

Round table proposal:

Organisers: Claudia Morsut and Ole Andreas Engen – University of Stavanger Norway

Title: *Exploring climate change through four analytical lenses: how securitisation, riskification, climatization and crisification contribute to the academic and political debate on climate security.*

How academia frames climate change related security issues can have relevant effects on the political agenda driven by the global community in its efforts to mitigate and adapt to a changing climate. While this agenda promotes its frames by pursuing the climate goals stemming from the 2015 Paris Agreement, climate change has clearly an impact on other policy fields, such as migration and conflicts, that interrelate and intertwine with increased frequency in the political debate on climate security.

In this round table, we aim to address the implications and challenges in studying climate security through four so-called analytical lenses - securitisation, riskification, climatization and crisification - to assess both what is at stake in including an increasingly wider range of meta-issues into the climate security debate at academic level and how the academic debate can influence the political agenda on climate change.

Not only are many traditional public policy issues now considered ‘security questions’; there is also a notion that these should be approached with a security frame of mind: a security logic. Securitisation is both the name and process by which these issues become viewed widely as issues of security rather than ‘normal’ public policy (Buzan et al. 1998). Securitisation shapes how we act, whether we are aware of it or not: the words we use, the problems we prioritize, the actors we enable, the tools we build, the resources we redirect, and the rationales we construct for the broader public. Securitisation affects whether we tackle problems effectively – and whether we do so in democratically comfortable ways. Previous research has used securitisation to study climate change by exploring the construction of threats that climate change poses to our societies (see Diez et al. 2016) and the academic debate shows that there are significant downsides in securitising climate change (Warner and Boas 2019). Riskification has thus emerged as an alternative lens to frame climate security, by considering climate change from a risk logic, rather than a security logic. Riskification shifts the focus from threat to risk to consider the conditions of possibility or constitutive causes of harm (Corry 2012) derived from climate change. This shift has practical consequences since it does not require extraordinary measures like in securitisation, but long-term precautionary governance. Climatization, as third analytical lens, has shed light on the ways migration, conflict and security should be inextricably linked. Instead of focusing on the processes that make climate change a security issue (like in securitisation), climatization calls for investigating issues such as migration and conflict as relevant for climate security (Oels 2012). Finally, crisification represents an attempt to stress the urgency of intervening to halt the negative consequences of climate change. It connects securitisation to crises (Rhinard 2019; Paglia 2018) to construct climate change as a crisis and an urgency that need to be addressed without delay.

The round table will debate about the pros and the cons in theoretical and practical terms to apply these analytical lenses to study climate security.

Potential participants:

Simon Neby University of Bergen Norway

Mark Rhinard University of Stockholm Sweden

Angela Oels Augsburg University Germany

Olaf Corry University of Leeds UK

Pia-Johanna Schweizer Research Institute for Sustainability (RIFS) - Helmholtz Centre Potsdam Germany.

References

- Buzan B., Wæver O., de Wilde J. 1998. *Security. A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Corry, O. 2012. Securitisation and 'Riskification': Second-order Security and the Politics of Climate Change. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 40(2): 235-258.
- Diez T., von Lucke F. and Wellmann Z. (eds.) 2016. *The Securitisation of Climate Change*. London. Routledge.
- Oels A. 2012. From 'Securitization' of Climate Change to 'Climatization' of the Security Field: Comparing Three Theoretical Perspectives. In J. Scheffran, M. Brzoska, H. Brauch, P. Link, and J. Schilling (Eds.), *Climate Change, Human Security and Violence*. Springer. 185-205.
- Paglia, E. 2018. The socio-scientific construction of global climate crisis. *Geopolitics*, 23, 96-123.
- Rhinard, M. 2019. The crisification of policy-making in the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 57(3), 616-633. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.12838>
- Warner J. and Boas I. 2019. Securitization of climate change: How invoking global dangers for instrumental ends can backfire. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 37(8), 1471-1488.