Climate justice relates to the distribution of benefits and burdens as the climate changes. The theoretical discussion over climate justice stems primarily from the literature in environmental justice, which began in earnest during the 1980s, as political theorists and environmental activists grew concerned enough to widen the focus of environmental ethics.

As with most justice issues, there are forward-looking distributional questions: How are benefits and burdens to be distributed? What parties ought to shoulder this burden? What parties ought to be the primary beneficiaries of climate policy? There
are also backward-looking questions: Who has benefitted from early emissions and/or resource consumption? Who has been marginalized and/or disadvantaged? Who is responsible for having created current distributional inequities? To what extent can they be held accountable?

Both sets of questions inform wider policy and governance prescriptions: What do responsible parties owe to aggrieved parties? Should early (and presumably unaware) emitters be held accountable to the same degree that contemporary (and presumably informed) emitters ought to be?

It would be too narrow, however, to limit the climate-justice debate to distributional questions alone. There are other important considerations as well, related to the procedural fairness of climate policy, participation of parties in the development of climate policy, recognition of diverse communities by the broader international community, and development of capacities for dealing with climate impacts.

Challenges
Climate change poses at least three unique challenges to traditional theories of justice, which tend to operate within a discrete community of subjects. Insofar as traditional theories of justice have tended to address justice claims within states, where moral standing is established by membership in a well-defined community, the global reach of climate change raises international questions related to legitimate jurisdiction, governance, development, population, and birthright. How, for instance, can justice (or injustice) be established without an international contract, a suitably empowered governing body, or a community of recognized citizens?

Perhaps even more problematically for traditional theories of justice, climate change will affect not only an international community of human subjects—typically the subjects of justice—but also a wider spectrum of parties, including animals and nature. These interspecies justice implications raise questions about the moral status of affected parties, the moral considerability of non-animal nature, and even the standing of abstract natural phenomena like marine ecosystems and boreal forests.

To complicate matters further, the distributional impacts of climate change are projected to linger for centuries, making climate change perhaps a paradigm case of intergenerational justice. Theories of climate justice must therefore consider the distribution of burdens and benefits on not only existing populations but also populations that do not yet exist—or, more vexingly, that might have, but may never exist. This latter consideration comprises the heart of the “nonidentity” problem.

Strategies and Solutions
Within this general constellation of questions, there are many proposed responses, each of which can be addressed using two central approaches: historical and ahistorical. Historical theories purport to answer the question of justice by appealing to the backward-looking questions—not simply how to attribute blame and/or liability, but also to integrate considerations related to needs, rights, freedoms, disenfranchisement, and previously discharged obligation into a determination of whether the current state of affairs is just; and/or what a more just state of affairs might look like. In contrast, ahistorical theories (or “time slice” theories) tend to avoid appealing to history, and instead seek the just distribution by simply appealing to optimal distributional arrangements. Both historical and ahistorical strategies can be used to support any of the following responses.

Just as there are multiple and varied strategies to address these questions, there are also multiple and varied responses, each saddled with further problems. For instance, the simplest distributional arrangement, strict egalitarianism, evenly distributes the benefits or burdens of climate change among all parties and/or persons. Strict egalitarian approaches have the merit of being straightforward, but they suffer from concerns of over-indexing—essentially, that benefits and costs must be identified, measured, bundled, and allocated in accordance with some consistent principle—and concerns about measurement over specific timeframes. In the case of climate change, these concerns relate specifically to considerations about whether the world is to be returned to an initial baseline state, or whether a mere compensation-and-restitution regime will resolve injustice, as well as how to account for future generations and nonhuman nature.

Almost all justice positions are caught up in the debate over equality, sufficiency, or priority.
That is, whether benefits and burdens should be distributed equally (egalitarianism), whether they should be distributed so as to provide enough and as good for affected parties (sufficientarianism), or whether the worse off should be given priority or extra weight (prioritarianism). More problematically, there is no agreement among theorists with regard to the nature of benefits and burdens, as benefits and burdens may relate to issues such as resources, emissions, happiness, or general welfare.

Therefore, there is a range of competing principles relevant to climate justice, including welfare egalitarianism, rights egalitarianism, luck egalitarianism, Rawlsian cosmopolitanism, justice as fairness, and capabilities theory.

Movement Uptake and Realpolitik
As a consequence of (and perhaps further fueling) the conceptual disparities and disagreements between the variety of climate justice positions, there are a wide range of representative climate-justice movement actors, each reflecting these theoretical rifts and divisions. Depending on the preferred approach to climate justice, a suite of practical outcomes related to health, wealth, wellbeing, freedom, security, food, natural resources, cultural heritage, and national identity assumes the dominant emphasis in political and policy negotiations, leaving movement actors to struggle against one another as well as against their perceived sources of injustice in the first place. To complicate matters, the climate-justice movement is also interspersed with opportunistic actors, including special-interest groups and representatives from state and industry, that seek to capture institutions, resources, and funding under the auspices of these generalized concerns.
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Further Readings

Climate Justice Now!
Climate Justice Now! (CJN!) is a transnational activist network of over 400 organizational and social-movement members committed to fighting for ecological, social, and gender justice as they relate to global climate governance. The network was founded in December 2007 at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of Parties 13 (COP 13) climate negotiations in Bali, Indonesia, as an open space for radical critique of current climate change policies and reformist environmental nongovernmental organizations (ENGOs). Since its founding, CJN has been actively engaged