Proposal:

Justice and inclusivity in assessing climate impacts

Name: Tim Forsyth, Professor
Affiliation: Department of International Development, London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE. UK
Email: t.j.forsyth@lse.ac.uk

Much discussion about climate justice focuses on finding fair responsibilities for countries that have contributed to climate change, or on highlighting the injustices faced by poorer societies who face the consequences. These discussions, however, tend to see climate justice in terms of allocations concerning predefined causes and effects—especially contributions to greenhouse gas concentrations as causes, and the immediate climatic impacts of concentrations as effects.

This briefing argues that all of these causes and effects are simple representations of more complex factors that constitute climate risk. The theme of research covered by this briefing is the need to consider the justices and injustices of how representations of risk are made and applied within climate change policy.

In terms of theory, this debate draws upon the critiques of Rawls' (1971) classic approach to justice outlined in Sen (2009). Rawls' argument was that justice is a fair and transparent process of allocation. Sen, however, argued there is also a need to be more participatory and inclusive about defining what is to be allocated. In effect, this seeks to integrate public deliberation about climate policy with insights from social studies of science and expertise (Forsyth, 2008; Hulme, 2009).

There are various implications for climate change policy. First, injustices might arise *from* climate change policy if it is based on un-examined visions of risk. For example, carbon-offset forestry has been criticized for imposing local costs on developing countries for the sake of alleged global benefits (Sikor, 2013). The Hockey Stick model has also been criticized for projecting a global notion of risk that hides differences in causes and effects of climate change (Agarwal & Narain, 1991).

Second, climate risk to people is not linked to emissions alone, but also to the availability of diverse livelihoods, resources, or other pathways to development (Forsyth, 2014). Indeed, new debates about resilience and transformative change acknowledge what, and for whom, these terms are for (Pelling *et al.*, 2015).

And third, they imply that we need to rethink how our own models of risk might also shape whom we think suffer injustices. Debates about indigenous groups, for example, often overlook risks faced by other groups and simplify the ways in which indigenous groups are also accessing new livelihoods and resources (Forsyth & Sikor, 2013). "Community"-based adaptation, at the same time, has also been criticized for either assuming the risks faced by communities, or the agency and social cohesion of local people (Aalst *et al.*, 2008; Forsyth, 2013).

New research seeks to resolve these matters by focusing on current approaches to risk also influence debates about justice, and vice versa (Jasanoff, 2010). There are also new approaches to putting Sen's analysis of justice into practice—by seeking more inclusive forms of climate expertise and risk assessment (Beck & Forsyth, 2015; Lövbrand *et al.*, 2015; Lövbrand *et al.*, 2011).

REFERENCES

Aalst, M. K. v., Cannon, T., & Burton, I. (2008). Community level adaptation to climate change: the potential role of participatory community risk assessment. *Global Environmental Change, 18*(1), 165-179. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2007.06.002

Agarwal, A., & Narain, S. (1991). *Global warming in an unequal world*. Delhi: Center for Science and Environment.

Beck, S., & Forsyth, T. (2015). Co-production and Democratizing Global Environmental Expertise: the IPCC and adaptation to climate change. In R. Hagendijk, S. Hilgartner & C. Miller (Eds.), *Science and democracy: Making knowledge and making power in the biosciences and beyond* (pp. 113-132). Abingdon: Routledge.

Forsyth, T. (2008). Political ecology and the epistemology of social justice. *Geoforum, 39*(2), 756-764. doi: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2006.12.005

Forsyth, T. (2013). Community-based adaptation to climate change: a review of past and future challenges. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 4*(5), 439–446.

Forsyth, T. (2014). Climate justice is not just ice. *Geoforum, 54*, 230-232.

Forsyth, T., & Sikor, T. (2013). Forests, development, and the globalisation of justice. *The Geographical Journal, 179*(2), 114-121.

Hulme, M. (2009). *Why we disagree about climate change : understanding controversy, inaction and opportunity*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jasanoff, S. (2010). A new climate for society. *Theory, Culture & Society, 27*(2), 233-253.

Lövbrand, E., Beck, S., Chilvers, J., Forsyth, T., Hedrén, J., Hulme, M., . . . Vasileiadou, E. (2015). Who speaks for the future of Earth? How critical social science can extend the conversation on the Anthropocene. *Global Environmental Change, 32*, 211-218. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.03.012

Lövbrand, E., Pielke, J. R., & Beck, S. (2011). A democracy paradox in studies of science and technology. *Science, Technology, and Human Values, 36*(4), 474-496. doi: 10.1177/0162243910366154

Pelling, M., O'Brien, K., & Matyas, D. (2015). Adaptation and transformation. [Article]. *Climatic change, 133*(1), 113-127. doi: 10.1007/s10584-014-1303-0

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Sikor, T. (Ed.). (2013). *The justices and injustices of ecosystem services*. London: Earthscan.