Malmö University

Department of International Migration and Ethnic Relations

IMER 61-90

Spring 2010

Malmö University, KS

The political construction of climate change induced migrants: A study of the connection between immigration/asylum and climate change in the EU.

Author: Karin Carlsson Kanyama-8804067463

Supervisor: Despina Tzimoula

Examiner: Maria Appelqvist

Abstract

Studies have shown that climate change causes large scale human displacement. With this as background this thesis investigates the connection between climate change and immigration/asylum in EU documents. The EU is an institution that has not acknowledged the existence of climate change induced migration despite outside awareness that the phenomenon exists. This thesis analyzes discourses about climate change and immigration/asylum in the EU in order to find out how EU regards climate change induced migrants, and why it has not acknowledged their existence or provides protection. The thesis found that discourses of inclusion and exclusion based on European ethnicity and culture restricts possibilities for migrants from developing countries to come to Europe. It also found that EU represents its strategy to fight climate change as comprehensive and leaves no room for changes in that strategy. These two findings in combination explain why climate change induced migrants are not acknowledged, and in extension do not get protection from the EU. The research found that the absence of an acknowledgement and protection for climate change induced migrants is influenced by political discourses in the EU that see unskilled immigrants from developing countries as a threat and danger to Europe and its current climate change strategy as sufficient for coping with the effects of climate change.

Key words: climate change, immigration/asylum, forced migration, human displacement, discourses, European identity, ethnic and cultural exclusion.

Contents

1. Introduction

Awareness that climate change will cause forced migratory populations has increased during the last decades. Even though most scientists believe that climate change will cause human displacement they disagree on the number of people that will be forced to migrate and what effects the migration will have. Estimates by UN University´s Institute for Environment and Human Security predicts that 50 million people will be displaced by 2050 and International Organization for Migration (IOM) predicts that 200 million people will be forced to move by 2050 (Fritz, 2010). Migrants forced to move because of climate change are not protected under international refugee law. Therefore supranational organizations like the EU have not formally recognized their existence and consequently, do not provide protection for this group of forced migrants. However, in other institutional settings like the UN, the media, and in NGOs climate change induced migrants are increasingly talked about as a group in need of protection and assistance.

There is a wide range of classifications and terminology for this group of forced migrants. The term "environmental refugees" has been widely used in academia, politics, and media. At the same time there are those who argue that the term "refugee" is a wrong because climate change induced migrants are not recognized under international law. Instead they advocate for the term "migrants". The EU has not recognized the existence of this group of this group of forced migrants at all. Whether they are called refugees, migrants or are disregarded completely make a big difference to how they are perceived and what protection they are entitled to.

The field of climate change and forced migration is relatively new and in dire need of more research. This research investigates and analyzes discourses about immigration and climate change in the EU with the aim of finding out what the relationship is between climate change and asylum/immigration. The EU is a key institution in determining how climate change induced migrants are perceived and in extension, what right to international assistance they have. Therefore it is important to understand the EU: s reasoning on this matter.

1.2. Aim and research questions

The aim of this research is to analyze discourses about climate change and immigration/asylum in the EU in order to understand how climate change induced migrants are viewed by the EU. More specifically, the research aims to study the relationship between discourses of climate change and immigration to see how they relate to each other.

The research also aims at developing an understanding of why the EU has not recognized the existence of climate change induced migrants. It aims to map the political interests behind asylum and climate change policy in order to understand why climate change induced migrants have not been acknowledged by the EU.

These aims are going to be achieved by answering the following research questions:

1.) How does the EU reason about climate change induced migration?

More specifically the question aims to find out what discourses about asylum/immigration and climate change respectively say about climate change induced migration. It also aims to find a correlation between discourses of climate change and asylum/immigration that explain the absence of an acknowledgement of climate change induced migrants in the EU.

Another major research question in this study is:

2.) How is political interests and power expressed in discourses about climate change and asylum/immigration in the EU?

More specifically the question aims to find out what political interests are behind EU policies regarding climate change induced migration. It also aims to see how political interests affect policies regarding climate change induced migration.

1.3.   Disposition

The research paper is divided in to five main sections: First a section *of background and previous research* where I present and reflect upon the background and previous publications in the field of climate change and forced migration. Then follows a section of *methodological considerations* where I present and motivate the methods used. Thereafter follows a section of *theoretical considerations* where I explain and motivate the theories used. After follows the *analysis* section where I analyze the empirical material with help of the theories. The analysis is divided in to four subsections in the following order: (1) *globalization and the EU*, (2) *immigration/asylum policy area*, (3) *climate change policy area*, (4) *the combination of climate change and immigration policy areas*. The final section of the paper consists of a *conclusion* of the analysis and the results.

2. Background and previous research

When searching for previous publications in the field of climate change induced migration I could not find any other study about the connection between climate change and immigration/asylum in the EU or any other institution. Much of the research and publications that I have found concerning the connection between climate change and forced migration is about classifications and definitions of the phenomenon of climate change induced migrants. There are diverse predictions and arguments by scholars regarding the effects and classification of climate change induced migration. Due to the large volume of published material I cannot recite them all in this paper. Instead subsequent section discusses a selection of these views. I included the reports and publications that were most re-occurring and referenced to in the bulk of material that I found. I also selected material from different sources, including international agencies, NGOs and academia in order to give a diverse picture of the previous publications. The next section also discusses international refugee law and the significance it has for climate change induced migration.

2.1. The debate about climate change induced migration

 In an assessment report in 1990 the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predicted that the biggest impact of climate change might be on human migration and displacement (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 1990; 20). Despite such warnings not much has been done in national or global arenas to meet climate-related migration or to build international capacity to handle large scale migration caused by climate change (Fritz, 2010).

Scholars, NGO´s and multilateral agencies have made predictions that climate change will trigger historically unprecedented waves of migration. The highest number of people displaced by climate change is put forward by the International Organization of Migration saying that 200 million people will be displaced by the year 2050. Alternatively, UN University's Institute for Environment and Security predicts that 50 million people will be displaced by climate change by the year 2050. Other studies by the UN agencies, IOM, and NGO´s show evidence that environmentally induced migration is already occurring (Fritz, 2010).

 At the same time there are radical differences in the debate about climate change induced migration. Dr Norman Myers and Dr Richard Black senior have both written extensively on

the subject of climate change and forced migration and disagree on many key issues. Myers paint a dramatic picture of how climate change induced migration will affect immigration, especially from developing to developed countries. He predicts that environmental pressures caused by climate change will lead to impoverishment of fragile areas and land competition. According to Myers, these events, if nothing is done to stop the trend, will trigger ethnic and political conflicts which may lead to violence and war, and then trigger flows of environmental refugees and displaced persons to developed countries. Moreover, Myers claims the influx of environmental refugees risk becoming a threat to social cohesion and national identity in the receiving countries. In effect, large scale migration can also create ethnic tension and civil disorder in receiving countries (Myers and Kent, 1995, 151-3). Myers further states that "the issue of environmental refugees promises to rank as one of the foremost human crises of our times" (Myers, 1997, 175).

 In contrast to Myers apocalyptic prediction, Black questions the very notion of "environmental refugees". In an UNHCR working paper entitled *Environmental Refugees: Myth or Reality* he argues that the concept of environmental refugees is misleading, and potentially damaging (Black, 2001). Black further argues that environmental migration is always linked to political and economic factors, so focusing on environmental reasons alone does not give a complete picture of why people migrate. Furthermore, Black claims that there is no evidence that environmental change directly leads to mass refugee flows, especially flows to developed countries. Instead he sees the focus on environmental refugees as a distraction from the central issues of development and conflict resolution (Black, 2001).

Contrary to Black, Myers claims that there were at least 25 million environmental refugees in the mid-1990s. In 1997 he predicted that the number of environmental refugees might double by the year 2010, and accelerate even more as an effect of global warming. Eventually, Myers predicts that 200 million people will eventually be at risk of displacement (Myers, 1997).

It is important to consider the differences and disagreements that Black and Myers illustrate in the debate about climate change induced migration. The lack of consensus and agreement in scientific community regarding the form and effects of climate change induced migration give contradictive and confusing information to policy makers. In other words, the inconsistency in the research provides a rather shaky scientific foundation on which to build and legitimate adaption policies. I am in this study aware of the mixed messages in scientific research, and

that they may be a contributive reason to why the EU has not acknowledged migration induced by climate change.

2.2. The UN 1951 Convention

The 1951 UN Convention is the main yardstick for determining who is entitled to refugee protection. The convention defines who a refugee is and thus who is entitled to international protection. According to the 1951 UN Convention relating to the status of refugees (the refugee convention), the term refugee is applied to a person who:

> "owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion is outside the country of his/her nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear unwilling to avail himself/ herself of the protection of his (/her) country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his (/her) former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it" (UNHCR, webpage, 2010).

Environmental reasons are absent from the convention. Thus climate change induced migrants do not get international refugee protection. Because of the lack of protection there are those who advocate for a legal recognition of "environmental refugees" either under a broader interpretation of the 1951 convention or within new regimes and protocols. They cite the need for climate change induced migrants to be legally recognized and access the same protection and assistance that "convention refugees" are entitled to. Opponents to this suggestion argue that an expansion of the refugee definition could lead to devaluation of the current protection for more traditional, "convention refugees", and consequently allow states to reduce the responsibilities to refugees in general (Fritz, 2010).

Because of the lack of recognition of climate change induced migrants in international law, Piguet (2008) in a working paper for the UNHCR remarks that the use of several authors of the term "refugee" to describe this group has led to confusion because in evokes juridical status by the convention that "environmental refugees" do not have. Whether these groups of displaced persons are called "refugees" or "migrants" make crucial difference to how they are perceived and what protection they are entitled to. I will in the next section proceed to discuss different terminology used to describe this group of forced migrants.

2.3. Terminology and classifications

Since the 1970`s several different terms have been used to describe the relationship between migration and climate change (Fritz, 2010). The most widely used term is "environmental

refugee". This term was coined in 1985 by United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) researcher El Hinnawi. He formulated the following classification of environmental refugees:

"…those people who have been forced to leave their traditional habitat, temporarily or permanently, because of a marked environmental disruption (natural and/or triggered by people) that jeopardized their existence and/or seriously affected the quality of their life. By 'environmental disruption' in this definition is meant any physical, chemical, and/or biological changes in the ecosystem (or resource base) that render it, temporarily or permanently, unsuitable to support human life" (El-Hinnawi, 1985; 4).

The term environmental refugee has since been widely used but also heavily criticized. Bates (2002) is one of the scholars who oppose the use of the term. She claims that there is an uncritical acceptance of the term environmental refugee. She further argues that the definition does not provide any generic criteria distinguishing environmental refugees from other types of migrants. Since so many people can be included under the "umbrella" of environmental refugees she questions the usefulness of the term. Instead Bates emphasizes the need for classifications that recognizes the differences in the causes of environmental migration. She proposes a classification scheme based on the causes of migration where environmentally induced migrants should be categorized in three subgroups: disasters, expropriations, and deteriorations. According to Bates this classification "allows researchers and policy makers to specify similarities and differences between population flows, without using faulty or controversial concepts" (Bates, 2002; 475). Bates argument importantly recognizes that the term environmental refugees includes a broad range environmentally induced refugees and not only those induced by climate change.

Castles (2002) in a working paper for UNHCR argues that the term environmental refugee is simplistic, one-sided, and misleading. He claims that the term is problematic because it implies mono-causality which does not exist in reality. In addition, he considers the term faulty because it does not fit under the meaning of the 1951 UN convention for refugees. According to Castles, the only way the term environmental refugee could have any legal meaning is in the sense of people forced to flee when repressive forces use environmental destruction, such as polluting water. However, he points out that such refugees would be recognized based on the persecution itself rather than the environmental form of it, hence making the term environmental refugee redundant (Castles, 2002; 8-9). Furthermore, Castles points to the harmfulness of using the term "environmental refugee". According to Castles,

the use of the term support those who want to restrict asylum opportunities for refugees by saying that those who seek asylum are not genuine victims of persecution, but fleeing environmental degradation and thus not deserving of asylum (2002; 10). However, Castles does not suggest any alternative definition for climate change induced migrants.

UN agencies and International Organization for Migration (IOM) have chosen to adopt the terms "environmental migrants", "environmentally displaced persons", and "environmentally motivated migrant" to describe those who experience environmentally induced migration. Other terms used to refer to people forced to move because of climate change are: "climate refugees", "climate change refugee", "disaster refugee", and "eco-refugee" (Fritz, 2010).

Definitions are crucial for guiding policies towards climate change induced migrants. Whether they are called "refugees" or "migrants" direct and shape attitudes and discourses. Therefore deciding what term to use in this research is not an objective choice, but a choice that unavoidably has political bias. After careful contemplation I have chosen to use the longer and more descriptive term: "climate change induced migrants". I use the term "migrant" rather than "refugee" because the group is not formally recognized under international law and therefore legally inaccurate. The term "climate change induced migrant" explicitly positions climate change as the cause of migration as opposed to terms like "environmental migrant" or "climate migrant" that do not particularly focus on climate change. I see the explicit descriptiveness of the term as an advantage because it avoids ambiguity and un-clarity in terms of cause of migration. Further, this term importantly recognizes that the migration is involuntary and caused by climate change. The length of the term can be seen as an inconvenience, but I consider the advantages of using the term to outweigh the length of it. I finally would like to emphasize that I am aware that it is not an objective term and that it reproduces political power.

2.4. Development, climate change, and forced migration

In most studies and research looked at there is an acknowledgement that developing countries are most affected by forced migration caused by climate change. This fact is important to consider in this research because it shows who is most likely to be affected by climate change induced migration and where adaption strategies should be focused. It is the lack of ability to adapt to climate change that makes developing countries most likely to experience climate change induced migration. Fritz (2010) argues that the effect of environmental changes is

expected to put pressures on land, food, and water resources and consequently contribute to existing problems in vulnerable areas. Food insecurity, malnutrition, the spread of disease, rapid urbanization, and political instability can increase as a result of climate change and trigger massive migration. Fritz also states that it is impossible to segregate environmental factors from other variables, such as poverty and demographics in the decision to migrate. The fact that developing countries are most affected by climate change induced migration is thus a consequence of the lack of resources necessary to adapt to climate change (Fritz, 2010).

It is also widely established in scientific research that developed countries have emitted more greenhouse gases and thus have more responsibility for causing climate change than developing countries (Rive et al, 2006). In this research, the fact that developing countries are most responsible for causing human-made climate change is used as a way to understand the EU: s role and responsibility for causing climate change.

3. Methodological considerations and tools

3.1. Qualitative methods

This research uses a qualitative approach rather than a quantitative approach. This means that it does not seek to show patterns of regularities like the quantitative approach would have shown, but emphasizes the fluidity of the text and content in an interpretive understanding of culture (May, 2001; 191). A qualitative approach emphasizes understanding, subjectivism, hermeneutics, and the assumption that events are more or less constructed by its context (Aspers, 2007; 26-31). A qualitative approach allows for an analysis of discourse in a way a quantitative approach does not. This research will not get a quantitative account of how many times climate change and immigration/asylum is mentioned in the documents analyzed. Instead it will study how climate change and immigration/asylum are talked about.

3.2.   Analysis of documents

Since this research sets out to analyze discourses in the EU, the choice of analyzing policy documents is appropriate. The strength of using documents as empirical material is that they do not change with time. They show how different events have been interpreted and categorized at a certain point in time (May, 2001; 181). May writes that documents can be analyzed in two different ways. One way is to see the document as a reflection of reality. This means that the researcher assumes that the text has not been shaped and influenced by the producers. The other way to analyze documents is to see the documents as shaped by the

interpretations of the producers. In other words, documents show how different events have been interpreted and categorized at a certain point in time, and not as an independent report of social reality (May, 2001; 182). The latter is the approach used in this research. This is a natural choice since the central idea in discourse theory is that events are shaped by meanings and interpretations.

3.3.   Discourse analysis

This research analyzes constructions of knowledge and structures of meaning in EU documents by using discourse analysis. Discourse analysis means to analyze discourses and counter discourses in a given material. Discourse analysis is not about finding what is true and not true, but rather to analyze what people perceive and represent as truth (Wetherell et al, 2001; 7). Discourse analysis is for example to analyze how an issue is talked about and who it benefits. Differently put, discourse analysis focus on the "how" questions rather than the "what" questions. How do people talk about a phenomenon? How is it represented? What different ways are there to talk about it? Often there are several different discourses that fight for the power to define. Since this research is concerned with how climate change induced migrants are constructed in the EU, I consider discourse analysis a suitable method for this research.

3.4.   Selection of material

This research analyses policy documents and press releases from the EU. I used documents collected from EU: s official website. The EU website had the far most comprehensive collection of EU policy documents and press releases than any other source I could find. Furthermore, EU: s official website offers the highest guarantee that the opinions in the documents reflect the EU. Therefore it ensures the documents authenticity and credibility (May, 2001; 189).

Before beginning the search for documents I decided to only use documents dated after the year 2000. I made this limitation because climate change, immigration and asylum are policy areas under constant change and reform and I wanted the documents to be representative of the present EU policies.

The EU website categorizes policy documents under different policy areas. Initially, I looked through all the policy areas to get an overview of where the material relevant for this research was located. Thereafter I made my first selection to only proceed with two policy areas: *environment* and *justice freedom and security*. The environment policy area included

documents about climate change policy and the justice freedom, and security policy area included documents about immigration and asylum policy. I judged that these two areas had the most relevant material for the research. Then I proceeded to read the documents under each policy area more carefully. Under the environment policy area I found five different documents concerning climate change. Out of those five, I chose three to include in the research based on a criterion of non-repetition. Under the justice freedom and security policy area I found nine documents concerning asylum and immigration. I chose seven of the documents to include in the research based on a selection of non-repetition.

 Press releases have a separate search engine on the website called *Press Release Rapid*. I searched by using the following key words: *climate change*, *asylum* and *immigration*. Searching for *climate change* gave 11164 results. The number was too big to read through, so I read the first 40 results and chose three documents that concerned climate change based on relevance to this research. Searching for *immigration* and *asylum* gave 1678 results. I looked through the first forty results and chose three documents that I thought relevant to the research. When selecting press releases I deliberately chose different types of documents in order to diversify the material. The final number included three speeches, two European Council conclusions and one opinion poll report that made the total number of six press releases. The documents also differed in length, some documents were only one page, and others were five pages. This meant that some documents contained much more empirical data than others. Finally, I had sixteen documents to analyze in the research.

3.5.   The strengths and weaknesses of the material

I consider the material to have several strengths. First, the documents gave different perspectives rather than repeating each other which increased the amount of empirical material. Second, the material included press releases and policy documents which increases the diversity and therefore ensures reliability. I therefore think that the documents used provide a strong empirical body for this research.

Since I only analyzed documents from the EU, this research does not get a perspective of how the discourses are resisted and received outside the EU. For example, an additional analysis of NGO documents or news articles would have shown how EU discourses are countered and received by other institutions. However, such an analysis is outside the scope and capacity of this research. However, I am aware of the limitation it inscribes in the material used.

3.6. Processing the material

I began processing the material by printing all the documents because I thought they were easier to process in paper format. Thereafter I read and re-read the material. When I had seen a general pattern in the texts I identified general themes and coding categories that I later used as starting point for the analysis. The categories that I came up with were:

Harmonization of European asylum system

The problem with immigration to Europe

Strategies to tackle the immigration problem

Climate change as a problem

Europe as a leader and role model in the fight against climate change

Strategies to tackle climate change

Developing (third countries) and climate change

Developing (third countries) and immigration to Europe

I highlighted the parts in the documents that I saw relevant for each coding category with different colors in order to make it easier to navigate in the material. Thereafter I went through each category and made some preliminary interpretations. I looked for inter-relationships between discourses and representations and I mapped out absences and silences in the discourses. Thereafter I identified resistances and counter-discourses in the material. I also mapped out what effect the discourses had and outlined the background to the issue. More about the analysis of discourse can be read in theory chapter 4.2.

3.7. Ethical considerations

Since the material used in the research is public, it is not sensitive in the same way as interview material or notes from participant observations. Therefore, the empirical material requires few ethical considerations.

However, it is important to be aware of the researcher's role in relation in relation to the researched. Bhavani (1995) has written about the constitutive relationship of power between the researcher and the researched. She argues that the socially inscribed characteristics of the researcher such as class, race, and gender carry hierarchical loadings that influence the analysis (34). In the case of this research, it is therefore important to acknowledge my

hierarchal position in relation to the subjects of study, namely climate change induced migrants. My identity as a European, educated citizen positions me in an economically and politically superior role in relation to climate change induced migrants. My interpretations and conclusions are shaped by the discourses that I operate in. Hence, it is not possible for me as researcher to position myself in an objective position and outside discourse. This is something that I am aware of and that I consider during the research process.

4. Theoretical considerations and tools

4.1. Social- constructivism in international relations

Since this study analyzes discourses in the EU it automatically takes on an overarching social constructivist approach. Constructivism is a social theory concerned with how to conceptualize the relationship between agents and structures. Constructivism in the area of international relations holds that international structures shape the identities, interests and foreign politics of states and non state actors (Barnett, 2008; 162). In international relations, constructivism competes with other dominant theories to explain the international political system. Theories like realism and neo-liberalism, established and ideologically dominant in international politics are not used as theoretical background in this research because they do not (or very marginally) recognize and address the importance of socially constructed discourses.

Constructivism is committed to both structuralism and idealism. It is idealistic because it sees material reality as dependant on ideas of interpretation. It holistic/ structuralist since it sees a structure that individual agents help to construct, reproduce and transform through their interactions (Barnett, 2008; 163). Thus, constructivism demands that one take serious the role of ideas in world politics in order to understand political structures. Some of the most important debates in world politics are about how to define particular activities. Barnett writes that states and non-state actors have rival interpretations of the meanings of political activities and will fight to try to have collectively accepted their preferred meaning (2008; 165). Barnett also points out that the concept of "refugee" has been changed and re-constructed as humanitarian pressures on politicians have increased. The term "refugee" has gone from initially only including people in Europe to apply to all people no matter what country of origin (Barnett, 2008; 164).The example show how political pressures can change the social construction of reality of what is a refugee, and in effect, also change the material

reality (refugee law). Differently put, the social construction of reality shapes what is viewed as legitimate action.

Constructivists argue that a state´s interest is affected by its identity as a state and that both its interests and identity are influenced by a social structure of interactions, normative ideas and beliefs. They reject the realist idea that institutions reflect the "rational" calculations either within inter-state competition or as a part of calculation of longer term economical advantage and benefit from corporation (Woods, 2008; 258).

Constructivism also holds that discourses in international relations can change and this can shift the attention, nature, and function of international institutions. Discourses can change as international attention to certain political issues is brought up on the agenda of international meetings and organizations that in turn influence political institutions (Woods, 2008; 258).

The fundamental idea in this research is that policies regarding climate change and immigration/asylum are socially constructed. Therefore constructivism is an overarching theoretical perspective in this research.

4.2. Discourse theory

Discourse theory, in contrast to many other theoretical perspectives sees the world as shaped by socially constructed meaning. Therefore discourse theory poses other types of research questions than those generated by behaviorists, institutionalists and rational choice perspectives. Torfing and Howarth state that "discourse theory is problem driven, in the sense that it seeks to identify specific empirical, analytical, and societal puzzles" (2004; 22). This research is concerned with the constructions of EU policies, it aims to understand how meaning is constructed in the EU, rather than for example seeking a general theory on EU policy making. Therefore discourse theory provides an appropriate theoretical perspective for this research.

This research mainly uses Focauldian discourse theory. Foucault is one of the founding and most famous discourse theorists; therefore the use of his theories provides a well established theoretical tool for this research. The concepts in discourse theory that will be presented below in this section are all part of or influenced by Focualdian discourse theory.

According to Foucault discourse is the way in which an issue is spoken about, through speech, writing, and practice. It defines and establishes what is regarded as "truth" in particular moments. Discourses are also productive and have power outcomes and effects (Carabine,

2001; 268). So in the case of this research, discourses of climate change and immigration/asylum within the EU reflect an established "truth" about climate change induced migrants. In extension, discourses also have an effect on policies and the treatment of these types of forced migrants.

Apart from conveying meaning about an issue, discourses also have material effects that constitute power relations between different groups. Discourse is according to Foucault a combination of power and knowledge. Foucault argues that power is constituted through discourses. Therefore power is important in the construction of knowledge and what counts as knowledge. Discourses can be powerful because they specify "what is" and "what is not" (Carabine, 2001; 275). Thus, silence and lack of recognition about climate change induced migrants in discourse constitutes this group of migrants as powerless compared to other more visible and established groups. And contrary, if there is knowledge and concern for climate induced migrants in discourses this group becomes more powerful and influential.

There may also be multiple and different discourses about the same issue in the same text. These are called counter discourses. Counter discourses might take contradictive and opposite views and stances in the representation of an issue. Moreover, discourses are by their nature dynamic and changing. Carabine states that "Discourses are also fluid and opportunistic, at one and the same time, drawing up existing discourses about an issue whilst utilizing, interacting with, and being mediated by, other dominant discourses" (2001; 269). In other words, discourse are not autonomous and separated, they must be understood in relation to each other. Furthermore, different discourses in the same text may have different validity and strength. This is also related to the idea that discourses interact with and are mediated by other discourses. Therefore, in order to conduct a successful discourse analysis one must look at the social context and social relations within which power and knowledge occur and is distributed (Carabine, 2001; 275).

Genealogy is a methodology established by Foucault and used in this research to conduct discourse analysis. It provides a good way of deconstructing discourses in order to analyze its meaning. Genealogy is concerned with describing the procedures, practices, apparatuses and institutions involved in the production of discourses and knowledge, and their power effects (Carabine, 276; 2001). Carabine explains that genealogy is not only about exposing the processes through which discourses are produced, but it is also about establishing the ways that those discourses are practiced, operationalized and supported institutionally,

professionally, socially, legally, and economically. It does this through examining discourses and mapping the strategies, relations, and practices of power in which knowledge is embedded and connected (2001; 276). So in this research, genealogy is used to map out the construction of discourses in the EU regarding climate change and immigration/asylum.

Foucault's concept of *normalization* is also used in this research as way to understand construction of norms and their power effect in EU discourses. The relationship between normalization and discourse is that discourses convey meanings about what is the norm and what is not. In effect, discourses also establish the norm. It is important to also remember that norms are contested. The normalization process is contradictory in the sense that individuals are in a constant process of reassessing, establishing and negotiating their position in relation to the norm (Carabine, 278; 2001). So in this research norms in EU discourse have to be seen as dynamic and changing. The construction of norms regarding climate change and immigration/asylum are not static but dependent upon and negotiated by their political context.

Another key concept in discourse theory used in this research is *social antagonism*. It is a concept developed by Lacau and Mouffe and influenced by Foucault (Torfing, 2005; 14). The concept holds that the normative articulation of meaning and identity is linked to the construction of social antagonism. Social antagonism is the construction of what is outside the discourse. It is achieved through a process of "othering". The concept holds that the limits and unity of the discursive system cannot be constructed by reference to an inner essence. Instead the discursive system is dependent on constructing "an other" that sets the limits and boundaries of the discourse. Put differently, social antagonism stabilizes the discursive system by establishing what the norm is not. Thus, one can say that social antagonism is a product of discursive norms. In this research, the concept is important in order to understand the entirety of the EU discourses. Social antagonism provides an important way for understanding constructions of inclusion and exclusion in EU discourse.

Torfing (2005) states that "social antagonism involves the exclusion of a series of identities that are articulated as a part of a chain of equivalence, which emphasize the sameness of the excluded elements" (14). Furthermore, these excluded elements pose a threat to the discursive system. In concrete discourse analysis, social antagonism shows itself through the production of political frontiers, which often invoke stereotyped pictures of friends and enemies. With

this in consideration, the concept of social antagonism is interesting for this research because it provides an additional way to understand practices of political power in the EU.

This thesis also makes use of Foucault's distinction between *positive and negative power*. Foucault meant that positive power is exercised through controlling, shaping, supervising, and normalizing knowledge and behavior. Negative power, on the other hand, is exercised through punishment and restrictions (Bergström and Boréus, 2005; 330). These concepts are used in this study in order to distinguish between different types of power in the EU. Further, this distinction is important in order to see how EU uses tools of power to legitimate and normalize discourses regarding climate change and immigration/asylum.

4.3. Hegemony

The concept of hegemony, developed by Antonio Gramsci, is used in this research to understand the relationship between culture and power. Hegemony consists of shared values, shared meanings, and shared beliefs that act in the interest of the dominant (hegemonic) class. Put differently hegemony is "the organization of consent based upon establishing the legitimacy of leadership and developing shared ideas, beliefs and meanings- a shared culture" (Baldwin et al, 2004; 106). This concept is interesting for this research because it provides an additional analytical dimension to understand the EU: s political power apart from the concepts generated by Foucault.

4.4. Europeans only

This research also uses theoretical concepts from Peo Hansén´s research on European cultural identity and difference in the book *Europeans Only*. Hansén, in his research, analyses EU discourses about European cultural identity (2000; 56). His study is interesting for this research because it concerns constructions of cultural exclusion and inclusion within the EU, the same organization that this study sets out to study. Furthermore, the concepts of cultural exclusion and identity formation give an important perspective on distributions of power and constructions of knowledge in EU discourses.

Hansén argues that the politics of cultural inclusion manifest itself by including European cultural differences under the umbrella of "the European identity". Within EU countries, cultural difference is represented as something positive that goes hand in hand with an overarching European identity. Put differently, cultural difference between European countries is represented as something that should be preserved and valued, at the same time as it is represented as inherently and naturally European (58).

Cultural exclusion applies to those who are "too" culturally different to be included in the official and hegemonic versions of national and regional cultures (58). The inclusive discourse only recognizes differences between national and regional entities in the Union as European, and excludes those who come outside of the EU. Hansén concludes that the discourse of European belonging establishes an "ethno –cultural understanding of Europe and what goes to make up today´s Europeans, where only those who fully embody the history, the roots, the cultural tradition, the (Christian) civilization and who take pride in the (colonial) era during which European nation states "changed the world" are fully included in European identity" (Hansén, 2000; 63). The consequence, according to Hansén is that many people living in Europe, and identifying with another culture than the European, are excluded from the "European identity".

Hansén´s research gives an important insight into constructions of ethnic and cultural inclusion and exclusion in the in the EU discourse. This research uses Hansen´s conclusions as an additional way to understand ideas of belonging in EU discourses.

4.5.   Geopolitics

This research will also apply the concept geopolitics as a perspective through which to understand discourses in the EU. The term geopolitics can be understood and employed in a number of different meanings. This research uses a wide understanding of geopolitics. Geopolitics in its widest sense can be described as different geographical political representations that help inform peoples understanding of the world. These geographical understandings of the world may differ radically depending on religious, ethnic, political reasons (Dodds, 2007; 11). Differently put, geopolitics is the connection between geographical areas and political events.

Geopolitics can be seen as a tool used by political leaders, journalists, and experts to mobilize people around implicit geographical understanding of world politics. For example, geopolitics hold that political terms such as "third world" do not just identify particular regions of the world, but they also carry political meaning about third world countries that direct the conditions and rules for third world citizens to migrate to Europe. Thus, geopolitics has material effect and power dimension (Dodds, 2007; 9).

Similarly, representations in EU policy documents of climate change and immigrants carry geopolitical meaning. Depending on how climate change is represented in relation to for example, who is responsible for it, reflect political interests and power. These geopolitical

representations influence the constructions of polces, and in extension, the possibilities for climate change induced migrants to get protection and assistance in the EU. Therefore, geopolitics is a relevant and valuable perspective in order to understand discourses about climate change and immigration/asylum in the EU from a political perspective.

4.6.   Globalization, regionalization, and the European Union

Globalization is a highly debated concept with contesting definitions and explanations. This research focuses on the economic and political dimensions of globalization, in order to position the EU in wider socio-political and economical context. Mc Grew states that globalization has brought with it a worldwide transition to a global capitalist market based economy. This political and economic transformation has created a new global order, where the world economy is interdependent, and trade and financing expanding (2008; 16). The EU must therefore be seen as an institution that is shaped by this political and economic context. In other words, the EU policies are influenced by the hegemonic discourse about globalization in world politics.

 Furthermore, the emergence and development of the EU can also be seen as a response to globalization. Best et al writes that that "regionalization has emerged as different parts of the globe are looking for different ways to accommodate themselves within a globalized world order, and regional arrangements are a way of doing so" (Best et al, 2008; 444-445). The harmonization of Europe can therefore be seen as part of a worldwide regionalization of the political and economic sphere in order to adapt to globalization.

In this research, globalization is used as a way to position the EU in a wider political and economic context. Globalization is an important concept in order to understand the wider political and economic system that influences the EU discourses analyzed in this research.

5. Results and analysis

5.1. Globalization, the EU and economic development

In this section I will start by analyzing the overarching discourse about globalization that is prevalent in the documents analyzed. Discourse theory holds that discourses are influenced by other discourses. Therefore, it is important to consider the discourse about globalization when analyzing the two policy areas that this research focuses on. The discourse regarding globalization is in the documents analyzed represented as a visionary idea of what Europe will look like in the future. This representation reveals EU: s political interests and its ideological

position. In extension, this discourse influences the construction of policies in the area of immigration/asylum and climate change. The following quote from a speech by the commissioner president is an example of how the discourse is articulated.

"The Europe of the future must also be a Europe of opportunities and solidarity. Where innovation and education is at the top of our agenda. Europe leads and innovates when its schools and its universities use the potential of the young to the full. With better education and better skills, European citizens will have the right jobs for the future. Social justice and social cohesion will be reinforced. And our free and open economies will be more competitive to face the challenges of globalisation" (speech, Barroso, 24-05- 2008).

This quote holds important meaning of EU: s political ideology. Globalisation is spoken of as the political and economic environment that the EU sees itself in, and the challenge of globalisation is to maintain continued economic growth. It is understood from this quote that being a leader in the field education and jobs is top priority for the EU. Furthermore, EU: s leadership in the fields of educations and jobs go hand in hand with having open and competitive economies, in order to face the challenges of globalisation. This shows that the EU is ideologically shaped by neo-liberalism and global capitalism. Looking at this representation through Foucault's concept of normalization one can see that globalization is positioned as a norm. Globalization is framed as an uncontested natural development. It is spoken of as something neutral, positive if EU meets the challenges it poses. The absence of critique against globalization can be seen as a discursive strategy that establishes the norm (globalisation is happening and must be adapted to). Further, this discourse about globalization reveals that economic development is at the top of EU: s political agenda. This ideological agenda setting is important to consider when analyzing the two policy areas because it reveals EU:s political interests.

5.2.   Analysis of asylum and immigration policy area

The underlying idea in all the documents analyzed in the policy area of immigration/asylum is that present immigration to Europe constitutes a problem that must be met. The following quote illustrate how the immigration problem is articulated in EU discourse.

"To level the asylum playing field and lay the foundations for a Common European Asylum System, on which could be built further structures to safeguard the EU as a single asylum space and ensure that our citizens could have confidence in a system that gave protection to those who required it and dealt fairly and efficiently with those without protection requirements." (Speech, Barroso, 24-05-2008).

The underlying idea in this quote is that immigration to Europe is uncontrolled under the present EU immigration/asylum system, and therefore constitutes a threat to Europe. This is understood by the use of the word "safeguard" which implies the presence of a threat that must be met. It is also implies that many asylum seekers coming to Europe do not have legitimate reason to seek protection. Therefore, the idea is that a more efficient and fair system must be installed to deal with this problem. The solution to the problem is found in what in the documents analyzed is call "the harmonization of Europe". The commisssionary president in his speech addresses harmonisation of the asylum and immigration system the following way:

"Asylum has been on the decline in recent years and it now needs some sort of selective management and harmonisation: asylum is traditionally a "fraternity" between free societies highlighting the difference between freedom and dictatorship." (Speech, Frattini, 23-02-2007).

Harmonisation is presented as the solution to the immigration problem that the EU faces. Harmonisation is described as tradition, something that is normal between "free societies". This way of representing harmonisation as tradition can be seen as a discursive strategy to create a norm. Another important divide in the quote is made between "freedom" and "dictatorship". Implicitly, the EU countries (granters of asylum) are said to be part of "freedom" and unspecified third counties (receivers of asylum) part of "dictatorship". Furthermore, this representation positions the EU and "unspecified third countries" as binary oppositions. This relates to the concept of social antagonism which holds that the discursive construction of a norm automatically comes with "othering" the discursive outside. So in this case, the norm in European countries is "freedom" and the "other" is constituted as "dictatorship". This representation has important meaning about EU: s relationship to asylum seekers and immigrants coming to Europe. Since the countries asylums seekers originate from are represented as fundamentally different from Europe, the culture and identity of the immigrants themselves is also represented as fundamentally different from Europeans.

The word solidarity is frequently used in the policy documents and press releases when talking about the need for European countries to adopt a common European asylum and immigration system. The following quote show how the term is applied.

"I will be particularly attentive to the need for the EU to have an asylum system which guarantees high standards and at the same time ensures there is *solidarity* between the member states with respect to

asylum seekers. Here again the external aspect of asylum policy will play an important role." (Speech, Frattini 30-11-2005).

The word solidarity has an important meaning in this context. It invokes the idea of "one European people" who have responsibilities (controlling immigration) that can only be solved by working together. Furthermore, the word solidarity has an ethical and moral dimension. The term is often used for humanitarian causes as call for help and assistance to people in need. Historically, the term has been used by workers movements and by disadvantaged people in the face some of oppression and as a call to stand together and help each other. Thus the connotations attached to the word solidarity give the impression that there is an outside danger and threat to Europe that can only be met by European countries helping each other out, and sticking together.

The following quote further exemplifies how the term solidarity is being used in the documents:

"Migration issues are high on the policy agenda of the European Union. But it wasn`t always like this: *solidarity* has been a recent turning point, a success story of the last two years. The EU now sees migration as one of the most visible challenges of globalisation." (Speech, Barroso, 23-02-2007).

This quote shows that the EU represent solidarity as a recent development in the relations between EU countries that has successfully brought with it positive change. This arguably goes counter to the previous discussed representation of harmonisation as a historically traditional relationship between European countries, rather than just a two year old success story. It is also clear in from the quote that solidarity between EU countries is seen as remedy to the challenges of migration and globalisation. Positioning solidarity as the solution to the problem enforces the idea of the problem and the solution (that there is an outside danger that can only be met with European countries standing united).

The idea that Europe must work together through solidarity to face the challenges (threats, dangers) of immigration can be seen through Foucault's concept of normalization. The way the issue of a harmonized Europe is represented builds very much on establishing a "common Europeanness" as normal and traditional. The reference to a common European history and ancestry normalizes the idea of a common European identity. This way of framing "common Europeanness" can be seen as a discursive strategy. The following quote shows how the idea of the common European identity is put in to discourse.

"As our founding fathers rightly decided, European integration started with coal and steel. From then on we had more that 50 years of successful European integration." (Speech, Barroso, 24-05-2008).

 The narrator refers to a common legacy of European integration and togetherness. By pointing to examples from the past, the narrator reinforces the norm by saying that European integration has existed throughout history, and is therefore not something unfamiliar but something normal, at home. Another way that the norm is constructed and put into discourse is by leaving out information. For example, the historical disagreements and wars between European countries are not mentioned because they do not support the idea of a harmonised Europe; it goes against the dominant norm. Instead European integration is represented as an ongoing success story without historical resistance. Furthermore, the idea of the European identity also has an explicit cultural dimension evident in the following quote:

"But Europe cannot be completed without a cultural dimension. Sixty years ago, a great European thinker, Denis de Rougemont, whose disciple I was, called for a cultural Europe. The Union of the Europeans would need to be founded on a community of culture, which Rougemont defined as "unite non unitary"; a culture that is common and diverse at the same time." (Speech, Barroso, 24-05.2008)

This quote shows more explicitly than previous examples that the EU sees a common culture as a necessary component of a harmonised Europe. The commissionary president, in his speech gives no elaboration of what is meant by a European culture. But he does say that European culture is "common and diverse at the same time". This framing of European culture can be related to Hansén´s theories. Hansén argues that EU discourses are based on ethno-cultural inclusion and exclusion. Meaning that within Europe, cultural difference is seen as something positive that belongs to the European identity. Cultural exclusion, on the other hand, applies to those who are "too" culturally different to be included in the hegemonic versions of national and regional cultures. The way European culture is framed in the quote above demonstrates that the same logic of cultural inclusion and exclusion that Hansén talks about, is prevalent in the documents analyzed in this research. The Commissionary president describes European culture as "common and diverse at the same time", this statement falls in line with Hansen's claim about ethno-cultural inclusiveness in EU discourse. Cultural diversity within European countries is represented as part of the overarching European culture. There is a distinctive "we" that consists of people who originate from Europe. This "we" is made up of people who have an "ethnic" link to the EU. Hansén articulated the meaning of the European identity the following way , " ...the ethno-cultural understanding of Europe and what makes up today's Europeans only include those who fully embody the

history, the roots, the cultural tradition, the (Christian) era during which European nation states changed the world" (Hansén, 2000; 63). In other words, European culture, as represented by the EU, only includes ethnic Europeans. People who identify with other roots, ancestry and traditions cannot be European. This social inclusion and exclusion in EU discourse is a way to antagonize "the other". The concept of social antagonism holds that the excluded element is represented as homogenous. The "other" in this context appear to be pretty uncomplicated and one dimensional. We do not get to know much at all about "the other" except that they are different from Europeans, often opposite to Europeans. This stereotyped, uncomplicated and negative picture of non-Europeans falls in line with the concept of social antagonism.

There are slightly different representations of European immigrants and asylum seekers in the documents analyzed. The following quote shows how immigrants and asylum seekers are portrayed as both victims and threats.

"Immigration has both a poverty and a richness strand: poverty is portrayed by waves of illegal migrants, victims of human trafficking, desperate and ready to risk everything in search of a better life. This poverty must be harnessed, and turned into richness. This in turn reflects Europe's need for selective immigration to continue its economic development and rise to the challenges of globalisation" (Speech, Frattini, 23-02-2007).

Immigration as a phenomenon in this quote is presented in two ways: as positive when it contributes to European economic development and as negative when threatening and hampering Europe's economic development. The phrase "waves of illegal migrants" paints the picture of an overwhelming amount of illegal immigrants entering Europe, representing immigrants as a threat to Europe's economic development. At the same time, immigrants are represented as victims of poverty and trafficking, desperate to risk everything for a better life in Europe. These two representations appear to contradict each other and can be seen as counter discourses. The meaning attached to the idea of victims is generally one of innocent people in need of help. Therefore, the representation of immigrants as victims could have been a way to legitimize more open policies towards immigrants. However, we can make out from the quote, and indeed from most of the policy documents analyzed in the research, that the EU enforces policies that are more selective, firm, and strict towards illegal immigration, rather than open. With this in consideration, it appears as though the representation of illegal immigrants as victims dose not influence the direction in which EU polices are going. Foucauldian discourse theory holds that different discourses in the same text can have

different validity and strength. These two representations can thus be seen as two contradicting discourses but where the discourse of immigrants as threats is more valid and has more strength than the one of immigrants as victims.

One of the strategies the EU will take as part of harmonisation of Europe is "the global approach" which will install more selective immigration policies. In this approach the EU will work more closely with what they call "third countries". The approach is described in the following quote.

"We will use this link with countries of origin to make Europe better known, especially what it has to offer, but also its values and ways of life. We have to prepare potential immigrants to make a conscious choice. On the one hand, we will highlight what is on offer and, to certain extent "choose" ourselves and encourage potential immigrants "to become European." (Speech, "Frattini, 23-02-2007).

This quote, as opposed to other times "European culture" is mentioned in the documents, provide a bit more explicit elaboration of what "European culture" consists of. More concretely, we find out that European identity consists of certain "values and way of life". It is also understood from an underlying assumption in the quote that immigrants are unfamiliar with these European values and way of life. Furthermore, immigrants who want to come to Europe are presented with an ultimatum; either to "become European" or as is implicitly understood from the quote, not to come at all. Analyzing this quote through Foucault's concept of normalization we can see the discursive presence of a norm, constituted by European culture. In addition to being presented as the norm, it is also implied that European culture is the only compatible culture with the European way of life.

From this the question arises: What is non European culture? And why is not compatible with life in Europe? We have already established that social antagonism manifests itself by constructing a "discursive other", namely, the asylum seekers and their country of origin. One way to further understand the discursive meaning of "the other" is to look more closely at how the European identity is framed in order to get an idea of its binary counterpart (non-European culture). I will re-visit a previously used quote that exemplifies how the European identity is represented.

"The Europe of the future must also be a Europe of opportunities and solidarity. Where innovation and education is at the top of our agenda. Europe leads and innovates when its schools and its universities use the potential of the young to the full. With better education, and better skills, European citizens will have the right jobs for the future. Social justice and social cohesion will be reinforced. And our

free and open economies will be more competitive to face the challenges of globalisation" (Speech, Barroso, 24-05-2008).

Apart from conveying a visionary idea about the future of Europe, this quote also contains important meaning about the European identity. Europe is said to be leading and innovating, excelling in the fields of education and jobs. Europe is also said to be a place where social justice and social cohesion reigns. From the logic of social antagonism, the "non European" is the opposite of these traits. So, if Europe is a place of social cohesion and justice, the "non European" is place that is unjust and unstructured. If Europe is a place that is leading in education and jobs, the non European is a place of high un- employment and low quality education. These characteristics are never explicitly used to describe other countries, but rather, they are omnipresent part of the discourse in order to determine the limits of the European identity.

The documents analyzed frequently bring up a new strategy the EU will develop in order to meet the asylum and immigration problem. This approach is called "regional protection programs" and involves increased collaboration with asylum applicant's countries of origin. The following quote describes this approach.

"...the importance of sharing the responsibility for managing refugees with third countries and countries of first asylum and the need for more effective cooperation to reinforce protection capacities in countries in the regions of origin which receive a far greater percentage of the world´s refugees than the EU does" (Policy document, "The European Union Policy towards a Common European Asylum System", 2010).

The regional protection programs are represented as a way to meet the asylum seekers need of assistance in their own region rather that accepting them to Europe. The idea of the increased collaboration with third countries is said to "reinforce protection capacities in countries and regions of origin". This approach is represented as rational and logical considering that "these regions receive far greater percentage of the world's refugees than the EU dose". But the unmentioned effect is that when EU puts its attention to assisting refugees outside the EU, it gives less attention to internal protection of refugees. The following quote further illustrates how regional protection programs are legitimized and normalized.

"It is a fact that the vast majority of refugees remain in their region of origin in circumstances of extreme poverty and questionable safety. It is therefore important to ensure that those who need

protection are able to access it as quickly as possible and as closely as possible to their needs." (Policy document, "The external aspect of the asylum policy: improving protection in third countries, 2010).

Here again, we can see that refugees are represented as victims of "poverty and unquestionable safety". Further, the regional protection program is spoken of as a positive, humanitarian, and just way to help refugees. In comparison to the debate about immigration to Europe, there is no suggestion that immigrants/ refugees constitute a threat in this context. It is interesting that the EU dose not problematize immigration when it occurs outside the EU, in the refugee´s regions of origin. The fact that regional protection programs might form a threat or problem to the receiving country in another region is not reflected upon. The absence of such a reflection contrasts with how immigration is spoken of when Europe is the receiving region. It is clear that immigrants and asylum seekers only are represented as a threat when they come to Europe, when they migrate within their region of origin they are just represented as victims in need of protection.

Furthermore, EU: s engagement in regional protection programs is represented as the best possible strategy the EU can take to help refugees. The sentence: "It is a fact that the vast majority of refugees remain in their region of origin in circumstances of extreme poverty and questionable safety" has a very matter of fact tone that suggest that the idea that refugees stay in their region of origin is unchangeable. The fact that most refugees remain in their region of origin is framed as something neutral and unproblematic. This representation can be seen as a discursive strategy to legitimize the use of regional protection programmes. Since the established discourse says that refugees need most help and assistance in their region origin, the regional protection program appears as a sensible and good strategy. In effect, this representation is therefore also a way to normalize and legitimize the decreasing protection to refugees and asylum seekers in Europe. Discourse theory holds that absences and silences construct meaning. In this case, the determinism and lack of critique against the idea that immigrants stay in their region of origin, enforce the discourse that the EU is doing the right thing to put more resources to regional protection programmes, rather than allowing more immigrants and asylum seekers to Europe. Regional protection programmes can be seen as a response and solution to the idea that immigration constitutes a threat to Europe. Assisting potential asylum seekers to the EU in their region of origin instead of in Europe is consistent with the idea in EU discourse that asylum seekers and refugees are a threat to Europe that needs to be held at bay.

5.3.   Analysis of Climate change policy area

There are two dominant representation of climate change in the documents analyzed. There is one initial representation of climate change as a global threat to all of humanity. This representation is often described in general terms, with sweeping formulations and without going in to details or elaborating. It is often positioned in the beginning of the documents analysed, forming an introduction to the topic. In most of the documents this representation is followed by a more detailed representation of climate change, where Europe is the centre rather the "the world". I believe that these two representations carry important meaning about the EU discourse about climate change. Therefore these representations will both be analysed in the following text. To begin with, the representation of climate change as global threat to humanity can be seen in the following quotes:

"Climate change is one of the biggest challenges facing mankind in the coming years. The risks for the whole planet and for future generations are colossal and we need to take urgent action." (Press release European council conclusions, 29 & 30-10-2009).

"Climate change is one of the gravest challenges facing humanity" (Policy document, "protecting, preserving and improving the world around us," 2010).

These representations of climate change reveal an antagonistic relationship between on the one side "climate change" and the other side "humanity" and "the whole planet". "We" in this representation is humanity (the world). Adapting to climate change is described with words like "battle" "combat" and "fight". These words invoke ideas of war between on the one side "climate change" and on the other side "humanity". In extension, this war rhetoric has connotations about "good" and "evil" where humanity is good and climate change is the evil villain that has to be fought. This is a remarkable representation considering that leading scientific research shows that climate change is caused by human beings. Furthermore, research also shows that industrialised countries have the biggest responsibility for the greenhouse gas emissions that have caused climate change. The effect of not mentioning human responsibility can be analysed through Foucault's concept absences and silences as constitutive for discourse.

According to Foucault knowledge is central part of discourse, what is regarded as knowledge reflect power relations. In this case, the absence of a discussion of responsibility deflects attention from industrialised counties guilt for causing climate change. One can also say that it also deflects a wider critique against global capitalism. The use of fossil fuels has facilitated

the increased production- and consumption that has characterized global capitalism and created economic growth. The EU is an institution that embraces the global capitalist system and places economic growth at the top of its agenda. Thus, an acknowledgement that industrialized countries production and consumption habits- facilitated by the use of fossil fuels- have enabled climate change could open doors for a wider critique against the capitalist free market economy. This would go counter to EU: s interests of continued economic growth within the capitalist system. Further, the absence of a discussion about responsibility can be seen as discursive strategy to normalize the idea that the EU and the capitalist system is guilt free for causing climate change. This can also be seen as an expression of Foucault's concept of positive power. Positive power is exercised through controlling, shaping and normalizing meaning. In this case, the EU holds the power to define and normalize, and chooses to do that in favour of its own interests.

The second representation of climate change in many of the documents analyzed positions the EU as the subject rather the humanity. In this representation "we" have changed from humanity to the EU. It indentifies the EU as a leader and role model in fighting climate change. An example of this representation can be seen in the following quote:

"European Union is at the forefront of efforts to fight climate change" (Policy document, "Protecting, preserving and improving the world around us", 2010).

This is a reoccurring description of EU: s efforts to fight climate change in the documents analyzed. Words like forefront, denoting leadership and responsibility are combined with other positive words like prominence, to describe the EU: s effort. The following quote provides another example of how EU: s strategy to tackle climate change is represented.

"Energy and climate change policies remain at the top of our agenda. To be credible we need to keep our commitments. As our founding fathers rightly decided, European integration started with coal and steel. From then on we had years of successful integration. Today, I believe, energy and climate change can produce a similar impetus and reinforce further integration inside Europe and for the world if we lead the debate and action on these issues" (Speech, Barroso, 24-05-2008).

Fighting climate change is said to be at the top of EU: s agenda, something that EU is excelling in, doing all that could possibly be done. There is also a forward looking part of this quote. It speaks of how EU will continue to be leaders in fighting climate change, if Europe continues to integrate. In other words, it suggests that Europe will lead the fight against climate change, but only under the condition that Europe continues to harmonize.

Interestingly, the harmonization of Europe is spoken of as the criterion that European countries must fulfil in order to continue to be successful. The quote implies an obligation of the European countries to live up to its commitments to fight climate change by harmonizing. Furthermore, the reference to Europe's "founding fathers", suggests that fighting climate change is part of the European identity. Here, as we saw with the asylum and immigration discourse, referring to tradition and legacy is a way to normalize European identity. The fight against climate change is represented as something inherently European. The connection between EU leadership and European identity can also be analysed with the help of Hansén´s theories. He suggests that European identity is based on an ethno-cultural discourse that only includes people with European origin. As previously discussed, fighting climate change is spoken of as something typically European, part of the European ancestry. This idea that European origin, European history, is associated with fighting climate change can be seen as a discursive strategy that reproduces the idea of the ethno-cultural European identity. It is part of the ethno-cultural discourse because it suggests that European culture and ethnicity is a reason to why the EU is best at fighting climate change.

In another European council document entitled "promoting the European way of life in a globalised world" a list of issues that the EU prioritizes is presented. Climate change is mentioned in this list as a problem requiring global solutions. The following quote illustrates:

"Climate change is a global problem requiring global solutions. The European Council therefore looks forward to a successful continuation of the discussions in the framework of the UN Framework convention on Climate Change..." (Press release, European council Conclusions, 29&30-10-2009)

This quote is particularly interesting because of the connection made between climate change and the title of the document "promoting the European way of life". The fight against climate change is represented as something particularly European. This is an example that supports previous discussed representation that fighting climate change is part of the European identity. Fighting climate change well, is represented as something exclusively European. Indeed, all the documents analysed concerning climate change include this representation. The following quote show how EU sees its relation to other parts of the world in the fight against climate change.

"Action by the European Union will not be enough. A comprehensive and ambitious agreement can only be reached if all parties contribute to the process. Other developed countries should also

demonstrate their leadership and commit to ambitious emission reductions and step up their current pledges." (Policy document, "Strategy on climate change", 2010).

In this quote the EU expresses doubt whether other developed countries will do their part if fighting climate change. EU is said to be ready for the task at hand but it is uncertain whether other developing countries will do the same. This shows that the EU considers itself separate from other developing countries. In other words, other developed countries are not as good at fighting climate change as the EU. This in turn legitimates the idea that the EU is the leader and the best at fighting climate change. Furthermore, the representation that EU is already doing its best leaves no room for critique and improvement in the EU strategy. One can say that the absence of self critique is a discursive strategy that enforces the discourse that the EU is best at fighting climate change.

In addition, one can see the representation of EU as leaders in fighting climate change as discursive norm. According to Foucauldian discourse analysis, normalization establishes the measure by which all are judged and deemed to conform to. We saw in the previous example that non-EU countries were doubted to live up to their responsibility in fighting climate change. This way of comparing and judging other developed countries in relation to the EU, can be seen as a way of inscribing the idea that EU is the best at fighting climate change. Put differently, European leadership is represented as a norm to which other countries should conform to. This can also be seen as an expression of social antagonism. The idea of the EU as a leader in fighting climate change must have a binary counterpart to determine the boundaries of the discourse; in this case other developing countries are constituted as "the other" who are not as good and efficient at fighting climate change as the EU.

It is evident from most of the documents analyzed that the EU: s efforts to tackle climate change are primarily in emissions cuttings. This is a strategy that the EU speaks of in very positive terms. In one document EU: s strategy is described like this:

"In a landmark decision in December 2008, EU leaders approved a comprehensive package of emission cutting measures. The plan aims to reduce greenhouse gases at least by 20% by 2020 (compared with 1990 levels), raise renewable energy share of the market to 20% and cut overall energy consumption by 20% (compared with projected trends). Within the drive for more renewable energy, it was agreed that 10% of fuel for transport should come from bio fuels, electricity or hydrogen." (Policy document, "Protecting preserving and improving the world around us", 2010)

The mitigation targets the EU has set up are said to be comprehensive, denoting that they are doing all that possible can be done. Other adjectives used in the policy documents to describe EU: s strategy is for example "effective" and "efficient". These positive adjectives also carry meaning about the idea of the "European identity". The discursive relationship between EU leadership in fighting climate change and the European ethno-cultural identity has already been established. With this relationship in consideration, the positive description of the EU strategy can also be seen as discursive strategy to normalize the idea of the European identity. As I have already discussed, the idea of European excellence in fighting climate change, is built on an ethno-cultural discourse about European identity. The way the strategy is described reflects the characteristics of "Europeanness" and European people. In effect, this representation of "Europeanness" also carry information about "non- Europeanness". The concept of social antagonism holds that "the other" is constructed as way to determine the limits of the discourse. So, "the other", in this case, has the qualities that are opposite to the European. If Europeans are spoken of as "efficient", "comprehensive" and "bold", the other is the opposite of those traits. In this case, "the other" is non- European developed countries that are spoken of as worse, or bad at fighting climate change in comparison to the EU.

Notably, there is a distinction made between developed countries and developing countries in this representation. EU compares itself to other developing countries in the fight against climate change. Developing countries do not seem to be on the playfield at all. This can be seen as an acknowledgement of difference in ability to adapt to climate change between developing and developed countries. In one of the policy documents analyzed there is also an explicit acknowledgement that developed countries have more responsibility for causing climate change than developing countries.

"All countries, except the least developed, should contribute to international public financing, through comprehensive global distribution key based on emission levels and on GDP to reflect both responsibility for global emissions and ability to pay, with considerable weight on emission levels. The weight of emissions should increase over time to allow for adjustments of economies. The EU and its member states are ready to take their resulting fair share of total international public finance." (Press release, Council conclusions, 29&30-10-2009).

This acknowledgement can arguably be seen as counter-discourse to the earlier discussed discourse that EU is guilt free in causing climate change. This representation acknowledges that developed countries are more responsible for green house emissions and have more money to contribute with than developing countries. In contrast, the representation of EU as

guilt free for causing climate change completely lacks recognition of responsibility. However, the representation that acknowledges a responsibility is rare and marginalized. It is only seen in one of the documents analyzed. While the representation of EU as guilt free is much more frequent and dominant.

The fact that EU sees itself as part of the category "developing country" may seem like an obvious and taken for granted part of the European identity. However, the term carries geopolitical meaning and therefore it is important to analyze its meaning. The terms "developed" and "developing" can arguably be seen as binary oppositions. They might be seen as an expression of social antagonism where developed countries are the norm in Europe and developing countries are its binary opposition. Interestingly, countries that are categorized as "developing" are said to be able to change their category and become "developed". The following quote illustrates this idea:

> "The growth in developing countries economies and emissions makes it essential for them to start reducing the rise in their emissions as soon as possible and to cut their emissions in absolute terms after 2020, since by 2020, these countries will be responsible for over half the greenhouse emissions" (Policy document, "Strategy on climate change", 2010).

This idea, that responsibility for fighting climate change increases as countries experience economic growth has significant geopolitical meaning. Geopolitics holds that terms such as "developed" and "developing countries" carry political meaning about geographical areas. In this case the geopolitical meaning attached to the terms "developed" and "developing" is that developed countries have better capacities and more resources, and therefore they should contribute more to emission cuttings than developing countries. At the same time, the representation recognizes that a geographical area can change its political category and move from "developing" to "developed". Thus, the geopolitical meaning is said to change as a country experiences economic growth. This has significance for determining who is responsible for climate change.

5.4. Climate change and immigration/ asylum discourse in relation to each other

In this section of the analysis I will combine the analysis of the two policy areas with the aim to see how the EU "view" climate change induced migrants. Because there is never a direct connection between climate change and human displacement in the documents analyzed this

section will to substantial extent make use of Foucault's concept of absences and silences as constitutive for discourse.

When comparing the analysis of the two policy areas in relation to each other one can begin to make out an explanation of why the EU has not recognized the existence of climate change induced migrants. In the immigration/asylum policy area it was established that the idea about the ethno-cultural European identity is spoken of as something to protect and preserve in the face of unskilled immigration from developing countries. In this area, the discourse of the European identity is used as way to normalize and legitimize the harmonisation of the European asylum/immigration system. European integration is represented as a natural and necessary development in order to preserve Europe´s common ancestry and history. Europe is said to need more restrictive, firmer, and harmonized immigration policies in order to solve the immigration problem that is threatening the European identity.

 With this in consideration, the absence of recognition and assistance to climate change induced migrants seems to be compatible with the idea that immigrants from third countries constitute a threat to Europe. An acknowledgement of the existence of human populations displaced by climate change by the EU could create claims that the EU assist climate change induced migrants. Perhaps by re-settling climate change induced migrants to Europe. This would go against EU: s interest of more selective and stricter regulations of non-skilled immigration from developing countries.

In the environment policy area, the discourse that the EU leadership in fighting climate change is part of the European identity has implications for how climate change induced migrants are treated by the EU. European leadership in the fight against climate change is represented as a European virtue; it is spoken of as something normal and natural for Europeans. Further, the EU climate change strategy is framed as completely exhaustive of all available solutions. Therefore, the absence of an acknowledgment of climate change induced migrants can arguably be seen as necessary for the EU to represent its strategy as exhaustive. Put differently, the discourse saying that the EU is doing all that can be done relies on the idea that the EU has identified all the problems that climate change causes. Without this idea the EU would not be able to legitimately claim the leadership and exhaustiveness in its climate change strategy that it lays claim to. Thus, the lack of acknowledgement of climate change induced migrants is necessary for the EU to represent its climate strategy as leading.

Furthermore, an acknowledgement that developed countries are particularly responsible for causing climate change could lead to more pressure on the EU to provide asylum to climate change induced migrants in Europe. It could possibly legitimate demands that the EU resettle climate change induced migrants to Europe, which goes against the EU: s interest to restrict asylum immigration. So the absence of an acknowledgement that developed countries are particularly responsible for causing climate change can be seen as a way to legitimize and justify the lack of protection to climate change induced migrants. Put differently, the silence about responsibility can be seen as a discursive strategy to enhance the idea that EU is leading the fight against climate change.

In both the policy areas analyzed the European identity is spoken of in terms of both culture and economic growth. European prosperity and leadership in the economic sphere is often explained with the superior ethno-cultural characteristics of European people. For example, Europe is said to be naturally leading in the fight against climate change and economic development because the European people have a superior origin and culture. Thus, the discourse about the "European identity" consists of two inseparable parts; the cultural and economical. The discourse implies that European ethno-cultural characteristics in the population are necessary to achieve economic growth. Non-skilled immigrants from developing countries are a primary group that the EU targets with more restrictive immigration policies. This group seek protection based humanitarian reasons rather than because of a connection to the European labour market. Therefore asylum seekers are a group that do not fit into the idea of the European identity. With this in consideration it is clear that the idea of mass-immigration from developing countries poses a double edged threat to the European identity. First, they come from non- European, non- developed countries and are therefore culturally incompatible with Europeans. Second, they are according to the discourse, unable to contribute to the European labour market.

This idea in EU discourse that asylum seekers constitute a threat to the European identity also affects how EU relates to climate change induced migrants. Climate change induced migrants fall in the same category as ordinary asylum seekers because they (are expected to) come from developing countries and are therefore perceived as incompatible with the European labour market. Just like other refugees, their residence in Europe would be given for humanitarian reasons rather than because of a connection to the labour market. They are also with probability coming from developing countries. These two factors make climate change induced migrants a potential threat to European identity, along with other unskilled

immigrants from developing countries. With this in consideration the absence of an acknowledgment that climate change causes human displacement falls in line with the idea in EU discourse that unskilled immigration from developing countries constitutes a threat to Europe that has to be fought. The two ideas in EU discourse, that non skilled immigration from developing countries constitutes a threat to the European identity, and that Europe is best at fighting climate change can both be seen as a means to normalize and legitimize the absence of a protection for climate change induced migrants.

However, there is also an idea that refugees and asylum seekers are victims in need of protection in EU discourse. Refugees and asylum seekers are for example represented as victims in the context of Regional Protection Programs. There is an idea in EU discourse that displaced people are better aided in their region of origin rather than in Europe. This idea is supported by saying that it is more efficient for the EU to concentrate its aid in the refugee´s regions of origin instead of in the EU, since that is where most refugees are situated. This can be seen as a strategy to both limit unskilled immigration to Europe and keep up the idea that EU is a humanitarian organization that offers protection to refugees and asylum seekers. Considering that many climate change induced migrants come from developing regions of the world, this might be a similar strategy that the EU will take to assist future climate change induced migrants, if they become acknowledged.

As the analysis has stressed, the EU commitment to economic growth and cultural homogeneity has to be seen in the context of global capitalism. The theory of regionalism holds that regions like the EU regionalize in order to meet the increased competition of the global capitalist market. From this perspective, the harmonisation of the European asylum and immigration system is a way for Europe to secure and protect its economic development and power in the face of fierce competition from other regions in the world. The restrictive protection towards asylum seekers and non-existent protection towards climate change induced migrants is a way to protect EU: s economic interests. Unskilled immigration to Europe is a threat to financial advancement and therefore the policies are becoming more restrictive and defensive towards this group in order to protect EU: s interests.

According to discourse theory, discourses (constructions of meaning) have material effects. The discourses analyzed in this research have material effects in determining who is welcome and who is rejected to Europe. It has been established that EU discourses see immigrants as a threat and danger to Europe and that this discourse is culminating in more restrictive and

selective immigration policies. In other words, the effect of the discourses analysed limits the possibilities for asylum seekers to get protection in Europe.

This also means no possibilities for climate change induced migrants to seek protection in Europe. Additionally, one can also say that the effect of the discourse manifest in what Foucault calls negative power. EU penalizes unskilled migrants from developing countries by restricting their possibilities to receive asylum in Europe. So in this case, negative power is exercised through an increased rejection of asylum seekers in Europe. Furthermore, EU discourses also exercise positive power. Foucault meant that positive power is exercised through the construction of norms and the inclusion and exclusion of people from the European identity. The exclusion of unskilled immigrants from developing countries from the European identity is represented as a norm in EU discourse. In parallel, the inclusion of people with European ethno-cultural characteristics in the understanding of Europe is also normalized. This power to define who is European and who is not through norms is thus an exercise of positive power.

Furthermore, the normalization of the meaning can be seen as a potential exercise in hegemonic power. It is only potential since this research has not analyzed the reception and resistances that EU discourses have, and therefore it cannot show if the discourses have hegemonic status in the wider society. However, the EU is a powerful democratic supernatural institution and the consent and agreement of many people across European states is necessary in the construction of policies. Therefore, the probability that the discourses analyzed in this research have hegemonic power is high.

6. Conclusion

This research has shown that both climate change and immigration/asylum policies are constructed on an ethno cultural discourse of the European identity. This discourse includes people with European origin and excludes people with other origin in the understanding of Europe. Particularly, the discourse of the ethno-cultural European identity excludes non skilled immigrants from developing countries by representing them as incompatible with the European way of life. This exclusion is manifested in firmer and more restrictive immigration policies for this group of migrants. With this background in consideration, the reason why climate change induced migrants are unacknowledged by the EU seem to be a consequence of the idea that unskilled immigrants from developing countries are seen as threat to the European identity. Put differently, the absence of an acknowledgement and protection to climate change induced migrants from developing countries seem to be part of EU: s interest to protect itself against unskilled immigrants from developing countries.

The research has also shown that the idea of the European identity has an economic dimension that positions Europe as leading in creating economic growth. This understanding of the European identity as compatible with economic leadership and economic growth also influences the idea that unskilled immigrants from developing countries as a threat to Europe. Immigrants from developing countries are represented as unable to contribute to economic development and thus a threat to Europe's continued economic growth. As a solution to this problem, the EU is currently limiting and restricting possibilities for these migrants to come to Europe through the project of European harmonization. From this perspective, the fact that climate change induced migrants are unacknowledged by the EU can be seen as part of the discourse that says Europe must protect its continued economic growth by restricting immigration from developing countries.

This research has also shown that EU positions itself as leader in the fight against climate change. The EU: s effort is represented as comprehensive, sufficient and exhaustive of all measures available. In addition, there is a dominant discourse that does not recognize human responsibility for causing climate change in the documents analyzed in this research. Instead climate change is represented as an autonomous enemy that the EU is guilt-free for causing. This representation of the EU as a leader in the fight against climate change, and as guilt free for causing it also explains the lack of acknowledgement of climate change induced migrants. The fact that EU represents its strategy as comprehensive leaves no room for additional improvements. In effect, this also excludes any possibility to assist climate change induced

migrants. In other words, since the EU strategy is already said to be sufficient there is no leverage to add a protection to climate change induced migrants. Thus, the discourse that EU strategy is comprehensive and adequate can be seen as a way to legitimize and normalize the absence of an acknowledgement and assistance to climate change induced migrants. In addition, the silence about human and particularly developed countries responsibility for causing climate change can be seen as another way to legitimize the absence of acknowledgement of climate change induced migrants. If there would have been a more powerful acknowledgement that developed countries are particularly responsible for climate change there would also be room for advocates to more legitimately demand that developed countries compensate developing countries for the human displacement they experience due to climate change. This in turn, could create legitimate demands that the EU accept climate change induced migrants, something that goes against the EU: s current interest to keep unskilled immigrants from developing countries out of the Europe.

This research has shown that policies regarding climate change and immigration/asylum are constructed with reference to the same discourse about the European identity. This discourse establishes a means for including people with European origin and excluding people of other origin/ethnicity from the understanding of Europe. It has also been shown that the discourse about the European identity represents Europe as consistent with future economic growth. In effect, this discourse includes people who are believed to be able to contribute to the European labour market and excludes those who are represented as unable to contribute to the labour market. These two aspects of the European identity are represented as two sides of the same coin. The same group of people that are seen to be contributing to economic growth are also represented as European. And contrary, the groups of people that are seen as culturally incompatible with the European culture are also said to be unable to work on the European labour market. Unskilled immigrants from developing countries are said to be neither culturally compatible with Europeans, nor able to contribute to Europe´s economic development. This in turn, legitimates policies that restrict and limit possibilities for this group of migrants to come to Europe. It also justifies the absence of acknowledgement about climate change induced migrants.

 The effect of the discourses analyzed in this research is that climate change induced migrants are not recognized and are not given any protection by the EU. This serves EU: s interest to restrict immigration of this group to Europe, but is disadvantaging for climate change induced

migrants, particularly from developing countries, who need international protection due to forced migration caused by climate change.

With this established I can draw the conclusion that in order for the EU to meet the need of assistance and protection that climate change induced migrants will increasingly require they must start connecting climate change and immigration/asylum policy. The EU must open up for the possibility of improvements and amendments to their current climate change strategy. They must not let ideas of ethnic and cultural belonging, and economic growth determine the protection and assistance given to asylum seekers or climate change induced migrants. The EU, as a developed region more responsible for causing climate change, has a particular responsibility to assist and protect people in developing countries forced to migrate because of climate change. With this as motivation, I see need for more critical research about the EU and climate change induced migration that can further scrutinize the practices of political power involved in the construction climate change and immigration/asylum policy.

Furthermore, it is important to remember that EU abides by international refugee law. The fact that the EU has leverage to ignore climate change induced migration is a result of that they are not protected under international law. More research about climate change induced migrants is therefore necessary in other political institutions such as the UN in order to more comprehensively understand the geopolitical meaning about climate change and human displacement. It is also important to analyze discourses in institutions that have acknowledged the existence of climate change induced migrants. Such research could give a valuable understanding of how EU discourses are received and negotiated, and in that way broaden the understanding of climate change induced migration.

7. Reference list

Books

Aspers, P. (2007). *Etnografiska metoder: att förstå och förklara samtiden*. Malmö:Liber

Baldwin, E. Longhurst, B. McCkracken, S. Ogborn, M. Smith G. (2004*). Introducing Cultural studies.* Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited

Bhavani, K. (1995). "Tracing the contours- feminist research and feminist objectivity." In Haleh A, Maynard, M (eds.), *The dynamics of race and Gender.* Taylor & Francis

Barnett, Michel. (2008)." Social constructivism" In Smith, S. Baylis, J, Owens, P (eds.), *The globalization of world politics.* New York*:* Oxford University Press

Best, E. Christiansen, T. (2008). "Regionalism in international affairs" in Smith S, Baileys, J. Owens, P (eds.), *The globalization of world politics*. New York: Oxford University Press

Carabine, J. (2001). "Unmarried motherhood 1830-1990: A genealogical analysis" in, Wetherell, M. Taylor, S, Yates, S (eds) *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis*.The open University Press

Dodds, K. (2007). *Geopolitics a very short introduction*. UK : Oxford University press

Hansen, P. (2000). *Europeans only?* Department of political science. Umeå University

Howarth, E, Torfing, J. (2005). *Discourse theory in European politics; identity, politics and governance.*New York: Palgrave MacMillan

May, T. (2001). *Social research, issue methods and* processes. (3ed,). Glasgow: Open University Press

Smith S, Baylis J, Owens P. (2008*). The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*. (4ed). New York: Oxford University Press

WebPages

 UNHCR webpage (2010) http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49da0e466.html 2010-05-25

Reports

Bates, C D. (2002). Environmental refugees? Classifying human migrations caused by Environmental change. Population and environment vol 23. Human sciences Press Inc. Sam Houston State University

Black R. (2001). *"Environmental Refugees: Myth or Reality*?," UNHCR Working Papers(34): 1-19

El-Hinnawi, E. (1985). *Environmental Refugees.* Nairobi: United Nations Environment Programme

Castles, S. (2002). *Environmental change and forced migration: making sense of the debate* UNHCR working paper (70)

Fritz, C. (2010). *Climate change and migration: Sorting through complex issues without hype* Migration and policy institute, Migration information source

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (1990). *Policymakers' summary of the potential impacts of climate change (Report from Working Groupe II to IPCC)* IPCC - Secretariat, Geneva

Myers, N. (1997). "Environmental Refugees," Population and Environment 19(2): 167-82.

Myers, N. and J. Kent (1995). *Environmental Exodus: An Emergent Crisis in the Global Area.* Washington DC: Climate Institute

Piguet, E. (2008). *Climate change and forced migration*. UNHCR Working papers (153)

Rive, N. Torvanger, A. Fuglesvedt, S. (2006). *Climate agreements based on responsibility for global warming: periodic updating, policy choices, and regional costs*. Oslo: Center for international climate and environmental research.

Policy documents:

Launching the European Climate Change Programme (ECCP). retrieved 2010-04-12 http://europa.eu/legalisation_summaries/environment/tackling_climate_change/128185_en.htm

Strategy on climate change: the way ahead 2020 and beyond- retrieved 2010-04-12http://europa.eu/legislation_summeries/environment/tackling_climate_change/128188_en.htm

Tackling climate change- retrieved 2010-04-12http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/environment/tackling_climate_change/index_en.htm

Protecting, preserving, and improving the world around us – retrieved 2010-04-12 http://europa.eu/pol/env/index_en.htm

Eurodac- a European Union-wide electronic system for the identification of asylum seekers- retrieved 2010-04-12 http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/asylum/identification/fsj_asylum_identification_en.htm

*The European Union clarifies what it means by refugee and subsidiary protection-*2010-04-12http://ec.europa:eu/justice_home/fsj/asylum/subsidary/fsj_asylum_subsidary:en.htm

Migration and asylum in numbers at European level- retreived2010-04-12http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/asylum/statistics/fsj_asylum_statistics

Protecting displaced persons in case of mass influx in the European Union- rereived2010-04-12

http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/asylum/temporary/fsj_asylum_temporary_en.htm

The European Union Policy towards a Common European Asylum System- 2010-04.12http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/asylum/fsj_asylum_intro_en.htm

The external aspects of the asylum policy: Improving protection in third countries- retrieved-2010-04-12http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/asylum/external/fsj_asylum_external_en.htm

Press releases:

European council conclusions (29&30-10-2009) –retrieved-2010-04- 12 http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=DOC/09/5&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

Barrosso, M (24-05-2008) *Building the Europe of the future* -retrieved 2004-04-12 http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/07/253&format=HTMLL&aged=0&language=ENgiuLanguage=en

Frattini, F (30-05-2005). EU *and the Western Balkans: Visa, Asylum and Immigration*. retrieved 2010-04-12
http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/754&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

Frattini, F, (2007-02-23). *The future of EU migration and integration policy*. Retrieved 2010-04-12. http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleases.do?reference=SPEECH/07/98&format=H

A significant majority of EU25 citizens consider that more decision-making should take place in the area of Justice, freedom, and security,(15-02-2007.) retrieved-2010-04-12
http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/07/59&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

European council conclusions (15&16-06-2006) retreived-2010-04-12http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=DOC/06/2&format=HTML&aged=language=EN&guiLanguage=en