securitization in CS terms at the international level, as Scott (2012) suggested, would probably involve a shift in global climate governance away from established negotiations fora like the UNFCCC and towards the UNSC, which entails largely undemocratic procedures. However, as the discourses identified in the analyzed speech acts include only sparse mentions of national or traditional security notions, notions that are prevalent in the Security Council, such a development resulting from the specific securitizing move is arguably not very likely. Therefore, a strict reading of the CS framework would suggest dismissing the securitizing move as a failed securitization. Thus, as the securitizing move would hypothetically fail, it is implied that there are no attributable effects on the existing social practice. Nevertheless, such a reading is not unproblematic.

As shown in the theoretical discussion of securitization, the CS has been thoroughly criticized for its fixed view on security and its insistence on the exceptionality of policy responses (Floyd, 2016; Trombetta, 2011). Moreover, a further weak spot of the theory identified by critics stemming from exactly that fixed view is its inability to account for different policy outcomes depending on the distinct discourses being drawn upon in the speech acts (Oels, 2012; von Lucke, et al., 2014). Those lines of criticism have increased relevance for the analysis of the securitization of climate change. Even though the identified securitizing move

performed by the UN bodies and agencies under investigation might not bring about exceptional measures like the suspension of ordinary law, the mobilization of militaries, or the move of global climate governance under the sole responsibility of the UNSC, it is misleading to conclude that axiomatically the securitizing move will not have any effect on the current social practice whatsoever. By drawing extensively upon the sociological strand of securitization (Balzacq, 2005; Stritzel, 2007), Trombetta (2011) has argued that the CS insistence on exceptional measures has dragged attention away from the fact that non-traditional security articulations, such as environmental security, have in fact in certain instances transformed security practices. According to that argument, previous securitizing moves in the environmental sector have brought about measures that otherwise would probably not have been adopted. In other words, intensified politicization has been achieved through securitization (de Wilde, 2008; Trombetta, 2011). Similarly, Rita Floyd (2016) argues that the success of securitization should not be determined by the adoption of exceptional measures or audience acceptance, but by a detectable change in the behavior of securitizing actors or actors instructed by them as result of the securitizing move, even if this change does not meet the exceptionality criteria. Drawing upon the criticisms elaborated here, it can be argued that the identified securitizing move performed by the UN bodies and agencies under investigation has the potential to influence policymaking, and by extension, social practice, despite the fact that this might not mean the adoption of emergency measures outside the normal political procedures.

The fixed and narrow view of security in the CS is also problematic on the grounds that it does not allow for an analysis of the different policy implications that the different discourses employed in the speech acts have (Oels, 2012; von Lucke, et al., 2014). For the CS it does not make any difference if climate change is articulated in national or human security terms, as in its conceptualization the evoking of security always bears negative connotations, such as the logic of threat and defense and the narrowing down of the available options (Buzan, et al, 1998; Wæver, 2011). However, as it has been repeatedly stated throughout this thesis, the different discourses of environmental security assume different, if not opposing,

policy suggestions. On the one hand, the environmental conflict approach focuses predominantly on a specific form of adaptation, − conflict prevention – which is primarily limited within state borders and entails an increased role for security institutions like the military. On the other hand, the human-centered approach is interested both in mitigation and adaptation and advocates policies that will reduce vulnerabilities and combat processes of environmental change that affect the whole of humanity (Detraz & Betsill, 2009).

The analysis of the discursive practice in the previous section demonstrated that the performed speech acts predominantly draw upon human-centered discourses of environmental security. Those discourses prioritize policy options, such as sustainable development and the enhancement of resilience and adaptive capacity, which will not only decrease current risks and impacts of climate change but will also contribute to the alleviation of vulnerabilities in the long-term. By taking onboard the above criticisms, the discussion reaches the conclusion that the framing of climate change as an imminent and unprecedented threat requiring immediate action (i.e. the securitizing move) might potentially lead to quicker action and more enhanced mitigation and adaptation efforts from the relevant stakeholders (i.e. the addressees of the speech acts). Even though this kind of action may not necessarily meet the exceptionality criteria, it would be wrong to discard the securitizing move as a failed securitization with no effects on the existing social practice. This is because, following Floyd's (2016) argument, if enhanced efforts would indeed be taken up, this would suggest a change in behavior that might have not occurred in the absence of the securitizing move.

Before concluding this thesis, it is imperative to address one last question that has normative connotations. This question concerns whether or not it is desirable to resort to securitization in order to deal with the issue of climate change. For CS theorists, securitization is a negative development, a failure to deal with a specific issue in normal politics, and thus the stated normative preference lies with desecuritization and normal political procedures (Buzan, et al, 1998; Wæver, 1995). This normative stance stems from the fixed view of security in the CS, which, as

elaborated above, is always viewed as bearing negative overtones. However, as it should be obvious by now, this thesis retains the position that different articulations of security have diverse social effects, and thus some are considered more beneficial and morally acceptable that others. This position is influenced by Floyd's (2007) argument, whereby in an attempt to theorize an approach that aspires to bring together the Copenhagen and the Welsh Schools of security studies, she contends that there are indeed both positive and negative securitizations. By employing a consequentialist moral philosophy, she argues that securitization is not inherently bad (as in the CS), nor good (as in CSS), but on the contrary issue-dependent. A securitization can be seen as positive and morally right when it is in the political interest of the majority and "benefits a security problem […] and deals with it faster, better and more efficiently than a normal politicization does, offering a just and useful alternative" (Floyd, 2007, p.342). Following this argument, the articulation of security in human security terms, contrary to traditional security articulations associated with the environmental conflict approach, is arguably morally acceptable and can be considered as a positive securitization. This is because whereas the environmental conflict approach assumes exclusionary policies that will benefit the few, mostly in the developed countries, and offers short-term solutions, the human-centered approach advocates policies that will address longstanding vulnerabilities and will likely be more efficient in achieving the ultimate aim, which is the elimination of the root causes of climate change (Floyd, 2007, 2015; von Lucke, et al., 2014). Therefore, under specific circumstances, security is not necessarily ascribed a negative meaning, but can be viewed as emancipation, to the extent that it frees people from physical and human constraints (Booth, 1991; Floyd, 2007).

However, this by no means implies that securitization is always a desirable option. The CS cautions still retain increased relevance. Even though, as demonstrated in this thesis, the influential UN bodies and agencies under investigation articulate security predominantly in human security terms, this is not the case with all the institutions that are involved in global climate governance (Floyd, 2015). Despite the UN's effort to constitute human-centered discourses dominant in the hegemonic discursive struggle (Fairclough, 1992), environmental

conflict discourses still inform the existing order of discourse to a certain extent. When environmental and climate security are articulated in environmental conflict and national security terms, not only the focus is placed on short-term measures that shift attention away from the root causes of the problem, but there is always the risk of the adoption of counterproductive policies and an undesirable militarization of climate change (Deudney, 1990; Levy, 1995). Regardless of their property of attracting attention and interest from policymakers, such discursive constructions are by definition exclusionary, advance specific (national) interests and do not work towards emancipatory causes, that is combating vulnerabilities and providing climate security for all people (Floyd, 2015; Kester & Sovacool, 2017; von Lucke, et al., 2014). Therefore, a securitization of climate change based on environmental conflict and national security articulations is not considered morally acceptable and desirable by thinkers affiliated with the human-centered approach (the author of this thesis included), who advocate inclusive and comprehensive environmental and climate security for the whole of humanity. Having said that, it follows that securitization is a strategy which can potentially contribute to enhanced efforts to deal with climate change and foster human security, largely owing to the mobilization power of security (Floyd, 2007). Nevertheless, at the same time, it is a double-edged sword (von Lucke, et al., 2014) and every securitizing move requires careful and critical scrutiny.

5. Conclusions

Over the course of the last few years and owing to a large extent to advances in scientific knowledge, climate change has been increasingly acknowledged as a legitimate concern requiring substantial responses. In several instances though, climate change has been portrayed not solely as an environmental problem, but also as a security issue with potential disastrous impacts and consequences, frequently featuring in discussions and publications of security actors and institutions. Against this backdrop, a vigorous debate emerged among scholars as to whether this

development has signaled a securitization of climate change. This thesis has hopefully provided a contribution to that debate by demonstrating that securitization of climate change is not only propelled by security actors, but also bolstered by influential institutions not explicitly tied to security, as the discursive analysis of the speech acts performed by the IPCC, the UNEP and the UNFCCC has highlighted.

Inspired by the arguments calling for an increased attention to contextual factors when researching securitization (Balzacq, 2005; Stritzel, 2007) and instructed by the ontological assumption that climate change is only partially a discursive phenomenon, this study employed the CDA approach in order to analyze the discourses featuring in the speech acts performed by the aforementioned UN bodies and agencies. Fairclough's (1992) three-dimensional analytical model provided a suitable and useful framework for the examination of each of the research questions and sub-questions that guided the study. First, the textual analysis revealed that a securitizing move is indeed occurring within the IPCC, the UNEP and the UNFCCC. This securitizing move was uncovered through the discourse analysis of selected discursive events performed by those bodies and agencies, whereby climate change is articulated as an unprecedented issue, which gravely threatens various aspects of human and social life, necessitating thus imminent and extraordinary measures and responses.

Second, the analysis of discursive practice showcased that this identified securitizing move is principally framed in human security, rather than traditional or national security terms. While environmental conflict discourses were not completely absent in the analyzed material, they were typically obscured by human-centered discourses of environmental security. Therefore, the suggested policy options advocated in the texts were primarily those of climate change mitigation, sustainable development, enhancement of adaptive capacity and building of resilience, especially for the most vulnerable segments of the world population. On the contrary, policy suggestions such as the improvement of national defense

capabilities and an increased military involvement, which are more consistent with environmental conflict discourse, were completely discounted.

Third, departing from the assertion that the employment of different discourses can lead to different kinds of securitization and incorporating criticisms on the CS fixed view of security, the analysis of social practice argued that the identified securitizing move maintains the ability to influence policymaking in the field of global climate governance. The representation of climate change as an unparalleled threat with potential devastating impacts by an institution with high authority and significant institutional position like the UN is likely to convince its member-states to adopt new policies, increase their efforts and commit more resources to combat the root causes and impacts of climate change. Even if not accompanied by exceptional and extraordinary measures, should policies like the promotion of sustainable development practices or the proclamation of more ambitious emissions targets be adopted, it would be misleading to simply discard the securitizing move as failed securitization with negligible effects to the social practice as the CS proposes. This is because those policies might have never been adopted in the absence of the securitizing move, which retains considerable mobilization power and conveys a generalized sense of urgency (Floyd, 2016). However, this is just theoretical reasoning and the extent to which concrete policies will be adopted in response to this specific identified securitizing move requires further empirical research. This task though goes beyond the stated aim of this thesis. Nevertheless, this piece has contributed to uncovering a noteworthy securitizing move and the investigation of its ultimate success or failure, meaning the adoption of new policies (extraordinary or not), enhanced efforts and allocation of increased resources from relevant stakeholders, is an imperative research task and could well be the subject of future research.

To conclude with some normative overtones, as long as the securitizing move is framed in human security terms and informed by human-centered discourses of environmental security, the securitization of climate change is morally acceptable and desirable. This is so because it draws attention to emancipatory

causes, that is providing environmental and climate security for all people, and especially for the most vulnerable, helping them to sustain their lives and livelihoods and protecting them from the disruptions caused by environmental and climate change. As this thesis has illustrated, the UN bodies and agencies under investigation appropriately frame climate change in such terms. Nonetheless, notwithstanding their high institutional position, they are only a part – albeit powerful and influential – of the discursive struggle around the issue of climate change. Still a number of influential institutions active in global climate security governance, such as NATO or the Pentagon, articulate climate change chiefly in national security or environmental conflict terms (Floyd, 2015), and consequently imply exclusionary policies that do not further the emancipatory cause of environmental and climate security for the whole of humanity. That is precisely why scholars need to continue critically and rigorously dissecting the discourses employed in every attempted securitizing move and scrutinizing the policy implications that those discursive constructions entail.

References

Abrahamsen, R. (2005). Blair's Africa: The politics of securitization and fear. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, 30*(1), 55-80.

Aradau, C. (2004). Security and the democratic scene: Desecuritization and emancipation. *Journal of International Relations and Development, 7*(4), 388-413. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jird.1800030

Aradau, C., & Van Munster, R. (2007). Governing terrorism through risk: Taking precautions, (un)knowing the future. *European Journal of International Relations, 13*(1), 89-115. doi:10.1177/1354066107074290

Balzacq, T. (2005). The three faces of securitization: Political agency, audience and context. *European Journal of International Relations, 11*(2), 171-201. doi:10.1177/13540661050529601

Barnett, J. (2001). *The meaning of environmental security: Ecological politics and policy in the new security era*. London: Zed.

Barnett, J. (2007). The geopolitics of climate change. *Geography Compass, 1*(6), 1361-1375.

Barnett, J., & Adger, W. N. (2007). Climate change, human security and violent conflict. *Political Geography, 26*(6), 639-655.

Barnett, J., Matthew, R. A., & O'Brien, K. (2008). Global environmental change and human security. In H. G. Brauch, N. C. Behera, B. Chourou, P. Dunay, J. Grin, P. Kameri-Mbote, . . . Ú Oswald Spring (Eds.), *Globalization and environmental challenges: Reconceptualizing security in the 21st century* (pp. 355-362). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Bergman Rosamond, A., & Kronsell, A. (2018). Cosmopolitan militaries and dialogic peacekeeping: Danish and Swedish women soldiers in

Afghanistan. *International Feminist Journal of Politics, 20*(2), 172-187. doi:10.1080/14616742.2017.1378449

Boas, I., & Rothe, D. (2016). From conflict to resilience? explaining recent changes in climate security discourse and practice. *Environmental Politics, 25*(4), 613-632.

Booth, K. (1991). Security and emancipation. *Review of International Studies, 17*(4), 313-326.

Booth, K. (1997). Security and self: Reflections of a fallen realist. In K. Krause, & M. C. Williams (Eds.), *Critical security studies: Concepts and cases* (pp. 83-119). London: UCL Press.

Booth, K. (2007). *Theory of world security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brauch, H. G. (2008). Conceptual quartet: Security and its linkages with peace, development, and environment. In H. G. Brauch, N. C. Behera, B. Chourou, P. Dunay, J. Grin, P. Kameri-Mbote, . . . Ú Oswald Spring (Eds.), *Globalization and environmental challenges: Reconceptualizing security in the 21st century* (pp. 65-98). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Brauch, H. G. (2009). Securitizing global environmental change. In H. G. Brauch, Ú Oswald Spring, J. Grin, C. Mesjasz, P. Kameri-Mbote, N. C. Behera, . . . H. Krummenacher (Eds.), *Facing global environmental change: Environmental, human, energy, food, health and water security concepts* (pp. 65-102). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Brown, C. (2008). Emergent sustainability: The concept of sustainable development in a complex world. In H. G. Brauch, N. C. Behera, B. Chourou, P. Dunay, J. Grin, P. Kameri-Mbote, . . . Ú Oswald Spring (Eds.), *Globalization and environmental challenges: Reconceptualizing*

security in the 21st century (pp. 141-150). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Brzoska, M. (2012). Climate change as a driver of security policy. In J. Scheffran, M. Brzoska, H. G. Brauch, P. M. Link & J. Schilling (Eds.), *Climate change, human security and violent conflict: Challenges for societal stability* (pp. 165-184). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Buhaug, H., Gleditsch, N. P., & Theisen, O. (2008). Implications of climate change for armed conflict. Paper presented at the *World Bank Workshop on Social Dimensions of Climate Change,* Washington DC. 1-52. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRANETSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/SDCCWorkingPaper_Conflict.pdf

Buzan, B. (2008). The changing agenda of military security. In H. G. Brauch, N. C. Behera, B. Chourou, P. Dunay, J. Grin, P. Kameri-Mbote, . . . Ú Oswald Spring (Eds.), *Globalization and environmental challenges: Reconceptualizing security in the 21st century* (pp. 553-560). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Buzan, B., Wæver, O., & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner.

Campbell, P. J., MacKinnon, A. S., & Stevens, C. (2010). *An introduction to global studies*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

CNA Corporation. (2007). *National security and the threat of climate change*. Alexandria, VA: CNA Corporation. Retrieved from https://www.cna.org/cna_files/pdf/national%20security%20and%20the%20threat%20of%20climate%20change.pdf

Collier, P. (2000). Doing well out of war: An economic perspective. In M. Berdal, & D. M. Malone (Eds.), *Greed and grievance: Economic agendas in civil wars* (pp. 91-111). Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner.

Dalby, S. (2002). *Environmental security*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.

Dalby, S. (2008). Security and environment linkages revisited. In H. G. Brauch, N. C. Behera, B. Chourou, P. Dunay, J. Grin, P. Kameri-Mbote, . . . Ú Oswald Spring (Eds.), *Globalization and environmental challenges: Reconceptualizing security in the 21st century* (pp. 165-172). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Dalby, S. (2009). *Security and environmental change*. Cambridge: Polity.

Dalby, S. (2013). The geopolitics of climate change. *Political Geography, 37*, 38-47.

Dannreuther, R. (2013). *International security: The contemporary agenda* (2nd, Fully Revised & Expanded ed.). Cambridge: Polity.

de Soysa, I. (2002). Ecoviolence: Shrinking pie, or honey pot? *Global Environmental Politics, 2*(4), 1-34.

de Soysa, I. (2008). Underdevelopment and human insecurity: Overcoming systemic, natural, and policy risk. In H. G. Brauch, N. C. Behera, B. Chourou, P. Dunay, J. Grin, P. Kameri-Mbote, . . . Ú Oswald Spring (Eds.), *Globalization and environmental challenges: Reconceptualizing security in the 21st century* (pp. 127-140). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

de Wilde, J. (2008). Environmental security deconstructed. In H. G. Brauch, N. C. Behera, B. Chourou, J. Grin, P. Kameri-Mbote, P. H. Liotta, . . . Ú Oswald Spring (Eds.), *Globalization and environmental challenges: Reconceptualizing security in the 21st century* (pp. 595-602). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Detraz, N., & Betsill, M. M. (2009). Climate change and environmental security: For whom the discourse shifts. *International Studies Perspectives, 10*(3), 303-320.

Deudney, D. (1990). The case against linking environmental degradation and national security. *Millennium, 19*(3), 461- 476.

Duffield, M., & Waddell, N. (2006). Securing humans in a dangerous world. *International Politics, 43*(1), 1-23. doi:10.1057/palgrave.ip.8800129

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Floyd, R. (2007). Towards a consequentialist evaluation of security: Bringing together the Copenhagen and the Welsh schools of security studies. *Review of International Studies, 33*(2), 327-350. doi:10.1017/S026021050700753X

Floyd, R. (2008). The environmental security debate and its significance for climate change. *International Spectator, 43*(3), 51-65.

Floyd, R. (2015). Global climate security governance: A case of institutional and ideational fragmentation. *Conflict, Security & Development, 15*(2), 119-146.

Floyd, R. (2016). Extraordinary or ordinary emergency measures: What, and who, defines the 'success' of securitization? *Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 29*(2), 677-694. doi:10.1080/09557571.2015.1077651

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Gleditsch, N. P., & Nordås, R. (2009). Climate change and conflict: A critical overview. *Die Friedens-Warte, 84*(2), 11-28.

Gleditsch, N. P., & Nordås, R. (2014). Conflicting messages? the IPCC on conflict and human security. *Political Geography, 43*, 82-90.

Gleick, P. H. (1994). Water, war & peace in the Middle East. (cover story). *Environment, 36*(3), 6-42. Retrieved from http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=8gh&AN=9405037922&site=eds-live&scope=site

Hansen, L. (2000). The little mermaid's silent security dilemma and the absence of gender in the Copenhagen school. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies, 29*(2), 285-306.

Hansen, L. (2012). Reconstructing desecuritisation: The normative-political in the Copenhagen school and directions for how to apply it. *Review of International Studies, 38*(3), 525-546. doi:10.1017/S0260210511000581

Hartmann, B. (2010). Rethinking climate refugees and climate conflict: Rhetoric, reality and the politics of policy discourse. *Journal of International Development, 22*(2), 233-246.

Homer-Dixon, T. (1991). On the threshold: Environmental changes as causes of acute conflict. *International Security, 16*(2), 76-116. doi:10.2307/2539061

Homer-Dixon, T. (1994). Environmental scarcities and violent conflict: Evidence from cases. *International Security, 19*(1), 5-40. doi:10.2307/2539147

Homer-Dixon, T. (1999). *Environment, scarcity, and violence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Huysmans, J. (2011). What's in an act? on security speech acts and little security nothings. *Security Dialogue, 42*(4), 371-383.

IPCC. (2007). Fourth assessment report, climate change 2007: Synthesis report. Retrieved from https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ar4_syr.pdf

IPCC. (2014). Summary for policymakers. In C.B. Field, V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (Eds.). *Climate change 2014: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. part A: Global and sectoral aspects. contribution of working group II to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change* (pp. 1-32). Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ar5_wgII_spm_en.pdf

Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Kaplan, R. D. (1994). The coming anarchy. *Atlantic, 273*(2), 44-77. Retrieved from http://ludwig.lub.lu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=lfh&AN=9404280908&site=eds-live&scope=site

Kester, J., & Sovacool, B. K. (2017). Torn between war and peace: Critiquing the use of war to mobilize peaceful climate action. *Energy Policy, 104*, 50-55.

Krause, K. (1998). Critical theory and security studies: The research programme of 'critical security studies'. *Cooperation and Conflict, 33*(3), 298-333. doi:10.1177/0010836798033003004

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Le Billon, P. (2005). Fueling war: Natural resources and armed conflict. *Adelphi Paper, 45*(373)

Levy, M. A. (1995). Is the environment a national security issue? *International Security, 20*(2), 35-62. doi:10.2307/2539228

Mathews, J. T. (1989). Redefining security. *Foreign Affairs, 68*(2), 162-177. doi:10.2307/20043906

McGrath, M. (2018, October 8). Final call to save the world from 'climate catastrophe'. Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-45775309

Methmann, C., & Oels, A. (2015). From 'fearing' to 'empowering' climate refugees: Governing climate-induced migration in the name of resilience. *Security Dialogue, 46*(1), 51-68.

Myers, N. (1989). Environment and security. *Foreign Policy,* (74), 23-41. doi:10.2307/1148850

Oels, A. (2012). From 'securitization' of climate change to 'climatization' of the security field: Comparing three theoretical perspectives. In J. Scheffran, M. Brzoska, H. G. Brauch, P. M. Link & J. Schilling (Eds.), *Climate change, human security and violent conflict: Challenges for societal stability* (pp. 185-206). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Oswald Spring, Ú, Brauch, H. G., & Dalby, S. (2009). Linking anthropocene, HUGE and HESP: Fourth phase of environmental security research. In H. G. Brauch, Ú Oswald Spring, J. Grin, C. Mesjasz, P. Kameri-Mbote, N. C. Behera, . . . H. Krummenacher (Eds.), *Facing global environmental change: Environmental, human, energy, food, health and water security concepts* (pp. 1277-1294). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Peters, K. (2018). Disasters, climate change, and securitisation: The United Nations Security Council and the United Kingdom's security policy. *Disasters, 42*(2), 196-214.

Rothschild, E. (1995). What is security? *Daedalus, 124*(3), 53-98.

Runyan, A. S., & Peterson, V. S. (2014). *Global gender issues in the new millennium* (4th ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Sakaguchi, K., Varughese, A., & Auld, G. (2017). Climate wars? A systematic review of empirical analyses on the links between climate change and violent conflict. *International Studies Review, 19*(4), 622-645.

Schwartz, P., & Randall, D. (2003). *An abrupt climate change scenario and its implications for United States national security.* Washington, DC: Retrieved from https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a469325.pdf

Scott, S. V. (2012). The securitization of climate change in world politics: How close have we come and would full securitization enhance the efficacy of global climate change policy? *Review of European Community & International Environmental Law, 21*(3), 220-230. doi:10.1111/reel.12008

Smith, D., & Vivekananda, J. (2009). *Climate change, conflict and fragility. understanding the linkages, shaping effective responses.* International Alert. Retrieved from https://www.international-alert.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate_change_conflict_and_fragility_Nov09.pdf

Stritzel, H. (2007). Towards a theory of securitization: Copenhagen and beyond. *European Journal of International Relations, 13*(3), 357-383. doi:10.1177/1354066107080128

Theisen, O., Gleditsch, N., & Buhaug, H. (2013). Is climate change a driver of armed conflict? *Climatic Change, 117*(3), 613-625.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis.* London: SAGE.

Trombetta, M. J. (2008). Environmental security and climate change: Analysing the discourse. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 21*(4), 585-602.

Trombetta, M. J. (2011). Rethinking the securitization of the environment: Old beliefs, new insights. In T. Balzacq (Ed.), *Securitization theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve* (pp. 135-149). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.

Trombetta, M. J. (2012). Climate change and the environmental conflict discourse. In J. Scheffran, M. Brzoska, H. G. Brauch, P. M. Link & J. Schilling (Eds.), *Climate change, human security and violent conflict:*

Challenges for societal stability (pp. 151-164). Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Ullman, R. H. (1983). Redefining security. *International Security, 8*(1), 129-153. doi:10.2307/2538489

UNDP. (1994). *Human development report*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_nostats.pdf

UNFCCC. (1992). United Nations framework convention on climate change. Retrieved from https://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf

UNFCCC. (2015). Paris agreement. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Retrieved from https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf

UNGA. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. New York, NY: UN Publishing. Retrieved from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf

von Lucke, F., Wellmann, Z., & Diez, T. (2014). What's at stake in securitising climate change? towards a differentiated approach. *Geopolitics, 19*(4), 857-884.

Watts, J. (2018, October 8). We have 12 years to limit climate change catastrophe, warns UN. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/oct/08/global-warming-must-not-exceed-15c-warns-landmark-un-report

Wæver, O. (1995). Securitization and desecuritization. In R. D. Lipschutz (Ed.), *On security* (pp. 46-87). New York: Columbia University Press.

Wæver, O. (2011). Politics, security, theory. *Security Dialogue, 42*(4), 465-480.

Wibben, A. T. R. (2018). Why we need to study (US) militarism: A critical feminist lens. *Security Dialogue, 49*(1-2), 136-148. doi:10.1177/0967010617742006

Appendix

Documents Analyzed in Discourse Analysis

IPCC. (2013). Summary for policymakers. In T.F. Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (Eds.), *Climate change 2013: The physical science basis. Contribution of working group I to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_SPM_FINAL.pdf

IPCC. (2014a). Summary for policymakers. In C.B. Field, V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (Eds.), *Climate change 2014: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Part A: Global and sectoral aspects. Contribution of working group II to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change* (pp. 1-32). Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ar5_wgII_spm_en.pdf

IPCC. (2014b). Summary for policymakers. In O. Edenhofer, R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. von

Stechow, T. Zwickel and J.C. Minx (Eds.), *Climate change 2014: Mitigation of climate change. Contribution of working group III to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ipcc_wg3_ar5_summary-for-policymakers.pdf

IPCC. (2018). Summary for policymakers. In V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J.B.R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, and T. Waterfield (Eds.), *Global warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty*. Geneva: World Meteorological Organization. Retrieved from https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/2/2018/07/SR15_SPM_version_stand_alone_LR.pdf

UNEP. (2016). *Frontiers 2016 report: Emerging issues of environmental concern*. Nairobi: United Nations Environment Programme. Retrieved from https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/frontiers-2016-emerging-issues-environmental-concern

UNEP. (2017). *Frontiers 2017: emerging issues of environmental concern*.
Nairobi: United Nations Environment Programme. Retrieved from
https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/frontiers-2017-emerging-issues-environmental-concern

UNEP. (2018a). *The adaptation gap report 2018*. Nairobi: United Nations
Environment Programme. Retrieved from
https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/adaptation-gap-report

UNEP. (2018b). *The emissions gap report 2018*. Nairobi: United Nations
Environment Programme. Retrieved from
https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2018

UNEP. (2018c). *UN environment 2017 annual report*. Nairobi: United Nations
Environment Programme. Retrieved from
https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/un-environment-annual-report-2017

UNEP. (2019a). *UN environment 2018 annual report*. Nairobi: United Nations
Environment Programme. Retrieved from
https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/un-environment-2018-annual-report

UNEP. (2019b). *Frontiers 2018/19: emerging issues of environmental concern*.
Nairobi: United Nations Environment Programme. Retrieved from
https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/frontiers-201819-emerging-issues-environmental-concern

UNEP. (2019c). *Global environment outlook – GEO-6: Summary for*

policymakers. Nairobi: United Nations Environment Programme. Retrieved

from

https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27652/GEO6SPM_E

N.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

UNFCCC. (2015). *The Paris agreement*. United Nations Framework Convention

on Climate Change. Retrieved from

https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf.

UNFCCC. (2018). *UN climate change annual report 2017*. United Nations

Framework Convention on Climate Change. Retrieved

from https://unfccc.int/resource/annualreport/

UNGA. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable*

development. New York, NY: UN Publishing. Retrieved from

https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Age

nda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf