Research Article

Submission Date
25/ 08 / 2024
Admission Date
06/ 12 / 2024

The Transformation of Climate Justice: New Approaches in Environmental Ethics and Human-Nature Relations

İklim Adaletinin Dönüşümü: Çevre Etiği ve İnsan-Doğa İlişkilerinde Yeni Yaklaşımlar

Dr. Gamze Mercan[1]
PHd Student, MSc Zümrüt Varol Selçuk[2]

How to Cite: Mercan, G., & Varol Selçuk, Z. (2024). The Transformation of Climate Justice: New Approaches in Environmental Ethics and Human-Nature Relations. *Journal of Environmental and Natural Studies*, 6 (3), 209-225. DOI: https://doi.org/10.53472/jenas.1538483

ABSTRACT:

This study aims to examine climate justice from the perspective of environmental ethics. While climate justice is often discussed in the context of international, class, and gender inequalities, the inequality between species and the connection to nature are frequently overlooked. This study seeks to propose an environmental ethics-based approach to end the climate crisis justly. The study employs literature review and theoretical analysis methods to examine environmental ethics approaches (anthropocentric, biocentric, and ecocentric) and evaluate the concept of climate justice in light of these approaches. Additionally, it explores the relationship between climate change and justice by drawing on deep ecology and justice theories. The study reveals that climate change creates significant injustices not only among human communities but also between humans and nature. It is found that low-income groups and women are more adversely affected by climate change despite being less responsible for it. Furthermore, the study emphasizes the need to redefine human-nature relationships to achieve climate justice. Climate change is not merely a matter of fair distribution but also a crisis that necessitates restructuring the human-nature relationship. Inclusive and fair approaches from an environmental ethics perspective must be developed to address this crisis. The deep ecology approach, which acknowledges the intrinsic value of nature beyond human needs, provides crucial guidance for a sustainable future. This study contributes uniquely to the literature by addressing climate justice in the context of not only human inequalities but also interspecies inequalities and recognizing nature as an ethical subject.

KEYWORDS: *Climate Justice, Environmental Ethics, Deep Ecology, Anthropocentric Approach, Biocentric Approach*

ÖZ:

Bu çalışma, çevre etiği perspektifinden iklim adaletini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. İklim adaleti, özellikle uluslararası, sınıfsal ve cinsiyet eşitsizlikleri bağlamında incelenirken, türler arası eşitsizlik ve doğa ile olan bağ genellikle göz ardı edilmektedir. Bu çalışma, iklim krizini adil bir şekilde sona erdirmek için çevre etiği temelli bir öneri sunmayı hedeflemektedir. Çalışmada, literatür taraması ve teorik analiz yöntemleri kullanılarak, çevre etiği yaklaşımları (antroposentrik, biyosentrik ve ekosentrik) incelenmiş ve iklim adaleti kavramı bu yaklaşımlar ışığında değerlendirilmiştir. Ayrıca, derin ekoloji ve adalet teorilerinden yararlanılarak iklim değişikliği ve adalet arasındaki ilişki ele alınmıştır. Çalışma, iklim değişikliğinin sadece insan toplulukları arasında değil, aynı zamanda insanlar ve doğa arasında da ciddi adaletsizlikler yarattığını ortaya koymuştur. Özellikle düşük gelirli grupların ve kadınların iklim değişikliğinden daha fazla etkilendiği, ancak daha az sorumlu oldukları tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca, iklim adaletinin sağlanabilmesi için insan-doğa ilişkilerinin yeniden tanımlanması gerektiği vurgulanmıştır. İklim değişikliği, sadece adil bir dağılım sorunu değil, aynı zamanda insanın doğayla olan ilişkisinin yeniden yapılandırılmasını gerektiren bir krizdir. Bu krizle başa çıkmak için çevre etiği perspektifinden daha kapsayıcı ve adil yaklaşımlar geliştirilmelidir. Derin ekoloji yaklaşımı, insan ihtiyaçlarının ötesinde doğanın içsel değerini kabul ederek, sürdürülebilir bir gelecek için önemli bir rehber sunmaktadır. Bu çalışma, iklim adaletini sadece insan

[1] **Corresponding Author Yetkili Yazar:** Hacettepe University Faculty of Education, gmercn@gmail.com, 0000-0001-5515-999X
[2] Ordu University Faculty of Education, zumrutvarolselcuk@gmail.com, 0000-0001-5015-0291

toplulukları arasındaki eşitsizlikler bağlamında değil, aynı zamanda türler arası eşitsizlikler ve doğanın etik bir özne olarak tanınması bağlamında ele alarak literatüre özgün bir katkı sağlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *İklim Adaleti, Çevre Etiği, Derin Ekoloji, Antroposentrik Yaklaşım, Biyosentrik Yaklaşım*

INTRODUCTION:

The foundation of climate justice lies in the principles of environmental justice, which addresses disparities in the distribution of environmental hazards. Environmental justice theory contends that certain groups, particularly marginalized communities, disproportionately face environmental risks due to social inequalities (Schlosberg, 2013, p. 38). Typically, environmental justice approaches analyze broad structural factors, focusing on how race, ethnicity, and class impact environmental quality and access to resources (Chung-En Liu & Mayerfeld Bell, 2017, p. 439).

Bullard's work in the 1990s was pivotal in contextualizing environmental justice within the United States, especially through his examination of racial and spatial factors. He argued that environmental pollution unequally burdens low-income communities and minorities, emphasizing that hazardous waste, industrial pollutants, and toxic sites are often situated in areas with high populations of marginalized groups (Bullard, 2000). His findings highlighted that low-income and working-class communities, particularly those with racial minorities, suffer the most from environmental degradation (Bullard, 2000, pp. 4-5). Within this framework, issues such as housing type, geographic location, and industrial practices became focal points for understanding environmental inequality (Bullard, 2000, p. 5).

The environmental justice movement gained traction on February 11, 1968, when sanitation workers in Memphis protested for fair wages and better working conditions, marking one of the earliest organized efforts addressing environmental labor justice (US EPA, 2022). In 1979, Houston residents legally challenged the establishment of a waste facility near a school, a case that underscored environmental discrimination concerns within civil rights law (US EPA, 2022).

In environmental sociology, the materialist perspective investigates how socioeconomic conditions—such as consumption, economic systems, and technological progress—impact environmental inequality. In contrast, idealist views explore the influence of culture, ideology, moral values, and social experiences on environmental perceptions (Chung-En Liu & Mayerfeld Bell, 2017). Practice-oriented perspectives, meanwhile, focus on the societal implications of environmental governance, highlighting issues like "environmental justice, power, and disparities in resource allocation" (Chung-En Liu & Mayerfeld Bell, 2017, p. 439). Environmental justice in regulatory contexts challenges these inequities, pointing out that waste disposal practices and resource extraction disproportionately impact low-income, non-white, and marginalized groups (Dreau, 2022).

A socio-historical, second-generation approach to environmental justice emphasizes the role of various social actors—including the state, environmental organizations, and the public—in the creation and perpetuation of environmental inequalities (Pellow, 2000, cited in Chung-En Liu & Mayerfeld Bell, 2017, p. 440). Contemporary research has expanded beyond the U.S., proposing a global perspective that considers the life cycle impacts of production and waste on the environment. Scholars argue that environmental justice frameworks must transcend national borders, especially given the globalization of environmental challenges (Chung-En Liu & Mayerfeld Bell, 2017, p. 440). Corporations in wealthier nations, for instance, may present an outward commitment to environmental responsibility, yet often export hazardous materials to underprivileged areas in developing countries, exacerbating these regions' environmental and health issues (Chung-En Liu & Mayerfeld Bell, 2017, p. 440). Although initially centered on the unequal distribution of toxic waste within the U.S., environmental justice has now emerged as a global concern, requiring attention to the environmental consequences of production and waste disposal practices worldwide (Chung-En Liu & Mayerfeld Bell, 2017, p. 440).

The increasing relevance of climate change has shifted the environmental justice discourse. Sociological perspectives now influence how climate change is perceived in relation to justice, contrasting with viewpoints that consider it solely a governance issue. Climate justice thus aims to reduce the disproportionate burden that climate change places on vulnerable populations, particularly those with limited capacity to adapt or mitigate these impacts (Doğru & Gökalp Alıca, 2019, p. 7). By linking climate change effects to broader concepts of environmental and social justice, climate justice advocates seek to ensure that those least responsible for climate change are also the least impacted (Doğru & Gökalp Alıca, 2019, p. 11). This shift from local to global perspectives underscores the urgent need for equitable solutions to climate change-related challenges.

No universally accepted definition for climate justice exists. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation approaches it as a framework that considers existing vulnerabilities, resources, and capacities to mitigate climate impacts, enhancing resilience and equity (Preston et al., 2014, p. 3). Such an approach calls for policies that prioritize marginalized communities, focusing on strengthening resilience and addressing disparities.

https://www.jenas.org
ISSN: 2146-9229

Climate change intersects with justice on multiple fronts: it exacerbates inequality, disproportionately impacts communities tied to fossil fuel-dependent economic structures, and amplifies disparities through unevenly distributed policy measures. These include emissions reduction, adaptation efforts, and transitions to renewable energy that may inadvertently burden vulnerable groups more than others. Addressing these complexities, climate justice advocates for an equitable distribution of emission rights, effective management of vulnerability, and fair cost-sharing (Audet, 2013, pp. 371-372). Additionally, climate justice aligns with "sustainable materialism," an approach that expands the environmental justice framework to include food and energy sustainability, advocating for a holistic management of material flows within sustainability (Schlosberg, 2013, pp. 45-46). By connecting climate justice to international agreements—such as the Rio Declaration, the 2002 Bali Principles, and the 2010 Cochabamba Agreement—it becomes apparent that climate justice plays a crucial role in advancing sustainability, from daily practices to systemic policies (Schlosberg, 2013, p. 48).

At its core, climate justice builds on environmental justice, concentrating on inequalities that climate change exacerbates, especially for vulnerable groups in lower-income regions (Dolsak & Prakash, 2022, p. 287). Through advocacy and policy reform, climate justice seeks to address these disparities, emphasizing the need for coordinated global efforts to achieve both environmental and social equity (Demirci, 2013, p. 185). However, the issue of justice in the context of climate change introduces an often-overlooked dimension: the inequality inherent in the human-nature relationship. Historically, this relationship has been characterized more by dominance than by equity. Deep ecology thinkers Bill Devall and George Sessions describe this dominance as an ingrained cultural obsession: "For thousands of years, Western culture has become increasingly obsessed with the idea of dominance: the dominance of humans over non-human Nature, males over females, the rich and powerful over the poor, and Western culture over non-Western cultures" (Devall & Sessions, 1999, p. 66). While historically marginalized groups have resisted various forms of domination, often achieving partial recognition, the domination of nature has largely been neglected, its significance emerging only now with the escalating climate crisis. This crisis demands a reevaluation of our relationship with the natural world. To foster a climate-compatible perspective, environmental ethics can serve as a guiding framework. Traditionally, ethics has sought to regulate relationships among humans, with ethical consideration seen as an exclusive right of humanity due to our capacity for moral agency. However, possessing moral agency and deserving ethical consideration are separate concepts. Here, we use "ethical subject" to refer to entities worthy of moral regard (Cevizci, 2021, p. 344).

Nature, along with all its living inhabitants, should be recognized as an ethical subject. This acknowledgment mandates that nature not be perceived merely as an object to exploit and pollute without consequence. Starting with Aldo Leopold, scholars have argued for a shift from an economic view of land to one that respects its intrinsic value. The "Deep Ecology" movement has expanded on this idea, redefining the human-nature relationship by underscoring the interconnectedness of humans and the environment. As Campbell notes, the ego that views the other as "you" differs fundamentally from the ego that sees it as "it" (Campbell & Moyers, 2017, p. 103). Deep ecology goes further, proposing that nature should be viewed not just as "you" but as an extension of "I" (Devall & Sessions, 1999, p. 66). The climate crisis has highlighted that humanity and nature are inseparable; our survival is intrinsically tied to the well-being of the natural world. Therefore, substantial changes in our lives and attitudes toward the environment are essential if we are to halt this crisis before reaching an irreversible tipping point.

Interestingly, policies intended to mitigate climate change, such as carbon transition strategies, renewable energy initiatives, and environmental movements, may unintentionally perpetuate climate-environmental injustices. For instance, the global goal to halve carbon emissions by 2030 and achieve net-zero emissions by 2050 has accelerated the production of electric vehicles. However, the manufacturing of lithium batteries, vital for these vehicles, presents serious environmental and social challenges. Due to opposition against lithium mining in the U.S., it is likely that the demand for lithium will be met by imports from other countries, mirroring past practices of exporting hazardous waste (Dolsak & Prakash, 2022, p. 291). This situation raises an equity dilemma: How will nations ensure fairness both domestically and internationally. Furthermore, how will emission reductions in one area affect environmental conditions elsewhere (Cameron et al., 2013, p. 8). While the U.S. may manage the environmental and economic effects of lithium extraction internally, globally, the environmental burden may shift to less protected regions. Thus, countries may face difficulties in balancing local and global justice in their transition to a sustainable economy.

This study aims to explore the concept of climate justice through the lens of environmental ethics, addressing a notable gap in the existing literature. Current discussions on climate justice predominantly focus on human-centered hierarchies, such as international, class, and gender inequalities, while often overlooking the ethical dimensions of interspecies inequality and the broader human-nature relationship. Although these discussions provide valuable insights into how climate justice intersects with social structures, they rarely address the ethical implications of humanity's dominance over nature. By highlighting the intrinsic value of non-human life and the interconnectedness of all living beings, this work seeks to expand the climate justice discourse. It proposes an ethical framework that goes beyond traditional human-centered perspectives, aiming to foster a more comprehensive and just approach to addressing the climate crisis. In doing so, this study fills a crucial gap in the literature by integrating ethical considerations that encompass both human and non-human entities, advocating for a justice model that recognizes the rights and value of nature itself.

1. To Whom Are We Responsible: Environmental Ethics

In classical ethical approaches, the focus of ethics is generally the relationship between humans. However, environmental ethics extends beyond the obligations humans have towards other humans currently living, thereby expanding the definitions of ethical subjects. Environmental ethics is primarily examined under three approaches: anthropocentric, biocentric, and ecocentric ethics (Des Jardins, 2006; Algan, 2008). The anthropocentric approach debates whether there is an ethical obligation to future generations who have no responsibility for the destruction of the environment but have a right to live in a clean environment. The biocentric approach brings the rights of other living beings, such as animals and plants, to the forefront. The ecocentric approach, on the other hand, includes discussions on whether ethics should extend beyond living beings to include the natural environment, such as the rights of ecosystems. These approaches are fundamental perspectives to refer to when defining justice related to the environment.

1.2. Anthropocentric Approach

Classical ethical frameworks are often rooted in an anthropocentric perspective, where human beings are placed at the center of moral concern. These ethical systems primarily focus on regulating relationships within human society (Yağanak & Önkal, 2005), viewing only humans as inherently valuable. Consequently, ethical principles are thought to apply exclusively to humans, attributed to their unique intrinsic worth (Ünder, 1996, p. 60).

For many thinkers in the Western philosophical tradition, only humans are worthy of moral concern (Des Jardins, 2006:203). Human needs and interests are prioritized over those of other beings, giving humans more value than other entities in nature (Ünder, 1996:60). Therefore, only humans are considered worthy of moral concern. Traditional ethical approaches have often set conditions related to humans to be considered members of the moral community. Some thinkers have suggested that being a member of the moral community requires having a "soul," "reason," or "the ability to use symbolic language," while others have emphasized "sensitivity to pleasure and pain" (Ünder, 1996:62, 160; Bentham, cited in Ünder, 1996:160). Beings with these qualities are seen as having intrinsic value, and rights, responsibilities, and duties are defined among them.

At this point, it is necessary to explain the concepts of instrumental and intrinsic value. Instrumental value refers to the usefulness of an entity (Des Jardins, 2006:260). A glass is valuable because you can drink water with it. Money is valuable because you can buy things with it. Instrumental value is the value an entity holds because it helps achieve something. When it loses this function, it loses its value and can be completely discarded (Des Jardins, 2006:260). Intrinsic value, on the other hand, refers to the inherent value an entity has within itself, independent of the evaluator's existence, and is valuable even when not used instrumentally (Des Jardins, 2006:261).

Anthropocentric ethical approaches consider only humans as having intrinsic value (Ünder, 1996:62). Environmental protection under anthropocentric ethical approaches is based on the instrumental value the environment provides to humans. Clean air and water are valuable because their absence harms human health and well-being. The preservation of plant and animal species is argued for due to their widespread use in medicine and agriculture (Des Jardins, 2006:260). In this approach, the environment is seen as a "resource" and is valued for its instrumental worth. The primary effort of environmental ethics is to expand the boundaries of the moral community to include non-human entities, some or all of which are considered subjects of moral concern (Ünder, 1996:63; Des Jardins, 2006:263).

Even within anthropocentric ethical approaches, the definition of moral subjects has expanded to include entities not traditionally considered in ethical approaches. John Rawls provided one of the most successful examples of this expansion by discussing moral obligations towards future generations. Environmental issues are broad enough to span beyond specific time periods. Considering that past actions affect the present, today's actions will also affect the future. Therefore, when addressing an environmental issue, it is necessary to discuss moral obligations to future generations.

1.2. New Approaches in Anthropocentric Ethics: John Rawls

Anthropocentric approaches are not limited to classical ethical approaches. The ethical interest of anthropocentric approaches has expanded with modern philosophers like John Rawls, who defined ethical responsibility towards future generations. Rawls introduced the concept of "intergenerational justice," addressing the issue of distribution among generations, which is crucial from an environmental ethics perspective. This concept of justice, which can be addressed under distributive justice, concerns the distribution of money, honor, and anything that can be distributed among people (Aristoteles, 2018:95-96). When considered within environmental ethics, the distributable items include clean air, water, and the sharing of resources. The concept of intergenerational justice extends the claim over all distributable items to future generations. Rawls' concept of intergenerational justice is part of his "justice as fairness" approach, which includes a hypothetical social contract to solve issues related to distributive justice (Rawls, 2020:38). This social contract, unlike those of John Locke and Thomas Hobbes, does not refer to a "state of nature" but creates an "original position." This original position is designed to allow free and equal persons to come together and discuss

rights impartially and fairly. The precondition for impartiality in the original position is the "veil of ignorance." The veil of ignorance refers to a hypothetical situation where parties are abstracted from all innate features and abilities such as race, ethnic group, gender, power, and intelligence (Rawls, 2020:39). From behind this veil, individuals do not know their bargaining power, making everyone equal and allowing for equitable discussions. Moreover, since they do not know which group they belong to, they must approach all groups equally, ensuring that representatives are free from personal interests and enabling fair sharing.

With this approach, Rawls reaches two principles of justice: "(a) Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberties compatible with similar liberties for others; (b) Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage and attached to positions and offices open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity" (Rawls, 2020:71). There is a hierarchy between these two principles where the first principle, equal basic liberties, takes precedence over the second. Within the second principle, the principle of fair equality of opportunity takes precedence over the difference principle.

Rawls' theory of justice as fairness addresses not only the fair distribution of resources within a single generation but also considers the responsibility of one generation to the next. This concept of intergenerational justice emphasizes the transfer of rights, resources, institutions, and cultural achievements across generations. According to Rawls, each generation has a duty to preserve and pass on societal gains while contributing a fair share of resources for future generations—a concept he describes as the "principle of just savings." Importantly, this principle does not demand excessive sacrifices from any one generation but rather promotes a sustainable continuity (Rawls, 2021). Rawls proposes the "original position" as a hypothetical setting to determine these fair principles of savings. In this scenario, representatives operate under a "veil of ignorance," unaware of their generational placement, societal status, or economic conditions. This impartiality encourages them to adopt principles that equitably address the needs of both present and future generations, ensuring a fair and unbiased approach. In contrast to Rawls' approach, utilitarian ethics advocate for maximizing overall happiness, which could theoretically justify sacrifices from poorer generations to benefit the greater good. However, Rawls questions whether current generations should bear such burdens for future ones, promoting instead a balanced approach that respects intergenerational reciprocity without imposing undue demands on any single generation (Rawls, 2021).

Brian Barry argues, "if justice equals reciprocal advantage, there can be no intergenerational justice" (Barry, 1989:189). The biggest criticism of intergenerational justice is the issue of reciprocity. Those living at different times cannot reciprocate each other's sacrifices. However, Otfried Höffe addresses reciprocity in intergenerational justice, stating, "parents take care of children who will later support them. This process continues ad infinitum (forever) in their children's children" (Höffe, 1998, cited in Mathis, 2009:50). Thus, it can be said that reciprocity is only lacking among distant generations. Although climate change and environmental problems are not solely caused by near generations and cannot be solved only by near generations, concern for near generations will undoubtedly contribute to solving these problems.

Justice has many definitions, but "reciprocal advantage" does not seem to be included in these definitions. According to Kant's ethical approach, the concept of "respect for persons" is central. People deserve respect simply for being human. Respect shown to someone does not stem from mutual advantage but from the duty of respect (Sandel, 2020:169). Defining justice as "showing respect when reciprocal advantage is achieved" involves a conditional imperative. However, Kant's defined duties are not actions performed to achieve desired outcomes (Kant, 2002:59). Thus, being just is explained not by expecting reciprocity but by acting rightly under all conditions. According to this approach, it is crucial not to instrumentalize people (Kant, 2002:46). Prioritizing one's interests over another's interests means instrumentalizing people (Sandel, 2020:169). In this case, enhancing the well-being of those living today, "keeping up with fashion," boosting production and consumption to stimulate markets, etc., means prioritizing one's interests over the future generation's right to clean air. This violates the duty to treat people as ends and instrumentalizes future generations. Therefore, Brian Barry's definition of justice can be easily refuted; reciprocal advantage does not equal justice.

Justice "requires a concern and care for others" (Solomon, 2004:133). Accepting justice as reciprocal advantage indicates that individuals only look after their interests. When climate crises and environmental issues are evaluated based on concern and care for others, concern for future generations and their environment arises. Even today, as freshwater resources dwindle, diseases related to air pollution increase, especially in industrial areas, and climate refugees emerge, it is clear that future generations will face much more severe problems if this lifestyle continues. Therefore, concern and care for future generations, defined as ethical subjects within intergenerational justice, manifest as a demand for justice and necessitate combating the climate crisis. This stems from being a moral agent who carries responsibility for justice and can fulfill this responsibility by living "now," not from producing mutual advantage.

The most significant demand of contemporary anthropocentric environmental ethics is related to future generations. With the creation of the concept of intergenerational justice, it has been stated that ethical responsibility should be felt not only towards those currently living but also towards future generations, allowing for the ethical evaluation of issues like the climate crisis, which is not caused solely by currently living generations. This responsibility has been partially acknowledged within international law,

leading to the emergence of concepts like "sustainable development." The expansion of environmental ethics in this way has paved the way for ethical responsibility to encompass different subjects.

1.3. Biocentric Approach

Biocentric ethical approaches broaden the scope of moral consideration within environmental ethics by extending ethical concern to all living beings, unlike traditional anthropocentric perspectives that focus solely on humans. However, interpretations of biocentrism vary among thinkers and can generally be categorized into individualistic and holistic approaches. The individualistic perspective emphasizes the rights and intrinsic value of individual beings, focusing on protecting each entity as an end in itself. Thinkers like Peter Singer and Tom Regan, for instance, consider only certain animals as individuals deserving of moral consideration, arguing that the rights of these individuals should not be compromised for the sake of the whole (Ünder, 1996:163). On the other hand, the holistic approach prioritizes the protection of entire ecosystems, species, and the ecosphere, viewing life as an interconnected whole that warrants ethical protection. From this perspective, ethics is defined more inclusively, encompassing all forms of life rather than focusing solely on individuals. This approach seeks to safeguard life itself, recognizing the importance of sustaining the integrity of larger ecological systems.

Peter Singer's ethical framework, grounded in utilitarianism, argues for extending moral consideration beyond humans to include non-human beings (Singer, 2021, pp. 33-34). Singer, drawing on Bentham's principles, asserts that the capacity to suffer or experience pleasure should determine moral concern. For him, the question of moral worth centers not on rationality or language but on the ability to suffer—suggesting that a mouse, capable of pain, holds moral value, whereas a non-sentient object like a stone does not (Singer, 2021, pp. 87-88).

Singer's "pain-centered" ethics faces critiques, particularly in measuring pain, especially in animals who cannot express it directly. Furthermore, critics argue that choosing which animals deserve moral consideration often reflects human biases, making it difficult to avoid an anthropocentric view (Kılıç, 2008, pp. 158-160).

In contrast, Tom Regan builds his argument on Kantian ethics, extending Kant's notion of "intrinsic value" to all "subjects of life," including mammals and birds, based on their capacity for meaningful life experiences (Regan, 2007, pp. 90-92). While Regan's framework partially aligns with Singer's in recognizing certain animals as morally considerable, he critiques utilitarianism for failing to adequately justify why sacrificing an innocent individual for the benefit of others would be inherently wrong (Regan, 2003, p. 85). Though they differ in their ethical foundations, both Singer and Regan agree that animals cannot advocate for their own rights, placing the moral responsibility for justice on humans.

In contrast to Singer's utilitarian biocentric ethics, Kantian ethics asserts that it is never right to treat an entity with intrinsic value merely as a means to an end (Regan, 2003:68). According to Regan's view on animal rights, subjects of life have intrinsic value and should never be reduced to mere instrumental value (Regan, 2003:85-86). Therefore, Regan's ethical approach does not involve balancing benefits and harms but categorically opposes the killing or exploitation of animals under any circumstances. For instance, it is not enough to reduce the suffering of animals by enlarging their cages; the cages must be emptied (Regan, 2007:94). Similarly, turning animals into food, clothing, performers, or racers is strongly criticized (Regan, 2007). Regarding animal experimentation, Regan argues that the benefits claimed by proponents of such experiments do not justify the harm inflicted on animals. Even if animal experiments were beneficial to humans, the question "Do our benefits justify the harm we cause them?" must be addressed (Regan, 2007:235). According to Regan, even if people benefit from and never suffer from this practice, ends do not justify the means; one cannot accept an evil such as animal experimentation in pursuit of good (Regan, 2007:262).

The approaches of Peter Singer and Tom Regan have shaped what is known as the animal rights movement. This movement reflects influences from the human rights movement. Similar ethical foundations—expanded to include animals—demonstrate the relationship between the two movements. The animal rights movement, inspired by the human rights movement, declared the rights animals should have through a declaration (Neumann, 2012:92). The Universal Declaration of Animal Rights, proclaimed in 1978 at UNESCO House in Paris, asserts that all animals have an equal right to life (La Fondation Droit Animal, 2023). This approach has led to debates in the legal field, questioning the legal status of animals. There is a demand to remove animals from their legal classification as property and define them as subjects of rights, arguing that speciesism should be rejected just like discrimination based on race or gender (Köybaşı, 2018:123-124).

Another proponent of biocentric ethics is Albert Schweitzer, who articulated the ethics of reverence for life, primarily through self-reflection. He stated, "I am a life that wants to live amidst lives that want to live" (Schweitzer, 1998:156; Artuç, 2021:171). The acceptance of the will to live forms the foundation of his ethical approach, rejecting philosophical ideas that do not recognize this as based on false premises (Schweitzer, 1998:156). The affirmation of life is a spiritual act through which one stops thoughtlessly living and begins to devote oneself with respect to giving proper value to life (Schweitzer, 1998:157). "As a thinking being, man feels obligated to give the same reverence for life that he gives to his own life to every will to live. He experiences the other life

within himself. He accepts as good preserving life, promoting life, and bringing all possible life to its highest value. He sees evil as that which ruins life, disrupts life, and suppresses life capable of development. This is the absolute, fundamental principle of ethics and a basic proposition of thought (Schweitzer, 1998:157).

Paul W. Taylor's life-centered approach, "Respect for Nature," aligns with Schweitzer's philosophy, expanding ethical consideration to all life forms. Taylor critiques the human-centered relationship with nature, arguing that living beings have intrinsic value as members of Earth's Life Community, independent of their usefulness to humans. His ethics advocate that animals and plants deserve protection for their own sake and should be respected similarly to humans. In this life-centered framework, Taylor outlines four core duties: non-maleficence, non-interference, fidelity, and restitutive justice (Des Jardins, 2001, p. 279). The duty of non-maleficence mandates that moral agents avoid actions that could harm organisms, without obligating them to reduce suffering caused by natural processes. Non-interference calls for respecting the freedom of individual organisms and communities by avoiding actions that could alter their habitats. The duty of fidelity is limited to wild animals in natural habitats, emphasizing that humans should not violate the trust or expectations these animals may form based on human behavior. Finally, restitutive justice requires moral agents to compensate for harm caused when they violate a moral obligation toward a living being (Taylor, 2011, pp. 172-186).

Arne Naess developed an ecocentric ethical approach, distinguishing between "shallow ecology" and "deep ecology," aiming to differentiate his philosophy from other environmental movements. Due to this distinction, his movement is named "Deep Ecology." Naess criticized many environmental groups for being insufficient and argued that they fail to challenge the established worldview of industrialized society. According to Naess, shallow ecology focuses solely on resource usage and pollution, with the primary goal of protecting people in developed countries. This approach seeks to protect nature only when it threatens human life and presents an anthropocentric perspective (Luke, 2002, p. 179; Naess, 1973, p. 95). Deep ecology, on the other hand, rejects the notion of "humans within nature" and embraces a more relational understanding. Naess argues that the intrinsic relationship between A and B is such that without this relationship, A and B cannot remain the same. He believes that a similar relationship exists between humans and nature; without nature, humans cannot truly be themselves. Therefore, rather than a concept of nature centered around humans, it is essential to recognize that what makes humans who they are is their relationship with nature. Through this relationship, nature moves beyond being something that merely surrounds and serves humanity to becoming something that defines and constitutes humanity itself. In this sense, preserving nature is akin to preserving humanity (Naess, 1973, p. 95). Naess defines this principle as a "rule" but acknowledges exceptions. In cases where there is a conflict between non-essential human needs and essential needs of other species, these needs must be compared; he emphasizes that the principle of "causing no unnecessary suffering to other beings" serves as an important guideline. He argues that necessity must be properly defined, and that fulfilling market demands cannot be considered a necessity (Naess, 1973, pp. 95-97).

2. Climate Change and Climate Justice

2.1. What is Climate Change?

Climate change refers to the long-term shifts in temperature and weather patterns observed over extended periods (United Nations Climate Action, 2022). While various natural and human-driven factors contribute to these changes, the exact causes of climate change are complex and not yet fully understood. One significant natural factor influencing climate is the Milankovitch Cycles, a theory proposed by Serbian astronomer Milutin Milankovitch. According to this theory, variations in the Earth's orbit, axial tilt, and axial precession affect the amount of solar radiation Earth receives, leading to climate fluctuations over time. This theory helps explain historical cycles, such as ice ages, although increased CO_2 emissions from human activities are believed to delay future glacial cycles by thousands of years (Rahmstorf & Schellnhuber, 2020, pp. 23-25). Other natural contributors to climate change include continental drift, volcanic activity, and solar variations (Uzmen, 2007, pp. 41-43). However, the primary focus today is on the greenhouse effect, a natural process that has been intensified by human activity.

The greenhouse effect is essential for maintaining Earth's habitability. Discovered by Joseph Fourier, it occurs when greenhouse gases—such as water vapor, carbon dioxide, and methane—trap heat in the atmosphere, preventing excessive cooling at night and maintaining a temperature difference between day and night (TBMM, 2021, p. 174; Walker & King, 2009, pp. 27-28). However, with the rise of industrial activities, emissions of greenhouse gases have drastically increased, intensifying this natural effect and raising global temperatures. Key greenhouse gases regulated by the Kyoto Protocol include CO_2, CH_4, N_2O, HFCs, PFCs, and SF_6, with each gas varying in its heat-trapping potency (UNFCCC, 1997; Türkeş, 2008, p. 31; Kurnaz, 2022, p. 156).

Since 1958, CO_2 levels have been tracked using the "Keeling curve," which shows a steady rise in atmospheric CO_2 concentration, now reaching 420 ppm—a substantial increase from pre-industrial levels (Walker & King, 2009, p. 35; NASA, 2022). Compared to the pre-industrial period, CO_2 has risen by 149%, methane by 262%, and nitrous oxide by 124% (WMO, 2022, p. 5). This dramatic rise in greenhouse gases has been directly linked to a 1.1°C increase in the Earth's average temperature since 1880, with implications documented in IPCC reports (NASA, 2022; IPCC, 2023, p. 11). The rise in global temperatures has led to a series of

ecological and environmental shifts: sea levels have risen, glaciers and polar ice sheets have melted, and extreme weather events have become more frequent. Species and ecosystems are affected, with nearly half of terrestrial species migrating toward cooler areas. Despite these adaptive responses, many species struggle to cope, leading to biodiversity losses (IPCC, 2023, pp. 12-13). Additionally, climate change threatens food and water security, as well as human health. Although CO_2 plays a significant role in climate change, climatologists recognize that it is not the sole cause—a concept known as the attribution problem, which refers to the difficulty in pinpointing precise sources of climate change (Rahmstorf & Schellnhuber, 2020, p. 42). Nevertheless, substantial evidence supports human influence on climate, leading Nobel laureate Paul Crutzen to label this new era as the Anthropocene, defined by human-induced environmental changes (Crutzen & Steffen, 2003, pp. 251-253). The IPCC's reports consistently underscore that most observed warming over the past 50 years is likely driven by human activities, officially framing climate change as "human-induced" (IPCC, 2022, p. 8).

Effective carbon sinks, such as forests, soils, and oceans, play a vital role in moderating atmospheric CO_2. However, deforestation and industrial emissions disrupt this natural carbon cycle, weakening the Earth's capacity to absorb excess carbon. As ocean saturation increases and methane reserves are released, feedback loops may accelerate warming, emphasizing the urgency to limit emissions before reaching an irreversible tipping point (Nordhaus, 2020, pp. 73-75). Whether fully human-induced or influenced by natural factors, there is broad consensus that human activities significantly impact climate change. Consequently, immediate actions are essential to mitigate future risks. Addressing climate change also entails tackling existing damage and ensuring that the burdens are fairly distributed, particularly where they cannot be eliminated. This equitable approach forms the foundation of climate justice, underscoring the moral and social responsibility to safeguard the planet for future generations.

2.2.Climate Justice

Climate Justice offers an ethical and political lens through which to address climate change, linking it directly to environmental and social justice (Doğru & Gökalp Alıca, 2019, p. 11). This framework highlights the inequities in climate impacts, noting that those who contribute least to climate change often suffer the most severe consequences. The concept is rooted in Environmental Justice, a term that gained prominence in the 1970s, emphasizing the disproportionate environmental hazards faced by marginalized communities (Des Jardins, 2001, p. 448; Mercan & Varol Selçuk, 2024, p.74). According to the EPA, environmental justice seeks fair treatment for all individuals, ensuring that no group disproportionately bears the burdens of environmental harm (EPA, 2022).

Scholar Robert D. Bullard has extensively documented how low-income and minority communities are disproportionately exposed to environmental risks due to structural inequalities. Research reveals that these communities are more likely to host hazardous facilities, which increases health risks, lowers property values, and heightens exposure to pollutants like lead (Bullard, 1993; Geschwind et al., 1992; Needleman et al., 1990). Environmental justice advocates for a balanced distribution of environmental benefits and harms, seeking to protect vulnerable groups from disproportionate risks (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014). This movement diverges from traditional environmentalism by prioritizing human rights and labor issues, redefining the environment as inclusive of the places where people "live, work, and play" (Novotny, 2000, p. 2). A foundational document in this movement is the 1991 declaration by the People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, which sets forth 17 principles. These principles stress ecological unity, sustainability, and the intrinsic rights of all species to exist without ecological harm. Additionally, they call for meaningful participation of vulnerable communities in environmental decision-making and fair access to healthcare for those impacted by environmental injustices.

Climate justice shares significant common ground with environmental justice, particularly in its focus on equitable adaptation and the fair distribution of environmental impacts. A prominent example is Hurricane Katrina, which revealed how existing racial and economic disparities intensified the effects of natural disasters, leaving marginalized communities at a distinct disadvantage. This event underscored the necessity of inclusive and just disaster preparedness and recovery (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014, p. 362; International Climate Justice Network, 2002).

In 2004, the Climate Justice Declaration was presented at the second People of Color Environmental Justice Summit, laying out 14 principles for equitable climate action. These principles advocate for fair adaptation, transparency in carbon markets, and accountability for major contributors to climate change. Additionally, the declaration emphasizes reducing fossil fuel dependency, culturally relevant climate education, and compensation for communities impacted by climate change. The 2009 Climate Change Environmental Justice Leadership Forum expanded upon these principles, setting specific goals for emissions reduction, public health protection, and transitioning to a sustainable energy economy (ILO,2021). It emphasizes that those most responsible for climate change should bear its costs and articulates a vision for a just shift to renewable energy sources. This summary enhances clarity and coherence by focusing on the key tenets of climate and environmental justice, ensuring a streamlined presentation of essential points (IPCC, 2014; IPCC, 2022a; IPCC, 2022b)

Climate justice is a concept that enables the ethical and political dimensions of climate change to be addressed and discussed. Climate change, together with the concept of climate justice, can be linked to environmental and social justice (Doğru & Gökalp

Alıca, 2019:11). Discussions within these frameworks highlight the injustices in the distribution of the impacts of climate change among different groups. There is an almost inverse relationship between the groups responsible for climate change and those most affected by it. Therefore, conceptualizing climate justice is of great importance.

The foundations of the concept of climate justice can be found in the concept of environmental justice. Thus, it is necessary to first discuss the concept of environmental justice. Environmental justice has been used since the 1970s to draw attention to the disproportionate risks faced by communities, particularly those of color, in relation to environmental issues (Des Jardins, 2001:448). According to the definition by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), environmental justice is "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies." Fair treatment means "no group of people should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental, and commercial operations or policies" (EPA, 2022).

Sociologist Robert D. Bullard is a pioneer in environmental justice, emphasizing the increased vulnerability of certain groups and communities to environmental hazards (Bullard, 1993, p. 821). He identifies that communities of color and low-income populations face heightened exposure to environmental risks due to systemic inequalities (Bullard, 1993, p. 822). Several factors contribute to this disparity, with disadvantaged communities more frequently situated near environmental hazards. For instance, a 1990 Greenpeace study found that areas hosting incinerators have an 89% higher minority population than the national average, with average incomes 15% below and property values 38% below the national averages. In areas designated for new incinerators, minority populations are 60% higher than the average, and property values remain 35% lower (Bullard, 1993, p. 823). This evidence reflects how income inequality and racial discrimination contribute to the uneven distribution of environmental risks.

A related study by a public relations firm in California indicated that communities with lower educational attainment, blue-collar workers, and low-income groups showed less resistance to "locally unwanted land uses" (Cerrell Associates, 1984). Such communities are thus more likely to host environmentally hazardous facilities, perpetuating the disproportionate burden of environmental risks. Additionally, air pollution exposure also reveals inequities. Studies in the United States indicate similar patterns, with economically and racially marginalized communities suffering the brunt of these environmental threats.

Similarly, there is an unjust distribution regarding exposure to air pollution. A study in the United States found that while 52% of predominantly white counties experience high ozone levels, this figure rises to 62% in counties with predominantly African American populations and 71% in counties with predominantly Latin American populations (Wernette & Nieves, 1992:16). In addition to exposure to environmental hazards, there are also inequalities in health risks (Bullard, 1993:828). A study by Yale University School of Medicine and the New York Health Department found that living near toxic waste sites increases the risk of congenital disabilities in babies by 12% (Geschwind et al., 1992:1202). Moreover, there are many studies on the health problems associated with lead exposure. Even "safe" levels of lead exposure can reduce children's IQ levels (Needleman et al., 1990:88). There is also significant inequality among social groups regarding lead exposure. In central cities, 49% of African American children and 16% of white children are harmed by high lead levels. In suburban areas, 36% of African American children and 9% of white children are affected (Bullard, 1993:829). Additionally, income inequalities play an important role in these risks. Among families earning less than $6,000, 68% of African American children suffer from lead poisoning, compared to 36% of white children in the same income group. Among families earning more than $15,000, 85% of African American children and 47% of white children have blood lead levels above the safe threshold (Bullard, 1993:829). These figures demonstrate the impact of race and income on the distribution of health risks. Individuals disadvantaged in terms of health problems are also vulnerable in terms of access to healthcare. Many citizens, families, or communities have limited or no access to healthcare services (Bullard, 1993:835).

The core focus of the environmental justice concept is the unequal distribution of environmental risks and governmental protection (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014:361). In simple terms, more vulnerable groups such as poor communities and people of color are disproportionately affected by environmental harms compared to white and wealthy communities. The environmental justice concept aims to make visible the existing injustices in the distribution of environmental costs, benefits, and conditions and seeks to rectify these injustices on a foundation where everyone has equal rights (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014:361). This concept differs from environmental activism. Post-war environmental activism has focused on protecting the nation's water and air, often associated with the suburban middle class. This approach has accused low-income communities of being less concerned about the environment while also being less concerned about the lives of the poor. In contrast, the environmental justice movement is primarily led by human rights groups and labor unions, redefining the concept of the environment as "the place we live, work, and play" (Novotny, 2000:2). This definition includes housing needs, occupational health, and workplace safety as part of environmental issues.

The environmental justice concept requires a broader perspective on environmental issues. Considering social and political inequalities within the framework of environmental justice helps make visible the injustices in the distribution of social rights. While human inequality is the focus of this concept, it should not be thought that the environment is considered only from an

anthropocentric perspective. One of the most important documents on environmental justice is the declaration published at the 1991 People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit. The declaration attempts to define what environmental justice is through 17 principles, with the first principle stating, "Environmental Justice recognizes the sacredness of Mother Earth, ecological unity, and the interdependence of all species, and the right to be free from ecological destruction" (People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, 1991). Other principles emphasize the need for the planet to be sustainable for both humans and other species, minimizing the consumption of Mother Earth's resources and producing as little waste as possible, and ensuring the health of the natural world for present and future generations. Additionally, the principles call for the reassessment of the situation of vulnerable communities, ensuring their participation as equal partners in environmental planning, decision-making, and evaluation processes, and providing quality healthcare and full compensation for those harmed by environmental injustices (People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, 1991).

The concept of environmental justice intersects with the concept of climate justice on many issues. Both concepts address environmental problems and are closely related to the concept of social justice, as they involve examining the distribution of benefits and harms. Both concepts identify vulnerable groups and investigate why these groups are more vulnerable. One of the most significant examples of the convergence of environmental justice and climate justice is Hurricane Katrina in 2005.

Hurricane Katrina demonstrated that the adverse effects of climate change disproportionately affect poor and colored people (Bullard & Wright, 2009:19). The existing racial discrimination, poverty, inadequate education system, and substandard housing in New Orleans were shown to have significant repercussions during the disaster. These conditions left these communities vulnerable before the storm and resulted in less information, less government aid, less credit, and continued discrimination after the storm (Bullard & Wright, 2009:19). However, the responses of environmental justice advocates to Hurricane Katrina went beyond these basic issues, raising awareness of other communities threatened by climate change based on climate vulnerability and disaster relief concerns (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014:362).

Environmental justice and climate justice concepts had converged before this event. The Climate Justice Declaration was published at the 2nd Meeting of the People of Color Environmental Justice Summit in 2004. The declaration listed 14 principles for achieving climate justice, emphasizing the need to protect vulnerable individuals and communities and ensure a fair adaptation process. It highlighted the importance of community participation in the process, stating that global problems require global solutions and that the U.S. should take a leadership role in this solution. The declaration also referred to future generations and Mother Earth, emphasizing individual and collective responsibilities toward them. It called for halting the search for fossil fuels and slowing greenhouse gas emissions, underscoring the need for transparency and accountability in national and international carbon emissions markets. The declaration also highlighted the role of financial institutions in promoting a consumption mentality and lifestyle that contribute to global warming and stated that these institutions should be held accountable. It emphasized the need for climate education to be provided in a culturally appropriate manner and called for full compensation for those negatively affected by climate change and the payment of ecological debt (People of Color Environmental Justice Leadership Summit, 2004). In 2009, the Climate Change Environmental Justice Leadership Forum again outlined the principles of climate justice. The first principle called for establishing a zero-carbon economy with targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 25% by 2020 and 80% by 2050. The second principle emphasized the need to protect all people and communities in America equally, regardless of race, gender, nationality, or socioeconomic status. The third principle stated that carbon policies should not harm public health or exacerbate existing health inequalities among communities. The fourth principle called for those most responsible for climate change to bear the proportional cost of climate change, including all environmental, health, social, and economic costs of energy use. The fifth principle aimed for a transition from a fossil fuel economy to a green, clean, and renewable energy economy by 2020 (People of Color Environmental Justice Leadership Summit, 2009).

The fifth principle calls for setting a national goal to transition from a fossil fuel economy to a green, clean, and renewable energy economy by 2020. The sixth principle aims to position the public sector as a catalyst for change in transitioning to a green, clean, renewable energy economy by allocating a portion of the revenues from carbon reduction strategies to support green, clean renewable energy initiatives. The seventh principle is about creating opportunities for all Americans, particularly people of color, indigenous peoples, and low-income individuals, to participate in and benefit from a green economy. The eighth principle emphasizes providing an economic and social safety net for vulnerable groups during the transition from fossil fuels to a renewable, clean, and green economy. The ninth principle includes ensuring job opportunities for those who need retraining in the green economy, particularly those historically underemployed, unemployed, or excluded from unions. The tenth principle demands that people of color, indigenous peoples, and low-income individuals, who are disproportionately affected by climate change, have an inalienable and indispensable right to participate in the most important debate of the 21st century (Environmental Justice Leadership Forum on Climate Change, 2009).

As seen, the concept of environmental justice significantly contributes to the development of the concept of climate justice. Environmental justice covers a wide range of topics, from where incinerators are located to who is commonly affected by lead poisoning. The concept of climate justice examines how environmental injustices specifically related to climate change occur. Unlike

other environmental issues, climate change has broader and more global effects, making its injustices apparent on an international level. There are injustices within countries as well as between countries.

The concept of climate justice entered public discourse in 1999 with CorpWatch's report "Greenhouse Gangsters vs. Climate Justice," which defines what climate justice is. According to the report, climate justice aims to eliminate the causes of global warming and allow the Earth to enrich the lives of all living beings. This means radically reducing carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. In the U.S., climate justice involves ensuring that solutions to global warming do not disproportionately impact low-income individuals, people of color, or workers employed in the fossil fuel sector. Climate justice includes helping communities threatened or affected by climate change. While all countries must participate in reducing greenhouse gases, climate justice demands that industrialized countries, historically and currently the most responsible, lead this process. The U.S., contributing 25% of greenhouse gas emissions, should be at the forefront of this transformation. For developing countries, climate justice involves the World Bank and World Trade Organization ceasing to finance and promote fossil fuel-based globalization and instead supporting sustainable and clean energy technologies. Ultimately, climate justice means holding fossil fuel companies accountable for their contributions to global warming (Bruno, Karliner, & Brotsky, 1999).

In 2000, the Climate Justice Summit was held at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Sixth Conference of the Parties, recognizing that climate change is a matter of rights and aiming to build state and cross-border collaborations that strengthen sustainable development in response to climate change (Doğru & Gökalp Alıca, 2019). In 2002, at the Rio+10 conference, various environmental organizations, including CorpWatch, OilWatch, and Greenpeace International, came together to publish the Bali Principles of Climate Justice. These principles identified fossil fuels as the primary cause of climate change and pointed to industrialized nations and multinational corporations as the main culprits. The principles also addressed the role of unsustainable consumption patterns among the elites in both the Global North and South. Vulnerable groups, including Small Island states, women, youth, coastal communities, indigenous peoples, fishers, the poor, and the elderly, were explicitly mentioned as being disproportionately affected by climate change. The principles criticized market-based mechanisms and emphasized the need for local communities, affected people, and indigenous populations to actively participate in decision-making processes. They also referenced intergenerational justice, highlighting the rights of future generations to access natural resources, a stable climate, and a healthy planet. Moreover, the principles did not solely define justice in anthropocentric terms but also acknowledged the sacredness of Mother Earth, ecological integrity, and the interdependence of all species, opposing the commodification of nature and natural resources (Bali Principles of Climate Justice, 2002).

In 2004, during the 17th Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC, the Durban Group for Climate Justice was formed, and the Durban Declaration on Carbon Trading was published. This declaration opposed carbon trading, one of the flexibility mechanisms introduced by the Kyoto Protocol. It argued that carbon trading creates more tradable rights to release emissions into the air, oceans, soil, and vegetation than these systems can handle. Carbon trading solidifies the demand for fossil fuels, which were previously identified as the primary cause of climate change, thereby exacerbating social and environmental injustices globally. Another flexibility mechanism, the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), was criticized for encouraging industrialized countries and companies to finance or create large-scale carbon sinks in the Global South, like tree plantations, as a profitable alternative to reducing their emissions. The declaration asserted that carbon trading, due to its inherent flaws and weaknesses, exacerbates global warming rather than mitigating it. It emphasized that the only viable solution is to reduce emissions from fossil fuel use and highlighted the responsibility to seek a sustainable solution that does not sacrifice marginalized communities (Durban Group for Climate Justice, 2004).

In 2007, at the 13th Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC in Bali, numerous civil society organizations came together to form the "Climate Justice Now!" network. This network continued to emphasize opposition to carbon trading but also included organizations working within the framework of environmental justice, such as OilWatch and the Indigenous Environmental Network. The founding press release of the network highlighted demands for "social, economic, and gender justice" and policies and practices that protect livelihoods and the environment (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014).

Recently, at the 27th Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC (COP27) in Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, indigenous peoples, climate activists, environmental defenders, human rights activists, labor and feminist groups came together to publish the People's Declaration for Climate Justice. This declaration again identified vulnerable groups, including women, black people, indigenous peoples, people of color, workers, peasants and rural communities, youth, disabled people, local and frontline communities, and emphasized their rights. It stated that climate justice cannot be achieved without human rights, as climate change exacerbates existing inequalities and injustices, undermining rights such as the right to life, health, safe and decent housing, food, livelihoods, decent jobs, a healthy environment, and cultural sovereignty. The declaration made four fundamental demands. The first demand was for decolonization of the economy and society, including ending the use of fossil fuels and transitioning to decentralized renewable energy, while ensuring access to public services like health and education, food sovereignty and agroecology, social protection, workers' rights, and decent wages, and respecting the rights of Mother Earth. The second demand was for the repayment of climate debt and the delivery of financial support, with wealthy countries reducing their emissions to real zero by

2030, as recommended by the IPCC, and financing adaptation, loss and damage in the Global South. The third demand was to achieve the 1.5°C target by 2030 through real zero emissions and rejecting false solutions like offsetting, carbon markets, carbon capture technologies, nature-based solutions, geoengineering, climate-smart agriculture, and instead adopting policies for achieving "real zero." The final demand was for global solidarity, peace, and justice, calling for an end to all wars, rebuilding multilateralism and internationalism on the foundations of peace and justice, ensuring a safe environment for civil society, and building global solidarity among nations, workers, and communities based on justice and peace, with human rights at the core of climate negotiations (People's Declaration for Climate Justice, 2022).

In the document adopted at COP27, it is noted that a clear emission reduction target was not set for greenhouse gas emissions, unlike in these declarations. The document mentions "reducing greenhouse gas emissions where applicable" and reiterates the 1.5°C target, stating that emissions must be reduced by 43% compared to 2019 levels to achieve this goal. The importance of climate justice in solving climate change was recognized, and it was emphasized that protecting the integrity of ecosystems, including forests, oceans, and the cryosphere, and preserving biodiversity are essential (UNFCCC, 2022). The document highlights that climate change is a "common concern of humanity" and calls for addressing climate change while considering human rights, such as the right to a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment, the rights of indigenous peoples, local communities, migrants, children, persons with disabilities, and vulnerable people, and gender equality. It emphasizes "sustainable development" as one of the critical focuses and notes the importance of sustainable lifestyles, production, and consumption in addressing climate change (UNFCCC, 2022).

As can be seen, there are various approaches to the concept of climate justice. The common point is the acknowledgment that climate change is caused by fossil fuels. Over time, except for official documents, there has been an increasingly stringent stance on fossil fuels. The urgency of reducing greenhouse gas emissions for the planet's future has become more significant as real measures to reduce fossil fuel use have not been implemented. Additionally, the documents related to climate justice often parallel the concept of environmental justice. Almost every document similarly defines vulnerable groups and discusses the disproportionate impact of climate change on these groups. The documents also search for those contributing to climate change, frequently holding fossil fuels and the countries and companies that profit from them accountable. They often address inequalities between the Global North and South, with the Bali Principles of Climate Justice also highlighting the contributions of the elite in the South to this issue, underscoring class inequality. Some documents also highlight gender inequality, noting the adverse effects on women. While the documents generally make similar demands, some prioritize nature-based approaches, while others emphasize human rights-based approaches. Some documents entirely reject market-based solutions, while others focus on sustainable development. These diverse perspectives and approaches illustrate the various facets of climate justice and the different ways to address it.

CONCLUSION:

Climate change is a phenomenon where the impact of human actions cannot be ignored, and numerous living and non-living entities must endure its harmful effects. The concept of distributive justice suggests that benefits and burdens should be distributed proportionally. However, in the context of climate change, benefits and burdens are distributed highly disproportionately among humans, living organisms, and nature. This disproportionate distribution is critically important from a justice perspective. Still, if climate change is not promptly addressed, even the equal distribution of benefits and burdens will become meaningless, indicating a significant issue—especially considering that the equal distribution of benefits and burdens seems impossible when considering species extinctions and ecosystem disruptions due to rising temperatures.

The concept of climate justice partially highlights these disparities. It is a significant injustice that the Global South, which has contributed the least to climate change, pays the price for the Global North's actions. Similarly, while the wealthy have lifestyles that harm the atmosphere more, lower-income groups are much more vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. Men and women also have different carbon footprints (Ermumcu, Aloğlu, Akdağ & Köroğlu, 2024) with women having a much higher mortality rate in climate-induced natural disasters.

Recognizing nature as an ethical subject will broaden the definition of climate justice. Approaches to climate justice often focus on which individuals should compensate for the damages suffered by others and how. These approaches are undoubtedly important in determining who should take responsibility for adapting to and preventing climate change. However, climate justice encompasses more than just "sharing the costs." What will matter more to future generations is not just who and how the costs are shared but the kind of world they inherit. The same applies to extinct species and dried-up rivers.

Therefore, a just approach to climate change must go beyond merely fair distribution. By tracing back to the period when the events leading to climate change occurred, we can better understand the changes that triggered it. Climate change has emerged as a result of the fossil fuel-based production model adopted since the Industrial Revolution. This production model requires the promotion of consumption to sustain itself. Overproduction and overconsumption by the wealthy are fundamental aspects of this

system. The view of nature as an unlimited resource for consumption, along with the irresponsible exploitation and pollution of nature to produce and consume beyond needs, should be addressed as an ethical issue.

To achieve this, humanity's relationship with nature must be redefined. Having progressed significantly in its struggle with nature, living in cities and avoiding rain and cold, humans are nearing a point where they forget their connection to nature. However, the bond between humans and nature cannot be severed. Even if city dwellers do not see it, the food they consume comes from the soil, and this food is irrigated with water that they do not hesitate to pollute through factories. Nature is not something humans can simply dominate; it is part of their "Self." By polluting nature, humans are harming their "Self," and climate change is the most evident example of this.

Climate justice can only be achieved by correctly positioning the relationship between humans and nature. With this correctly positioned relationship, habits can change, and people will have the time to consider the environmental impact of wearing more stylish clothes, buying different colored sports shoes, using private vehicles unnecessarily, and acquiring the latest accessories just because they are advertised. They will question whether they have exceeded their needs.

However, stopping here would be taking the easy way out. Although everyone contributes to the climate crisis, the bill should not be handed solely to individuals. It would be unfair to hold individuals, who use public transportation at the expense of spending an extra two hours daily, burn natural gas when cold, or buy new clothes to fit in with society, as the primary culprits. Instead, companies that still produce and market fossil fuel-based vehicles, governments that do not strive to eliminate fossil fuel dependency in energy, and companies and their media collaborators that promote the ever-changing fashion to increase consumption should be held accountable.

One of the earliest documents discussing climate justice, CorpWatch's "Greenhouse Gangsters vs. Climate Justice" report, correctly points out the responsibility of corporations. However, while it rightly emphasizes the responsibility of corporations, it is incomplete because it focuses solely on fossil fuel companies. It is essential to remember that the issue of climate change dates back to the Industrial Revolution. Since then, the most significant change in everyday life has been the emergence of corporations as actors. Corporations are the key representatives of capitalism. In this understanding, material and economic growth are paramount. According to deep ecology, needs should serve the goal of self-realization. An ethical approach harmonious with nature must bind and transform not only individuals but also corporations, the primary actors in this crisis.

Another key actor is the state. The responsibility of states in the climate crisis has come to the fore through international agreements. However, the debates in these agreements are often limited to discussions on the distribution of damages. States have significant responsibilities due to their power to enact binding regulations on reducing the carbon footprints of individuals and companies and to enforce penalties for violations. States also undertake infrastructure projects and manage large budgets through collected taxes. They are the only actors with the power to change fossil fuel dependency in energy consumption and allocate funds for the transition to renewable energy. Therefore, while the responsibility of states in covering the costs of climate adaptation and repaying historical ecological debts is crucial, their responsibility does not end there. States must also aim to achieve zero emissions as soon as possible.

As emphasized by the deep ecology approach, the ethical responsibility towards nature requires a shift in the dominant worldview. Biocentric equality must be accepted, evaluating human non-essential desires against the vital needs of other species, and avoiding unnecessary harm to other creatures—for instance, killing animals for fur when warming needs can be met without harming nature represents such a conflict of rights. Living with minimal impact on the world is of great importance according to the deep ecology perspective. This principle should guide the actions of all actors mentioned above. Needs should replace material and economic growth, and sustainable consumption and recycling should replace the culture of consumption. Increasing ecological consciousness is crucial according to deep ecology. City dwellers may overlook their vital connection to nature, but nature-oriented activities conducted appropriately can help increase ecological consciousness. With heightened ecological awareness, the mistaken view of human separateness from others can be eradicated, leading to a recognition of the interconnectedness of all life. This can foster a departure from the notion of dominance.

The deep ecology approach does not aim to return to the past. It does not call for the dismantling of the existing system but for changing its current moral paradigms. Therefore, environmental approaches cannot be criticized for being utopian or disconnected from reality. It does not oppose development and progress but seeks to prevent them from becoming ultimate goals that justify everything else. Production should be oriented towards needs rather than excess. The solutions developed must be compatible with sociological realities. The advocates of this movement argue that the use of environmentally friendly technologies should not deepen class disparities. In this context, this approach offers a significant perspective on defining climate justice and addressing the climate crisis.

When examining the demands and official documents related to climate justice, it is evident that, except for the Bali Principles of Climate Justice, the concept is primarily human-centered design (HCD) https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/topics/human-centered-design. The Earth's temperature has already risen by more than 1 degree, and without immediate action, the agreed-upon target of limiting the increase to 1.5 degrees, a consensus among both civil society and the United Nations, will be missed. Civil society organizations' declarations advocate against carbon trading and reiterate the necessity of reducing emissions to zero. The Bali Principles of Climate Justice provide an example of how the definition of climate justice can expand towards an ecocentric ethic. However, the weak voice of this example among civil society organizations and academic approaches prevents it from resonating with official institutions.

ETHICAL STANDARDS:

Conflict of Interest: There are no potential conflicts of interest with the authors or third parties in this article.

Ethics Committee Permission: This article does not require ethics committee approval.

Financial Support: No financial support was received for this article.

REFERENCES:

Artuç, A. (2021). Deep ecology and environmental ethics. *Ecological Studies*, 18(3), 167-182.

Audet, R. (2013). Climate justice and bargaining coalitions: A discourse analysis. *International Environmental Agreements, 13*, 369-386. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-012-9195-9

Barry, B. (1989). *Theories of justice*. University of California Press.

Bozoğlu, E. (2019). Climate change and its impacts. *Environmental Research Letters*, 14(2), 32-48.

Bullard, R. D. (1993). Anatomy of environmental racism and the environmental justice movement. *In Confronting Environmental Racism: Voices from the Grassroots*. South End Press.

Bullard, R. D., & Wright, B. H. (2009). *Race, place, and environmental justice after Hurricane Katrina: Struggles to reclaim, rebuild, and revitalize New Orleans and the Gulf Coast*. Westview Press.

Cameron, E., Shine, T., & Bevins, W. (2013). *Climate justice: Equity and justice informing a new climate agreement*. World Resources Institute Mary Robinson Foundation Climate Justice.

Campbell, J., & Moyers, B. (2017). *The power of myth*. Anchor Books.

Cerrell Associates. (1984). *Political difficulties facing waste-to-energy conversion plant siting*. California State Solid Waste Management Board.

Cevizci, A. (2021). *Introduction to philosophy*. Istanbul: Sentez Yayıncılık.

Chung-En Liu, J., & Mayerfeld Bell, M. (2017). Environmental sociology. In K. O. Korgen (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociology*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316418376.043

Crutzen:J., & Steffen, W. (2003). How long have we been in the Anthropocene era? *Climatic Change*, 61(3), 251-257.

Demirci, D. (2013). The problem of intergenerational justice in the context of climate change. *Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 23(4), 183-200.

Luke, T. W. (2002). Deep ecology: Living as if nature mattered: Devall and Sessions on defending the earth. *Organization & Environment, 15*(2), 178-186.

Naess, A. (1973). The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement. A summary. *Inquiry, 16*(1-4), 95-100. https://doi.org/10.1080/00201747308601682

Des Jardins, J. R. (2001). *Environmental ethics: An introduction to environmental philosophy*. Wadsworth.

Des Jardins, J. R. (2006). *Environmental ethics: Concepts, policy, and theory*. Wadsworth.

Devall, B., & Sessions, G. (1999). *Deep ecology: Living as if nature mattered*. Gibbs Smith.

Doğru, E., & Gökalp Alıca, B. (2019). Climate justice and social justice. *Journal of Human Rights*, 7(1), 10-28.

Dolsák, N., & Prakash, A. (2022). Three faces of climate justice. *Annual Review of Political Science, 25*, 283-301. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051120-125514

Durban Group for Climate Justice. (2004). *Durban declaration on carbon trading*.

Environmental Justice Leadership Forum on Climate Change. (2009). *Principles of climate justice*.

EPA. (2022). Environmental justice. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Retrieved from https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice

Ermumcu, M. Ş. K., Aloğlu, B., Akdağ, N., & Köroğlu, N. B. (2024). Türkiye beslenme rehberinde yaş gruplarına özgü önerilen menülerin yaşam döngüsü göstergeleriyle incelenmesi: Su ve karbon ayak İzi. *Fenerbahçe Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, *4*(1), 144-164.

Geschwind, S. A., et al. (1992). Risk of congenital malformations associated with proximity to hazardous waste sites. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 135(11), 1197-1207.

ILO. (2021, October 22). *Frequently asked questions on just transition.* https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/green-jobs/WCMS_824102/lang--en/index.htm

International Climate Justice Network. (2002, August 28). *Bali Principles of Climate Justice.* Corpwatch. https://www.corpwatch.org/article/bali-principles-climate-justice

IPCC. (2014). *Climate change 2014 synthesis report* (Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (Eds.)]). IPCC.

IPCC. (2022). *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

IPCC. (2022a). *About—IPCC.* https://www.ipcc.ch/about/

IPCC. (2022b). *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability.* IPCC. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg2/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGII_FullReport.pdf

IPCC. (2023). *Sixth assessment report*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Kant, I. (2002). *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals* (trans. M. J. Gregor). Cambridge University Press.

Kılıç, F. (2008). Criticisms of Peter Singer's pain-centered ethics. *Journal of Moral Philosophy*, 14(3), 156-162.

Köybaşı, F. (2018). *Legal status of animals and the problem of speciesism*. Adalet Yayınları.

Kurnaz, M. L. (2022). *Climate change and its effects*. Palgrave Macmillan.

La Fondation Droit Animal. (2023). Universal declaration of animal rights. Retrieved from https://www.fondation-droits-animal.org/en/

Lu, J. (2018). *The Keeling curve and climate change*. Science Press.

Mathis, K. (2009). *Intergenerational justice: Key issues and concepts*. Routledge.

Mercan, G., & Varol Selçuk, Z. (2024). Integrating environmental justice and education: A comprehensive review. *Eurasian Journal of Forest Science*, *12*(2), 73-83.

NASA. (2022). Carbon dioxide concentrations. Retrieved from https://climate.nasa.gov/vital-signs/carbon-dioxide/

Needleman, H. L., et al. (1990). The long-term effects of exposure to low doses of lead in childhood. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 322(2), 83-88.

Neumann, R. P. (2012). *Making political ecology*. Routledge.

Nordhaus, W. D. (2020). *The climate casino: Risk, uncertainty, and economics for a warming world*. Yale University Press.

Novotny:(2000). *Where we live, work and play: The environmental justice movement and the struggle for a new environmentalism*. Praeger.

People of Color Environmental Justice Leadership Summit. (2004). *Climate justice declaration*.

People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit. (1991). *Principles of environmental justice*.

People's Declaration for Climate Justice. (2022).

Rahmstorf, S., & Schellnhuber, H. J. (2020). *The climate crisis*. Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.

Rawls, J. (2020). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (2021). *Justice as fairness: A restatement*. Harvard University Press.

Regan, T. (2003). *The case for animal rights*. University of California Press.

Regan, T. (2007). *Empty cages: Facing the challenge of animal rights*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Sandel, M. J. (2020). *Justice: What's the right thing to do?* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Schlosberg, D., & Collins, L. B. (2014). From environmental to climate justice: Climate change and the discourse of environmental justice. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 5(3), 359-374.

Schweitzer, A. (1998). *Reverence for life: The ethical principles of Albert Schweitzer*. Open Court.

Singer:(2018). *Practical ethics* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Singer:(2021). *Animal liberation*. HarperCollins.

Solomon, R. C. (2004). *Morality and the good life*. McGraw-Hill.

Stern, N. (2007). *The economics of climate change: The Stern review*. Cambridge University Press.

Talu, N. (2015). *Climate change: Challenges and responses*. Springer.

Taylor:W. (2011). *Respect for nature: A theory of environmental ethics*. Princeton University Press.

TBMM. (2021). *Climate change and its effects*. Turkish Grand National Assembly.

Türkeş, M. (2008). *Climate change and global warming: Science, policy, and societal impacts*. TUBITAK.

UNFCCC Climate Change Secretariat. (2004). *Third assessment report*. United Nations.

UNFCCC. (1997). *Kyoto protocol to the United Nations framework convention on climate change*.

UNFCCC. (2022). *Sharm El-Sheikh implementation plan*.

United Nations Climate Action. (2022). What is climate change? Retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/what-is-climate-change

US EPA. (2022, July 18). *Environmental justice timeline.* https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/environmental-justice-timeline

Uzmen, D. (2007). The Milankovitch cycles and their role in climate change. *Journal of Earth Sciences*, 18(1), 35-45.

Ünder, E. (1996). *Ethics and the environment: Theoretical perspectives*. Metis Publications.

Walker, G., & King, D. (2009). *The hot topic: What we can do about global warming*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Wernette, D. R., & Nieves, L. A. (1992). Breathing polluted air: Minorities are disproportionately exposed. *EPA Journal*, 18(1), 16-17.

WMO. (2022). Greenhouse gas bulletin. World Meteorological Organization. Retrieved from https://public.wmo.int/en/resources/bulletin/greenhouse-gas-bulletin

Yağanak, T., & Önkal, D. (2005). Anthropocentric and biocentric approaches in environmental ethics. *Philosophical Inquiry*, 26(3), 45-60.