6. Injustice versus insecurity
Climate-induced displacement in the Fijian and New Zealand public discourses

Abstract: Debate surrounding climate-induced displacement has attracted considerable critical attention in recent years. This debate has engendered diverse perspectives including the North-South divide, solidarity with affected people and climate justice. In this study, the authors consider how various policy advocates have attempted to influence public discourses about climate displacement in Oceania. Using Ulrich Beck’s concept of risk, we analyse discourse in policy documents and in Fijian and New Zealand newspaper articles. Our investigation found that climate action related to addressing the adaptation and insecurity of the affected people were prominent in the Fijian discourse. However, in the New Zealand discourse, action addressing climate displacement was less prevalent, but the displacement as a threat to the country’s national security was prominent. In this article, the authors analyse potential reasons underpinning these patterns of discourses.
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Introduction

RECENT RULINGS in Kiribati resident Ioane Teitiota’s climate migration case found in favour of the basic human right to life and protection from the threat of climate change. Despite the fact that New Zealand rejected Teitiota’s application for refugee status in 2015, the country’s Court of Appeal recognised the fundamental right of affected people to migrate to another country. A more recent ruling by the United Nations Human Rights Commission on this subject stated that ‘countries may not deport individuals who face climate change-induced conditions that violate the[ir] right to life’ (UNHRC, 2020). Teitiota’s New Zealand claim—and his appeal to the UNHRC—drew public attention to the plight of Pacific nations already affected by climate-induced displacement (Kimura, 2018). Some critics warned that climate displacement...
is not just a one-off phenomenon. Rather, it is an ‘unfolding crisis’ complicated by scarce land availability, river erosion, storm surge and the intrusion of salt water into fresh water (Castles, 2003; McAdam, 2015). Regions with lengthy coastlines have already been exposed to climate-induced risks including sea level rise, ocean acidification, drought and floods. Delegates attending the UN Conference of Parties (COPs) and officials of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) have brought the issue of climate displacement to the forefront of climate policy debate. The UN Conference of Parties in Madrid in December, 2019 (COP25) emphasised the link between oceans and climate change (Pierre-Nathoniel, 2019).

In the context of the potentially devastating consequences of climate change and emerging international policy initiatives, we explore how policy advocates, including politicians, journalists, experts, activists and NGO officials have attempted to influence public discourse about climate displacement. Recognising that the mainstream media act as a primary conduit for the processes of policy formulation (Voltmer & Koch-Baumgarten, 2010), we have examined selected Fijian and New Zealand newspaper articles and policy documents to see how various advocates engaged in public debates surrounding climate displacement. These countries, which represent the Global South and North, have played critical roles in tackling displacement. In 2018, both countries endorsed the Global Compact for Migration, an initiative that facilitated the formulation of an international migration policy with links to climate change. Due to its vulnerability to a range of rapidly-approaching climate factors, such as salinity, tropical cyclones and the erosion of shorelines (Hermann & Kempf, 2017; World Bank, 2013), Fiji is at the forefront of climate displacement discussion. The small island nation is remarkable for some recently-introduced policy initiatives, such as the Suva Expert Dialogue on Loss and Damage in COP23. New Zealand is also engaged in climate displacement debate, particularly subsequent to its rejection of Ioane Teitiota’s refugee claim.

**Climate-induced Displacement: Global North and South**

Climate-induced displacement has engendered divergent perspectives including the North-South divide, solidarity with the affected people and climate justice (Bettini, 2013). Viewed from this perspective, climate displacement reflects policy debate in migrant destination countries, such as Australia and New Zealand and reaction to the looming challenges to survival from originating countries, for example, Fiji and Kiribati.

Few studies have explicitly focused on media narratives related to climate change and the policy implications of these narratives. According to these studies, Australia and New Zealand view the effects of climate change through the prism of South Pacific islands (e.g., Tuvalu, Kiribati). Accordingly, they have
listed security threats and adaptation challenges as priority areas in their policy discussions (Farbotko, 2018). Within this scenario, the South has become a moral concern for the North. The media frequently label low lying Pacific islands such as Funafuti in Tuvalu and the Carteret Islands in Papua New Guinea as ‘disappearing islands.’ This narrative, which describes inhabitants of these islands as potential ‘climate refugees’, is heavily contested in the South (Farbotko, 2018).

Social science and media studies scholars propose two strands of argument around climate justice and climate change. While some critics have identified the source of climate injustice in media content and meaning-making processes (e.g., Farbotko, 2010; Hoeg & Tulloch, 2019), others have directly intervened in issues of injustice identified by the media. On occasion, their proposed recommendations for mitigation have broad policy implications (Pham & Nash, 2017; Cass, 2018; Robie & Chand 2018). While each strand has value in its own right, it is nonetheless necessary to recognise the interconnectivity between the media meaning-making process and the social issues about which meaning is reached. In this study of discourse, we consider it necessary to examine both media meaning-making and the fundamental points of the issue involved, particularly in view of the need for an interdisciplinary approach to journalism scholarship (Nash, 2016; Zaman & Das, 2020). In the process, we have drawn on Ulrich Beck’s concept of risk and employed Fairclough and van Dijk’s Critical Discourse Analysis in our attempt to understand the ‘relations of definition’ underpinning the journalistic discourses surrounding climate displacement. In Beck’s view:

... Risks are essentially man-made, incalculable, uninsurable threats and catastrophes which are anticipated but often remain invisible and, therefore, depend on how they become defined and contested in ‘knowledge.’ (Beck, 2010, p.261; italics in original)

The term ‘relations of definition’ refers to the ‘matrix of ideas, interest, epistemologies, and different rationality claims (scientific, social, legal, etc.) that compete and contend within the field of risk and ecological interdependency crises’ (Cottle, 2008, p.78). The public discourses surrounding these categories that constitute ‘relations of definition’ ultimately influence what can and should be said about threats and hazards attributable to climate displacements (Cottle, 2010). The debate surrounding climate displacement is complex because it encompasses looming crises in both scientific and socio-political contexts and raises serious moral and political questions. When analysing this complex debate, it is important to understand how power relations in public communication are exercised and negotiated.

We set out to explore qualitatively how different discourses had been produced and challenged in public discussions. We also explored how this production
of knowledge or challenge to this production either opened up opportunities for various policy advocates or constrained them in their deliberations. Our broad concern was climate justice; in other words, whether or not debate surrounding climate governance or climate policy formulation was geared towards the protection of human welfare against climate impacts (Klinsky et al., 2017).

**Method of data collection**

To analyse public discourses in Fiji and New Zealand, we decided to study quality newspapers (Schmidt & Schäfer, 2015) due to their continued relevance to policy debates and selected *The Fiji Times*, *The Fiji Sun*, *The New Zealand Herald* and *The Dominion Post*. The selection was based on the largest circulation figures in the two countries (NZ Audit Bureau of Circulation, n.d.; Tarte, 2014). These publications were assumed to exert a significant level of influence on the two countries’ decision makers and policy priorities. We also assumed that newspapers were still a key site of contestation among politicians, businesses, civil society representatives and others.

Several databases were searched using the terms ‘climate refugees,’ ‘climate migration,’ ‘climate migrants’ and ‘climate change migration.’ We used Newsbank for *The Fiji Times*, *The Fiji Sun*’s web archive and Factiva for the two New Zealand publications. Variation in the search platform was due to the varied availability of the respective newspaper content. The time frame was from 2009 to 2019 to cover COP15 (Copenhagen) through to COP25 (Madrid). A total of 212 articles (165 from Fiji and 47 from New Zealand) were returned in the initial search. This was followed by a focused search of articles that dealt with climate displacement in detail, based on purposive sampling (Seale, 2012) which allowed us to select articles on the basis of their significance to the research topic. The purpose was to select articles that had focused on the issue of climate-induced displacement and not just mentioned it. For the purpose of this exercise, one of us read each article thoroughly with particular focus on headlines and lead paragraphs, article length, the section in which it appeared (if available), the numbers and types of news sources used, and the overall nature of each article (e.g., analysis, investigative report, or informed commentary). We narrowed the sample size to 22 articles (11 each from Fiji and New Zealand). They were then subjected to detailed discourse analysis based on three divergent discursive categories: climate change action, climate change inaction, and climate change insecurity. These categories were identified following literature relevant to climate change, displacement and migration (Hajer, 1993; Vollmer, 2017). The sample size was deemed sufficient because the study’s focus of qualitative analysis was not an article, but ideas expressed in the article. The longest article was 3855 words and the shortest 135 words; giving an average length of 605 words.
**Findings**

Public discourses surrounding climate displacement occurs in the context of wider discussions of climate change. As some critics have noted, climate change discussions in the South Pacific media generally align with the scientific consensus (Hopkins et al., 2015; Chand, 2017). However, in some media the issue is being portrayed as a matter of political contestation over the right approach to deal with the perceived impending environmental threat. The discourse in Fiji was about bearing the brunt of climate change and struggling against ‘carbon colonialism’ (Robie, 2014; Robie & Chand, 2017). Migration triggered by climate change was deemed one of the consequences of it. New Zealand newspapers rarely addressed the Pacific’s woes (Nash, 2015). Instead, they seemed preoccupied with defining the ‘visibility’ (Beck, 2016) of the potentially catastrophic effects of climate change in the South Pacific. The three discourse categories of action, inaction and insecurity were represented in the newspapers in different ways. For example, whereas New Zealand articles focused predominantly on climate inaction and insecurity, in Fiji, insecurity and climate action or adaptation appeared dominant.

**New Zealand**

**Climate inaction**

Inaction related to climate-induced displacement can be explained through the conscious exercise of power by key actors. According to Hajer (1993), powerful interests care mainly about national interests in addressing the impacts of climate change. They ignore or delay any preventative action that does not serve this interest. In the New Zealand discourse, this lack of action was evident in various expert reports and documents related to policy issues (Wesselbaum & Aburn, 2019; Hooton, 2018; Hall, 2019). This inaction was also perceptible in public discussions of climate catastrophes such as Cyclone Winston in Fiji in 2016 and bushfires in Australia in 2019-2000. Commentators frequently demanded that New Zealand ‘be ready’ to tackle their effects (Azhar, 2017).

Media representations of climate change in New Zealand have been significantly different from those of other OECD countries. Yet, somewhat similarly, New Zealand public discourse on climate-induced displacement has been politically contested (Bell, 1994; Hopkins et al., 2015). This was manifested in the arguments surrounding a perceived lack of adequate action by the government. In the articles selected from New Zealand, we observed that a range of policy advocates, including activists and leaders of parties like the Greens, expressed their exasperation regarding the government’s slow response to climate migration. Lawless (2014) wrote:
The first climate refugees from Kiribati, Tuvalu and Tokelau are now landing on our shores. The atoll nations will come first as the sea infiltrates their freshwater, making traditional agriculture impossible. A king tide already swamps villages. Farcically, a New Zealand judge told them to ‘drink bottled water’, as if that was a cure for their ills.

This excerpt clearly illuminates inaction attributable to a lack of articulation by both mainstream political coalitions of a long-term vision to tackle the threat of frequent natural disasters. However, it is worth noting that the newspapers also used a broad spectrum of other policy advocates including activists and experts in economy, psychology and geo-science to establish the need for the government to take action. Articles based on these sources highlighted the potential risk of climate change driving people out of their countries of origin and moving to receiving nations (Morton, 2017a). Morton (2019) raised the issue of a potential challenge to New Zealand’s mental health services, saying service providers would have to deal with any psychological effects experienced by migrants. Dr Jemaima Tiatia-Seath from the School of Māori Studies and Pacific Studies at the University of Auckland said Pacific peoples forced to relocate would likely face mental health challenges because of cultural loss and the stress of climate-induced migration (Morton, 2019). However, others disagree. Morton (2017b) quotes the University of Plymouth’s Professor Gerd Masselink as saying:

‘Islands may be resilient to rising sea level … islands did move and change, but the direction of global debate was not allowing their populations to adapt and plan for the future using this knowledge and understanding.’

Although Masselink identified the global debate as a problem, our findings indicate that it was the national debate that created impediments to the adaptation efforts of the affected peoples. For example, the political notion of ‘more refugee intake’ (Davison, 2017), once proposed by New Zealand’s Green Party member and Climate Change Minister James Shaw, received a ‘cool response’ (Manch, 2018) from both sides of politics on the grounds that the issue of refugee intake was complex. Referring to the Niue Declaration on Climate Change (2008), the Green’s immigration spokesperson Golriz Ghahraman said:

Tuvaluans want to be Tuvaluan… self-determination for Pacific communities, which warranted a collective solution rather than an individualised visa approach. (Manch, 2018)

However, the collective solution did not receive any traction in the articles under scrutiny. Rather, we observed that different policy actors brought very different dimensions to the debate; for example, questioning the prediction regarding
sea level rise (Morton, 2017b) and negating any potential devastating impact of the rise on the Pacific micro-states. Central to the climate inaction discourse was a broadly-held perception that the New Zealand government needed to do more. This accentuated recent political responses regarding collective solutions including demands for ensuring the self-determination of Pacific communities and the UN’s in-principle recognition of climate refugees. These issues would collectively mark a new era in the politics of climate displacement.

Climate insecurity
Experts and politicians alike have alerted us to the likelihood of deteriorating human and environmental security situations, and the increasing possibilities of harm due to the severe consequences of climate change (Ransan-Cooper et al., 2015). The fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2014) discussed a similar threat to human security.

An important document in New Zealand’s public discussion of the impact of climate change was a Ministry of Defence report *The climate crisis: Defence readiness and responsibilities* (Vance, 2018). The report centred on the security situations in New Zealand and the South Pacific, stating that regional insecurity was underpinned by the effects of global warming, conflict and disaster (Vance, 2018). The threat was discussed in public documents and newspaper articles written by academic security experts, media commentators and politicians. Defence Minister Ron Mark was quoted as saying: ‘The effects of climate change will challenge NZ Defence, in terms of responding to more frequent and more intense [climate] events in our region’ (Walls, 2018). *The Massey Report*, a document produced by a group of diplomats, defence and security experts reflected a similarly dystopian view of the future:

> The human security implications of climate change could lead to insecurity as a consequence of displacement, the breakdown of traditional power structures, and the placing of governments and system under duress. It puts access to food, water, and land as the top three ‘climate stressors’ that could lead to security problems. (Vance, 2018)

They discussed New Zealand’s defence capability, saying: ‘We don’t really have the right toys, the right kit to respond in the same way as Australia and the US’ (Vance, 2018). Almost invisible in this discussion was the nature of conflict that could emerge from a lack of resources. The difference in conflict is important because ‘a quarrel for a loaf of bread is not the same as an armed conflict [between] opposing states’ (Bettini, 2013, p.16). The defence report, which drew from a number of Pacific declarations, including the Boe Declaration and the Niue Declaration, emphatically stated that ‘climate change presents the single greatest threat to the livelihoods, security and well-being of the Pacific
people’ (Ministry of Defence, 2018, p. 4). However, the report pays little attention to policies crucial to the well-being of the Pacific peoples. The newspaper articles we examined demonstrated the imperatives of a strong and combative New Zealand using its armed forces to tackle a chaotic situation.

The crucial point is the way in which the notion of climate insecurity was justified by using two complementary strategies. On the one hand, it was aligned with policy arguments that supported the need for New Zealand to re-align its defence policy from a pacifist to a combat ready position. It would be done without raising any question of the potential consequences of such a shift. A case in point here was the discussion about the granting of experimental visas to affected Pacific islanders instead of considering a climate change visa, despite New Zealand’s commitment to international climate governance frameworks. These commitments include endorsing the Global Compact for Migration and in-principle agreement to granting climate visas under the climate change plan. On the other hand, the securitisation notion showed respect for Pacific Islanders’ desire to stay in their own islands in the wake of climate consequences.

The debate surrounding climate-induced displacement in New Zealand was defined by a contestation between climate inaction and a more dominant climate insecurity discourse. In inaction discourse, activists, experts and leaders of small political parties who were ‘outside and beyond representative institutions of political systems of nation-states’ (Bulkeley, 2001, p. 433), raised politically important questions about New Zealand’s responsibility to addressing climate displacement. However, this perspective was eclipsed in the insecurity discourse by an overwhelming concern for New Zealand’s national security in the wake of fast approaching climate effects in the region. The security concern was primarily defined by experts, and by politicians who were in a political realm demarcated by the traditional state institutions of accountability and control (Beck, 1999, p. 39).

Fiji

*Climate insecurity*

In the articles from Fiji, journalists seemed to have employed two strategies. Firstly, they highlighted the environmental vulnerabilities of the small island nations such as Tuvalu and Kiribati. Secondly, they pointed to the unpreparedness of New Zealand and Australia to tackle climate challenge by promoting critical voices that expressed outrage regarding the continued effects of climate change. In the process, they accused the Global North of perpetuating climate apartheid, or climate attack on the South. In the vulnerability articles, debate centred on the island nations’ insecurity was evident from 2009. The finger-pointing articles became predominant from 2014 on following Kiribati’s purchase of a 5500 acre Anglican estate in Fiji for future rehabilitation. The
Fijian newspapers emphasised the vulnerability of neighbouring Kiribati and Tuvalu, while simultaneously urging everyone to ensure international human rights. These publications highlighted the sentiment ‘Fiji is ready to help’ as they reported that people from 45 islands had already experienced the dire situation of having ‘Nowhere to run’ (Panapasa, 2009). The articles also expressed continued support for the island nations’ aspiration to ‘migration with dignity.’

A close reading of the articles showed that climate insecurity was manifested in such a way that highlighted the vulnerability of neighbouring island micro-states or atoll nations, for example Kiribati or Tuvalu, but not that of Fiji. In these articles, ‘threat to survival’ (Burese, 2012) became apparent because there was ‘no protection for displaced persons’ (*Fiji Times*, 2016).

In the debate, the themes of insecurity or uncertainty emerged from ‘daily facts’ in the South rather than the ‘future deliberations’ of the North. Currently observable environmental conditions, together with the lived experiences of the people in the South, made their insecurity and/or uncertain futures clear. Compared with the North’s emphasis on what will happen in the future, the South’s perspective is underpinned by a strong sense of environmental inequality between the two. Their deliberations were dominated by a range of policy advocates including officials from international non-government organisations and church groups, who author op-ed pieces or opinion columns. Because these advocates wrote their own articles, their reflections were detailed in a less mediated fashion. In the articles from Fiji, we observed a significant absence of the impact of relocation on the affected peoples. However, a UNICEF report, ‘Climate Change Impacts on Children in the Pacific: Kiribati and Vanuatu,’ alerted readers to the dangers of relocation, especially for children. The report stated that the relocation of population to so-called ‘safer islands’ would result in intense overcrowding. For children, this could result in anxiety, loss of culture and identity (Nabilivalu, 2012).

The issues of anxiety and overcrowding also resonated in a statement by John Anderson, an Australian resident living in Kiribati, who said: ‘All it takes is one wave’ to wash away the island. Its highest point is just three meters above the sea level (Goldberg, 2013). Similarly, George Fraser, the Australian High Commissioner to Kiribati, stressed Kiribati’s insurmountable challenge:

> On the one hand, it is President Tong’s duty to attract investment and aid.  
> On the other hand, he must also plan for his country’s eventual evacuation.  
> It’s difficult to attract investment.

Fraser’s comment demonstrated the degree to which Australia, a Global North country, had abdicated its responsibility regarding international human rights; the diplomat only highlighted critical circumstances for Kiribati, but over-
looked any part Australia might play to mitigate the problem. The author of the article used this quote without questioning Australia’s role in Kiribati’s plight. However, the people of Kiribati viewed their vulnerability differently; for them, the important issue was not an impending evacuation, but rather their belonging to the land. This was highlighted by former Kiribati President Anote Tong who said:

But … our people like it here. We will lose our homeland unless the ocean stops rising. It’s very simple. We want to stay home. This is where the spirits live. This is where we’re from. This is not caused by us. This is caused by you. (Goldberg, 2103)

These excerpts clearly depict a sense of strong inequality due to an uneven distribution of the impacts of climate change (Klinsky et al., 2017). These effects expose an existential threat to the people of Kiribati despite their aspiration to remain resilient. They considered themselves abandoned by the North, i.e., by those mainly responsible for Kiribati’s perilous situation due to their high rates of emissions. The dominance of various policy advocates in public debates resulted in Kiribati’s President receiving a mere mention and the Australian High Commissioner not being subjected to any interrogation regarding his country’s responsibilities. The newspapers in Fiji appeared to depict insecurity as a mere physical processes rather than as a political question (Bravo, 2009). As a result, it was left to the dominant voices quoted in newspaper articles to address the risks implicit in climate-induced displacement. The frequent usage of these voices that tackle the potential challenges and risks on behalf of the South Pacific nations may be interpreted as a declaration of urgency for climate action.

**Climate action**

The discourse of climate action as a political aspiration for Fiji was dominated by the following aspects. Firstly, the articles demonstrated Fiji’s ambition to mobilise political action to mitigate climate change driven insecurity. Secondly, Australia and New Zealand have expressed willingness to assist with critical issues such as displacement and relocation. Beck (2016) emphasised that action was about reflection, status and perceptions held by actors. This was evident in the Fijian discourses which highlighted Australia’s seemingly lackadaisical approach to climate change, with headlines reading ‘Pay up’ (Qounadovu, 2015) or ‘Climate change is no “laughing matter”’ (*Fiji Times*, 2019). Another article quoted the Vanuatu Foreign Minister as stating in the Boe Declaration on regional security that Australia’s authority in the Pacific was ‘eroded by its refusal to address climate change’ (*Fiji Times*, 2018a).

As well as newspaper articles, the political rhetoric was also evident in some official policy documents, including Fiji’s Relocation Guidelines, drafted in
2013 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Displacement Guidelines prepared in 2019 by the Ministry of Economy following Fiji’s endorsement of the Global Compact for Migration and the IPCC report (2018). The Displacement Guidelines stated that one of its aims was ‘[T]o reduce the vulnerabilities associated with displacement and consider durable solutions to prevent and minimize the drivers of displacement in affected communities in Fiji’ (Ministry of Economy, 2019, p. 5).

Fiji’s aspirations were clearly evident in headlines stating ‘Fiji to rescue neighbours’ (Fiji Times, 2009) or ‘Fiji ready to help’ (Naleba, 2015). These stories highlighted the Pacific island nations’ aspiration for ‘migration with dignity’ (Panapasa, 2015) and actively supported their claim that the people who had been displaced due to environmental reasons were not refugees. The notion of ‘migration with dignity’ exposed a not always subtle tension. Concern about mass evacuation from Kiribati to Fiji was widely expressed. One of the articles referred to it as the ‘weirdest business deal of the week’ (Guilford, 2014).

Action discourse included the relative invisibility of a number of issues including post-relocation tension and technological solutions to reclaiming sinking lands. The last solution was an aspiration of some Pacific island leaders. The land reclamation issue was covered in some articles: ‘To build climate resilience, the remote nation has consulted foreign governments and companies on land reclamation technology as well as the idea of external floating accommodation’ (Fiji Times, 2018b). However, the risk associated with the relocation of communities, which had been emphasised by some non-governmental organisations and cultural geographers, received scant attention in discussions centred on displacement policies.

**Conclusion**

Within the media-policy nexus, Global North and South public discourses were dominated by critical policy discussions with a visible prominence of the realm of politics. The top-down approach exercised by the established institutions left little or no room for exploration of bottom-up perspectives evinced by affected communities. These climate displacement discourses reinforced the views of critics who claimed that while the media emphasised the abstract issue, it failed to focus on any one affected individual, such as a displaced person. Some critics, who termed this omission a ‘collective problematisation’ or ‘deagentilation’ (Farbotko, 2010; Hoeg & Tulloch, 2019), claimed that the problem was presented as broad and collective, obscuring the relevance of or consequences for individuals. This invisibility of affected persons is likely to perpetuate a certain direction for policy debates (Russell et al., 2016) related to critical climate displacement issues, such as the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage and ignores significant questions pertinent to the affected
communities. Our findings suggest that affected people’s perspectives received scant attention, particularly in the New Zealand discourse. This absence may be explained by the fact that the issue of displacement is often politicised and dominated by powerful vested interests. The latter prefer an abstract and broad policy focus that eschews any human angle (Cass, 2018) that has the potential to trigger a humanitarian public response to the subject of displaced people from neighbouring island nations.

However, the disregard of the affected Islanders’ perspectives may indicate the challenges journalists face when attempting to tell the story of climate displacement. Although Fiji is among the countries affected by climate change, its journalists have chosen to overlook to some degree the issue of climate displacement. This may have been due, as Robie argues, to the ‘sole replication of Western news values’ (Robie, 2019, p. 4). Fijian journalists have preferred abstract policy matters over lived human experiences and the Fourth Estate model over the ‘fifth estate’ which is considered a ‘counter balance to all other forms of power including news media’ (Robie, 2019, p. 4). However, sometimes pragmatic problems such as deadline pressures, cost and staffing shortages could make it difficult to interview human subjects at different locations, compared with churning out government policy or position statements.

In accordance with Beck’s definition, the Fijian narrative demonstrated that the displacement experienced by the islands’ inhabitants was, in fact, a man-made anticipated risk which could be mitigated by the deliberate actions of those responsible for triggering the chain of climate impacts. In the Fijian discourse, Australia and New Zealand have been sluggish in action and irresponsible in behaviour when it came to tackling climate change. In the New Zealand discourse, the risk of displacement was real, but invisible. In this discourse, it was defined as a spatially distanced uncertainty, a matter of adaptation by both the islanders and government policy makers in New Zealand. To best serve New Zealand’s national interest, the issue should be treated as a security matter with the implications tackled accordingly.

In this scenario, the wielding of power was manifested in the Fijian accusation of the ‘irresponsible’ parties, and in the New Zealand calculation of climate-induced displacement as a security concern.
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