

Climate governance according to ideals of justice

By Patrick Bond

Presented to the symposium

Climate governance in the post-Copenhagen era:

New directions in policy practice and scholarship

Centre for Climate Policy and Science Research, Linköping University, 8 May 2014

Introduction

Global and national climate governance regimes are characterised, I have argued (Bond 2012), by ‘paralysis above, movement below.’ The paralysis above comes largely from the failure of market-centric systems of governance, in which carbon trading and offset strategies were anticipated to successfully manage an incremental decline in GreenHouse Gas emissions, in the 1997 Kyoto Protocol. For a variety of reasons, the market strategy has failed miserably, yet as Antonio Gramsci would have put it, the climate governance ‘crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born.’ What kind of governance might result if demands made by the climate justice movement were given more attention?

Movement origins

The ‘CJ’ movement emerged during the early 2000s, fusing a variety of progressive political-economic and political-ecological currents in order to combat the most serious threat humanity and most other species face in the twenty-first century. The concept of climate justice addresses the intersections of ‘green’ ecological concerns and ‘red’ socio-economic ethical considerations, ranging from public policy deliberations to political practices. Climate justice follows directly from the much older ‘Environmental Justice’ movement that especially emphasised the racial and class injustices of pollution in the United States (Bullard 1990; Schlosberg 1999).

The first known conference based on the term climate justice was a 2000 event in The Hague sponsored by the New York group CorpWatch (Karliner 2000). Four years later, the Durban Group for Climate Justice was launched, and for many years remained an important strategic listserv for those opposed to carbon trading and other ‘false solutions’ to the climate crisis (<http://www.durbanclimatejustice.org/>). The sometimes inchoate advocacy movement known as Climate Justice Now! (CJN!) began in 2007, and played a role in grassroots environmental advocacy as well as global-scale United Nations climate summits (<http://www.climate-justice-now.org/>; see also Kaara 2009). The highest-profile of these, with 100,000 protesters demanding a strong agreement from negotiators, was in Copenhagen in 2009. In contesting mainstream environmentalists, Danes and other Europeans formed a Climate Justice Alliance (CJA) whose ‘Reclaiming Power’ protest was severely repressed by Danish police protecting the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP) 15 (<http://www.climate-justice-action.org/>).

Shortly after the Copenhagen summit's well-recognised failure, the Bolivian government led by Evo Morales and his then UN Ambassador Pablo Solon hosted a 2010 conference in Cochabamba, attended by 35,000 activists, including 10,000 from outside the country (<http://pwccc.wordpress.com/>). This was important partly because of attempts to more deeply incorporate within mainstream climate politics a commitment to carbon markets and offset payments, especially through the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD). The Cochabamba conference adopted several demands that were anathema to mainstream climate politics. The Bolivian government campaigned to put these (and a few others) into official UN texts:

- 50 per cent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2017;
- stabilising temperature rises to 1°C and 300 parts per million;
- acknowledging the climate debt owed by developed countries;
- full respect for human rights and the inherent rights of indigenous people;
- universal declaration of rights of Mother Earth to ensure harmony with nature;
- establishment of an International Court of Climate Justice;
- rejection of carbon markets and commodification of nature and forests through the REDD programme;
- promotion of measures that change the consumption patterns of developed countries;
- end of intellectual property rights for technologies useful for mitigating climate change; and
- payment of 6 per cent of developed countries' GDP to addressing climate change (<http://cochabamba2010.typepad.com/blog/2010/08/the-proposals-of-peoples-agreement-in-the-texts-for-united-nations-negotiation-on-climate-change.html>).

As Edgardo Lander (2010) explained in his review of the Cochabamba conference,

[s]truggles for environmental or climate justice have managed to bring together most of the most important issues/struggles of the last decades (justice/equality, war/militarization, free trade, food sovereignty, agribusiness, peasants' rights, struggles against patriarchy, defense of indigenous peoples' rights, migration, the critique of the dominant Eurocentric/colonial patterns of knowledge, as well as struggles for democracy, etc., etc.). All these issues were debated in Cochabamba and, to some degree, present in the Cochabamba Peoples' Agreement.

Cochabamba was a critical moment for generating positions and a Climate Justice manifesto, in part because several other uses of the term soon emerged. Grassroots social justice activists continued to radicalise these traditions when it became apparent, in the aftermath of the Copenhagen Accord between leaders from Washington, Pretoria, Brasilia, Beijing and New Delhi (followed by the Obama Administration's bribery and bullying to gain more support, unveiled by WikiLeaks), that global-scale advocacy would not succeed (Bond 2012).

Climate justice versus mainstream climate governance

From the realisation that ‘neoliberalized nature’ was the new global-governance approach for environmental (and social) management, there emerged, in direct response, a new Climate Justice philosophy and ideology, principles, strategies and tactics. Four key aspects that distinguish justice from mainstream environmentalism include, first, the legacy of anti-racist environmentalism in the 1980s-90s, which first conclusively linked social justice to geographically-discrete ecological problems, but which transcended ‘Not in My Backyard’ arguments in favour of a system-transforming narrative. Secondly, there were global-scale demands in the 1990s to recognise the ‘ecological debt’ owed by the North to the South, made by groups such as Acción Ecológica (based in Quito, Ecuador), as well as for much wider-ranging considerations of climate politics, leading up to the Kyoto Protocol negotiations. Thirdly, the late 1990s Jubilee campaign against Northern financial domination of the South added ecological debt to financial debt, and soon compelled consideration of climate from a radical standpoint within the World Council of Churches and other faith movements. Finally, these strands were reinforced in the 2000s by the global justice movement, which came to the fore with the December 1999 Seattle World Trade Organisation (WTO) protest and challenged corporations and multilateral institutions with much greater force than in prior years (see Agyeman et al 2003; Bullard 2013; Camacho 1998).

Since the 2000s, the climate justice manifestation has grown in strength and prominence. At the time of the Reclaim Power CJA/CJN protest at the Copenhagen COP17, which was the high point of the climate justice movement’s global-scale advocacy, Anne Petermann (2009) of the Global Justice Ecology Project defined the concept as follows:

Climate Justice is the recognition that the historical responsibility for the vast majority of greenhouse gas emissions lies with the industrialized countries of the global north. It is the understanding that peasants, indigenous peoples, fisher-folk, women and local communities have been disproportionately affected by climate change, also by the fossil fuel industry and by false solutions to climate change, including tree plantations, genetically modified organisms like crops, large scale hydro projects and agro-fuels. These are also the people least responsible for climate change. Climate Justice recognizes that instead of market based solutions, the sustainable practices of these peoples and communities should be seen as offering the real solutions to climate change. Climate Justice is the fundamental knowledge that climate change cannot be addressed through corporations and the market as these are the entities that caused the problem in the first place.

The development of climate justice politics has been built around an orientation to questioning the for-profit economy as the underlying cause of the climate crisis, and an uncompromising opposition to market-based strategies. There is also an ambitious emphasis on emissions cuts (far greater than those proposed by UN negotiators), and a marked disdain for the inadequacy of official global-scale and most national climate mitigation efforts. In a rejection of technocratic and tinkering responses to climate change there is a hostility to technological fixes and geo-engineering, and instead a search for

prefigurative post-carbon lifestyles and production systems. Climate Justice activists seek explicit alliances with activists specialising in food sovereignty and land access (Via Campesina is typically central within Climate Justice mobilisations), decommodified water, renewable energy, economic justice and other overlapping struggles – given how many issues have climate implications. This is a feature of a broader orientation to the politics of the ‘Global South’ (not just North-South power adjustments), and an openness to fusing traditional Left and radical environmental politics with new ‘Rights of Nature’ strategies, ecofeminist and ecosocialist philosophies, and horizontalist political strategies and tactics, especially in concrete sites of struggle.

These ideas emerged from the early 2000s as the limits of prior climate advocacy efforts became clear. For many, the replacement of the phrase ‘Climate Action’ as a late 1990s slogan mobilising civil society with ‘Climate Justice’ occurred because of the ongoing failure of elite power deal-making in the COPs and acquiescence to the dominant mode of neoliberal public policy within the UN negotiating framework – especially the 1997 Kyoto Protocol – by the large environmental NGOs that for many years set the activist agenda. This acquiescence followed the persuasiveness of US Vice President Al Gore’s pledge that in exchange for adding carbon trading to the Kyoto Protocol, it would receive US Senate endorsement – when in fact a few months earlier the vote *against* was 95-0 (in the Byrd-Hagel Global Warming/Climate Change Sense of the US Senate Resolution). Those in Chicago who attempted to mimic Kyoto by establishing a voluntary carbon market were rewarded with bankruptcy in 2010, in part because neoconservative forces funded by petroleum and coal industry interests swayed public opinion towards a climate denialist perspective, fatally denting demand for emissions trading within the national economy that over the prior century was by far the world’s largest greenhouse gas polluter (Lohmann 2006). Attempts by the Obama Administration to generate carbon trading legislation in 2009-10 simply failed in this context, although after Superstorm Sandy in October 2012 assisted Obama’s re-election campaign against climate-denialist Mitt Romney there was talk of reviving the neoliberal strategy in 2013 (Skocpol 2013). As of mid-2014, however, no US climate legislation appears imminent, and instead, the US State Department is anticipated to continue with its sabotage and spying strategies and tactics at the COPs, as unveiled by Wikileaks and Edward Snowden in 2010 and 2013, respectively.

The climate justice advocacy challenge to orthodox market-oriented environmentalism and failed insider deal-making surfaced as a formal movement beginning in 2007, at the UN COP13 climate summit in Bali, Indonesia. By then it was obvious that the era of extreme global state failure and market failure – i.e., because the ‘externality’ of pollution remained unaccounted for within capitalist production, trade, consumption and disposal – would continue unabated. Within months, these failures were amplified by a world capitalist crisis that had broken out in East Asia and soon threatened the world economy. The basic dilemma was the inability of global leaders to solve major environmental, geopolitical, social and economic problems; none of significance were properly addressed in world summits after 1987, the year that the Montreal Protocol on the ozone hole banned chlorofluorocarbons. The inadequacy of global climate negotiations, and the turn by the United Nations towards ‘Type Two Partnerships’ involving corporations, together generated enormous frustration in civil society. Indeed, by the time of the 2002 World

Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, many activists had come to the conclusion that the UN was part of the problem, not the solution. This frustration was dramatized by a march of 30,000 against that UN summit in Johannesburg, from a poor neighbourhood in Alexandra across to Sandton (the wealthiest suburb in Africa) where the convention was held (Death 2010). This was at a time when South Africa had become the world's most unequal major country; Johannesburg had become a major site of conflict over water privatisation; and carbon trading experimentation had begun in nearby Durban (Bond 2002; McDonald 2002; Bond 2012).

In short, climate justice only arrived on the international scene as a coherent political approach in the wake of the failure of a more collaborative strategy between major environmental NGOs and the global managerial class. The first effort to generate a global climate advocacy movement in civil society was the Climate Action Network (CAN). But from 1997 in Kyoto, CAN adopted as its core strategy an emphasis on regular UN interstate negotiations aiming at minor, incremental emissions reductions augmented by carbon trading and related offsets. The cul-de-sac of CAN's commitment to carbon trading was confirmed when Friends of the Earth International broke away in 2010. But even before this, at the time of the December 2009 COP15, CAN's critics from the climate justice movement made the case for an alternative strategy with such force that they gained half the space reserved for non-governmental delegations in Copenhagen's Bella Centre.

Climate justice activists entered this terrain with a programme that was beyond the capacity of the global establishment to meet, even if 'science required' a level of targeting of roughly a 50 per cent greenhouse gas emissions cut by 2020 and 90 per cent commitment for 2050, simply so as to prevent runaway climate change and keep temperature rises within reason. But there was a broader agenda, and the CJN! network made the following five core demands at its founding meeting in Bali, in December 2007:

- reduced consumption;
- huge financial transfers from North to South based on historical responsibility and ecological debt for adaptation and mitigation costs paid for by redirecting military budgets, innovative taxes and debt cancellation;
- leaving fossil fuels in the ground and investing in appropriate energy-efficiency and safe, clean and community-led renewable energy;
- rights-based resource conservation that enforces indigenous land rights and promotes peoples' sovereignty over energy, forests, land and water; and
- sustainable family farming, fishing and peoples' food sovereignty.

To these ends, core concerns of climate justice activists included the decommissioning of the carbon markets so favoured by elites, massive investments in renewable energy, a thoroughly reformed agricultural system, public transport and other transformative infrastructure, production and disposal technologies. Strategically, however, it soon became evident that the next stage of the climate justice struggle was necessarily to retreat from a naively over-ambitious reform agenda at the global scale, given the adverse power balance. Instead of politely asking UNFCCC delegates to save the planet, the challenge for

climate justice activists from Copenhagen in 2009 into the future would be to whistle-blow and prevent further deterioration in global environmental governance at the annual COPs, but in the meantime to intensify both local and national activism.

However, contradictions and gaps marked at the least the first period of climate justice advocacy, and these deserve explicit mention especially in their manifestations at the annual COPs, but more generally in the failure to broaden the climate justice movement to new constituencies. The REDD mechanism proved amongst the most important wedge issues within the Climate Justice community, for late in 2010 sharp controversies emerged at the Cancun COP16 over forest preservation as major US environmental foundations attempted to resurrect market strategies. In 2013 at the World Social Forum, such pressure led to a 'No REDD in Africa' network accusing proponents of contributing to a potential 'genocide' (<http://climatespace2013.wordpress.com/2013/04/08/launch-of-no-redd-in-africa-network-redd-could-cause-genocide/>). In the US, tensions between the Climate Justice approach and the group of NGOs comprising the Climate Action Network and 1Sky continued over whether legislative lobbying, social marketing and top-down co-ordination of consciousness-raising activities without further strategic substance (for example, TckTckTck in 2009) are more appropriate advocacy methodologies than bottom-up linkage of organic climate activism. In a letter to 1Sky in October 2010, a coalition self-described as 'grassroots' and allied organisations representing racial justice, indigenous rights, economic justice, immigrant rights, youth organising and environmental justice communities criticised the vast expenditures on congressional lobbying (estimated at more than \$200 million), at the expense of movement building:

[a] decade of advocacy work, however well intentioned, migrated towards false solutions that hurt communities and compromised on key issues such as carbon markets and giveaways to polluters. These compromises sold out poor communities in exchange for weak targets and more smokestacks that actually prevent us from getting anywhere close to what the science – and common sense – tells us is required.

Climate justice as issue linkage

One reason for the turn to local processes was the strongly autonomist orientation of some leading strategists for climate justice. They brought to the movement a conviction, first, that the prevailing global and national balance of forces favoured micro-level interventions in most settings, and second, that even where a few national states were run by self-described socialist leaders – especially Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia – there were nevertheless major contradictions between ecological ambitions and their economies' addiction to extractive industries, especially hydrocarbons. Thus whereas 'Climate Justice' was occasionally declared as policy in such states, the reality was that sharp challenges to oil extraction were emerging from radical environmentalists and indigenous peoples in Amazon jungle sites like Ecuador's Yasuni Park and Bolivia's TIPNIS.

Still, the 2010 Cochabamba people's summit was a site for a few state elites, formal academics, NGO workers and organic activist intellectuals to mull over the nature of their

demands. The conference reflected both activist experience and influences from key thinkers in the field. Since the climate justice perspective is a relatively new one, given that climate itself only gradually became a concern for environmentalists during the 1990s, the mix of formal analysis and activism only gradually created a cadreship of strategists. Strategic reflection within the Climate Justice movement has been largely based upon site-specific struggles, which began reaching critical mass in some of the hot-spots.

But the bigger challenge awaits a connecting-of-the-dots between such sites, and between climate and the capitalist mode of production itself. The single biggest movement with the potential to generate such links is probably 350.org, whose visionary founder Bill McKibben – an economics professor from a small US university – long avoided an explicit identification with Climate Justice so as to continue building a big tent of activists from across the spectrum. The tactical graduation of 350.org from publicity-oriented consciousness-raising to civil disobedience at the White House in 2012, to a 2013 divestment campaign – with more than 200 campaigning groups mainly at universities – aiming to defund fossil fuel corporations is a trajectory reflecting the necessity of growing militancy, more concrete local activities, and common campaigning strategies, tactics and targets.

Some of the other best-known names in environmental advocacy are firmly within the Climate Justice camp, having produced influential books, films and high-profile statements. These include Nnimmo Bassey (2010), Tom Goldtooth, Martin Khor Kok Peng, Naomi Klein (2008, 2014) and Avi Lewis, Annie Leonard (2009, 2010), Joan Martinez-Alier (2005), George Monbiot (2006), Sunita Narain (1990), Vandana Shiva (2008) and Pablo Solon and Walden Bello (2012). Other scholar-activists and critical academics have written specialist books about climate justice, including critiques of carbon trading, led by Larry Lohmann's seminal analyses and a special issue of *Development Dialogue* journal (2006); other authors or editors of important climate justice books include Praful Bidwai (2011), Steffen Böhm and Siddhartha Dabhi (2009), Gar Lipow (2012), Hilary Moore and Joshua Kahn Russell (2012), Ted Nace (2009), Jonathan Neale (2008), Christian Parenti (2012), Brian Tokar (2010) and Chris Williams (2011). Those green-left intellectuals who are best known for promoting ecosocialism – e.g. Ian Angus (2010), David Barkin (2002), Uli Brand (2012), John Bellamy Foster (2009), Joel Kovel (2007), Michael Lowy (2001), Ariel Salleh (1997) and Derek Wall (2010) – typically utilise the climate justice movement's arguments as much as they rely upon the core insights from founders of the eco-feminism and environmental justice intellectual currents, e.g., Maria Mies (1997) and Robert Bullard (1990; 2013).

It is anticipated that the 2014 book/film *This Changes Everything* in which Klein and Lewis link capitalism and climate, arguing for a space-time decompression. As Klein (2014) puts it,

Late capitalism teaches us to create ourselves through our consumer choices: shopping is how we form our identities, find community and express ourselves. Thus, telling people that they can't shop as much as they want to because the planet's support systems are overburdened can be understood as a kind of attack, akin to telling them

that they cannot truly be themselves. This is likely why, of the original "three Rs" – reduce, reuse, recycle – only the third has ever gotten any traction, since it allows us to keep on shopping as long as we put the refuse in the right box. The other two, which require that we consume less, were pretty much dead on arrival.

Climate change is slow, and we are fast. When you are racing through a rural landscape on a bullet train, it looks as if everything you are passing is standing still: people, tractors, cars on country roads. They aren't, of course. They are moving, but at a speed so slow compared with the train that they appear static. So it is with climate change. Our culture, powered by fossil fuels, is that bullet train, hurtling forward toward the next quarterly report, the next election cycle, the next bit of diversion or piece of personal validation via our smartphones and tablets.

To these ends, there is no doubt that civil society organisations have done the most to contest the terrain of ideas about climate simply by driving forward practical and political challenges to state and corporate power, ranging from the UN COPs to local emitters. As an illustration (with an English-language bias), some of the leading organisations and highest-profile personnel include:

- Accion Ecologica: Ivonne Yanez, Esperanza Martinez
- BiofuelWatch: Rachel Smolker
- Carbon Trade Watch: Joanna Cabello
- Climate Justice Alliance: Bente Andersen, Stine Gry
- Corporate Europe Observatory: Olivier Hoedeman
- Democracy Center: Jim Shultz
- Earth in Brackets: Anjali Appadurai
- Ecologistas en Accion: Tom Kucharz
- Fern: Jutta Kill
- Focus on the Global South: Nicola Bullard, Dorothy Guerrero,
- Friends of the Earth: Tord Björk, Michelle Chan, Siziwe Khanyile, Stephanie Long, Ricardo Navarro, Karen Orenstein, Lucia Ortiz, Bobby Peek, Asad Rehman, Joseph Zacune
- Gender CC: Nina Somera
- Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives: Ananda Tan, Neil Tangri, Mariel Vilella
- Global Exchange: Shannon Biggs
- Global Justice Ecology Project: Jeff Conant, Orin Langelle, Anne Petermann
- Grassroots Global Justice: Sha Grogan-Brown, Michael Guerrero, Jen Soriano, Cindy Wiesner
- Indigenous Environmental Movement: Ben Powless, Clayton Thomas-Muller
- Institute for Policy Studies: Daphne Wysham, Janet Redman
- Jubilee South: Beverly Keene, Lidy Nacpil
- Leave it in the Ground: Kjell Kuhne
- National Forum of Forest Peoples, Forest Workers: Soumitra Ghosh
- OilChange: Steve Kretzmann

- Our World is Not for Sale Trade, Climate Working Group: Deborah James, Karen Lang
- PanAfrican Climate Justice Alliance: Robert Chimambo, Michele Maynard, Mithika Mwenda, Noah Zimba
- Peoples Movement on Climate Change: Maria Theresa Nera-Lauron
- Platform: Kevin Smith
- Red Ecologista Autónoma de la Cuenca de México: Miguel Valencia
- REDD-Monitor: Chris Lang
- Rosa Luxemburg Foundation: Judith Dellheim, Tazio Mueller
- South Asian Dialogue on Ecological Democracy: Soumya Dutta
- Third World Network: Lim Li Lin, Chee Yoke Ling, Meena Raman, Dale Wen
- TransNational Institute: Praful Bidwai
- Via Campesina: Mary Lou Malig
- What Next: Niclas Hallstrom
- World Development Movement: Tim Jones, Kirsty Wright
- World Rainforest Movement: Ana Filippini, Winnie Overbeek

It is, however, worth acknowledging that at least three well-regarded personalities whose climate advocacy has a very high profile – Kumi Naidoo of Greenpeace, Mary Robinson (ex-President of Ireland) and David Suzuki (geneticist and broadcaster) – are not Climate Justice proponents in terms of the definitions and movement priorities described above, given that they (or their organisations) favour keeping the carbon trading option on the strategic table. For example, in relation to the Clean Development Mechanism, in spite of all the evidence to the contrary, Robinson argued in a 2011 London School of Economics lecture that carbon trading is ‘finally starting to reap dividends for Africa and least developed countries’ and that ‘the experience gained through the design and implementation of successful regional cap-and-trade programs is hugely valuable if shared with developing country regional groups’ (Robinson 2011). Other leading climate thinkers whose ambivalence about market mechanisms might also leave them outside the CJ camp include Tom Athanasiou, Mark Lynas, Peter Newell and Matthew Paterson (see Newell and Paterson 2010). Another category of those concerned with much more legalistic notions of justice applied to climate (e.g. per capita pollution rights – hence not empowering base organisations or contemplating wider-scale socio-economic transformation) includes influential lawyers such as Eric Posner and Cass Sunstein (2007), amongst others.

Another line of tension has developed over whether a ‘right to development’ should be invoked to permit higher levels of emissions in emerging market economies. Because climate justice has always included an emphasis on South-North justice, and because interstate diplomatic negotiations over climate are the main site for this struggle, organisations such as the South Centre (led by Khor) and Third World Network (led by Meena Raman), as well as the Bolivian government, have stressed the ongoing importance of the UN COP terrain (Tandon 2009). In addition, Malaysian political economist Jomo KS (2010) argued on behalf of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs that the semi-peripheral countries should have carbon-space rights to industrialise as part of climate justice. In contrast, Solon and Bello (2012) have argued strongly against the

Brazil-Russia-India-China-South Africa (BRICS) countries' strategy of delaying binding emissions cuts: 'The elites of emerging economies are using the just demand of "historical responsibility" or "common but differentiated responsibility" in order to win time and have a weak binding agreement by 2020 that they will be part of.'

Some of these tensions became apparent in the COPs at Durban (2011), Doha (2012) and Warsaw (2013), when concrete strategies regarding 'loss and damage' began to emerge, and the importance of narratives that transcend North and South boundaries became obvious. The North's strategy, as witnessed in Durban, was to eradicate the difference between 'developed' and 'developing' – whereas climate justice would treat this difference even more acutely but shift from national borders to intra-national uneven development; the idea of the 'Global South' would thus incorporate climate change victims from Ward 8 of New Orleans, for example. These are some of the areas where, from below, critical potentials exist to transcend older, nationalist framings, by ensuring that a full critique of the BRICS' copy-cat accumulation processes is offered by Climate Justice activists across the Global South.

Critical potential from local to global

In order to overcome the barriers that exist to climate justice at the global scale and in the South-North confrontations discussed above, and in order to build the climate justice movement from direct local experiences, the most sophisticated activists have redoubled efforts in key sites of struggle across the world, such as Nigerian and Ecuadorian oilfields, Australia's main coal port, Britain's coal-fired power stations and main airport, Canada's tar sands, and US coalfields, oil pipelines and corporate headquarters. To illustrate this in the most difficult setting – the United States – in 2010 the Detroit Social Forum began to consolidate progressive US climate justice networking, featuring struggles led by people of colour. In a letter criticising the Washington-centric character of major environmental group lobbying, Movement Generation and its allies provided an impressive list of direct action events and resulting community organising victories in the US, in various categories:

stopping King Coal with community organising; derailing the build-up of coal power; preventing the proliferation of incinerators; defeating Big Oil in our own backyards; stopping false solutions like mega hydro; and building resilient communities through local action (Movement Generation 2010).

Climate justice strategist Janet Redman (2012) noted how, just after Obama's re-election, North American activists were 'already building alternatives to our fossil-fueled economy while making their communities more resilient to climate disruption'. Examples of this grassroots activism, Redman (2012) observes, include

WeACT in West Harlem, who are fighting for bus-rapid transit as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, create public sector jobs and protect residents' health; the New York City Environmental Justice Alliance's Waterfront Justice Project – the Big Apple's first citywide community resiliency campaign – who are working to protect communities from toxic inundation during storm surges; the Right to the

City and Grassroots Global Justice Alliance groups like CAAAV, Picture the Homeless, Make the Road and many more, who work to end displacement and economic inequality (which render families particularly vulnerable when climate disasters hit); Ironbound Community Corporation, a member of the Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives and the New Jersey Environmental Justice Alliance, who are crafting 'Zero Waste' solutions that create recycling and composting jobs while drastically reducing climate and toxic pollution from landfills and incinerators; and the Indigenous Environmental Network which has been working with Indigenous communities throughout Canada and the United States, fighting to protect their lands from fossil fuel development like tar sands mines and the Keystone XL, Kinder Morgan, and Enbridge Northern Gateway pipelines.

The highest-profile US climate activism – albeit not Climate Justice in tone – was arranged by 350.org in August-September 2011, when 1,252 people were arrested at the White House during protests against the probable import of tar sands oil through the Keystone XL pipeline. This followed scores of localized victories against Big Coal, especially coal-fired power plants. According to the sub-movement's lead chronicler, Ted Nace (2011), '[S]ustained and passionate grassroots activism is challenging the idea that fossil fuels are the only option. Many governments have backtracked or shelved plans in response to political pressure or legal actions.' These reforms follow the strategy to 'Leave the Oil in the Soil, the Coal in the Hole, the Tar Sand in the Land, and the Fracking Shale Gas under the Grass'. Campaigns to prevent extraction from Yasuni Park in Ecuador, Norway's Lofoten region and various anti-fracking sites are indicative of the broad-based coalitions required (Bond 2012).

The strategies of climate activists include the most progressive forms of juridical action to name and collect ecological debt (such as that Chevron owes Ecuador for Texaco's decades-old damage or that BP owes for its 2010 Gulf oil spill – both contested in the Ecuadoran courts). The activists can build transition towns, or generate plans to detox areas of carbon-intensive industry (as in sites such as Oakland, California and South Durban in South Africa). They can encourage extraction-site protests (such as in the Niger Delta and West Virginia), and work towards regional and then national bans on new emissions (even the first Obama administration made some minor progress on coal-fired power plants). They can foster a post-consumerist mentality (e.g., the *Story of Stuff* series which has around 40 million internet downloads – <http://www.storyofstuff.org>). And they can also contemplate 'ecosocialist' argumentation and long-term environmental planning (e.g. <http://ecosocialisthorizons.com/>).

Some activists and theorists (for example, those associated with the journals *Capitalism Nature Socialism* and *Monthly Review*) anticipate that the linkage of red and green struggles under the climate justice banner will require society moving from a fossil fuel dependent capitalism to eco-socialism. This will entail, as Joel Kovel and Michael Lowy explain,

a transformation of needs, and a profound shift toward the qualitative dimension and away from the quantitative ... a withering away of the dependency upon fossil fuels integral to industrial capitalism. And this in turn can provide the material point

of release of the lands subjugated by oil imperialism, while enabling the containment of global warming, along with other afflictions of the ecological crisis ... The generalization of ecological production under socialist conditions can provide the ground for the overcoming of the present crises. A society of freely associated producers does not stop at its own democratization. It must, rather, insist on the freeing of all beings as its ground and goal (Kovel and Lowy 2009).

Before such a vision can be properly articulated, several critical missing elements must be accounted for. Some of these issues include the question of how to achieve a stronger labour input, particularly given the potential for 'green jobs' to make up for existing shortfalls. British eco-socialists have taken the lead here, with demands for a million green jobs (Neale 2011). It is also necessary to draw an explicit connection between climate justice and anti-war movements, given that military activity is not only disproportionately concerned with supplies of oil and gas (Iraq and Afghanistan) but also uses vast amounts of CO₂ in the prosecution of war (Smolcker 2010). There is also a requirement to foster a stronger presence of both environmentalists and socialists in many high emissions sites not yet suffused with grassroots climate justice movements, from China to the Arab oil world to petro-socialist Venezuela.

However, against eco-socialist orientations of the sort proposed by Kovel and Lowy, there are not only are climate justice movement anarchists suspicious of central planning, but advocates of a bottom-up socialism who would preferably generate manifesto statements from actual practice – such as the efforts described briefly above – and from generalised movement sensibility and demands, as opposed to top-down pronouncements. The forging of unity in movements that address climate and social justice from below is especially important during times of apparently intractable conflict and division, which at the time of writing appear to have disrupted and distracted the immediate future of climate justice politics.

Meanwhile, the feminist and socialist movements are engaged in dialogues with climate justice activists which are worth considering. Teresa Brennan (2003) makes the link from the household scale to climate change, which is the biggest crisis women will face in the coming decades. Rearranging spatial and re/production arrangements is crucial to ending the unfair role of women in subsidising capitalism's destructive irrationality. In her book, *Globalization and its Terrors: Daily Life in the West*, Brennan (2003) wrote: '[t]he closer to home one's energy and raw material sources are, the more one's reproduction costs stay in line: paid and domestic labour will be less exploited, the environment less depleted.' The need now to limit the 'distance over which natural resources can be obtained' is obvious given how shipping, trucking and air transport contribute to carbon emissions.

This is one of the insights an eco-feminist political economy gives climate justice strategists such as Nicola Bullard of Focus on the Global South. A typical debate with neoliberals is over whether the globalisation of industry has helped break up feudal-patriarchal relations, drawing women out of oppression into Mexican maquiladoras or Bangkok sweatshops. Such export-led growth is now an increasingly untenable 'development' strategy, and in any case always generated extremely uneven development, drawing on the women's care

economy for its hidden subsidies. Bullard (2009) likens the climate negotiations to those of the WTO: '[b]y and large, countries are defending their narrow economic interests and the rich countries in particular are trying to grab the last slice of the atmospheric pie.'

Bullard (2009) breaks down the climate policy narrative into three discourses: business as usual, catastrophism, and climate justice. The first comes from business and most Northern governments while the second, Bullard (2009) argues, is advanced by some smaller and vulnerable countries as well as many NGOs. Catastrophism also 'leads to dangerous last-gasp strategies such as geo-engineering, nuclear and carbon markets.' Third, feminists committed to climate justice are connecting the dots between these various oppressions, to warn how, in times of crisis, their opponents are emboldened. In a report, *Looking Both Ways*, the group Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice (2009) documents Hurricane Katrina's deeper political damage: '[f]ollowing a disaster, women of colour – particularly African American women, low-income women and immigrant women – are routinely targeted as burdens of the state and the cause of over population, environmental degradation, poverty, crime and economic instability'. And more than for men, all eco-feminists with a climate justice orientation agree that ending women's economic instability is a vital component of the struggle for justice.

Conclusion

Climate governance is stymied by the lack of climate justice. But the climate justice movement is not sufficiently mature to jump scale to tackle global governance challenges, nor is the balance of forces favourable for such a move. To improve the movement's maturity, it is vital to draw together eco-feminist and eco-socialist insights to link issues, analyses, challenges and alliance-building efforts. In addition, *generational justice* will have to become more prominent, as several profound challenges are addressed:

- *Red-green organisations are networking and expressing eco-socialist sentiments.* The components of the eco-socialist movement are thousands of organisations in all parts of the world whose own assumptions about fighting environmental degradation are increasingly anti-capitalist. This is abundantly evident from the manifestos, analyses, press releases, demands, leaflets, slogans and other expressions of voice that they have generated in recent years. However, fragmentation and divisions prevent climate justice activists from having a coherent identity and impact.
- *The networks are typically single issue and do not sufficiently link across subsectors of environmental justice.* The biggest intellectual problem these movements face is linking their concerns across other sectors. This is often because the networks come together around specific targets, and because their funding sources or major in-house intellectual resources are extremely deep within the single issue they address, but unable to move beyond it (Harvey 1999).

- *Youth remain underrepresented in the movement.* Although there are exceptions (e.g. Anjali Appadurai's high-profile role - at the Durban and Doha COPs - http://www.democracynow.org/2012/12/5/one_year_after_stirring_address_youth), the ability of young people to both organise and make major interventions in support of climate justice has been limited. Given the rise of universities as sites of fossil-fuel divestment campaigning, there are good prospects for a new cohort of intellectual, creative and strategic leadership to emerge.
- *The networks' analysis is sometimes delimited by the specific problem they are addressing.* As single issue networks, the organisations generally view the attack by capitalism on nature as a problem that they may not be in a position to name, much less propose sweeping large-scale solutions to. That has generated a void, not only insofar as naming the problem (an environmentally voracious capitalism), but also naming a global-scale socialist solution – with, of course, profound respect for difference and the uneven development of both capitalism and the movements against it. A further problem is that most such manifestos by these movements have not been particularly conscious of gender. And finally, the other kinds of interlocking and overlapping oppressions and resistances – along lines of race, indigenous heritage, different ableness, sexual preference, generation and other divisions – are not sufficiently respected to generate a strong critique.
- *The networks' hunger to continue building links.* The obvious next step for groups like CJN! is to make common cause with other movements addressing environmental issues where similar analysis, strategies, tactics, enemies and allies can be found. There is a huge gap, though, in information about each other, since with a few exceptions (for example, the World Social Forum which had a vibrant 'Climate Space' in the 2013 Tunis meeting, or protests at major world summits or meetings of well-networked organisations such as Friends of the Earth International), these organisations have no opportunities to get together in a systematic way. And yet it is imperative that these links become ever stronger. It seems inexorable, too, that to properly address the challenge we face – nothing less than planetary and species survival – we confront the overarching power of patriarchal, racially divisive, uneven capitalist 'development'. Climate justice will require nothing less.

Bibliography

- Agyeman, Julian, Robert D Bullard and Bob Evans (eds) (2003) *Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World*, London: Earthscan.
- Angus, Ian (Ed) (2010) *The Global Fight for Climate Justice: Anticapitalist Responses to Global Warming and Environmental Destruction*, Toronto: Resistance Books.
- Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice (2009) 'Looking Both Ways: Women's Lives at the Crossroads of Reproductive Justice and Climate Justice, Oakland, http://www.reproductivejustice.org/ACRJ_Looking_Both_Ways.pdf, last accessed 12 April 2013.

- Barkin, David (2002) *Wealth, Poverty and Sustainable Development*, Mexico City: Center for Ecology and Development.
- Bassey, Nnimmo (2011) *To Cook a Continent*, Oxford: Pambazuka Press.
- Bidwai, Praful (2011) *The Politics of Climate Change and the Global Crisis: Mortgaging Our Future*, Hyderabad: Orient BlackSwan.
- Böhm, Steffen and Siddhartha Dabhi (2009) *Upsetting the Offset*, London: Mayfly Books.
- Bond, Patrick (2002) *Unsustainable South Africa: Environment, Development and Social Protest*, London: Merlin Press.
- Bond, Patrick (2012) *Politics of Climate Justice: Paralysis Above, Movement Below*, Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Brennan, Theresa (2003) *Globalization and Its Terrors: Daily Life in the West*. New York: Routledge.
- Bullard, Robert D. (1990) *Dumping in Dixie: Race, class and environmental quality*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bullard, Robert D. (2013) 'Environmental justice in the 21st century', available online at <http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/ejinthe21century.htm>, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Bullard, Nicola (2009) 'The state of climate politics', Speech delivered at a Rosa Luxemburg Foundation conference in Johannesburg, South Africa, November 19.
- Camacho, David (1998) *Environmental Injustices, Political Struggles: Race, Class, and the Environment*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Death, Carl (2010) *Governing Sustainable Development: Protests, partnerships and power at the World Summit*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Foster, John Bellamy (2009) *The Ecological Revolution: Making Peace with the Planet*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Harvey, David (1999) 'The environment of justice', in F. Fischer and M.A. Hajer (eds) *Living With Nature: Environmental Politics as Cultural Discourse*, Oxford: OUP.
- Kaara, Wahu (2010) 'Reclaiming Peoples' Power in Copenhagen 2009: A Victory for Ecosocialist Ecofeminism,' *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 21, 2, pp.107-111.
- Karliner, Joshua (2000) 'Climate justice summit provides alternative vision,' CorpWatch, <http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=977>, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Klein, Naomi (2008) *Shock Doctrine*, New York: Henry Holt.
- Klein, Naomi (2014) *This Changes Everything: Capitalism versus The Climate*, London: Allen Lane.
- Kovel, Joel (2007) *The Enemy of Nature: The End of Capitalism or the End of the World?*, London: Zed Books.
- Kovel, Joel and Michael Lowy (2009) *An Ecosocialist Manifesto*, Paris.
- Lander, Edgardo (2010) 'Reflections on the Cochabamba climate summit,' Caracas, 27 April, <http://www.tni.org/article/reflections-cochabamba-climate-summit>, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Leonard, Annie (2009) *The Story of Cap and Trade*, <http://www.storyofstuff.org>, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Leonard, Annie (2010) *The Story of Stuff*, New York, Free Press.
- Lipow, Gar (2012) *Cooling It! No Hair Shirt Solutions to Global Warming*, Boulder: Praeger Press.

- Lohmann, Larry (2006) *Carbon Trading: A Critical Conversation on Climate Change, Privatisation and Power*, Uppsala: Dag Hammarskjold Foundation, *Development Dialogue* 48.
- Lowy, Michael (2001) *The politics of combined and uneven development. The theory of permanent revolution*, London: Verso Books.
- Martinez-Alier, Joan (2005) *The Environmentalism of the Poor*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- McDonald, David A. (ed.) (2002) *Environmental Justice in South Africa*, Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Mies, Maria (1997) *Patriarchy and Accumulation On A World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*, London: Zed Books.
- Monbiot, George (2006) *Heat*, London: Penguin.
- Moore, Hilary and Joshua Kahn Russell (2011) *Organizing Cools the Planet*, San Francisco: PM Press.
- Movement Generation *et al*, 'Open letter to 1 Sky,' Oakland, 2010.
- Nace, Ted (2009), *Climate Hope: On the Front Lines of the Fight Against Coal*, San Francisco: CoalSwarm.
- Nace, Ted (2011) 'Down with coal', *Grist*, 27 May, <http://www.grist.org/coal/2011-05-27-down-with-coal-the-grassroots-anti-coal-movement-goes-global>, last accessed 13 April 2013.
- Narain, Sunita (1990) *Global Warming in an Unequal World*, New Delhi: Centre for Science and Environment.
- Neale, Jonathan (2008) *Stop Global Warming*, London: Bookmarks Publications.
- Neale, Jonathan (ed) (2011) *One million climate jobs: Solutions to the economic and environmental crises*, A report by the Campaign against Climate Change trade union group in conjunction with the Communication Workers Union (CWU), Public and Commercial Services Union (PCS), Transport Salaried Staffs Association (TSSA) and the University and College Union (UCU), London.
- Newell, Peter and Matthew Paterson (2010) *Climate Capitalism: Global warming and transformation of the global economy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parenti, Christian (2011) *Tropic of Chaos: Climate Change and the New Geography of Violence*, New York: Nation Books.
- Petermann, Anne (2009) 'What is climate justice?', Vermont, Global Justice Ecology Project, http://globaljusticeecology.org/climate_justice.php, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Posner, Eric and Cas Sunstein (2007), 'Climate Change Justice', John M. Olin Law & Economics Working Paper No. 354, University of Chicago Law School, Chicago.
- Redman, Janet (2012) 'Now will Obama break his climate silence?', *Huffington Post*, 8 November, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/janet-redman/obama-climate-change_b_2091210.html, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Robinson, Mary (2011) "Protecting the most vulnerable," Speech at the London School of Economics Centre for the Study of Human Rights, London, 10 March. http://www.mrfcj.org/news_centre/2011/mary_robinson_lecture_lse.html, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Salleh, Ariel (1997) *Ecofeminism as Politics*, London: Zed Books.
- Schlosberg, David (1999) *Environmental Justice and the New Pluralism*, Oxford: OUP, 1999
- Shiva, Vandana (2008) *Soil not Oil*, Boston: South End Press.

- Skocpol, Theda (2013) 'You can't change the climate from inside Washington', *Foreign Policy*, 24 January, [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/01/24/you can t change the climate from inside washington barack obama](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/01/24/you_can_t_change_the_climate_from_inside_washington_barack_obama), last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Smolker, Rachel (2010) 'Militarism and climate change, in Climate Justice Now!-lists.riseup.net [Internet]. <https://lists.riseup.net/www/info/cjn>. Seattle, November 22, 2010, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Solon, Pablo (2013) 'How to overcome the climate crisis', Focus on the Global South, Bangkok, <http://climatespace2013.wordpress.com/2013/03/14/a-contribution-to-the-climate-space-2013-how-to-overcome-the-climate-crisis/>, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Solon, Pablo and Walden Bello (2012) 'Why are climate negotiations locked in stalemate?,' *Bangkok Post*, 4 September <http://www.bangkokpost.com/opinion/opinion/310683/why-are-climate-negotiations-locked-in-a-stalemate>, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Sundaram, Jomo Kwame (2010) 'Climate change and industrial development, Presentation to the University of KwaZulu-Natal, 17 May.
- Tandon, Yash (2009) 'Dangers and opportunities: political, economic and climatic crises of Western civilization, Pambazuka News, 426, <http://pambazuka.org/en/category/features/55334>, last accessed 12 April 2013.
- Tokar, Brian (2010) *Toward Climate Justice*, Vermont: Communalism Press.
- Wall, Derek (2010) *The Rise of the Green Left: Inside the Worldwide Ecosocialist Movement*, London: Pluto Press.
- Williams, Chris (2011) *Ecology and Socialism: Solutions to Capitalist Ecological Crisis*, Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Climate justice refers to the fundamental asymmetry that those who have contributed least to global warming are the ones who will be affected significantly by the impacts of climate change. Taking into account importance of studying climate justice, this paper is devoted to analyzing different approaches to climate justice. Bronen R., Climate-induced Community Relocations: Creating an Adaptive Governance Framework Based in Human Rights Doctrine, *New York University Review of Law & Social Change*, Vol.37, 4 August 2011, p. 374; Ebinger and Zambetakis 2009. The geopolitics of Arctic melt. *International Affairs* 85(6):1215 - 1232. Contestations over justice and equity in the climate regime provide the most striking evidence of the quest by relevant actors to ensure that institutions for global environmental governance are based on widely shared ethical standards of responsibility and fairness. This review article examines recent policy debates and literature on distributive justice and the climate regime and highlights some areas of key research. The review indicates that while discussions on climate justice have gained ascendancy within the international regime circle with noticeable impacts, a lot remains to be clarified about the status of justice concepts and how to best design policies that reconcile moral ideals and power politics. Advocates for climate justice are striving to have these inequities addressed head-on through long-term mitigation and adaptation strategies. The following are key factors to consider in thinking about climate justice: 1) Climate justice begins with recognizing key groups are differently affected by climate change. From the United Nations and the IPCC to the NAACP, many organizations are connecting the dots between civil rights and climate change. As a UN blog describes it: "The impacts of climate change will not be borne equally or fairly, between rich and poor, women and men, and older and younger generations." "Climate change is happening now and to all of us. No country or community is immune," according to UN Secretary-General António Guterres.