From the ‘ethics of climate change’ to the ‘politics of climate justice’
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The academic literature on climate justice has been dominated by a focus on the international scale, primarily climate mitigation (Gardiner, 2004; Caney, 2005), but also adaptation (Adger et al., 2006; Jagers & Duus-Otterström, 2008). This literature often revolves around how to balance the responsibilities and rights of different actors across both the mitigation and adaptation domains, in both distributive and procedural terms (Caney, 2010; Newell et al., 2015). While this international focus has been critiqued as potentially problematic (Harris, 2010) we contend that it must be brought into more direct conversation with the growing literature on the politics of climate change at multiple scales. Both mitigation and adaptation interventions happen in particular places (such as cities) and are pursued and directed by different actors in aid of multiple, often conflicting ends. Moreover ‘climate justice’ itself has become a lightning rod for civil society, whose framing of it articulates with broader concerns about the political economy of development in the context of economic globalization and neoliberalism (see, e.g. Chatterton et al., 2013).

In this context, we propose two directions for researchers concerned about climate justice:

(1) An expanded theorization of climate justice

The distributive and procedural focus of much of the climate justice literature must be supplemented by attention to issues of recognition (Fraser, 1997, 2012; Bulkeley et al., 2014), capabilities (Sen, 2009; Schlosberg, 2012), and well-being (Deneulin, 2014; Edwards et al., 2016) as well as alternative framings of justice (Goodman, 2009; Wainwright & Mann, 2013). There is significant potential here to build on from Environmental Justice which has argued that justice must be understood as ‘multivalent’ (Schlosberg, 2007), and which also forms antecedent to much of the contemporary climate justice movement (Martinez-Alier et al., 2014; Schlosberg & Collins, 2014; see, e.g. CorpWatch et al., 2002; Shepard & Corbin-Mark, 2009).

(2) An explicitly urban focus for empirical work on climate justice

Climate change interventions produce new landscapes of justice as they generate costs for some people and benefits for others; include some people and exclude others, and so on. These conflicts are magnified in cities, which now house the majority of the world’s population. A growing body of literature has explored the urban politics of climate change (Bulkeley et al., 2015), but less work has explicitly focussed on climate justice at this scale (for some examples, see Steele et al., 2012; Bulkeley et al., 2014; Edwards & Bulkeley, 2017; Fuller, Forthcoming). Cities provide a crucial empirical context, then, for exploring the politics of climate justice: which is both a matter of what should be and what can (politically) be.
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