



Geographical Sovereignty in Times of Crisis

The Eyjafjallajökull Eruption and the International Community

Einar Pétur Heiðarsson

Thesis of 6 ECTS credits

Master of Project Management (MPM)

May 2013



Geographical Sovereignty in Times of Crisis

The Eyjafjallajökull Eruption and the International Community

Einar Pétur Heiðarsson

Thesis of 6 ECTS credits submitted
to the School of Science and Engineering
at Reykjavík University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Project Management (MPM)

May 2013

Supervisor:

Dr. Haukur Ingi Jónasson
Lecturer, Reykjavík University, Iceland

GEOGRAPHICAL SOVEREIGNTY IN TIMES OF CRISIS: THE EYJAFJALLAJÖKULL ERUPTION AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

Einar Pétur Heiðarsson¹

Paper presented as part of requirements for the degree of Master of Project Management (MPM) at Reykjavik University - May 2013

ABSTRACT

The needed transformation of the concept of sovereignty in a globalized world has until now mostly been a topic for political scientists. This is, however, changing since the complexity, interdependencies and importance of international cooperation is becoming more self-evident. Project management and crisis management are study fields that must take notice of the transforming sovereign state system. The volcanic eruption in Eyjafjallajökull-glacier, Iceland, in 2010, raised several questions regarding state sovereignty in natural crisis situation. The eruption is used here as a crisis management case that demonstrates the globalization of the international society and the transboundary risk that follow increased systematic and technological complexity of modernity. The fact that a volcanic eruption within an self-governing island in midst of the Atlantic ocean could seriously inflict European and international air traffic was an eye opener for politicians, government, the airline industry and the public. An original conceptualization of 'geographical sovereignty' is introduced as a tool to explain the complex relationship between nature, the globalized international community and the sovereign state system.

ÁGRIP

Hin nauðsynlega umbreyting á fullveldishugtakinu í hinum hnattvædda heimi hefur til þessa nær eingöngu verið umfjöllunarefni stjórn málafræðinga. Þetta er hins vegar að breytast þar sem margbreytileiki, gagntengsl og mikilvægi alþjóðlegrar samvinnu verður æ augljósara. Verkefnastjórnun og krísustjórnun eru rannsóknarsvið sem þurfa að taka mið af umbreytingu kerfis fullvalda ríkja. Eldsumbrotin í Eyjafjallajökli árið 2010 vöktu upp margar spurningar varðandi fullveldi ríkisins þegar náttúruhamfarir ganga yfir. Eldgosið er notað sem dæmi til að sýna hvernig áhrif hnattvæðingar alþjóðasamfélagsins og kerfis- og tæknivæðing nútímans auka við þá áhættu sem fer þvert á landamæri hins fullvalda ríkis. Sú staðreynd að eldgos á sjálfstæðri eyju í miðju Atlantshafi gæti haft veruleg áhrif á evrópskar og alþjóðlegar flugsamgöngur, varð til þess að opna augu stjórnámálanna, stjórnvalda, flugmálayfirvalda, flugfélaga og almennings. Nýstárleg hugmyndagerving, 'landfræðilegt fullveldi' er hér notuð til þess að skýra hið flókna samband á milli náttúrunnar, hins hnattvædda alþjóðasamfélags og fullveldiskerfisins.

¹ MA International Relations, Einar.Petur.Heidarsson@gmail.com, +354 822 1927

1. INTRODUCTION

The eruption in Eyjafjallajökull in April 2010 was an extraordinary event in many senses of the word. Some would even go as far as to call it a Black Swan (Taleb, 2010), which is an extraordinary event in the sense that it was, to a large degree, unexpected with unexpected effect and unforeseen consequences. But only to 'a large degree' unexpected, because there were actually some people, Icelandic volcanologists and civil protection authorities, expecting Eyjafjallajökull to erupt and who had prepared a contingency plan mapping out the most likely course of events (Guðmundsson & Gylfason, 2005). So was it unexpected? Scientists and authorities writing and publishing contingency plans and still there is a talk about an unexpected event?

The eruption in Eyjafjallajökull is a good example, and a case to study, of the complexity and diversity of natural disasters crisis that crosses all boundaries and borders when it comes to defining the actual event and to analyse what did take place in April 2010. The eruption itself is in no sense abnormal seen through the eyes of volcanologists, or even the general public in Iceland, where volcanic eruptions and natural hazards are a part of normal life in this young and active island rising up from the seabed of the Euro-America rig dividing the two continents. From the perspective of civil protection and natural disasters in Iceland, the eruption, in itself is neither the biggest or most disastrous incident to hit the nation in recent years. No human life was lost and infrastructure was not greatly damaged. So where is the Black Swan?

There is no reason to downplay the inconvenience, and in some cases, human tragedy, of the eruption and the ash cloud that covered a large part of the south coast of Iceland with both long term and short term effect on livestock, vegetation, harvest, lost land, and human mental and physical health. But with all this in mind, and without playing judgement on importance or triviality of the eruption as a whole or some parts of it or related incidents, there is one dimension of the Eyjafjallajökull crisis that stands out: the global dimension of the eruption. The fact that a fairly small or medium size volcanic eruption could cost so much disruption for the everyday lives of millions of people in far away places is a demonstration of the fact that globalization and the interdependency of modern world is not just some academic jargon but the everyday reality of the general public around the world.

But why bring up the subject of sovereignty in relation to disaster and project management? This connection may not appear to be obvious but when defining the boundaries of a project, or an incident that needs to be managed, sovereignty is the defining factor of the key player at hand: the state. In that sense sovereignty defines the boundaries of the project. If sovereignty is understood in the narrowest sense and no notice is taken of the world outside these boundaries, then this is how the project manager will define and think the project through. If the viewpoint would be altered, the angle widened, the project would be defined in a different way. Understanding sovereignty as an interconnected system of number of actors will force the project manager to take a broader view when defining and responding to, and preparing for, natural disasters.

The eruption in Eyjafjallajökull effected people and business outside the limits of the Icelandic state, outside the limits of its sovereignty. To study the incident without giving this fact full attention is to misunderstand, and mismanage, the case. This study will focus on the transformation of the concept sovereignty in relation to civil protection and human security. Key documents in the literature on civil protection in the international arena will be analysed and put into context with the eruption in Eyjafjallajökull in 2010.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Sovereignty is a political concept that has been instrumental in forming the interdependent globalized state system that has truly conquered the world of international relations. The formation of the modern state system can be traced back to the peace agreement in Westphalia in 1648 where the concept sovereignty was used to identify the ruler of a given territory and the people who lived there (Osiander, 2001). The revolution at that time, for the formation of the state, was the devolution of power from the Pope, a divine representative of God on Earth, to the mortal sovereign, the prince.

Since that time, the classical understanding of the concept sovereignty has been used to represent the undivided legal right of the state, the sovereign, to control its own matters inside the borders of the state and to participate on levelled playing field with other sovereign states (Krasner, 1999, p. 9). This classical understanding, of the twofold internal and external sovereignty, has changed through the passing of time and milestone events in history. The most important one, for the formation of the modern state and the modern state system, are: the French Revolution in 1789-1799, where authority and legitimacy of sovereign rule were understood to be two different things with the later belonging to the people as the ultimate source of sovereignty, and the aftermath of the two world wars of the 20th century (WWI and WWII), where international institutions and organizations begin to take over some of the obligations of the state and to function as the regulator of the anarchy between them (Bull, 2002); (Philpott, 2001). The foundation of the United Nations (UN) and the establishment of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in 1945 and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948 are key events in the formation of the modern state system (Karns & Mingst, 2010, pp. 95–142).

Geographical sovereignty is not a classical concept used in political theory and discourse on the nature of sovereignty. The classical concept is 'territorial sovereignty' which has been used since the 17th century to represent the direct link between the sovereign and his land (Ruggie, 1993). In that sense territorial sovereignty has been the foundation of the rule of 'non-intervention', which has been a fundamental rule in international law since that time (Krasner, 1999, p. 9). This clear-cut reality of non-intervention and the sanctity of territorial rule is now being challenged by the transformation of the international community which used to be made up of states but is now made up of states and variety of other actors. With the development of international law, strengthening of human rights, build up of international institutions, organizations, multinational corporations (MNC's) and non-governmental organizations (NGO's) the international arena has been fundamentally changed, or more accurately: transformed, over the last 70 years (Karns & Mingst, 2010, p. 14).

The theoretical debate on the nature of this issue is, among other things, what divides the international relations (IR) discourse into contrasting schools of thoughts. Realists like Thomas Hobbes (17th century) and Hans Morgenthau (20th century) claim that the state system is a logical game of power and balance that can be directly linked to the selfish nature of us humans. Therefore, the strong hand of the Leviathan is needed to control society and to secure peace (Guzzini, 1998).

Liberal and neo-liberal thinkers like John Locke (17th century) and Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye (20th century) also refer to the rationality of the system although they differ from realists by leaning towards idealistic and systemic explanations of the international system where ideas of common interests and economical efficiency encourage and directs society in the direction of cooperation

and peace across cultural barriers (Keohane & Nye, 2012). Social constructivism on the other hand is not a rational theory that relies upon the inner logic of one strong system of explanations. Instead the emphasis is on relativity and evaluation of ideas, culture and identity which modern thinkers like Alexander Wendt and Ted Hopf use to explain the social structure of civil society (Wendt, 1999); (Hopf, 2002). In their view the concept of sovereignty is a socially constructed knowledge, based on elite interests and social norms that can be detected through, e.g. analysis of national discourses and the role of ideas.

Here in Iceland, there is one scholar in particular, Eiríkur Bergmann (2009), who has written on sovereignty and used discourse analysis to define the important status of the concept for the national identity of the Icelandic nation. Other Icelandic writers on the issue are Baldur Þórhallsson (2004) and Guðmundur Hálfðanarson (2007) who both have focused on the relationship with Europe in historical context and concluded that national identity and bilateralism, with strong relations with Washington, are the strongest explanations for strong national sentiments towards the concept sovereignty and what defines the meaning of the concept for the Icelandic people.

Small state theory is also a strong and relevant school when one seeks to understand the great relevance of sovereignty in the Icelandic context. Ingebritsen, Keohane, Baldur Þórhallsson and Katzenstein (2006) have all contributed to the analysis of the concept to explain how small states systematically use sovereignty to protect national resources or as an entrance ticket to the shelter of larger states or supranational organizations and unions, i.e. EU and NATO.

Globalization is an academic concept that is used to define the rapidly changing reality facing the sovereign state system. The globalized sovereign state system is now interdependent in the sense that it is made up of independent actors who are dependent on each other. Sovereign states are no longer the only actors in the international arena that are strong enough to have their voice heard (Scholte, 2005). Jan Aart Scholte has written a notable book on globalization in which he states that traditional understanding of both place and space have now been superseded in the sense that the globe is now a single place, or what he calls 'supraterritorial', and a single space, or 'transplanetary' (2005, pp. 59–64). The reason is that communication, travelling, shipping of goods, monetary transaction, media interaction and so forth has deleted constraints of both place and space. This great 'change' that is driven forward by technological innovations and global interaction is in fact much more drastic and fundamental than can be conveyed by the term 'change'. Transformation is the concept that reveals the nature of the revolution in a transparent manner for it is not enough to understand that 'the times they are a changing', which they surely are, but the fact of the matter is that the change is going in different directions and taking on new and unforeseen forms. This topic has been a research priority in the University of Bremen, Germany, where Stephan Leibfried and Michael Zürn have been leading the study on the *Transformation of the state* (2005).

This transformation has also called for a new understanding of the concept security. The classical understanding of the concept, or the 'narrow' understanding of security, is very much connected to the concept of national defence and to military security. In contrast to this 'narrow' understanding the 'broad' understanding is more focused on human rights, the diversity of global actors, and new threats, e.g. cyber threats, terrorism, environmental threats in relations to climate changes, pandemic diseases and industrial accidents (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2009, p. 11). This new understanding of security has been gaining grounds in recent years following the complete reassessment of military security in the western hemisphere after the end of the Cold War and again after the events of

11th September, 2001. It was though not until 2009 that Iceland implemented this new conceptualization into its own security strategy.

The most daring and fruitful attempt, in recent times, to redefine the concept sovereignty was done by the UN in 2005. The then Secretary-General Kofi Annan called, in the year 1999 and again in 2000, on the member states of the UN to come together and unite in finding a way to adjust this principle of the international community to the changing reality facing the sovereign state system and changing understanding of security (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty & International Development Research Centre (Canada), 2001, p. VII). A commission of experts suggested that sovereignty would not only be understood as a 'right to control' but also as a 'responsibility to protect' (R2P). This new understanding has since then been ratified both by the General Assembly and the Security Council of the UN (UN Security Council, 2006) (UN General Assembly, 2009).

Ásthildur Elva Bernhardsdóttir has researched crisis management in Iceland and done case studies of the most serious natural disasters in Iceland in the 20th century, the 1995 Avalanches (Bernhardsdóttir, 2001), and on the Earthquakes in southern Iceland in the year 2000 and the stranding of Ms. Vikartindur (Bernhardsdóttir & Svedin, 2004). In her study she has worked with The Center for Crisis Management Research and Training (CRISMART) in Stockholm, Sweden, and applied the method of the institution on the Icelandic cases, giving her research a very strong theoretical and methodological structure that is applicable in comparing these cases with other natural disaster cases done by CRISMART. If one were to study the eruption in Eyjafjallajökull thoroughly, the CRISMART method would be the most obvious choice. Such a study would be much larger than is possible here but an attempt will be made, at the end of this thesis, to lay down the outline of such a study.

Other 'key documents' that are used in this study are Hyogo Framework for Action, which is a UN strategy for disaster reduction (UN ISDR, 2005), Risk Assessment and Mapping Guidelines for Disaster Management, an EU strategy, which is still in the process of ratification, for prevention of natural and man-made disasters (EC, 2011), and Áhættumatsskýrsla fyrir Ísland (Risk Assessment Report for Iceland)(Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2009).

3. RESEARCH PROJECT

3.1 Project description and objectives

This research is directed at the concept sovereignty and the role sovereignty plays in project management and crisis management when dealing with natural disasters and natural hazards. The eruption in Eyjafjallajökull is used as an example of the complexity of the modern state system and the effect that transboundary crises can have across the system. Does the understanding of sovereignty matter for the project manager who works with natural disasters and variety of different crises? Does his/hers prejudices, or narrow understanding of sovereignty and security, play a role in how he manages his projects? What does sovereignty mean today?

3.2 Research methodology

The research is an interpretive case study in its design and method and in that sense it follows the long tradition of social science (Andrade, 2009, p. 43); (Hart, 2004, p. 194). The method is based on the fact that for us humans to be able to make sense of the world we live in, we must construct our own sense of meaning

and logic through complicated network of texts and signs. This method differs from the cold and quantitative method of natural science, but the history of science has shown that both fields contribute equally in the creation of knowledge. The research is executed as follow:

1. Disaster management defined.
2. R2P used to define sovereignty.
3. The new definition of sovereignty as R2P compared to the 'key documents' to find out if sovereignty is being used in accordance with the new UN inspired definition of the concept.
4. Geographical sovereignty defined.
5. Transboundary disasters defined.
6. What are the benefits of using geographical sovereignty in transboundary crisis in disaster management?
7. Apply key findings on the eruption in Eyjafjallajökull.
8. Define the CRISMART research method.
9. Suggest further studies on the eruption in Eyjafjallajökull by applying the CRISMART method.

The general idea behind the study has now been explained carefully, the general literature has been introduced and, lastly, the research method has been laid down.

4. RESEARCH RESULTS

1) Disaster management (DM) is best explained with the picture below from the Australian Development Gateway. Similar pictures can be found in large numbers online, and it is not straightforward to establish who first drew this image. What is more important is that the general idea behind DM is clearly pictured and easy to understand, and importantly, easy to communicate. DM is a method to define different stages of the disaster and can be used both to analyse the situation and to control response, recovery or preparation.



2) Responsibility to protect (R2P) is a revolution in the history of sovereignty although the implementation of the concept has not been without pitfalls and hard criticism (Bellamy, 2009)(Jackson, 2007). In relation to that criticism it is worth mentioning that the system has been developing for more than four centuries and is interwoven into the most sacred fabric of the modern state, superseded by nothing except (possibly) religion, if those two things have not already merged into one state guarded sovereign religion (or sect) (Kahn, 2000).

Through careful reading one can find following key articles where the meaning of sovereignty is being redefined on issues directly linked to civil protection and disaster management:

- 1.28 Human security (2001, p. 6).
- 2.15 Human security and the constant strengthening of human rights (2001, p. 13).
- 2.19 Justice without borders (2001, p. 14).
- 2.21 The security of people, physical safety, economical and social well being (2001, p. 15).
- 2.23 Human security is important because it embraces the complexity of human life and rejects simple explanations of security as bare armament (2001, p. 15).
- 2.29 In humanitarian situations, where sovereignty must be compromised, it is done out of 'responsibility to protect' not because of the 'right to intervene'. The focus is not only on 'responsibility to react', but also on the 'responsibility to prevent' and responsibility to rebuild' (2001, p. 17).
- 3.1 Responsibility to prevent (2001, p. 19).
- 3.7 Responsibility to prevent is not only humane it is also more cost-efficient than conflict management (2001, p. 20).

These direct quotes to the R2P report show that this new definition of sovereignty is much more radical than one might think at first glance. The definition specifically refers to 'human security' as a defining factor, so the security concept has also been redefined. In 2.23 one can detect a reference to another UN inspired concept that changed the discourse at the time, and which is still today a fundamental concept in the global discourse, but that is 'sustainable development' which is understood as a threefold equation of environment, economy and society (United Nations, 1987, p. 15). And one can also see a direct link to the spirit of DM in point 2.29, 3.1 and 3.7, where the emphasis is, again, threefold: react, prevent and rebuild.

Taken together, sovereignty as R2P must be defined as a broad, inclusive, humanitarian concept which transforms the concept of human rights into a claim on states to take responsibility of the welfare of their citizens and that goes even further by conditioning all sovereign states to serve as protectors of human rights and by doing that, sovereignty is now formally an attribution of humans as much as it is an attribution of the state. States have a responsibility to citizens of other sovereign states. In fact they have a responsibility to all citizens in every state. But it is also important to remember point 2.29 that states that the rule is based on 'responsibility', but not on 'rights'. One can e.g. not cross state borders and demand a citizenship. But states should work together to 'prevent' those circumstances from emerging, where people are forced to leave their homes in search of 'human security'.

3) When the 'key documents' of the study are read through with the new definition of sovereignty, as a responsibility to protect, in mind, it becomes quite clear that the UN and the EU do approach the issue, concerning civil protection and

disaster prevention and management, from different directions. The Hyogo Framework for Action (the Framework), which was published in 2005, is in perfect harmony with R2P without ever mentioning it directly, as such (UN ISDR, 2005). The Risk Assessment and Mapping Guidelines for Disaster Management (the EU Guidelines), which was produced by the European Commission in 2010, is much more focused on protecting sovereignty (or what is left of it) and to administer decision-making power to the sovereign states and to the regions of the EU. The EU Guidelines are also much more technical and use the language of ISO 31000, ISO 31010 and ISO Guide 73 (EC, 2011, p. 9). The third key document, Risk Assessment Report for Iceland, is more in line with the UN Framework than with the EU Guidelines. The security concept has been defined to include human security and one senses that line of thought all through the document (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2009).

4) Turning the attention to 'geographical sovereignty', the original concept which is proposed to sharpen the vision of the project manager, for one, and to break up the terminology and the thinking of those who are responsible for civil protection at national level. As has been explained in the study, so far, the classical meaning of sovereignty is that of authority, legitimacy, territory and non-intervention, while sovereignty as responsibility is focused on human rights and welfare. Geographical sovereignty is always focused on the geography of issue at hand and never on jurisdiction or legally defined rights or responsibility. Geographical sovereignty is a tool for the project manager to see nature as it appears without the restraints of jurisdiction and ideas of control.

5) Transboundary crisis, are crises that do cross these cognitive lines, such as jurisdiction, borders and territorial sovereignty (in the classical understanding), and technical and systemic boundaries as well (Boin, Ekengren, & Rhinard, 2008, p. 20). Transboundary crises either build up and go on from system to the nest, or come like a storm on many systems at the same time. What makes these kinds of threats and disasters so interesting and relevant today is that they fit perfectly with the transformation of the globalized sovereign system. The international arena has never been so crowded as she is today and the boundaries, between those actors, have never been as blurry as they are today. According to Scholte, these boundaries have all been superseded and the world has been come 'supraterritorial' and 'transplanetary' (2005). What this means, in this relation, is that the man-made are systems more and more connected and dependent on each other, and so, the risk increases exponentially. A failure in the electricity system closes the digital monetary transaction system, but in order to turn on the diesel engine that produces electricity, in times of crisis, you need to buy diesel and pay for it electronically, which is impossible since the computer is not working. The transboundary effect has gone full circle.

6) The gain of using geographical sovereignty in transboundary crisis and disaster management is a shift back to the natural perspective. Geographical sovereignty focuses on the land, distances, and infrastructure, not in relation to jurisdiction or authority but in relation to geographical threats and strengths. Natural hazards could be evaluated more openly on nature's term and without the restraint of jurisdictions, authority and legitimacy.

If an analyst would evaluate a region or a terrain, he would not follow district limits or borders, and yet he would not be trespassing in any sense of the word. He, or she, would simply be following the natural context of the area under inspection. A river flows to the sea, or into the lake, without any consideration of the political authority of the area. A volcano is located on the sovereign terrain but the plume of ash can reach kilometres up to the air where winds will blow small particles of ash across long distances in the atmosphere. The whole event is far

away from sovereignty, but still the event is considered an Icelandic disaster, and Icelandic crisis, when the biggest part of the problem is nowhere near the Icelandic jurisdiction.

The method can be compared to Edward's de Bono six thinking hats (Jónasson & Ingason, 2011, p. 135). By putting on the geographical sovereignty hat the analyst is out of the box and can act and think more freely. He may question all authority, legitimacy, sovereignty, districts, borders and restrictions. The borders of the African continent have e.g. very little to do with the natural or cultural makeup of that geographical area. How would an analyst work around that issue without some methods of this kind? His only obligation is to understand the geographical makeup of the area in relation to civil protection and disaster management.

7) If these methods are applied on the eruption in Eyjafjallajökull one does soon see how narrow the traditional perspective is. As has been mentioned above, the contingency plan that was written for possible eruption in Eyjafjallajökull is a civil protection document of high quality with a thorough volcano logical clarification of the area (Guðmundsson & Gylfason, 2005). In that sense the document is geographical, but it does not view possible consequences from outside of the sovereign jurisdiction. The transboundary dimension is not explored in the contingency plan.

8) When the Icelandic scientists were working with CRISMART in analysing crisis management in Iceland, they were asked to follow an analytical theme from the research institution (Bernhardsdóttir & Svedin, 2004, p. 16). The analytical theme is divided into 10 overarching crisis themes that are listed here:

1. Preparedness, Prevention and Mitigation.
2. Decision Units.
3. Leadership.
4. Problem Perception and Problem Framing.
5. Value Conflict.
6. Politico-Bureaucratic Cooperation and Conflicts.
7. Crisis Communication and Credibility.
8. Transnationalization and Internationalization.
9. Temporal Effects.
10. Learning.

By looking over these themes it is obvious that the transboundary dimension is included in the method of analysis, in theme no. 8., and the issue of sovereignty, authority, legitimacy and responsibility is covered in themes no 2., no 5., and no 6.

9) These analytical themes would provide an excellent foundation for an in depth research on the eruption in Eyjafjallajökull, and by adding the themes of sovereignty as responsibility and geographical sovereignty, the study would also introduce a modern perspective of the important dimension of rights and responsibility. Possible research questions might sound like this:

- Do transboundary issues get enough attention in contingency planning in Iceland or are contingency plans ignoring the transformational forces of globalization?
- Does the Icelandic government respect the will of the UN to understand sovereignty as a responsibility by keeping moral questions in high esteem when planning, preparing and preventing disasters?
- Is geography, and geographical phenomenon, used as an explanation or as a tool when natural risk factors are evaluated, or are district limits and

jurisdictions a defining factor that blinds examiners and writers of contingency planes? Can the concept 'geographical sovereignty' help to break down barriers that blind examiners?

5. DISCUSSION

From what has been said above it is clear that the concept sovereignty is an important factor in organizing the international state system. Sovereignty is used to define key players and their rights to act in an organized manner. Equally clear is the fact that sovereignty is not a new idea and in no way a constant that always stays the same. The opposite is true: sovereignty is always changing and adapting to the changing human reality.

It is important for the project managers, and for the execution and success of the project management, to have a clear understanding of key stakeholders, key actors, the legal framework, the political reality and so on (Ingason & Jónasson, 2012, pp. 111–120). Sovereignty is one of those key factors that have not been given enough attention in the project management literature and to make matters even worse, the definition of sovereignty is changing faster than scholars can write.

To have sovereignty defined as a responsibility can have a big effect on project management and especially for disaster management. The reason is that moral questions are now more than ever a part of the project definition followed by moral burden for the project manager. If the responsibility of the state has been defined by an organization like the UN it will be more difficult for sovereign states to ignore such rules or requests for in the end the international community will be made responsible for protecting civilians.

Now one can say that these rules were designed for protecting people in war torn places and failed states (Krasner, 2004)(Chauvet, Collier, & Hoeffler, 2007). To that criticism one can replay that security has been redefined, like has been shown above, and now security is not only bound to military threat but to variety of issues and most of them related, in one way or the other, to the transformation called globalization.

Natural disasters are therefor a part of the security issue, in the broad understanding of the concept, and it has also been shown that R2P also includes an understanding of prevention and preparedness and is therefor very much connected to the cycle of disaster management. The state is responsible for protecting and preventing and recovering. This is, in a way, a new reality. And where does new reality lead society?

One answer to that question was given recently by an Italian judge who sentenced a physicist to six years in jail for wrongly dismissing a prediction of a large earthquake in a small town, L'Aquila, which has been a victim of large earthquakes through history (Kington, 2012). The state, who one thought would be responsible for what this scientist was doing has now sentenced him to prison for not doing his job right. What exactly was he supposed to do? How was his project defined?

Another answer has been given to this question in the UK where civil protection authorities, The United Kingdom (UK) National Risk Register of Civil Emergency, has put 'Severe effusive (gas-rich) volcanic eruptions abroad' in fourth place on it's list of 'The highest priority risks' facing the UK (Cabinet Office, 2012, p. 6). One must take his hat off for the scientists who suggested putting the event on

the National Risk Register. He or she is brave for it may take decades or centuries before the next eruption of this kind comes from Iceland.

The concept 'geographical sovereignty' is an attempt to conceptualize the location, not the jurisdiction, of a natural disaster in relation to the geographical nature of the incident. The focus is not on the responsibility of the state, but on the responsibility of the scientist to do his job without bowing to invisible lines on a map. The concept is though in no way in opposition to R2P, but rather in opposition to ill thought actions of misguided judges.

The important point is that the world is changing and project management must be aware of that fact and embrace the transformation and all the opportunities that come with new ways of working and new ways of thinking. To suggest that the entire international community would come together and redefine a concept such as sovereignty describes the mind of a genius. Kofi Annan is that man. A true vision in scoping the problem and a true leadership in proposing the project at the right time and then see it all the way through.

The international community still does not have any single executive power or executive branch like most sovereign states have. Here is the problem or this is where the transformation is at right now. The understanding of anarchy in the international community has transformed over the last centuries from Hobbesian culture of enmity, where hostility and distrust is the norm, to the Lockean culture of rivalry, where mutual recognition of rights and fair competition is the norm, to use the conceptualization of Alexander Wendt in his much proclaimed *Social Theory of International Politics* (1999, p. 246). The final step, or the next step at least, in the transformation of the international community is the step from Lockean culture to Kantian culture of friendship where, firstly, violence is not accepted as a way to resolve problems among member states and, secondly, where those sovereign states that have reached this stage act together as a team when they do need to use violence to settle disputes with hostile states who still tend to live and act in the Hobbesian culture of enmity (Wendt, 1999, p. 250).

6. CONCLUSIONS

The most important, or the most fundamental, concept of the international community has been the subject of this thesis. Sovereignty is a defining principle and should be embraced as such by all section of science. In project management the scope of the project, and the environment in which the project takes place, are fundamental issues in a successful execution of a project. But if the project is immoral almost all other defining factors of the project cease to be of any importance. Project management is a moral field.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank Elísabet Magnúsdóttir for moral support during the writing period of this thesis. The author also gratefully acknowledges Jóhanna Sigurjónsdóttir og Kristian Guttesen for their valuable help during the final hours. The author gratefully acknowledges the altruistic help and guidance of his mentor Dr. Haukur Ingi Jónasson. This thesis is dedicated to the 2013 MPM class of Reykjavík University for their love.

8. REFERENCES

- Andrade, A. D. (2009). Interpretive Research Aiming at Theory Building : Adopting and Adapting the Case Study Design. *The Qualitative Report Volume, 14*(1), 42–60.
- Baldur Thorhallsson (Ed.). (2004). *Iceland and European integration: on the edge*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Bellamy, A. (2009). Realizing the Responsibility to Protect. *International Studies Perspectives, 10*, 111–128.
- Bernhardsdóttir, A. E. (2001). *Learning from past experiences: the 1995 avalanches in Iceland*. Stockholm: Försvarshögskolan.
- Bernhardsdóttir, A. E., & Svedin, L. (2004). *Small-state crisis management: the Icelandic way*. Stockholm: Swedish National Defence College.
- Boin, A., Ekengren, M., & Rhinard, M. (2008). Future Crises and Supranational Responses: Towards a New Paradigm for the EU? In *Security in transition: towards a new paradigm for the European Union*. Stockholm: National Defence College.
- Bull, H. (2002). *The anarchical society: a study of order in world politics* (3rd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Cabinet Office. (2012). *National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies* (No. 408697/0212). London: Gabinet Office.
- Chauvet, L., Collier, P. M., & Hoeffler, A. (2007). *The cost of failing states and the limits to sovereignty*. Helsinki, Finnland: UNU World Inst. for Development Economics Research (UNU/WIDER).
- EC. (2011). *Risk Assessment and Mapping Guidelines for Disaster Management* (No. SEC(2010) 1626 final). Brussels: European Commision. Retrieved from <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/10/st17/st17833.en10.pdf>
- Eiríkur Bergmann Einarsson. (2009). *"Hið huglæga sjálfstæði þjóðarinnar": áhrif þjóðernishugmynda á Evrópustefnu íslenskra stjórnvalda*. Reykjavík: Háskóli Íslands, Stjórnmálafræðideild.
- Guðmundsson, M., & Gylfason, Á. G. (Eds.). (2005). *Hættumat vegna eldgosa og hlaupa frá vestanverðum Mýrdalsjökli og Eyjafjallajökli*. Reykjavík: Ríkislögreglustjórnin : Háskólaútgáfan.
- Guzzini, S. (1998). *Realism in international relations and international polical economy: The continuing story of death fortold*. London: Routledge.
- Hálfdanarson, G. (2007). Glatast fullveldið við inngöngu í Evrópusambandið? In S. B. Ómarsdóttir (Ed.), *Ný staða Íslands í utanríkismálum*. Reykjavík: Háskólaútgáfan.
- Hart, C. (2004). *Doing a masters dissertation*. London: SAGE.
- Hopf, T. (2002). *Social construction of international politics: identities & foreign policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Ingason, H. T., & Jónasson, H. I. (2012). *Skipulagsfaerni: verkefni, vegvisar og vidmid*. Reykjavik: JPV utgafa.
- Ingebritsen, C. (Ed.). (2006). *Small states in international relations*. Seattle : Reykjavik: University of Washington Press ; University of Iceland Press.
- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, & International Development Research Centre (Canada). (2001). *The responsibility to protect: report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- Jackson, R. (2007). Sovereignty and its Presuppositions: Before 9/11 and After. *Political Studies*, 55, 297–317.
- Jónasson, H. I., & Ingason, H. Þ. (2011). *Leiðtogafærni: sjálfsskilningur, þroski og þróun*. Reykjavík: JPV.
- Kahn, P. W. (2000). Speaking Law to Power: Popular Sovereignty, Human Rights, and the New International Order. *Faculty Scholarship Series. Paper 329*.
- Karns, M. P., & Mingst, K. A. (2010). *International organizations: the politics and processes of global governance* (2nd ed.). Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (2012). *Power and interdependence*. Boston: Longman.
- Kington, T. (2012, October 23). Italian scientist convicted over L'Aquila earthquake condemns "medieval" court. *Guardian.co.uk*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/oct/23/italian-scientist-earthquake-condemns-court>
- Krasner, S. D. (1999). *Sovereignty: organized hypocrisy*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Krasner, S. D. (2004). Sharing Sovereignty New Institutions for Collapse and Failing States. *International Security*, 29(2), 85–120.
- Leibfried, S., & Zürn, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Transformations of the state?* Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2009). *Áhættumatsskýrsla fyrir Ísland: Hnattrænir, samfélagslegir og hernaðarlegir þættir*. Reykjavík.
- Osiander, A. (2001). Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth. *International Organization*, 55(2), 251–287. doi:10.1162/00208180151140577
- Philpott, D. (2001). *Revolutions in sovereignty: how ideas shaped modern international relations*. Princeton N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Ruggie, J. (1993). Territoriality and beyond: problematizing modernity in international relations. *International Organization*, 47(1), 139–174.
- Scholte, J. A. (2005). *Globalization: a critical introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Taleb, N. (2010). *The black swan: the impact of the highly improbable* (2nd ed., Random trade pbk. ed.). New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks.
- UN General Assembly. (2009). Resolution 63/308. United Nations. Retrieved from <http://www.globalr2p.org/media/pdf/UNResolutionA63L.80Rev.1.pdf>
- UN ISDR. (2005). *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*. Geneva: UN ISDR. Retrieved from <http://www.unisdr.org/2005/wcdr/intergover/official-doc/L-docs/Hyogo-framework-for-action-english.pdf>
- UN Security Council. (2006). Resolution 1674. United Nations. Retrieved from <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/331/99/PDF/N0633199.pdf?OpenElement>
- United Nations. (1987). *Our Common Future* (p. 247). New York.
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.