# Sjostrom/Verska – Round 5 Negative

### Our Sole Contention is Arctic Drilling

#### Oil corporations are thirstier than ever in their pursuit for oil, they are trying to expanding their fields to increase their profits– Sarah Kent explains in 2018:

Sarah Kent, 5-6-2018, "Oil Companies Look to Profit at the Pump," WSJ, https://www.wsj.com/articles/oil-companies-look-to-profit-at-the-pump-1526472000, Date Accessed 8-27-2018 // WS

Main oil corporations are doubling down on gasoline stations, refineries and processing vegetation, betting on a once-unloved a part of the power enterprise to shore up earnings and broaden their buyer bases. BP PLC plans to open 1000’s of gasoline stations in new markets equivalent to Mexico and India over the following three years. Exxon Mobil Corp. is investing closely to broaden its petrochemical operations, which make merchandise like plastics and the fundamental substances for all kinds of family items. In November, Royal Dutch Shell PLC began work on a large petrochemical complicated in Pennsylvania—its first large new plant within the U.S. because the 1960s. Corporations are anticipated so as to add 7.7 million barrels a day of recent refining capability by 2023, in line with the Worldwide Vitality Company. In petrochemicals, it estimates funding within the U.S. alone over the following 5 years will add 13 million tons a yr of recent capability to provide ethylene, the primary element of plastic. American refining, specifically, is booming. Surging shale manufacturing has supplied plentiful, low cost oil near the nation’s petrochemical heartland across the Gulf Coast. Gas demand is anticipated to rise. All these dynamics helped drive Marathon Petroleum Corp.’s settlement to purchase rival Andeavor final month for $23 billion, a deal that might create the nation’s largest refiner. As smaller refiners consolidate, the world’s main oil corporations are promising that funding of their so-called downstream companies—and restructuring efforts they’re concurrently pursuing to enhance effectivity—will add billions of to earnings. The give attention to downstream grew amid a interval of decrease oil costs and issues over long-term oil demand. Cheaper crude—the first feedstock for refining—boosted margins and earnings. Oil corporations’ “upstream,” or oil exploration and improvement, in the meantime, was affected by decrease costs. “Upstream sooner or later was not earning profits,” mentioned Tufan Erginbilgic, head of BP’s refining and retail arm. That gave his unit a recent crucial to “actually considerably contribute to group efficiency, as a result of we have now to.” At the moment, greater crude costs pose a danger that margins from refining gained’t be as robust as they’ve lately. And all the brand new funding in capability may find yourself swamping the market, analysts warned. “It stays to be seen the best way demand goes to form up,” mentioned Jonathan Leitch, analysis director at Edinburgh-based consultancy Wooden Mackenzie. Huge corporations say the downstream funding is price it—irrespective of the place crude costs head. Executives say that integrating the oil they produce with refining and retail companies can maximize earnings, and assist regular funds amid the sometimes-wild swings in crude. Investor strain additionally has mounted on the most important oil corporations to begin positioning for an age when fossil fuels might not energy the world’s fleet of passenger automobiles. Executives are betting their large petrochemical vegetation can supply diversification. In keeping with the IEA, petrochemical manufacturing is anticipated to be the most important driver of oil demand progress within the coming many years. Fuel stations, too, are promising new progress. They provide entry to rising markets, the place demand for gas is anticipated to be particularly strong. A geographically extensive community of branded, shops additionally may create new alternatives the place the business now sees threats—equivalent to electrical charging stations. Final yr, Shell purchased one in every of Europe’s greatest electric-vehicle charging corporations, New Movement. It has teamed up with a bunch of automobile producers to put in greater than 500 fast-charging factors at present Shell stations, throughout 10 international locations in Europe over the following two years. The rise of electrical automobiles is “a actuality, and a chance,” Shell’s downstream director, John Abbott, advised analysts in March. “We’re adjusting our supply to satisfy this new demand.” BP began its push earlier than oil costs collapsed in 2014. The corporate was in search of stability after promoting off billions of in belongings to pay for cleanup charges and authorized prices related to its catastrophic blowout within the Gulf of Mexico in 2010. It offered off a few of its refining companies however resisted investor strain to eliminate its downstream unit altogether. That was regardless of it being an business laggard. Mr. Erginbilgic, the downstream boss, eradicated a layer of administration and ordered up focused enchancment plans at every plant. “At the moment, we had been the worst within the business. Actually the worst,” he mentioned. BP says now it’s on monitor to extend earnings from Mr. Erginbilgic’s division by $three billion between 2017 and 2021, doubling the advance made within the two years from 2014. Over the following three years, BP sees the most important alternative to spice up earnings in gasoline stations. It’s doubling down on partnerships with comfort shops, which has boosted profitability at gasoline stations in mature markets, and is pushing exhausting into new international locations the place demand is anticipated to develop. BP says it’s on monitor to open 500 retail websites in Mexico by the tip of the yr, up from zero at the beginning of 2017. Elsewhere, it’s trying to construct gasoline stations in India, China and Indonesia.

#### Given this profit driven desire, the Arctic becomes a valuable area as Hobson explains in 2013:

Margaret Kriz Hobson, 7/18/13, E&E reporter, “Is Arctic oil exploration dead in the U.S.?”, <http://www.eenews.net/stories/1059984582>, Date Accessed 9-6-2018 // AS

The report estimated that the territory north of the Arctic Circle holds 90 billion barrels of oil and 1,669 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, with a staggering 84 percent of those hydrocarbons located offshore. The vast majority of the oil and gas is located in the West Siberian Basin, Alaska's Arctic and the East Barents Basin. The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management has estimated that Alaska's offshore region contains 23 billion barrels of oil. At the time the USGS assessment was released, the Interior Department had already held several lease sales in the American Arctic, including a record-breaking 2008 sale in the Chukchi Sea that brought in $2.7 billion.

#### **Sorokin indicates that accession grants companies the legal certainty needed to drill. They argue in 2015 that:**

Iosif Sorokin, 3-30-2015, "The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea: Why the U.S. Hasn’t Ratified It and Where It Stands Today," No Publication, http://berkeleytravaux.com/un-convention-law-sea-u-s-hasnt-ratified-stands-today/, Date Accessed 7-10-2018 // WS

UNCLOS is also vital to expanding [conservation efforts](http://www.maritime-executive.com/article/governments-to-expand-unclos-for-conservation) in the oceans and allowing nations with Arctic coastlines to make [legal claims](http://www.military.com/daily-news/2015/03/17/papp-says-us-must-better-prepare-for-melting-arctic.html) to the oil and gas reserves that lie beneath the Arctic waters. Denmark, Norway, Canada, and Russia have already used UNCLOS to make legal claims to the [Arctic Ocean and seabed](http://www.newsweek.com/putins-arctic-ambitions-send-chill-through-neighbors-315089). By abstaining from the treaty, the U.S. lacks official standing in these important initiatives, which are being taken advantage of by other nations.

#### That is vital to investment as Fabio Coelho indicates in 2015 that:

Fábio Ulhoa Coelho, Spring 2015, “Legal certainty and Commercial Law: a comparative perspective”, IALS Student Law Review, Volume 2, Issue 2, pp. 3-7, <http://journals.sas.ac.uk/lawreview/article/download/2173/2102>, Date Accessed 9-20-18 // JM

Global entrepreneurs interested in expanding their businesses do not make only economic calculations. They make legal calculations, as well, based on the laws in force in each jurisdiction. They pay attention to the manner in which the law has been applied by the courts. The legal certainty degree frames the kind of global investment to be attracted. Countries with a high legal uncertainty degree tend to hold back more conservative entrepreneurs and attract the boldest ones. We know a basic equation of investments, adopted millenniums ago: the higher the risk, the higher the return must be. This is a derivation of the law of supply and demand. The number of persons interested in investing in less risky businesses is higher than that of persons interested in investing in more uncertain businesses. In the first case (lower-risk businesses), many investors dispute few alternatives, and the return will be necessarily tiny. In the second case (higher-risk businesses), fewer investors dispute the alternatives, assuring a perspective of a higher return. In countries with a lower legal certainty degree, the risk is higher. As a consequence, bold investors, which seek significant gains, feel more attracted to invest in these jurisdictions. Any entrepreneur wishing to invest in a low legal certainty degree jurisdiction will be required to behave as bold investors, however conservative such entrepreneur’s profile may be in other jurisdictions. The entrepreneur will not be satisfied with tiny returns and will seek more substantial gains for its investment. The consequence will be higher prices for low-quality products or services. After all, all capitalists, even those with a conservative profile, when they invest in countries with a low legal certainty degree, are forced to adopt the logics of the “search for higher returns”. Moreover, because legal uncertainty increases the risk of the investment, there will be fewer agents interested in investing. In other words, there will be less competition. The country with a low legal certainty degree tends to have a uncompetitive economy. And, in uncompetitive economies, prices tend to be higher. The “search for higher returns” and the low competitiveness jeopardize the consumers of the country with a low legal certainty. Entrepreneurs defend themselves, either by transferring their investments to other countries or adjusting themselves to the economic environment of low predictability of judicial decisions. Consumers have no defence. In a globalised economy, entrepreneurs have the whole world to make investments. Countries compete for investments. Legal certainty is one of the most important tools in [driving] this competition. Therefore, countries interested in improving their position in the global economy must be concerned with strategies to increase their legal certainty. These strategies will be even more efficient if they are consistent with the correct diagnosis of the legal certainty matter. This diagnosis requires the previous definition of its most important aspect. Ideology is this most important aspect. When we discuss legal certainty, “ideology matters”.

#### And investment determines profitability. Daniel Spiro indicates in 2017 that as:

Justin Leroux & Daniel Spiro, August 2017, “Leading the Unwilling: Unilateral Strategies to Prevent Arctic Oil Exploration”, CESifo Working Paper No. 6629, , https://www.cesifo-group.de/DocDL/cesifo1\_wp6629.pdf, Date Accessed 8-28-2018 // JM

Extraction of oil in the Arctic requires tailored technologies due to the harsh weather and sea conditions (Wilson Center, 2014). These technologies do not exist today and developing them sufficiently to ensure that extraction costs are lower than the oil price requires large investments (Moe and Vigeland, 2015; Lindholdt and Glomsrud, 2011; Harsem et al., 2011). Thus, as for the development of any technology, market size is important in the Arctic. 2 More buyers of Arctic technologies implies that extraction per barrel will be cheaper (e.g., McDonald and Schrattenholzer, 2001) and the oil industry has expressed that bigger volumes of Arctic extraction will make extraction profitable under a lower oil price (see, e.g., Aftenposten, 2015). What makes this interesting from a perspective of unilateral action is the fact that there is a limited number of countries than can extract in the Arctic. Russia, the U.S., Canada, Greenland and Norway each have jurisdiction over a certain area (see Figure 1).3 Hence, if any one of these countries chooses to stay out of the Arctic, it will imply a smaller market for Arctic exploration and drilling technologies, and higher costs of extraction for the remaining four. These higher costs may then imply that another one of the countries prefers to stay out, thus increasing the costs for the remaining three. 4 This way, there is potential for a chain reaction whereby all countries end up staying out. This is particularly true under conditions – which preside today and are expected to remain for the next decade or two – where the oil price is low.5

#### In fact, McDonald quantifies that:

Justin Leroux & Daniel Spiro quoting McDonald and Schrattenholzer, August 2017, “Leading the Unwilling: Unilateral Strategies to Prevent Arctic Oil Exploration”, CESifo Working Paper No. 6629, , https://www.cesifo-group.de/DocDL/cesifo1\_wp6629.pdf, Date Accessed 9-17-2018 // JM

McDonald and Schrattenholzer (2001) estimate the learning spillovers in terms of reducing production costs in the energy sector. For North-Sea oil (the closest equivalent to Arctic off-shore oil) a doubling of the number of rigs lowers the average cost per rig by 25%. That is, for a current cost of production 𝑘0, average production costs will be 𝑘(𝑠) = 𝑘00.75𝑠 where 𝑠 = ln(𝑚) /ln(2) and m is the number of multiplications of current market size.

#### Unfortunately, Cathleen Kelly explains in 2014 the consequences. She argues that:

Cathleen Kelly, 3-19-2014, "Why a Melting Arctic Could Sink the Global Economy," Center for American Progress, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/reports/2014/03/19/85967/why-a-melting-arctic-could-sink-the-global-economy/, Date Accessed 8-30-2018 // JM

As Arctic sea ice vanishes, companies and countries are scurrying to set in motion plans to exploit natural resources in the region, including through oil and gas development, commercial fishing, and trade via new shipping routes. Of the Arctic’s emerging industrial uses, oil and gas development is the most troubling. The rush to push fossil-fuel production offshore—despite a worrying dearth of oil spill cleanup knowledge, infrastructure, and response capacity in this harsh and remote area—may spell disaster for the region’s sensitive environment and the indigenous communities and others who depend on it for their livelihoods. Widespread fossil-fuel extraction in the Arctic and elsewhere will also exacerbate disruptive climate changes already underway in the region and globally—which have contribut[ing]ed to an increase in destructive storms, flooding, and heat waves—adding fuel to the fire of an already warming planet. Arctic warming is caused by carbon pollution from fossil-fuel-burning power plants, cars, and other sources all over the world. And super pollutants, or short-lived climate forcers—such as black carbon and methane—are driving up Arctic and global temperatures and eroding public health and agricultural productivity. Black carbon from inefficient diesel cars and trucks, shipping, wood-fired stoves, burning agricultural waste, and forest fires is a dangerous air pollutant that coats Arctic snow like a heat-absorbing quilt, accelerating local warming and snow and ice melt. Methane from oil and gas production, agriculture, and landfills is also a major driver of Arctic and global warming.

#### That’s a problem since Harry Cockburn indicated in 2017 that:

Harry Cockburn, 9-19-2017, "Global warming may be occurring more slowly than previously thought," Independent, https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change-global-warming-paris-climate-agreement-nature-geoscience-myles-allen-michael-grubb-a7954496.html, Date Accessed 9-22-2018 // JM

Computer modelling used a decade ago to predict how quickly global average temperatures would rise may have forecast too much warming, a study has found. The Earth warmed more slowly than the models forecast, meaning the planet has a slightly better chance of meeting the goals set out in the Paris climate agreement, including limiting global warming to 1.5C above pre-industrial levels. Scientists said previous models may have been “on the hot side”. The study, published this week in the journal [Nature Geoscience](http://go.redirectingat.com/?id=44681X1458326&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.nature.com%2Fngeo%2Fjournal%2Fvaop%2Fncurrent%2Ffull%2Fngeo3031.html&sref=http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change-global-warming-paris-climate-agreement-nature-geoscience-myles-allen-michael-grubb-a7954496.html), does not play down the threat which climate change has to the environment, and maintains that major reductions in emissions must be attained. But the findings indicate the danger may not be as acute as was previously thought. Myles Allen, professor of geosystem science at the University of Oxford and one of the study’s authors told The Times: “We haven’t seen that rapid acceleration in warming after 2000 that we see in the models. We haven’t seen that in the observations.” The original forecasts were based on twelve separate computer models made by universities and government institutes around the world, and were put together ten years ago, “so it’s not that surprising that it’s starting to divert a little bit from observations”, Professor Allen added. According to [The Times](https://www.thetimes.co.uk/edition/news/we-were-wrong-worst-effects-of-climate-change-can-be-avoided-say-scientists-k9p5hg5l0), another of the paper’s authors, Michael Grubb, a professor of international energy and climate change at University College London, admitted his earlier forecasting models had overplayed how temperatures would rise. At the Paris climate summit in 2015, Professor Grubb said: “All the evidence from the past 15 years leads me to conclude that actually delivering 1.5C is simply incompatible with democracy.” But speaking to The Times he said: “When the facts change, I change my mind, as [John Maynard] Keynes said. It’s still likely to be very difficult to achieve these kind of changes quickly enough but we are in a better place than I thought.” Professor Grubb said the reassessment of the situation was good news for low-lying countries and island states in the Pacific, which would be swamped by sea-level rises if average temperatures rose by more than 1.5C. The previous scenario allowed for the planet to emit a total of 70 billion tonnes of Carbon after 2015, in order to keep temperature rises to just 1.5C above pre-industrial levels. But the reassessment allows for a “carbon budget” of another 240bn tonnes of emissions before catastrophic damage is done. “That’s about 20 years of emissions before temperatures are likely to cross 1.5C,” Professor Allen said. “It’s the difference between being not doable and being just doable.

#### Peter Wadhams quantifies in 2016 that:

Peter Wadhams, 9-26-2016, "The Global Impacts of Rapidly Disappearing Arctic Sea Ice," Yale E360, https://e360.yale.edu/features/as\_arctic\_ocean\_ice\_disappears\_global\_climate\_impacts\_intensify\_wadhams, Date Accessed 8-30-2018 // JM

By my calculations, the terrestrial warming in the Arctic is roughly equivalent to a 25 percent boost in global CO2 emissions. This, combined with the warming caused by the loss of Arctic sea ice, means that the overall ice/snow albedo effect in the Arctic could add[ing] as much as 50 percent to the direct global heating effect of CO2. Scientists can debate the potential magnitude of such increases. But there is no doubt that they will be significant — vividly illustrating how the Arctic can become a driver of, rather than just a responder to, global climate change.

#### That’s extremely problematic because John Moore indicated on Thursday that status quo:

European Geosciences Union citing research from Michael J. Wolovick and John C. Moore, 9-20-2018, "Glacial engineering could limit sea-level rise, if we get our emissions under control," https://www.egu.eu/news/430/glacial-engineering-could-limit-sea-level-rise-if-we-get-our-emissions-under-control/, Date Accessed 9-21-2018 // WS

Doing geoengineering means often considering the unthinkable,” says Moore, a scientist at Beijing Normal University, China, and a professor of climate change at the University of Lapland, Finland. The term ‘geoengineering’ is usually applied to large-scale interventions to combat climate change. But instead of trying to change the entire climate, Wolovick and Moore say we could apply a more targeted approach to limit one of the most drastic consequences of climate change: sea-level rise. Instead of, or in addition to, limiting the effects of rising seas through traditional coastal protection, using glaci[al]er geoengineering to [can] stop [sea-level rise] the flood at the source could be a viable option, as Wolovick and Moore show. “The most important result [of our study] is that a meaningful ice sheet intervention is broadly within the order of magnitude of plausible human achievements,” says Wolovick. A more sophisticated project, going beyond the scale humanity has attempted so far, would have higher chances of success in avoiding a runaway ice-sheet collapse within the next 1000 years (the time the simulations run for), as well as better odds of causing the ice sheet to regain mass. **A small underwater wall blocking about 50% of warm water from reaching the ice shelf base could have 70% chance of succeeding, while larger walls would be even more likely to delay or even stop ice-sheet collapse**. [however] Despite the encouraging results**, the scientists [needs more time] say they don’t advocate starting these ambitious projects any time soon.** While the simplest design would be similar in scale to existing engineering projects, it would be built in one of Earth’s harshest environments. So, the engineering details still need to be worked out. Nonetheless, the team wanted to see whether glacial geoengineering could work in theory, and wanted to get the scientific community to think about, and improve on, the designs. “We all understand that we have an urgent professional obligation to determine how much sea level rise society should expect, and how fast that sea level rise is likely to come. However, we would argue that there is also an obligation to try to come up with ways that society could protect itself against a rapid ice-sheet collapse,” says Wolovick**. Ice physics shows glacial geoengineering could work to hold off ice-sheet collapse**, but both Wolovick and Moore are adamant that reducing greenhouse-gas emissions remains a priority in the fight against climate change. “There are dishonest elements of society that will try to use our research to argue against the necessity of emissions’ reductions. Our research does not in any way support that interpretation,” they say. Engineering glaciers would only limit sea-level rise, while reducing emissions could also limit other harmful consequences of climate change, such as ocean acidification, floods, droughts and heat waves. In addition, the team points out that **[but with] more warming would mean glacial engineering [these] projects** would **become less feasible and would** have **lower chances of success**. After all, their underwater structures might protect the bottom of the ice shelves, but wouldn’t prevent warm air from eating away the ice at the top. “The more carbon we emit, the less likely it becomes that the ice sheets will survive in the long term at anything close to their present volume,” Wolovick concludes.

#### Two impacts. The first is economic destruction. Aristos Georgiou indicates that:

Aristos Georgiou, 7-3-2018, "Rising seas could the cost the global economy a staggering $14 trillion a Year by 2100," Newsweek, https://www.newsweek.com/rising-seas-could-cost-world-14-trillion-year-2100-1006823, Date Accessed 8-21-2018 // WS

For their study, the researchers examined different sea level rise projections and warming scenarios where the increase in temperatures was restricted to 1.5°C (2.7°F), 2°C (3.6°F) or not restricted at all. In these scenarios, 1.5°C of warming led to a sea level rise of 0.52 meters (1.7 ft) by 2100, 2°C resulted in a rise of 0.86 meters (2.8 ft), and unrestricted warming led to a 1.8m (5.9 ft) increase in sea levels. The scientists then used data from the [World Bank](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups), which groups nations into different income levels, to assess the impact of sea level rise on a global scale, as well as for individual countries. They found that in the worst-case scenario, global annual flood costs could increase to $14 trillion per year by 2100 if sea levels rise 0.86 meters. And this figure could jump to $27 trillion annually—which would be equivalent to 2.8 percent of global GDP by the end of the century—for a rise of 1.8 meters. Furthermore, the scientists found that higher income countries would suffer the least economic damage, thanks to their more developed flood defenses, while upper-middle income countries like China will incur the biggest costs. The researchers also suggest that sea level rises are likely to be more extreme in tropical areas. "These extreme sea levels will have a negative effect on the economies of developing coastal nations, and the habitability of low-lying coastlines," Jevrejeva said. "Small, low-lying island nations such as the Maldives will be very easily affected, and the pressures on their natural resources and environmental will become even greater.” "These results place further emphasis on putting even greater efforts into mitigating rising global temperatures,” she concluded.

#### Second, endless intrastate conflicts. Josh Gabbatiss contextualizes in 2018 that:

Josh Gabbatiss, Science Correspondent, 3-19-2018, "Climate change could force more than 140 million people from their homes by 2050," Independent, https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change-force-140-million-people-from-homes-2050-developing-countries-global-warming-report-a8263741.html, Date Accessed 9-21-2018 // JM

Experts warn of 'looming human crisis' as millions are driven to migrate within national borders due to water scarcity, sea-level rise and storm surges. Analysis of likely outcomes suggests a “looming human crisis” as the inhabitants of at-risk countries move within their national borders to safer areas. These people will be driven by growing problems like water scarcity, crop failure, sea-level rise and storm surges, all of which are linked with the changing climate. The report is the first of its kind to combine socioeconomic data with climate impact analysis to predict likely shifts in populations within countries as a result of climate change. According to the researchers’ analysis, a “worst-case scenario” could see[s] over 143 million people moving within their country's borders by 2050 as the effects of climate change make their homes uninhabitable. As the analysis only explored three developing regions – sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia and Latin America – the worldwide numbers could be far larger. Awareness of “climate refugees” has been growing steadily in recent years, and the scientists behind the new report noted that cross-border migration in particular has been “capturing media attention”. Barack Obama has warned that climate change could creat[ing]e a refugee crisis that is “unprecedented in human history”, and one study predicted global warming could cause asylum applications in Europe to nearly triple. However, [through] internal migration as a result of climate change has received less coverage, despite its potential for severe social and economic disruption. “Internal migration – that is people moving within their borders – is probably three times the level or international migration,” said John Roome, senior director for climate change at the World Bank. World Bank chief executive officer Kristalina Georgieva said the research provides a wake-up call to countries and development institutions. “We have a small window now, before the effects of climate change deepen, to prepare the ground for this new reality,” she said. “Steps cities take to cope with the upward trend of arrivals from rural areas and to improve opportunities for education, training and jobs will pay long-term dividends. “It’s also important to help people make good decisions about whether to stay where they are or move to new locations where they are less vulnerable.” The authors of the report looked at three potential climate change and development paths, ranging from “pessimistic” to “climate friendly”. They noted that certain “hotspots” are likely to experience drastic out and in-migration. As water availability declines in the northern highlands of Ethiopia, for example, people are likely to rapidly evacuate its agricultural regions. Meanwhile, population hubs like Mexico City and Nairobi will see significant influxes of people fleeing regions hit hard by climate change. “Without the right planning and support, people migrating from rural areas into cities could be facing new and even more dangerous risks,” said the report’s team lead Dr Kanta Kumari Rigaud. “We could see increased tensions and conflict as a result of pressure on scarce resources.”

#### This is deadly as Dan Andre concludes in 2017 that:

Dan Andre, 6-6-2017, "Internal Migration and Conflict – D. M. Andre – Medium," Medium, https://medium.com/@Goodsvejk/internal-migration-and-group-conflict-422c1f214dfe, Date Accessed 9-21-2018 // WS

While there has been much discussion surrounding international migration over the past few years, there has been less discussion on a related topic — internal migration. In particular, the relationship between internal migration and group conflict. Internal migration refers to people moving from one region to another, while remaining within their state borders. Group conflict can occur between numerous different types of groups — ethnic, religious, class, but is always underscored by an us against them mentality. Therefore, when internal migration introduces new groups into a region; it has the potential to cause conflict. Conversely, group conflict may cause internal migration as people flee a region to avoid conflict. This correlation between internal migration and group conflict does not imply causation. It does not follow that where there is internal migration, there will be group conflict; nor does group conflict necessarily precede migration. Regardless of which comes first, the relationship between the two makes conflict resolution difficult, because it exacerbates and confuses the underlying issues of a conflict, making it exceedingly difficult to resolve. Unlike immigrants or refugees, internal migrants have not crossed borders, or changed citizenry; they have a right to live in their country. This does not preclude the existence of primordial resentment, though, as ethnic enclaves are often present in multinational countries and ethno nationalist politics may be present.[[1]](https://medium.com/%40Goodsvejk/internal-migration-and-group-conflict-422c1f214dfe#_ftn1) Where strong local identities prevail, internal migrants can be akin to foreigners in their own country, as is the case of the Madhesis in Nepal who, while admitting that some internal migration occurred, “take offence to being called outsiders and see themselves as people who have always lived in the region.”[[2]](https://medium.com/%40Goodsvejk/internal-migration-and-group-conflict-422c1f214dfe#_ftn2) However, since internal migration is usually the result of economic issues, war, or natural disaster, the migrants are motivated by what they feel is an existential threat. Although sometimes, internal migration can be the product of a government agenda, as was the case in Indonesia in twentieth century when populations were moved from the main islands of Java and Bali to the outer islands under the presumption of development.[[3]](https://medium.com/%40Goodsvejk/internal-migration-and-group-conflict-422c1f214dfe#_ftn3)Increasing the difficulty of integration is the likelihood that many internal migrants often keep ties with their original communities, meaning that they may not fully integrate within the community, even if welcomed. In addition to the primordial implications of internal migration, there are constructivist challenges as well. When groups feel they are not being properly cared for or represented by the state’s institutions it may result in conflict. Writing about the Karen in western Thailand, Mikael Gravers details the impact that internal migration had on the moral, social, and culture fabric of a culture. After internal migration intermingled the Thai and Karen, the Thai culture dominated. After a number of years, “schools came to the area, and a new Thai-speaking generation [of Karen] with a modernist view of the world came to see the flaws in their ancestors’ worldview and in their intimate cultural core, which many Thai consider primitive.” In this case, the institutions of the state did not properly represent the Karen culture after internal migration brought them into schools with the dominant Thai culture. In addition to under representing cultures, the limited resources within a state can also lead to group conflict, the study of which was presented by Marie Besancon. If internal migration causes stress on the local institutions, or challenges their methods, it may lead to conflict. Lastly, Unrestricted migration, has the potential to turn ethnic populations into minorities in their own land, this phenomenon often results in inter-communal violence. This is illustrated by the insurgency in the Tripura state of Northeast India that started as a reaction to the unrestricted migration of Hindu Bengali population from East Bengal to the state of Tripura. While the reasons for internal migration vary, it seems apparent that the introduction of new people into a region, when coupled with religious and political differences or limited resources, can cause resentment and conflict. Since internal migration causes and is caused by group conflict, it has significant implication for the resolution of the conflict. Uyghurs in the Xinjiang province provide a good study for how the relationship between internal migration and group conflict impedes conflict resolution. The migration of Han Chinese into the autonomous province, which the Uyghurs see as an existential threat, has only exacerbated the conflict between Uyghurs and the government in Beijing.[[7]](https://medium.com/%40Goodsvejk/internal-migration-and-group-conflict-422c1f214dfe#_ftn7) However, not everyone believes that primordial feelings represent an impediment to conflict resolution. As Donald L. Horowitz writes, “The persistence of group identity, no matter how deeply felt, is not synonymous with antipathy, even well established antipathy, toward particular out groups.”[[8]](https://medium.com/%40Goodsvejk/internal-migration-and-group-conflict-422c1f214dfe#_ftn8) Using examples of European and Chinese immigration, Horowitz shows that conflicts fade over time through mechanisms of social and political integration, which suggests that the primordial challenge to internal migration appears to be temporal. This points to the idea that internal migration does not prevent group conflict resolution. Another result of internal migration that certainly has a negative effect on the prevention or resolution of conflict, is when the internal migration leads to segregation. In Myanmar, after violence caused internal migration, the Rakhine Buddhist and Rohingya communities were essentially segregated, even including separate displacement camps.[[9]](https://medium.com/%40Goodsvejk/internal-migration-and-group-conflict-422c1f214dfe#_ftn9)This separation limits interaction, thereby decreasing the likelihood that either side will enter into agreements to end the conflict. In this case, separation prevents the fading of group resentments because the group’s position hardens through physical separation. The correlation between internal migration and group conflict has a negative impact on conflict prevention and resolution. With new groups, comes new social, cultural, and political dynamics that challenge people’s idea of the state and stresses institutions and resources, which can lead to conflict. When conflict does arise, often times a group’s attitude hardens as they feel an existential threat to their culture. In other cases, groups maintain ties to other regions within the state, which causes mixed loyalties or external pressures, only serving to confuse the underlying issues that caused the conflict. Therefore, internal migration — sometimes a result of group conflict, other time the cause of group conflict — presents a significant impediment to conflict prevention or resolution. This suggests that international migration — despite its difficulties — may provide more sustainable solutions than internal migration. And if the desired end state is conflict prevention versus mere conflict containment this needs to be given serious consideration.

#### Luckily, Gabbatiss concludes:

Josh Gabbatiss, Science Correspondent, 3-19-2018, "Climate change could force more than 140 million people from their homes by 2050," Independent, https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change-force-140-million-people-from-homes-2050-developing-countries-global-warming-report-a8263741.html, Date Accessed 9-21-2018 // JM

 However, the team behind the research also said the situation is far from hopeless, and there is much that can be done to curtail climate migration and the problems associated with it. “This is the worst case scenario – although there will be some climate migration under any scenario, this does not have to be a crisis,” said Mr Roome “If we can take action now that is significant with respect to both climate change and development planning, this number of 140 million people could be reduced by as much as 80 per cent.” Key actions recommended by the report include cutting greenhouse gas emissions, transforming development planning to account for the reality of climate migration and investing in more analysis to understand migration trends on individual country levels. The report comes ahead of the Global Compact on Migration, which is currently being negotiated in the United Nations (UN) and has the potential to provide protection for climate refugees under international law.