

FORCED MIGRATION OF ALASKAN INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES DUE TO CLIMATE CHANGE: CREATING A HUMAN RIGHTS RESPONSE

By: Robin Bronen
University of Alaska
Resilience and Adaptation Program

ABSTRACT

Forced migration due to climate change will present one of the most severe challenges to the resilience of communities forced to migrate as well as to local and national governments. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has identified the regions of the world most vulnerable to climate change and predicts that 150 million people will be displaced by 2050. Alaska is projected to experience increased climatic change more rapidly. Temperature increases since 1974 confirm this projection. Several communities in Alaska are faced with permanent relocation due to climate change. Erosion, flooding, and sea level rise are the primary causes of displacement. This paper describes the experience of Alaskan indigenous communities and outlines a legal and institutional framework, based in human rights doctrine, to respond to climate-induced human migration.

Key words: Climate Migration Indigenous Alaska Governance

1. DEFINING THE DISPLACEMENT CATEGORY OF CLIMATE-INDUCED MIGRATION

In Alaska, climate change is evident. Temperatures have increased 2 to 3.5 degrees Celsius since 1974, arctic sea ice is decreasing in extent and thickness, wildfires are increasing in size and extent and permafrost is thawing. (IPCC, 2007:339); (Borenstein, 2008). These ecological phenomena are creating a humanitarian crisis for the indigenous communities that have inhabited the arctic and boreal forest for millennia.

Four Alaskan indigenous communities must relocate immediately and dozens of others are at risk. There is currently no organized institutional system in place, and

government agencies are struggling to meet the enormous new needs of these communities.

In order to create an appropriate humanitarian response, the first step is to define the displacement category of climate-induced migration and profile the population groups that must move. After creating a definition, a legal and institutional framework can be constructed to relocate communities.

The disparate drivers of climate-induced migration can be segregated into three distinct categories: random extreme weather events, such as hurricanes and tornadoes, the depletion of ecosystem services, such as drought and salt water intrusion, and on-going ecological changes caused by the combination of random extreme weather events and depletion of ecosystem services that severely impact public infrastructure, such as health clinics and schools, as well as the livelihoods and lives of the people residing in the community.

These climate change drivers cause three distinct patterns of human migration: the migration of individuals and households where climate change is one of several factors causing migration, mass migration where entire communities are forced to temporarily evacuate and mass migration where entire communities are forced to *permanently* relocate. Each migration pattern requires a unique institutional adaptation strategy to ensure that the humanitarian response is appropriate and that people's human rights are protected.

“Climigration” is the word that best describes forced permanent migration of communities due to climate change. Climigration results from on-going climate-induced ecological changes in a community's environment that severely impact infrastructure, such as health clinics and schools, as well as the livelihoods and well-being of the people residing in the community. Climigration occurs when a community is no longer sustainable for ecological reasons. Climigration differs from migration caused by catastrophic random environmental events, such as hurricanes, where disaster relief and the temporary relocation of individuals and communities is the humanitarian response. Climigration means there is no ability to return home because home is under water or sinking in thawing permafrost.

Failure to recognize the signals of permanent socio-ecological changes will critically

impede a community's capacity to adapt and can lead to social and economic collapse. Government agencies will also be hampered if they are unable to identify the early socio-ecological warning signals requiring a community to relocate. Funding will be one of the key factors which will facilitate the relocation process. The sooner a community and governmental agencies recognize that relocation must occur, the sooner funding can be diverted from disaster relief to the relocation effort. New funding can also be allocated to the relocation effort. Determining which communities are most likely to encounter displacement will require a complex assessment of a community's ecosystem vulnerability to climate change, as well as the vulnerability of its social, economic and political structures. In addition, communities forced to relocate must participate in the relocation process, including the decision to relocate.

Early indicators of socio-ecological vulnerability demonstrating that relocation is required may include: 1) repetitive loss of community infrastructure; 2) imminent danger to the community from the on-going ecological changes and repeated random extreme weather events; 3) no ability for community expansion; 4) number of evacuation incidents; 5) number of people evacuated; 6) predicted rates of environmental change (e.g., sea level rise) from IPCC; 7) repeated failure of hazard mitigation measures; 8) viability of access to transportation, potable water, communication systems, power and waste disposal; and 10) decline in socio-economic indicators, including food security, loss of livelihood, and public health.

1.1 Should the UN Convention Relating To the Status of Refugees be Expanded To Include Climate-Induced Migration

Twenty-three years ago, scholars began to advocate that the issue of environmental-caused displacement be incorporated into the international human rights framework of refugee protection and humanitarian assistance. Working for the United Nations Environment Programme, Essam El-Hinnawi coined the term "environmental refugee" in 1985 (El-Hinnawi 1985). He identified three categories of environmentally-displaced

peoples: 1) those temporarily displaced due to natural hazards; 2) those permanently displaced because of a marked environmental disruption (natural and/or triggered by people); and 3) those who migrate permanently or temporarily because of ecological changes in their environment and can not afford to mitigate the changes (El-Hinnawi 1985).

The word “refugee” has enormous power in the English lexicon and traditionally has referred to a narrow category of people who need refuge because of horrific violence perpetrated against them. As Stephen Castles states: “Definitions reflect and reproduce power . . . it makes a big difference whether people are perceived as *refugees*, other types of *forced migrants* or *voluntary migrants*” (Castles 2002). The reason this distinction is so critical is because of the policy of sovereign nations to admit very few migrants. Those who are accorded refugee status receive not only the benefit of admission but access to services and resources that are unavailable to all other categories of migrants. In a time when sovereigns are hesitant to open their doors to any migrant, Castle correctly notes that expansion of the refugee definition to include “environmental” refugees may have the affect of making it more difficult for refugees fleeing violence to reach safety and sanctuary outside their country of origin (Castles 2002).

Scholars using the term “environmental refugee” want to expand the traditional definition of “refugee” to include individuals fleeing environmental degradation so that they can have access to the same international structure of humanitarian assistance and protection (Myers 1995). The term “environmental refugee”, however, has met with much controversy. Although there are similarities between the two groups of migrants, the most obvious being the forced nature of their flight and then their need for material assistance and permission to live elsewhere, there are also important differences.

Incorporating climigration into the refugee definition is not appropriate. Refugee law is based on the fundamental principle that a person needs legal protection because they are outside of their country of origin due to persecution by a government actor or an actor the government cannot control. Implicit in this definition is the understanding that the nation-state has failed in its responsibilities towards its citizens. Refugees cannot turn to their own governments for protection because nation-states are often the source of their persecution. Refugees need international intervention to ensure there is safe refuge.

In contrast, in the situation of climate change migration, the majority of climigrants will migrate *within* their country of origin. Communities may still be able to rely on national protection to respond to the humanitarian crisis. Most significantly, persecution is not a contributing factor in forced migration due to climate change. In conflict-based refugee

migration, international diplomacy plays a critical role in creating durable solutions to resolve the humanitarian crisis.

In comparison, scientists will play the critical role in responding to climate-induced migration. Clearly a spectrum of environmental events causes people to leave their communities. In some situations it is impossible to identify the specific cause of the flight. By analyzing socio-ecological data, scientists will assist communities and governments to determine a durable solution and the appropriate adaptation strategy. The spectrum of solutions may range from mitigation measures, such as erosion control, to relocation. For these reasons, the term “refugee” defined by the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees should *not* be expanded. Climigration requires a completely new Protocol to define this displacement category and establish human rights principles to frame the humanitarian response.

In addition, forced migration due to climate change must have a unique framework of response that is distinct from other environmental catastrophes that cause people to migrate. Narrowly defining the circumstances of climigration will enable national, regional and local governments and international organizations to respond and ensure communities’ resilience.

2. ALASKA

In Alaska, climigration is happening. Shishmaref, Kivalina, Shaktoolik and Newtok are faced with the most critical situation because of their geographic location on the west coast of Alaska. These coastal communities must relocate because climate-induced disappearance of sea ice and sea-level rise create stronger storm surges that are eroding the land on which they are situated, thereby precluding a sustainable future of each community in its present location. Newtok is a Yupik Eskimo village located on the Ninglick River

beside the Bering Sea. (ASCG, 2004). Shishmaref and Kivalina are Inupiat Eskimo villages and located further north on the Chukchi Sea. (Weyiouanna, 2007); (Swan, 2007a). Shaktoolik is a Malemiut Eskimo village located on Norton Sound. These villages have active subsistence lifestyles and have existed on the coast of Alaska for thousands of years. (US Corps of Engineers, 2006). Environmental studies conducted by the US Corps of Engineers and engineering firms hired by Newtok, Kivalina and Shishmaref indicate that a catastrophic climatic event could submerge all communities within the next 15 years. (US Corps of Engineers, 2006; Tetra Tech 2004; Tryck, Nyman Hayes 2006; DOWL 2004; ASCG 2004). There is no higher or more distant ground to which these villages can move to avoid the encroaching erosion. Their only alternative is migration. Despite the consensus that these communities must relocate, no government funding has been specifically allocated to begin this process.

Each community is involved in an ad hoc process with state and federal government agencies that are struggling to provide protection to the communities while they figure out a relocation process. Climate change is challenging the disaster relief framework of response. Government agencies have responded to increased coastal erosion through their traditional methods of erosion control and flooding prevention. However, due to the severity of the erosion, these adaptation strategies have proved ineffective to protect the communities from a rapidly deteriorating environmental habitat. In Kivalina, the Army Corps of Engineers built a new seawall to protect the community in 2006. The day after the dedication

ceremony, a storm ruined a critical component of the seawall leaving the community vulnerable and exposed (deMarban, 2006). In 2007, the community was forced to evacuate when a fall storm that threatened the lives of community members (Bragg, 2007).

Temporary evacuation of the villages, rebuilding public infrastructure and erosion control structures, and returning the population to original locations is no longer protecting the communities. Permanent relocation is the only durable solution.

Newtok is the most advanced in its relocation efforts. The community has identified a relocation site and has acquired the land through an act of Congress. A state agency planner has also been dedicated to coordinating the efforts of approximately 25 different government agencies to facilitate relocation. However, these agencies have no mandate or dedicated funding for relocation assistance (Cox, 2007). Complex regulations that guide the work of each agency also present tremendous roadblocks to moving forward with the relocation effort. The regulations of several agencies require that an existing community with a minimum population be at the site before infrastructure is built. The agencies responsible for erosion control and flood prevention have no regulatory guidance to relocate the communities.

In addition, there is no lead agency designated to create a relocation strategy and coordinate the various agencies working on housing, transportation, community infrastructure, education, health and related socio-economic needs (Cox, 2007). The indigenous tribes are also hampered because of limited administrative and

technical staff to work with multiple state and federal agencies on relocation activities. The Governor of Alaska created a Sub-Cabinet on Climate Change in 2007. A sub-committee of the Sub-Cabinet, the Immediate Action Work Group, has been meeting since November 2007 to develop an action plan to provide protection to endangered communities. Their work, however, has been challenging because relocation is the only durable solution, and no government agency has the authority or experience to relocate communities.

3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF CLIMIGRATION

The humanitarian crisis in Alaska clearly demonstrates the need to create clear guidelines so that governments can protect and assist the communities forced to migrate due to climate change. Alaska is the logical place to develop climigration principles that can serve as a model for other regions because of the rapid pace of climate change, the inevitability of permanent displacement in many cases, and the large number of communities where this issue must be addressed in the coming years.

Guiding Principles on Climigration, based in human rights doctrine, need to be developed. Refugee law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the recently adopted Universal Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples provide a theoretical basis for creating these principles. However, none of these legal documents address the complex and unique social, economic and political crises of populations facing climigration.

Guiding Principles of Climigration will ensure that the social, economic and

cultural human rights of individuals and the communities forced to migrate are protected during displacement as well as during resettlement. (United Nations: 1976). Forced migration creates significant stress and adverse impacts on the health and well-being of those forced to leave their communities. (World Bank: 2004). These adverse consequences can be minimized only if the affected community is a key leader in the relocation process and culturally and linguistically appropriate mechanisms for participation and consultation are fundamental components of the relocation process.

The Guiding Principles will also affirm that families and tribes remain together during the relocation process. For indigenous communities, tribal relationships are essential to cultural identity. (United Nations: 2007). The relocation process must ensure that socio-cultural institutions remain intact. (World Bank: 2004). The Guiding Principles must also ensure that subsistence rights and the customary communal rights to resources are protected and that the relocation process is framed with an intent to improve income strategies. (United Nations: 2007).

The Guiding Principles will also affirm the human rights principles regarding access to safe and sanitary housing, potable water, education and other basic amenities. (United Nations: 1976). The living standards of the affected communities must not be diminished in the relocation process and must implement sustainable development opportunities as part of the relocation process. (World Bank: 2004). In this way, the relocation process will enhance the resilience of communities by addressing socio-

economic issues that are currently contributing to the vulnerability of communities.

Creating an international institutional framework of response to migration caused by climate change is the next essential step that needs to be taken by the international community. Debates about the number of people forced to migrate delays the creation of institutional response mechanisms and ensures that a global humanitarian crisis will occur. The institutional response requires the identification of continua of conditions that cause communities to migrate for environmental reasons.

The first continuum will identify the environmental causes of flight. Climigration will be at one end of the continuum when no other environmental issue, such as overuse of natural resources by humans, is causing the community to relocate. At the other end of the environmental displacement continuum, factors such as overuse of resources will be included. This continuum will define the variety of environmental factors that can force communities to migrate. Accurately defining the cause of the environmental displacement is critical in order to ensure that the institutional response is appropriate.

The second continuum will define the institutional response and will incorporate factors, such as the temporal nature of the displacement and the site of the relocation, i.e., whether international, state and local borders are crossed that impact the ability of the community to resettle in a particular location. The institutional framework created will mirror the environmental displacement continuum to ensure that the humanitarian response is appropriate. For example, the agencies that have traditionally provided “disaster relief”

and erosion control will continue to engage in these activities until it is determined that relocation must occur to protect the life and well-being of the community. At this point, the community, along with tribal, state and federal governments, will shift their focus to create a relocation process.

4. CONCLUSION

Climate change is forcing communities to permanently relocate. There is no ability to return home. For these reasons, guiding principles and an institutional framework, based in human rights doctrine, need to be created to address the specific circumstance of climigration and ensure the resilience of communities forced to migrate. The experience of Alaskan indigenous communities is guiding the creation of these principles and the institutional response.

References:

- ASCG Incorporated. (2004): *Newtok Background for Relocation Report*. Publisher: ASCG Incorporated Alaska.
- Black, R. (2001): *Environmental Refugees: myth or reality*.
- Castles, S. (2002): *Environmental change and forced migration: making sense of the debate*. UNHCR Working Paper 70.
- Conisbee, M. and Simmons, A. (2003): *Environmental Refugees: The Case For Recognition* (nef Pocketbook).
- Cox, S. (2007): *An Overview of Erosion, Flooding, and Relocation Efforts in the Native Village of Newtok*. Alaska Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development, Alaska.
- deMarban, A. (2006): New wall takes sea's first test. In: *Anchorage Daily News*. 15 Sept. B1.
- DOWL Engineers (2004): *Kivalina*. DOWL Engineers. Alaska.
- El-Hinnawi, E. (1985): *Environmental Refugee*. United Nations Environmental Program.
- Hassol, S. (2004): *Impacts of a Warming Arctic: Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- International Organization for Migration (2007): Migration and the Environment, Ninety-Fourth Session, Discussion Note. International Organization for Migration, Geneva.
- IPCC 2007: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Scientific Basis. Contributions of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)] Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York,

NY, USA.

Lee, S. (2001): *Environment Matters: Conflicts, Refugees & International Relations*, World Human Development Institute.

Martin S., Fagen, P., Jorgensen, K., Mann-Bondat, L., Schoenholtz, A., (2005): *The Uprooted: Improving Humanitarian Responses to Forced Migration*. Lexington Books, Maryland.

Myers, N. with Kent, J., *Environmental Exodus: An Emergent Crisis in the Global Arena*. Climate Institute 1995.

OCHA (1999): *The Guiding Principles of Internal Displacement*. OCHA: New York.

OCHA (1999): *OCHA Orientation Handbook on Complex Emergencies*. OCHA: New York.

Shulski, M; Wendler G. (2007): *The Climate of Alaska*. University of Alaska Press, Fairbanks.

Swan, C. (2007): A presentation by the Native Village of Kivalina and the City of Kivalina to the Alaska Climate Impact Assessment Commission. Alaska. June 28.

Swan, C. (2007): A presentation to the Subcommittee on Disaster Recovery HSGAC. Alaska. October 11.

TetraTech, Inc. (2004): *Shishmaref Partnership Shishmaref Relocation and Collocation Study*. TetraTech, Inc. Alaska.

Tryck, Nyman Hayes, (2006): *Kivalina, Alaska: Relocation Planning Project Master Plan*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District.

United Nations (1951): *UN Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*. United Nations General Assembly, New York.

United Nations (1948): *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. United Nations General Assembly, New York.

United Nations (2007): *Universal Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. United Nations General Assembly, New York.

United Nations (1976): *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. United Nations General Assembly, New York.

US Army Corps of Engineers (2006): *Alaska Village Erosion Technical Assistance Program*. US Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska.

United States General Accounting Office (2003): *ALASKA NATIVE VILLAGES: Most Are Affected By Flooding and Erosion, but Few Qualify For Federal Assistance*. General Accounting Office, Washington D.C.

Weyiouanna Sr., T. (2007): *Shishmaref Erosion and Relocation Coalition Concerns*. In: *Immediate Action Workgroup Hearing*. Fairbanks, Alaska, November 6.

World Bank (2004): *Involuntary Resettlement Sourcebook: Planning and Implementation in Development Projects*. World Bank, Washington, D.C.

PAGE

PAGE 2

