

32nd International Geographical Congress 2012

Key Topic:

Risks & Conflicts

List of Session Abstracts

Session: Anxiety, biosecurity and conflicts

Chairs: Jonathan Everts & Ben Coles

Abstract:

The interrelation between so-called natural hazards such as floods, earthquakes and more broadly climate change with human systems informs a tradition of geographical research into human/environment interaction. More recently, other "natural" agents, such as microbes and invasive species, and their links to human systems, such as public health or food/agriculture (including food security) have begun to be incorporated into this programme. Much of this research, however, focuses on bio-physical hazards and contamination, and is incorporated into scientific practices and policy frameworks, which are organized around concepts of bio-security. Notions of bio-security, as a result, have themselves become the object of closer scrutiny within Geography and the social sciences at large (Braun 2007, Bingham & Hinchliffe 2008, Lakoff & Collier 2008). This session extends the scope of this existing work in two ways. First, it seeks to examine ways in which bio-security measures and related practices are shaped, influenced or otherwise informed through social anxieties (Jackson & Everts 2010). Second, this session seeks to investigate the ways in which "bio-security" as a term is socially and politically deployed (and contested) across various geographical scales and spaces to effect policy, to influence change and to enact social, political and economic agendas.

Session: Broadening the IPCC focus: extreme events, vulnerability to multiple stresses and adaptation options

Chair: Joern Brinkmann & Susan Cutter

Abstract:

The past discourse in climate change adaptation has primarily focused on vulnerability as the impact climate change related hazards. However, there is a need to broaden the focus in the assessment of vulnerability and adaptation needs; shifting from an impact analysis towards an improved understanding of vulnerability and the limits of adaptation. The IPCC Special report on Managing the Risk of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (published end of 2011) also underlines the importance of moving from the evaluation of gradual climate change (changes in the mean temperature) towards the identification of changes in extreme events and the analysis of societal capacities to deal with these extreme events and other stressors. The panel will deal with the contested terrain on how to define vulnerability, risk and adaptive capacities and thus how to identify priority groups and regions for adaptation and adaptation funds. In this context mismatches and potential linkages between an exposure and impact oriented understanding of vulnerability (direct impacts of climate change) on the one hand and a broader understanding of social vulnerability also considering societal development patterns, such as governance, trends in social security networks, risk communication etc., that modify and determine vulnerability on the other will be discussed. Options for linking physical and social geographies of climate change and climate change adaptation will be examined.

Practical cases of current adaptation processes identified in different regions will be used to illustrate the difficulties in identifying sustainable adaptation strategies and effective vulnerability reduction tools. Based on case study examples, also questions around tipping points and maladaptation will be explored. Different aspects that constrain adaptation – particularly of coupled social-ecological systems - will be outlined. In the final part recommendations will be formulated on how to improve the consideration of vulnerability in multiple-interacting systems and the acknowledgement of multiple-stressors.

Applications

Discussion of different approaches on how to determine vulnerability in the context of climate change, extreme events and adaptation

Examination of the implications of the different vulnerability and risk assessment approaches used for the selection of adaptation strategies /adaptation funding

Comparing and evaluating IPCC work (IPCC SREX report) with various approaches of geographic risk research

This session aims at encouraging an interdisciplinary and international debate about how climate change adaptation, extreme events and risk reduction can be usefully linked. Key findings of the session can also inform the ongoing work of the IPCC (AR5).

Session: Coasts at risk by extreme events I

Chairs: Andreas Vött & Helmut Brückner

Abstract:

Coasts represent the highly sensitive and dynamic interface between land and sea. The littoral zone is subject to climatic, tectonic, geological and anthropogenic influences and constitutes one of the most rapidly changing geomorphic systems on Earth. At the same time, more than one third of the world's population is concentrated in coastal areas. Thus, both gradual and rapid changes of coastal environments have direct consequences for mankind.

This session focuses on the role of extreme events, such as storms, tsunamis, near-coast landslides and related hazards, for the overall Holocene evolution of coastal zones. This is also a prerequisite for improving risk assessment strategies. Special attention is given to the identification of geo-scientific traces of extreme events in the coastal sedimentary record and coastal geomorphologies to be used to determine risk-related factors such as spatial and temporal variability, frequency and magnitude. Modern extreme event research is highly interdisciplinary, uses a multi-methodological approach and substantially supports the setting up of prospective scenarios of coastal hazards. The session will be organized under the auspices of the IGU Commission on Coastal Systems (CCS) and the German working group "Geographies of Seas and Coasts" (Arbeitskreis Geographie der Meere und Küsten, AMK), the latter commemorating its 30th anniversary in 2012.

Session: Coasts at risk by extreme events II

Chairs: Andreas Vött & Helmut Brückner

Abstract:

Coasts represent the highly sensitive and dynamic interface between land and sea. The littoral zone is subject to climatic, tectonic, geological and anthropogenic influences and constitutes one of the most rapidly changing geomorphic systems on Earth. At the same time, more than one third of the world's population is concentrated in coastal areas. Thus, both gradual and rapid changes of coastal environments have direct consequences for mankind.

This session focuses on the role of extreme events, such as storms, tsunamis, near-coast landslides and related hazards, for the overall Holocene evolution of coastal zones. This is also a prerequisite for improving risk assessment strategies. Special attention is given to the identification of geo-scientific traces of extreme events in the coastal sedimentary record and coastal geomorphologies to be used to determine risk-related factors such as spatial and temporal variability, frequency and magnitude. Modern extreme event research is highly interdisciplinary, uses a multi-methodological approach and substantially supports the setting up of prospective scenarios of coastal hazards. The session will be organized under the auspices of the IGU Commission on Coastal Systems (CCS) and the German working group "Geographies of Seas and Coasts" (Arbeitskreis Geographie der Meere und Küsten, AMK), the latter commemorating its 30th anniversary in 2012.

Session: Conflicts evolving from (re)constructing regions and borders based on historic geographies

Chairs: Sabine von Löwis & Nora Lafi

Abstract:

One reason for conflicts within and beyond nation states may be the existence of historic borders and regions which become alive as so called phantom borders. Very obvious has been for example the development of the former Yugoslavia towards a number of formerly existing historic spaces related to religious affiliations connected with heavy conflicts after a time of over 40 years of the state of Yugoslavia. In the Ukraine an obvious divide between the East and the West of Ukraine can be observed concerning different issues as languages (Russian, Ukrainian) or geopolitical orientations (towards Russia or Europe) which evolve towards conflicts as for instance the struggle about Ukrainian and Russian as official languages. Beyond that within the West of Ukraine for instance a

number of historic regions can be traced, which show significant differences in voting behavior which distinguish parts of the historic regions of Galicia, Volhynia, Carpathia Ruthenia and Bukovina from the rest of Ukraine, especially the East. These territories belonged to various power entities in different times in the past and belong to the Ukraine today. Nowadays such historic territories do not exist as such anymore but seem to remain as perhaps observed in the voting behavior.

Looking at the given examples the historic constitution needs be researched to understand the territorial and social dynamics within the regions. Without analyzing the historic dynamics the existence of phantom regions and potential evolving conflicts can not be explained sufficiently. Such phantom regions can and may lead to conflicts if they question current nation states, existing and agreed borders, national belongings or cause disputes about space and territory. Conflicts can be different as for example rather soft disputes about official languages but also stronger once about calling for national independence of territories.

Knowing the relevance of historic geographies for causing potential conflicts the question occurs how and in what way such phantom regions and borders are shaped and characterized on the one hand and how and why they are (re)constructed and continued in certain situations and contexts on the other hand. Beyond that it is essential to know how such phantom regions and borders lead to what kind of conflicts. And why and in what way do territorial and spatial / social differences in one context lead towards conflicts and in others not.

The (re)construction of phantom regions and borders are seen in multiple dimensions. The reasons and processes for such (re)constructions may be searched for in material structures and necessities of territorial space (e.g. watersheds, infrastructures as railways), continuous social behavior of societal and individual actors (e.g. cultural associations of displaced persons, retention of cultural traditions), remaining institutional and regulative structures by politics and society (e.g. formation of ethnic groups within political parties, continuation in the application of administrative / judicial regulations) but also in the handling of symbols and signs as maps, flags or architecture (e.g. urban and regional spatial development structures, major buildings).

The (re)construction of phantom regions is also seen connected with a number of levels of societal action which enhance or inhibit the processes of (re)constructions. First of all the practices of daily life on a local and regional level dealing with the above mentioned dimensions of space (e.g. use of language, practices in schools and universities) are relevant actions to look at for understanding (re)constructions of phantom regions. Second the political practices and institutions framing the local and regional actions are a further level of action to look at. While the first level is rather focused on social action and practices, the second level rather concerns political action and practices dealing with the institutional framework of how to deal on a local, regional or national level with religions, languages, ethnic groups, economic or social problems, etc. within nation states. Third, after all there exist a meta level of societal action framing the local and regional practices of day to day life and the political institutional level building institutions above that, as for example normative ideas as the concept and image of Europe, the concept of a Russian federation regarding for example the political actions in Ukraine or even the Habsburg Empire which still seem to show effects even it perished long ago.

The mentioned levels of societal and political actions may memorize historic dimensions and constellations of space but also disremember them. The session therefore wants to invite and discuss empirical studies from different contexts from all over the world and different nation states, which address one or all of the mentioned dimensions and also levels of societal actions (re)constructing borders and regions. The session wants especially discuss how such (re)constructions have lead to conflicts in the past or may in the future. To explain phantom frontiers, it is important to analyze different times and dynamics in history: phantom borders and regions do not come back automatically the spatial division must be historicized. At the same time the empirical studies to be presented shall theoretical reflect how to analyze and how to explain the occurrence of phantom regions and borders as potential cause for conflict.

Session: Development-induced displacement: Addressing conflict and impoverishment

Chairs: Jane Singer & Andreas Neef

Abstract:

Large-scale development – from road, dam and other infrastructure construction to rural land grabbing by foreign investors– is said to displace more than ten million people a year around the world. While development projects promise economic boons for the nation, for industry and the middle class, the greatest negative impacts are felt by already marginalized local communities, with many suffering at least short-term impoverishment. These projects may even exacerbate ethnic tensions or lead to conflict over land tenure or access to natural resources. The panel will discuss the implications of displacement for affected residents, those who are not physically displaced but are subject to other adverse impacts, and the host communities that must accommodate displaced populations. The panel will address the following specific topics:

- Human and environmental impacts: livelihood and living standards, mental and physical health, social and family networks, political change, community cohesion
- Determinants of successful resettlement and community resilience: links with form of governance, local implementation of regional and national policy and legislation
- Human rights and legal considerations – What is a migrant? Obligations of the state and the project authority, equitable access to resources, assessing common ownership of land and resources
- Rural displacement: Land-grabbing in Africa, Southeast Asia and Latin America; impacts on indigenous local communities; land use and agricultural practices
- Urban displacement: Defining targeted populations, reestablishing communities, coordinating government and civil society responses
- Achieving broader participation and choice for resettlers and safeguarding their rights
- Organized resistance and advocacy for affected populations
- Conflict generation and policies for defusing conflict
- Policy and implementation reform: Compensation, capacity-building at the regional and local level; restoring income-generating capacity, benefit-sharing with affected groups

Session: Early warning systems for natural hazards - technical challenges and social demands I

Chairs: Thomas Glade & Juergen Pohl

Abstract:

Natural hazards and consequent risks challenge various research disciplines. Respective studies range from sensor development and their implementation in the field to risk communication and governance strategies. The demand on real time information on natural hazards, and even forecasting the potentially damaging natural processes and the societal responses is of highest interest, not only for research but also for practical applications. Most recent events tragically demonstrate this need. In order to obtain such information, early warning systems for natural hazards are increasingly important.

This session aims to address the different early warnings systems for natural hazards. Hereby, the purpose is to address either the whole warning chain from process investigation to social responses or to present specific aspects of such a warning chain. Respective contributions might include, but are not limited to, detailed technical solutions, new data collection, transmission and analysis schemes, advanced modeling techniques, hazard and risk analysis, socioeconomic responses, risk communication as well as risk governance. Herein, the contributions might range from specific case studies to theoretical and conceptual approaches.

Session: Early warning systems for natural hazards - technical challenges and social demands II

Chairs: Thomas Glade & Juergen Pohl

Abstract:

Natural hazards and consequent risks challenge various research disciplines. Respective studies range from sensor development and their implementation in the field to risk communication and governance strategies. The demand on real time information on natural hazards, and even forecasting the potentially damaging natural processes and the societal responses is of highest interest, not only for research but also for practical applications. Most recent events tragically demonstrate this need. In order to obtain such information, early warning systems for natural hazards are increasingly important.

This session aims to address the different early warnings systems for natural hazards. Hereby, the purpose is to address either the whole warning chain from process investigation to social responses or to present specific aspects of such a warning chain. Respective contributions might include, but are not limited to, detailed technical solutions, new data collection, transmission and analysis schemes, advanced modeling techniques, hazard and risk analysis, socioeconomic responses, risk communication as well as risk governance. Herein, the contributions might range from specific case studies to theoretical and conceptual approaches.

Session: Emerging risksapes and the spatial dimension of risk I

Chairs: Detlef Müller-Mahn & Ragnar Löfstedt

Abstract:

The papers in this panel shall focus on the relations between risk and space, or rather, the constructedness of risk and space. They should, for example, address the following questions, and be based on theoretical debates and empirical research:

What do we mean when we talk of the spatial dimension (or dimensions?) of risk? For example with respect to the relevance of spatial categories in the context of risk research such as place, locality, scale, distance, co-presence, area, expansion, boundary setting, or with respect to the constructedness and/or materiality of space. How can we distinguish between risks that have a clear spatial (and material) dimension (natural hazards, floods etc.) and those that have not (Beck's notion of 'world risk', i.e. terrorism, climate change, financial crisis)? How are practices of risk inscribed into space, and how are they influenced, confined or even determined by material structures? How is the social construction of space related to the social construction of risk, and vice versa? Which are the practical implications of this relationship? What does that mean for technical measures to control risk (physical geography!), or for public discourses about issues of risk and uncertainty (social geography!)? How do different types of risk accumulate in (material and/or socially constructed) space? How do they influence each other, spread or move? Or is their apparent 'movement in space' only a projection of risk awareness into spatial patterns, but not a quality of space itself? What is the effect (be it spatial or not) of upscaling and downscaling of risk, i.e., the relationship between risk on a macro-level that is manufactured by specific social conditions, and awareness, decision-making and agency (risk-taking) by individuals? What is the relevance of scales for risk governance? What is the role and relevance of space for risk awareness and governance? How can the spatial dimension of risk be used for practical purposes, for example technological measures of risk control?

Session: Emerging risksapes and the spatial dimension of risk II

Chairs: Detlef Müller-Mahn & Ragnar Löfstedt

Abstract:

The papers in this panel shall focus on the relations between risk and space, or rather, the constructedness of risk and space. They should, for example, address the following questions, and be based on theoretical debates and empirical research:

What do we mean when we talk of the spatial dimension (or dimensions?) of risk? For example with respect to the relevance of spatial categories in the context of risk research such as place, locality, scale, distance, co-presence, area, expansion, boundary setting, or with respect to the constructedness and/or materiality of space. How can we distinguish between risks that have a clear spatial (and material) dimension (natural hazards, floods etc.) and those that have not (Beck's notion of 'world risk', i.e. terrorism, climate change, financial crisis)? How are practices of risk inscribed into space, and how are they influenced, confined or even determined by material structures? How is the

social construction of space related to the social construction of risk, and vice versa? Which are the practical implications of this relationship? What does that mean for technical measures to control risk (physical geography!), or for public discourses about issues of risk and uncertainty (social geography!)? How do different types of risk accumulate in (material and/or socially constructed) space? How do they influence each other, spread or move? Or is their apparent 'movement in space' only a projection of risk awareness into spatial patterns, but not a quality of space itself? What is the effect (be it spatial or not) of upscaling and downscaling of risk, i.e., the relationship between risk on a macro-level that is manufactured by specific social conditions, and awareness, decision-making and agency (risk-taking) by individuals? What is the relevance of scales for risk governance? What is the role and relevance of space for risk awareness and governance? How can the spatial dimension of risk be used for practical purposes, for example technological measures of risk control?

Session: Broadening the IPCC focus: extreme events, vulnerability to multiple stresses and adaptation options

Chairs: Joern Birkmann & Susan Cutter

Abstract:

The papers in this panel shall focus on the relations between risk and space, or rather, the constructedness of risk and space. They should, for example, address the following questions, and be based on theoretical debates and empirical research:

What do we mean when we talk of the spatial dimension (or dimensions?) of risk? For example with respect to the relevance of spatial categories in the context of risk research such as place, locality, scale, distance, co-presence, area, expansion, boundary setting, or with respect to the constructedness and/or materiality of space. How can we distinguish between risks that have a clear spatial (and material) dimension (natural hazards, floods etc.) and those that have not (Beck's notion of 'world risk', i.e. terrorism, climate change, financial crisis)? How are practices of risk inscribed into space, and how are they influenced, confined or even determined by material structures? How is the social construction of space related to the social construction of risk, and vice versa? Which are the practical implications of this relationship? What does that mean for technical measures to control risk (physical geography!), or for public discourses about issues of risk and uncertainty (social geography!)? How do different types of risk accumulate in (material and/or socially constructed) space? How do they influence each other, spread or move? Or is their apparent 'movement in space' only a projection of risk awareness into spatial patterns, but not a quality of space itself? What is the effect (be it spatial or not) of upscaling and downscaling of risk, i.e., the relationship between risk on a macro-level that is manufactured by specific social conditions, and awareness, decision-making and agency (risk-taking) by individuals? What is the relevance of scales for risk governance? What is the role and relevance of space for risk awareness and governance? How can the spatial dimension of risk be used for practical purposes, for example technological measures of risk control?

Session: Flood risks under conditions of global change: Dealing with uncertainties and dynamics of flood risk in urban areas

Chairs: Dagmar Haase & Laurens Bouwer

Abstract:

Under conditions of global change flood risk governance has to deal with dynamic and uncertain developments. On the one hand climate change will influence the probabilities of flood events and on the other hand socio-economic development will alter vulnerabilities to flooding. Especially urban areas will have to deal with these dynamics in flood risk. Predictors of how cities will be able to cope with and adapt to future flood risks will be, among others, its demographic and economic development, but also its social structure, its technical infrastructures as well as its governance capacity. Since already today more than half of the world population lives in cities and urban areas the topic is of global relevance and, considering actual urban growth rates, increasing priority. And, what is more, conditions become increasingly polarised: While some cities are rapidly growing and

become Megacities, others are declining. Thus, there are good reasons to suggest that different types of urban development result in different patterns of vulnerability.

The overall aim of the session is therefore to improve our understanding and management of uncertainties arising from the intersection of flood risk assessment and global change projections (e.g. climate, demographic and economic change but also shocks) with policy making in a specific urban context. The session is concerned with (1) the technical and scientific challenges involved in assessing the impacts of climate change on flood risks, with (2) the projection of future demographic, political, economic and institutional development of urban areas and their consequences for urban vulnerabilities as well as with (3) the institutional challenges involved in using model-based and/or scenario-based projections for policy making and the development of urban adaptation strategies. We will have a two timeslots session (80 minutes each).

Session: Flood risks under conditions of global change: Dealing with uncertainties and dynamics of flood risk in urban areas II

Chairs: Volker Meyer & Christian Kuhlicke

Abstract:

Under conditions of global change flood risk governance has to deal with dynamic and uncertain developments. On the one hand climate change will influence the probabilities of flood events and on the other hand socio-economic development will alter vulnerabilities to flooding. Especially urban areas will have to deal with these dynamics in flood risk. Predictors of how cities will be able to cope with and adapt to future flood risks will be, among others, its demographic and economic development, but also its social structure, its technical infrastructures as well as its governance capacity. Since already today more than half of the world population lives in cities and urban areas the topic is of global relevance and, considering actual urban growth rates, increasing priority. And, what is more, conditions become increasingly polarised: While some cities are rapidly growing and become Megacities, others are declining. Thus, there are good reasons to suggest that different types of urban development result in different patterns of vulnerability.

The overall aim of the session is therefore to improve our understanding and management of uncertainties arising from the intersection of flood risk assessment and global change projections (e.g. climate, demographic and economic change but also shocks) with policy making in a specific urban context. The session is concerned with (1) the technical and scientific challenges involved in assessing the impacts of climate change on flood risks, with (2) the projection of future demographic, political, economic and institutional development of urban areas and their consequences for urban vulnerabilities as well as with (3) the institutional challenges involved in using model-based and/or scenario-based projections for policy making and the development of urban adaptation strategies. We will have a two timeslots session (80 minutes each).

Session: Free flow or better stay at home? Changing practices in the management of international mobility

Chairs: Martin Geiger & Harald Bauder

Abstract:

This session discusses new developments in the field of mobility and migration politics. The international governance or 'management' of human mobility is based on the (re-)construction of migrants as 'risks' and of cross-border mobility as a 'risky project' for individuals and receiving societies. The trend to distinguish between the 'openness' to skilled migration ('free flows' across 'smart borders') and the 'closure' to unskilled workers obscures the convergence of apparently different state and non-state policies and practices in creating categories that order human mobility. Contemporary state and non-state practices of cross-border mobility and migration are characterized by a high degree of complexity; they are based on a mix of traditional coercive and direct interventions ('border management') and less repressive and indirect practices. Mobility and migration 'management' takes place at mostly all political levels and scales: transnational, international, and national scales; the individual migrant 'level'; social behavior and body politics (as

illustrated e.g. by the use of large-scale 'information campaigns' that promote 'better stay at home policies' or the increasing popularity of 'medical pre-departure screenings'). Against these material practices of control and regulation, migrants and the advocates for 'free movement' and 'no borders' are challenged to find their own creative spaces and answers to the question if and how migration should be regulated and how autonomous mobility projects can still be realized.

We invite contributions that analyze the (1) narratives and worldviews of recent mobility and migration politics; (2) key actors and practices motivating and promoting changes in the management of international mobility; (3) social consequences for migrants and societies resulting from mobility-related discourses and practices; (4) spatial and multi-level modes of mobility politics; and/or (5) normative ideas of the free and open cross-border flow of people.

Session: Geographies of violence

Chairs: Derek Gregory & Benedikt Korf

Abstract:

The end of the Cold War, 9/11 and the 'war(s) on terror' seem to have fundamentally transformed the structures and dynamics of contemporary warfare. While this proposition of "new wars" has remained controversial, critical geographers have engaged with the changing geographies of violence pertinent in contemporary "warscapes". Warscapes are landscapes of violence, coercion, suppression, fear, suffering – and at the same time, spaces of opportunism, economic enrichment and social transformation. It is this dialectics of warscapes and other landscapes of violence that these panel sessions seek to address. Several different sub-fields of interest can be identified: first, projects that focus on the spectacle of war, on the technologies through which the battle space is produced, visualized and mediatized, and on the operational conduct of military violence as well as projects that explore sites of embodied and emotional experiences of violence, coercion, suppression and militarization. These papers would examine the scalar politics of the dispersed battle space, the compound spatialities of theatres of war and national spheres, and the interfaces between military techno-science and the experiential dimensions of militarized life. A second strand of projects studies the social condition of war, the everyday practices of military and civilian actors in the political economies of warscapes and how dealing with the warscape is related to and embedded in the life-projects of those actors. These set of papers discuss the multiple spaces of violence, coercion as well as getting by, resistance and navigation that emerge in the political economies of warscapes. Potential contributors to this panel include (without being an exhaustive list): Jennifer Hyndman, Simon Dalby, John Morrissey, Timothy Raeymaekers, Oliver Belcher, Klaus Schlichte, Alex Veit, Markus Kienscherf, Ben Anderson, Peter Adey, Nick Megoran, Philippe le Billon, Michael Wattsm Jonathan Spencer, Michael Flitner

Session: Geography and totalitarian regimes

Chairs: Mark Bassin & Astrid Mehmel

Abstract:

Through a critical view on German history we can see, that geography can play a certain role in the legitimization and organization of totalitarian regimes. Not only the scientist's personal political view, but also science as such can play a certain role in undemocratic systems. When Hitler came to power, for example, some geographers were already active in research fields connected with or later integrated into the NS ideology. Geography stabilized the political regime or had input on certain research programs; was even claimed to be of strategic importance.

Research into German geography and biographies of geographers in the first half of the 20th century have been restudied in recent years to understand their role in the time. Similar efforts are undertaken to examine the dependencies of geographical research in the GDR.

Besides the history of geography, historical geographical research is also committed to coping with totalitarian regimes. This research might help to re- or even deconstruct the role of space and place in totalitarian regimes. As can be seen in the example of the NS training institution Vogelsang, the regime used landscape as a means of propaganda. Another example is Prora. Originally planned as a

touristic structure for the program Kraft durch Freude, its subsequent use as a barracks by the Nationale Volksarmee demonstrates how the function of spaces may differ from regime to regime. "Geography and Totalitarian Regimes" seeks to bring together scientists from all fields of geography researching on totalitarian regimes. Possible papers are not restricted to the history of German or to socialist and national-socialist regimes. The aim is to provide a deeper insight into the conjunction of geography and totalitarian regimes as such.

The topic will be discussed in two sessions representing two perspectives. The first will focus on the role geography as a subject had or has within totalitarian regimes.

Session: Indigeneity, state power and struggles over space

Chairs: Judith Miggelbrink & Bernd Belina

Abstract:

Struggle over space is central to all conflicts involving indigeneity as the very idea of "having been there before" entails land claims to be made against those who came later, usually actors of state or capital. In the session we want to discuss the various forms these conflicts take in different settings. We are especially interested in bringing together scholars who attempt to place conflicts between indigenous groups and state or capital actors over land (rights) into a framework of Political Geography that is sensitive to the way in which

- group identities of imagined communities such as indigenous, ethnic and national groups are used strategically in conflicts over space;
- political conflicts are translated into legal conflicts in which group rights are crucial;
- trans- and international coalitions and collaborations of indigenous people are formed and use international law;
- risk is used as descriptive or legitimizing tool in these conflicts;
- socio-economic and political economic aspects are relevant in these struggles.

We solicit contributions from all continents and political systems, concerning all types of land (right) struggles. Our aim is to discuss questions of indigeneity and struggles over space in a comparative manner, building on a variety of case studies.

Session: Infrastructures as a key topic for societal disaster resilience

Chairs: Alexander Fekete & Jörn Birkmann

Abstract:

The relevance of infrastructures to society is revealed in case of a severe service interruption. Water, food, energy, IT, transport and other infrastructure services are paramount for society, which becomes especially evident when disasters happen. Modern societies have become increasingly dependent on the reliance on infrastructures. At the same time, global and technical interdependencies between infrastructures grow and "normal accidents" have a potential in triggering widespread cascading effects of failure or loss of service. The concept of societal disaster resilience combines a wide range of dealing with criticality, vulnerability and capacities in the pre- and post disaster phases.

The session invites contributions to the following aspects

- Interdisciplinary approaches dealing with infrastructure and disaster
- Criticality of infrastructure as a risk paradigm in security policies
- Challenges of spatial risk assessments of infrastructure and interdependency effects
- Long-term sustainability of infrastructures as a proactive planning instrument
- 'Basic needs' reconsidered: the development of societal safety and security goals
- Benefits and challenges of Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) concepts, risk governance and securitisation

Applications

- Risk assessment and management
- Multi-level stakeholder involvement in the discourse on societal resilience
- Opportunities for increasing societal resilience through infrastructure criticality research for civil protection and civil contingencies agencies

This session aims at encouraging an interdisciplinary debate, involving perspectives by different scientific disciplines, public authorities, economy and the affected people. The scope on infrastructures will be extended from a pure technical focus on physical assets to societal resilience.

Session: Inter-cultural tensions and post-conflict political identity

Chair: Rainer Rothfuss & Anton Gosar

Abstract:

National, ethnic, religious and other layers of identity play an important role in violent intra-national conflicts. The point of departure of such conflicts in some cases is the dysfunctionality of the spatial receptacle of the "state" which does no longer fulfill its basic roles of providing security, welfare and self-identification for all its diverse groups composing its citizenship. When identity conflicts have led to the falling apart of a nation state or to the secession of parts of it a new state structure has to take over the above mentioned functions for the respective territory and its citizens. Cases like Nigeria raise the question whether a joint nation state can subsist in the long run. Others like South Sudan seem to have put an end to decade long identity related civil war but have created one of the world's poorest states with a number of ethnic groups that have to struggle for a new joint identity to form the new nation. Within Europe, the case of former Yugoslavia is a doubtful example of trying to adapt national boundaries to the complex spatial pattern of ethnic and religious groups. What peoples all over the world seem to be seeking are territories in which people live with a rather homogeneous identity, basic value sets and notion of society. For countries having undergone more recent processes of violent conflict, separation and subsequent nation building there are multiple challenges to be overcome which are of major importance to the different branches of human geographic research: political and administrative system, infrastructure, territorial planning, identity related issues of education, citizenship and belonging. The session seeks to join experiences from different processes of nation-building worldwide and to derive lessons learned. Both theoretical, conceptual and empirical papers on the issues of inter-cultural tensions, post-conflict state-building, spatial identity (re-)formation and mitigation strategies for violent identity conflicts are welcome.

Session: Local Responses to Natural Disasters

Chairs: Andreas Neef & Rajib Shaw

Abstract:

Communities affected by natural disasters are often stigmatized as being passive with regard to disaster prevention, mitigation and adaptation, waiting only for government assistance in the aftermath of such events. This panel intends to discuss the resilience mechanisms of local communities and the creative responses of individuals and groups at the local level to natural disasters that threaten their livelihoods. Specifically, the panel addresses the following questions:

- How do individuals, families and social groups in rural and urban communities perceive natural disasters, their underlying reasons and their effects on their livelihoods?
- What are specific factors that determine the degree of vulnerability and resilience among disaster-affected communities?
- How can external expert knowledge and local wisdom and experience be creatively combined to enhance communities' preparedness for natural disasters?
- What are the most vulnerable groups in local communities and how can their resilience to disasters be strengthened and their long-term livelihoods be secured?
- How can institutional and policy frameworks in support of community-based disaster risk management be designed?
- What is the role of social capital, collective action and human agency in enhancing disaster preparedness, mitigation and adaptive capacity?
- Which theories, conceptual frameworks and methodologies can inform vulnerability assessments at the community level?
- What are the interfaces and possible tradeoffs between individual, community and state responses to natural disasters?

Session: Natural resources and risk management in developing countries - Networking for sustainability

Chairs: Udo Nehren & Junun Sartohadi

Abstract:

The management of natural resources - land, water and energy resources – determines human nutrition, health and development status. Developing countries are in particular need for a sustainable natural resources management and thus risk mitigation, since

- major shares of their population and economy depend to a high degree on the natural resources base,
- they face severe problems associated with demographic changes (population growth and migration) exerting additional pressures on the environment,
- in addition, many developing countries are highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change.

A particular challenge of research on natural resources management is the close interrelation between technological, environmental, economic, social, and political aspects. It has to address complex human-environmental systems at various spatial scales that are situated in a highly dynamic world. Thus analyzing the complex problems and deriving systemic solutions undoubtedly requires a holistic approach.

The session shall be open for papers presenting research on natural resources and risk management in developing countries, including the natural and human dimensions of risks and disasters. Of particular interest are multidisciplinary studies.

The session will be organized as normal paper session, with open submissions of papers, plus a keynote from IGU members of CNRD in the beginning. Preference will be given to papers presenting results of joint research or international research collaboration as the organizers believe in the necessity to unite the internal expertise and experience.

It will be organized and chaired by members of the Center for Natural Resources Development (CNRD), an international and interdisciplinary university network regarding issues on assessing and managing the natural resources base as prerequisite for sustainable development.

Session: New cartographies of risk and conflicts

Chairs: Boris Michel & Georg Glasze

Abstract:

The emergence of web 2.0 considerably changes the production and use of maps. The “neo-cartographies” of the “geoweb” challenge not just the role of cartographers and geographers as the authorized producers of maps and cartographic knowledge, but produce a wide range of new mapping practices. This becomes most apparent in the context of web based crisis and risk cartographies where collaborative and highly dynamic mapping projects open up new ways of recording and managing crises and assessing risk. Recent examples include crisis mapping of the earthquakes in Haiti and Japan, mapping conflicts in North Africa and the Middle East, as well as the deployment of web mapping in risk assessment and environmental planning.

While these new practices are frequently celebrated as a new democratic and instant way of responding to social, political and ecological crises in very different contexts, there are a number of questions that call for a critical examination. This session invites papers related to the (online) mapping of conflicts and crises. We are looking for practical examples and reflective research, including critical cartography, that addresses some of the following questions:

- How are conflicts played out within crisis mappings. What new power relations are produced, what voices silenced?
- How are existing power relations and hegemonies contested, sustained or enhanced by these new cartographic practices?
- What is the role of technology in these processes and how can we conceptualize it?
- How do practices of defining and constructing risks, crises and conflicts change?
- How is knowledge produced by these new discourses and practices and how does it differ from the previous power-knowledge of cartographic reason?

- Despite the overwhelming positive response to most of these projects by media and academia there is very little work done on their actual impact. Does web mapping in these contexts make a difference?

Session: New cartographies of risk and conflicts II

Chairs: Boris Michel & Georg Glasze

Abstract:

The emergence of web 2.0 considerably changes the production and use of maps. The “neo-cartographies” of the “geoweb” challenge not just the role of cartographers and geographers as the authorized producers of maps and cartographic knowledge, but produce a wide range of new mapping practices. This becomes most apparent in the context of web based crisis and risk cartographies where collaborative and highly dynamic mapping projects open up new ways of recording and managing crises and assessing risk. Recent examples include crisis mapping of the earthquakes in Haiti and Japan, mapping conflicts in North Africa and the Middle East, as well as the deployment of web mapping in risk assessment and environmental planning.

While these new practices are frequently celebrated as a new democratic and instant way of responding to social, political and ecological crises in very different contexts, there are a number of questions that call for a critical examination. This session invites papers related to the (online) mapping of conflicts and crises. We are looking for practical examples and reflective research, including critical cartography, that addresses some of the following questions:

- How are conflicts played out within crisis mappings. What new power relations are produced, what voices silenced?
- How are existing power relations and hegemonies contested, sustained or enhanced by these new cartographic practices?
- What is the role of technology in these processes and how can we conceptualize it?
- How do practices of defining and constructing risks, crises and conflicts change?
- How is knowledge produced by these new discourses and practices and how does it differ from the previous power-knowledge of cartographic reason?
- Despite the overwhelming positive response to most of these projects by media and academia there is very little work done on their actual impact. Does web mapping in these contexts make a difference?

Session: Placemaking and guerilla strategies in contested public spaces

Chairs: Martin Klamt & Martin Sondermann

Abstract:

An urban development towards sustainability and liveability requires new ways to integrate civil society into development processes such as placemaking and appropriation of public spaces.

Regarding the latter, creative and informal activities can be observed reaching from street art and flashmob dances to guerrilla gardening and benching. These grass-roots activities are related to several contemporary discourses in human geography about the constitution of and the right to space.

Public spaces are urban arenas for different social groups. Conflicts may arise due to (seemingly) incompatible interests of the users of public space. Public space is therefore always contested space. Conflicts arise from planning concepts and architecture which do not correspond to the user's perspective sufficiently. Property rights, legal provisions, and social control have to be seen as contested instruments of regulating public space.

So-called 'unintended' behaviour is causing tensions – and so are urban placemaking and guerrilla strategies. At the same time, this opens up whole new perspectives of urban life. The broad geographical scope of contested public spaces includes for example political demonstrations on the streets and squares of the city, 'twitter revolutions' in virtual public space as well as planting flowers on the pavement as new forms of intervention. Recent political events such as the clashes on Tahrir Square in Cairo might serve as an example here as well as urban gardening projects, any experimental or playful use of public space, and street art.

What are the possible solutions regarding geographical research as well as social behaviour, law, planning, and architecture? Calling for a wide range of possible contributions, conflict analyses, and 'usability' studies, we are pleased to see theoretical and methodological approaches as well as international case studies. The regional focus is decisively unlimited. Interdisciplinary perspectives, e.g. with a view to environmental psychology, legal studies or political science are particularly welcome. The task is to integrate various perspectives into new geographical research approaches to existing conflicts and possible solutions evolving from and related to placemaking and guerrilla strategies in public spaces.

Session: Power struggles – energy systems governance and conflict I

Chairs: Johannes Hamhaber & Günther Weiss

Abstract:

Across economic, political, environmental and social dimensions, energy systems regularly create uneven distribution of costs and benefits – with all related conflict potentials. Currently, the expected system transformation (e.g. to post-fossil energy futures) and the related implementation of new energy technology carries diverse and extensive conflict potentials as these cost and benefits will systematically be redistributed:

- Technology installations and their acceptance create mainly local conflict lines (e.g. NIMBY syndrome).
- Existing large scale supply systems are structurally inert (e.g. lock-ins) and resistant to transformation and will be negotiated mainly on national to supra-/trans-national levels.
- Globally, the disjunct distribution of resources and demand, and the localisation of global environmental risks, regularly create geopolitical disruptions.

Common to all these conflict lines is the underlying struggle for the narrative, and the combat for the definition and construction of accepted 'truths'.

The session therefore intends to present and analyse these conflict potentials and the ensuing manifest conflicts related to risks specific to both, existing energy systems and to their ongoing transition. Papers and presentations should analyse these conflict lines from a decidedly theoretical perspective such as the negotiation, re-construction and deliberate use of spatialities (and their use such as inclusion, exclusion, scaling,...) on shaping future energy systems.

This double session will invite a minimum of 8 presentations. Depending on the submitted proposals, the selected topics will be organized into two thematic clusters of four presentations per part-session.

Session: Power struggles – energy systems governance and conflict II

Chairs: Johannes Hamhaber & Günther Weiss

Abstract:

Across economic, political, environmental and social dimensions, energy systems regularly create uneven distribution of costs and benefits – with all related conflict potentials. Currently, the expected system transformation (e.g. to post-fossil energy futures) and the related implementation of new energy technology carries diverse and extensive conflict potentials as these cost and benefits will systematically be redistributed:

- Technology installations and their acceptance create mainly local conflict lines (e.g. NIMBY syndrome).
- Existing large scale supply systems are structurally inert (e.g. lock-ins) and resistant to transformation and will be negotiated mainly on national to supra-/trans-national levels.
- Globally, the disjunct distribution of resources and demand, and the localisation of global environmental risks, regularly create geopolitical disruptions.

Common to all these conflict lines is the underlying struggle for the narrative, and the combat for the definition and construction of accepted 'truths'.

The session therefore intends to present and analyse these conflict potentials and the ensuing manifest conflicts related to risks specific to both, existing energy systems and to their ongoing transition. Papers and presentations should analyse these conflict lines from a decidedly theoretical perspective such as the negotiation, re-construction and deliberate use of spatialities (and their use such as inclusion, exclusion, scaling,...) on shaping future energy systems.

This double session will invite a minimum of 8 presentations. Depending on the submitted proposals, the selected topics will be organized into two thematic clusters of four presentations per part-session.

Session: Pro-poor Environmental Governance: Pathways to Address Socio-Ecological Conflicts in Tropical Rainforest Regions

Chairs: Dörte Segebart & Pablo Pacheco

Abstract:

Institution-building currently features prominently among the solutions to reconcile poverty reduction and sustainable resource use. Recent works emphasize the significant contribution of institutional reform to more sustainable socio-ecological systems. A large body of this literature often advances depoliticised notions of governance. These governance concepts do not sufficiently take into account that institutional change often takes place in highly inegalitarian societal contexts. However, environmental governance is about institutional change that resolves conflicts over environmental resources. This implies that pro-poor environmental governance is also about creating boundaries and potentially about excluding non-poor resource users. Understanding the challenges to pro-poor environmental governance in inegalitarian contexts also requires a structural approach to resource use and the power relations that underpin them. Governance concepts need not only be politicised, they also need to build on a dialectical understanding of structure and agency. The Amazon is an interesting case to study governance along these lines. Several conflicting resource use concur in the Amazon. They materialise in a social context characterised by severe inequalities in resource access. The dominant resulting pattern is one of continuing marginalisation of poor groups and unsustainable resource use. Severe socio-ecological conflicts often ensue. Risks related to climate change and increasing resource scarcity because of, i.a., integration of regional products in global markets is likely to intensify these conflicts. At the same time, a large array of institutional responses to these socio-ecological conflicts is currently being implemented. The panel will contribute to a better understanding of socio-ecological conflicts in the Amazon and will discuss concepts of and pathways to pro-poor environmental governance. It welcomes conceptual papers and original research.

Session: Reconstruction devastated lands

Chairs: Derek Gregory & Jean Radvanyi

Abstract:

In the last decades, many countries were devastated by conflicts and wars:

Chechnia, Irak and Afghanistan, Palestine and Soudan are the most recent examples. Bombing of cities, mining of agriculture lands, disrupting of roads, pipes, water systems are some of the impacts of the conflicts. How can Geographers help to evaluate these damages, participate to reconstruction, find new solutions in the new borders, the new territories designed by wars. What can be proposed in long-term tense situations as “frozen conflicts” when large part of territories cannot be used in normal ways.

Session: Resettlement and relocation as a hazard prevention strategy

Jürgen Pohl & Swen Zehetmair

Abstract:

Over the past years, comprehensive concepts of risk management and risk governance have been discussed. Within this discussion the importance of prevention as one element of disaster risk reduction has been pointed out. The responsible authorities implement many different strategies in risk prevention, at which the avoidance strategy (mitigation) – and in particular relocation – can be seen as most extensive. Relocation can be understood as a resettlement of a residential area – not single buildings – from a hazard prone area to a safe domain. The voluntariness of these hazard mitigation measurements represents another important characteristic of relocations. As a natural hazard prevention several relocations have been carried out so far, for example relocations in the context of earthquakes, tornados, landslides and floods. Circumstances and restrictions have differed in each case.

Aim of this session is to present different forms of voluntary resettlement and relocation in the context of natural hazard prevention. One objective of the session is to present different case studies of relocation projects. Thereby the prospects and obstacles of different financial, political, socio-economic, structural and legal settings should be discussed. It would also be of interest for hazard-related relocations, if lessons could be learnt from relocation in the context of open-cast mining or dam projects. Other points of interest could be the challenges of functions likely to cause conflicts (e.g. nuclear power plants and residential areas as in the events of Fukushima in Japan in 2011) or of climate change with increasing natural hazards and sea level rise. Are relocations a proper strategy to cope with climate change? If yes, for which types of hazard and in which settings?

Session: Risk analysis and management in urban areas: the challenge for methodological geodata and remote sensing approaches

Chairs: Kerstin Krellenberg & Rene Höfer

Abstract:

Urbanization is the phenomena of the 21 century, and, especially in the Global South, associated with an increase of large agglomerations. Urbanization processes like urban expansion often go hand in hand with land-use and land-cover changes, both having a significant impact on environmental services. Among these changes is for example the reduction of green spaces that show positive effects related to the urban energy balance, storm water infiltration, etc. Changes associated with urbanization processes are therefore likely to amplify the intensity of potentially hazardous events like heat stress or flooding. However, it is the urban population that suffers from the related consequences such as increasing temperatures, flooding and air pollution, among others.

For reducing the impacts of urbanization, especially the impacts of hazardous events, the monitoring of urban dynamics is among the major issues of urban research. Updated and spatially differentiated information about the exposed population is essential for a better risk management.

Geodata-based and remote sensing approaches provide a cost efficient possibility to capture the dynamics of a growing urban environment. Therefore, this session will provide a platform for ongoing research on different approaches for risk analysis, with a special focus on large agglomerations in the Global South. Contributions are especially welcome that present approaches for an efficient

monitoring of the urban environment, related to the complexity dealing with different scales, the estimation of social variables from remote sensing data or combined geodata-based approaches for risk analysis and management. The main emphasis lies on innovative methodological approaches as well as comparative case studies.

Session: Risk governance in Southeast Asian cities

Chairs: Javier Revilla Diez & Frauke Kraas

Abstract:

Cities in South East Asia face manifold challenges. These are consequences of the dynamic growth processes, including migration, fragmentation and social polarization, lack of resources, deficits in infrastructure and provision of housing. During the last years, one further aspect comes into discussion. Cities are more and more seen as hotspots of natural and socio-economic risks. The exposure towards shocks is increasing and aggravating the mentioned challenges. Cities in Southeast Asia are prone to external shocks which are influenced by natural processes (like climate change) or by economic processes (Asian crisis, Global Economic Crisis 2008/9), and they are challenged also by internal, mainly socio-economic crisis phenomena (social unrest, growing disparities). In order to maintain their functional capability as growth engines, integrative, participatory approaches in spatial and economic development are needed. Joint efforts of regional and national stakeholders (private households, companies, administration, politics, civil society) can contribute to the evolution of effective governance modes.

It is the aim of this session to discuss theoretical and empirical studies on different governance modes of dealing with urban risks in Southeast Asian cities by addressing to the following research topics:

- Cities as hotspots of multiple risks exposed to external and internal shocks (either naturally or economically driven)
- Adaptation strategies of national, regional and local stakeholders
- Governance modes for an efficient spatial and economic development

Session: Spatial landslide analysis and its implementation in spatial planning

Chairs: Rainer Bell & Alexander Brenning

Abstract:

Landslides are a major threat in mountainous areas throughout the world. They cause significant economic damage and numerous deaths each year. To reduce these severe consequences and prevent intensified land use in hazardous areas in the future, landslide susceptibility and hazard maps must be prepared and implemented in spatial planning.

Numerous questions remain open not only in landslide susceptibility and hazard modeling but also regarding the implementation of such models within spatial planning. The session aims at discussing new and innovative methods of landslide susceptibility and hazard modeling, including suitable validation tools. However, it seems that state-of-the-art landslide susceptibility maps that are optimized for their predictive performance are not necessarily best suited for implementation in a spatial planning context. The resulting maps need to be optimized for particular end users, addressing the special needs of spatial planning. This involves, for example, the consideration of respective regulations and laws, if available, but also the choice of a suitable cartographic representation that conveys adequate information on susceptibility or hazard as well as model uncertainties. Presentations are welcome that focus on spatial landslide analysis methods or applications, either in the context of susceptibility or hazard, using heuristic, deterministic or physically-based models, and on respective validation tools. Furthermore, we seek contributions on the implementation of landslide susceptibility or hazard maps in local, regional or national spatial planning of various environmental and socio-economic settings. Discussing the reasons for the successful implementation or its failure will help to identify future research needs related to model development, validation, and application.

Session: The fight against disenfranchisement: Emerging cultures of protest in the city

Chairs: Luis Del Romero Renau & Samuel Mössner

Abstract:

As the logics and dynamics of capitalism are transforming urban space (Brenner et al. 2009; Harvey 2009), cities constitute arenas of conflicts and social contestation (Berking et al. 2006). Even though social contestation in capitalist cities can be regarded as an integral part of the daily urban experience (Lefebvre 1970), conflicts yet remain rather underrepresented within human geography. Conflicts as social phenomena draw the attention to protests that emerge from power differentials in the city. Being situated within the realm of civil society, these protests against the economization of urban space were relatively strong in the 1970s and 80s. In the 1990s, however, it seems like citizens had largely accepted contestation as an urban fact (Borja 2003).

During the past few years urban protests re-occurred in many European cities, indicating a new relationship between conflicts and protests. As conflicts refer to actual processes of postmodern restructuring (Soja 2006) – such as governmental strategies to gentrify inner-city and historical neighborhoods, the “festivalization” of old-industrial areas or processes of exurban metropolization – civil protest becomes crucial for denouncing trends of disenfranchisement in urban governance. Drawing on the concept of the “right to the city” (Lefebvre 1968; Marcuse 2009) a vivid landscape of single protest initiatives has formed to a unique social movement, addressing re-investments into the built-environment and neo-liberal growth-machines with their informal, yet less transparent decision-making processes.

This panel aims at developing a comparative perspective on the relationship between protest cultures and urban conflicts. Drawing on a series of case studies as well as statistical analysis, we would like to better understand the causes of conflicts, the motivations and practices to articulate protest and strategies to manage conflicts within different cultural and political contexts and epochs.

Session: Urban dynamics and environmental conflicts

Chairs: Ellen Banzhaf & Alexis Vásquez

Abstract:

The global urban issue of the 21st century shows more than 400 cities with populations of one million and more. Only one hundred years ago, just 16 cities worldwide had more than one million inhabitants. The quantity of large cities and the scale of urbanized areas make urbanization as the decisive driver of land-use change. Landscapes change rapidly, and population is urbanizing at high velocity. Current socio-spatial configurations of cities could be characterized as fragmented, due to their complexity and heterogeneity, and to the lack of social, spatial and environmental integration. In the course of social dynamics, demands on land use are becoming highly differentiated and transform regions. Urban growth results in expansive use of agricultural land and open spaces which leads to a growing potential of land use conflicts. Furthermore, stagnating or shrinking cities struggle with land-use conflicts through densification or perforation processes in the economic, ecological and social dimensions.

Adaptation to global and climate change is essential at local and regional scale. It is the urban dynamics that makes the urban system socially and physically fragile evoking physical, social, ecological, and environmental implications.

Environmental conflicts comprise demographic and social conflicts as well as resource and development conflicts. They have in common that different interests, goals or values of population, governance or private sector seem to be incompatible, and result in imbalances between issues such as environmental protection, urban dynamics, and equity and social justice. Such disequilibrium leads to a flaw in urban sustainable development.

Conflicts are produced and accelerate, first, because the numbers in population and their density increase, the complexity in social structure is higher, and the biophysical flows are highly modified. Second, people struggle with conflicts because different ramifications do not exist singularly, but appear conjointly and form a complex system of multiple dimensions.

To develop solutions is of crucial importance for urban sustainability. The session will look into the subject urban dynamics in terms of changing land use, preserving nature-related spaces, and

population development impacting environmental conflicts. The development of land-use options and well-adapted planning instruments is the challenge to secure the quality of life in cities. The session will address to spatial planners, social and environmental scientists and geographers. It will encourage to deal with modern techniques, e.g. GIS and remote sensing analysis, spatial research in social sciences, and conceptual approaches.