

North Produces and South Consumes: A Discourse on Principles of Equity and Climate Justice in Climate Change Negotiations

Sanjay Sharma * & Maneesh Kumar **

Abstract: In the political discourse of situating responsibilities as a contribution to generating global warming and climate change, the Global South has been stressing principles of equity and climate justice since the beginning. However, the response from the global North is to bring the global South at par while sharing the responsibilities. Global South has become mere consumers of the industrial goods and waste produced by the North. On the one hand, the South's natural resources are exploited for raw materials and Indigenous markets were destroyed to create space for the industrial goods produced in the North; on the other hand, the South is also bearing the cost of Industrialisation due to climate change and global warming without any tangible financial and technical support from North.

Keywords: Principles of Equity, Climate Justice, Global North-south, Industrialisation and Climate Change.

Since the late 20th century, climate change has been a critical issue that has alerted the world. Climate change falls within the broader space of environmental degradation worldwide, increasing in intensity since Industrialisation. Climate change can have everlasting impacts and threaten human survival (Lindwall, 2022). The global failure on the part of nations and organisations to initially predict the consequences attached to the issue of climate change amid rapid Industrialisation and development has made the situation worse and more alarming. In the late 20th century, nations took the issue seriously and became one of the core elements of global policy discourse and negotiations. While the issue of climate change is worth considering, the other problem that needs attention is responsibility. It is well-known that Industrialisation and development

*Associate Professor, Department of Politics & International Studies, Pondicherry University.

**Research Scholar, Department of Politics & International Studies, Pondicherry University.

have happened worldwide differently. While some countries have achieved a high level of development, most still need help to develop. Unequal development and the issue of responsibility have divided the world into two parts- Global North representing the developed nations like the United States of America and Western Europe, which underwent development and rapid Industrialisation starting from the late 17th century. The second group of nations labelled as the 'Global South' represents Third World countries, mainly from Asia, Africa, and South America, where rapid Industrialisation and development started in the late 20th century; thus, they are currently in the growing phase (Uddin, 2017). The term 'Global South' was coined in 1969 by Carl Oglesby to represent countries that have faced the historical dominance of the Global North (Patrick & Huggins, 2023). The term became popular in global discourse and highlighted differences between countries regarding per capita income and GDP. The term also gained prominence in environmental discourse in the 1980s when the issue of taking responsibility for environmental damage arose.

While discussing climate change, it is essential to understand who is responsible for the current climate crisis. Climate change is happening because of the release of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere due to rapid Industrialisation and urbanisation. Looking at the historical trajectory of development, it is evident that the current climate change issue results from GHG emissions from developed countries (Ulgen, 2021). As per reports, North America and Europe are responsible for half of the historical emissions, and compared to them, the third-world countries stand nowhere close in historical emissions (UNDP, 2021). These inequalities have led to varied perspectives on tackling the issue of climate change at the global level.

Climate Change and the North-South Divide

The unequal economic development worldwide led to the rise of the Global North and Global South. The distinction became more significant with the Brandt Commission report 1980 titled *North-South: A Programme for Survival*. Based on the report, the world was divided into two groups, the wealthy North and the poor South, along the Brandt Line, highlighting the economic disparities among nations (Lees, 2020). The distinction is not restricted to the economic dimension; thus, when the issue of addressing climate change gained attention, the world was divided between North and South, propagating different perspectives to deal with the problem of climate change. The clear difference between Global North and South aspirations came to the forefront in the first environment conference held in Stockholm in 1972. Since then, the North-South Divide issue has remained central to international climate negotiations (Uddin, 2017). Global North has focused on global problems and initially advanced them

for an equal share of responsibility. In contrast, the Global South has stressed the issue of development poverty and environment-related difficulties that are more local and can have disastrous impacts on local communities (Gonzalez, 2015).

When it comes to taking responsibility for the damage done to the environment, which has led to the global climate crisis, Global North believes that every country should take equal responsibility and share in the current climate situation and should put in equal efforts to minimise the damage. The Global South, on the other hand, wants the North (developed countries) to take majority responsibility for the current environmental crisis because the current situation results from historical emissions from the developed countries. In contrast, the Global South consists of mainly developing countries entering the phase of Industrialisation and urbanisation; thus, it is not fair to put them under the burden of equal responsibility as it will hinder the development process in these countries (Rajan, n.d.). It was at the time of the Rio Summit in 1992 when the issue of the North-South divide was given due attention, and the principle of 'Common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities' was adopted, which also got enshrined in Article 3 of 'United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change'. On the one hand, the principle talks about global environmental problems that require collective efforts from all nations to achieve significant results. At the same time, on the other side, it recognises historical inequalities that exist among countries in terms of damage done to the environment; thus, it advocates for the nation's contribution to tackling the issue of climate change based on their level of development and historical emissions. In this way, the principle aims to achieve substantive equality rather than just formal equality (Ole, 2021). The principle tries to bridge the gap between the Global North and South to ensure cooperation in dealing with global climate change problems. The countries are divided into two parts- Annex 1, which includes the developed countries on whom the emission targets are legally binding, and Annex 2, which consists of the developing countries on whom the targets are not binding but have to respond about their emissions. It was codified during the signing of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 (Bortscheller, 2010). CBDR was supposed to reduce tensions among developed and developing countries and tackle climate change, but its result needs to be more satisfactory and practical. Kolmaš (2023) highlighted three key issues that are preventing the success of CBDR- First, there is a lack of intention on the part of developed countries to adopt and internalise the norm. Second, developing countries are too occupied with other domestic issues, so they cannot create significant momentum towards the principle. Third, some of the critical elements of CBDR have attracted intense debates and discussions that have prevented its effective implementation. There have been several efforts at the international level

to provide a platform where nations can come together and collectively deal with environmental challenges like climate change but with little success. The roots of the contemporary tension between the developed and developing countries lie in the history of the present-day undeveloped and developing countries that suffered colonisation, which played an essential role in exaggerating the gap between the Global North and Global South.

Buried in the Past: The Colonial History of Exploitation

Colonisation is one of the reasons for the contemporary inequalities between developed and developing nations (Salmon, 2017). The colonisation process left the colonies with catastrophic results, leading to economic underdevelopment, depletion of natural resources, loss of human resources, and much more. Not only historical emissions from developed countries but also colonisation have added fuel to the current tensions between the Global North and South regarding climate change. The expansionist approach of European nations resulted in devastating consequences for the indigenous communities in the colonies. These communities were detached from their natural resources and suffered exploitation by colonisers (Mohammed, 2023). Natural resources and raw materials from the colonies were used to further the development process in the colonising nations like the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Portugal, and Germany (Patnaik & Patnaik, 2021). The raw material that should have been used for the growth of the colonies was used for the growth of the colonising nations.

Further, the raw material was used in the industries in these colonising nations, and the final products were sold at a very high price in the colonies, making the situation wholly exploitative and unfair (Kenton, 2024). These colonies faced the result of the over-extraction and exploitation of natural resources in the postcolonial period, where they needed help to develop. The colonisers, to increase their economic gains, forced the people of the colonies to grow cash crops that had high value in the international market (Guerrero, 2023). Though the colonised people put their hard work and labour into growing these crops, the colonisers enjoyed the benefit. In India, the Britishers emphasised tea and jute plantations. In Malaysia, the focus was on rubber plantations; on the same line, the Japanese focused on sugarcane plantations in Taiwan (Light, 2020). The local communities gained little from these plantations. Instead, it was the colonisers who forced the Indigenous communities to change their practices and focus on crops that were more beneficial for the colonisers.

The colonies also lost their human resources because of the selfish needs of the colonisers. Hundreds of Thousands of people from the colonies were sold as slaves to America and European countries as a cheap source of labour. African nations were the prime victims of the slave trade, as

millions of Africans were sent to America to work at plantations (Anyanwu & Ani, 2020). Not only were they detached from their homeland, but also the working conditions in the alien land were pathetic and inhumane. Colonialism transformed the world economy, and the erstwhile countries that had a significant share of the world economy shrunk to just a fraction due to colonial exploitation. Highlighting the same, Voskoboynik (2018) wrote: "Colonialism reconfigured the world economy. India's share of the global economy shrank from 27 per cent to 3 per cent. China's share shrank from 35 per cent to 7 per cent. Europe's share exploded from 20 per cent to 60 per cent."

Colonialism was extractive and exploitative, and the colonies struggled with the consequences for a very long period, even in the postcolonial era. The resources extracted from the colonies were used for industrial development in the colonising nations, and the colonies were deprived of their resources, which could have been significant for their development. Colonisation significantly heightened the economic gap between the colonies and colonisers. In his book *The Wretched of the Earth*, Frantz Fanon emphasised the dehumanising effect of colonialism on the colonised people and how it left an everlasting impact on the colonised people's minds (Hogan & Patrick, 2024). The colonisers left the colonies in extreme poverty, depleting natural resources and underdevelopment. The exploitative relationship between developed and underdeveloped countries, which continued in the postcolonial period, is explained through Dependency Theory and Immanuel Wallerstein through the *World System Theory*.

Since the colonial era, most emissions have been from the colonising countries. The majority are part of the Global North, which has played the most significant role in the present-day environmental crisis, but the whole world faces the consequences of the crisis. The countries deprived of development in the colonial era, also known as the Global South, are asked to share equal burden and responsibility to mitigate the effect of environmental degradation, especially the climate crisis. While the Global North has the technology and capital resources to deal with climate change to some extent, the Global South needs help to develop and, simultaneously, requires more technology and capital to deal with the crisis. Thus, developing and underdeveloped nations are more vulnerable than developed nations when affected by the climate crisis (Suri, 2023).

Unequal Exchange in Post-Colonisation

This concept of unequal exchange evolved in the 'United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (UNECLA)' under the chairmanship of Raul Prebisch. Essentially, ECLA accepted the proposition that out of the trade between Latin America and the developed west, a new form of bourgeoisie shall emerge that will be industrial and commercial,

and it will protect the national interests of the third world countries and prevent the exploitation from the outsider capitalists. Prebisch has also developed a notion of a core and periphery economic system where the core benefits from the raw material of the periphery, and similarly, the periphery also benefitted from the supply of furnished materials from the core. It was a complementary situation where both core and periphery were considered integral parts of a working economic model at global levels by ECLA (Chilcote, 1994, pp. 230-31).

It is also supported by other Latin American scholars like Celso Furtado, who was once part of the ECLA and presented similar ideas. Furtado criticised the Marxist development theories but also accepted that foreign intervention should be checked to gain national development and autonomy as it is responsible for unequal exchange and further exploitation of decolonised states (Furtado, 1963). This argument is further contributed by A.G. Frank, who introduced the new terminology of metropolises and satellites in the dependency theory. Frank has maintained that the Metropole and satellite must be deconstructed to understand the trade relationship between the developed and underdeveloped countries. He stated that the development theory can only be understood by dwelling on the history of social and economic underdevelopment inflicted upon the colonies in the past (Frank, 1966, pp.17-25). In *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, Frank has maintained four critical dimensions to understand the development theory through Metropole and satellite. First, he states that underdevelopment is a byproduct of colonisation and is not original. He argues that the present developed countries had been undeveloped but never underdeveloped. The present underdevelopment results from the past relationship between the metropolitan and present underdeveloped satellite states. It is a reflection of the capitalist system at the world scale. In the Second dimension, he propounds that the division of the world into the binary of modern and capitalist and other as feudal and pre-capitalist is a false notion as the underdevelopment of the third-world countries is the product of the same historical process which has created the developed countries hence it should be witnessed in a continuum rather than two bipolar conditions. Their development/underdevelopment should be analysed in terms of the continuity of history. The third dimension given by Frank mentions that the relationship between the metropole-satellite is not restricted to the economic sphere only; instead, these relations also cover the political and social dimensions. It is well established that metropolises intervene not only in the political affairs of underdeveloped countries but also in social life, which is affected by the developed countries. It is also witnessed that soft power in language, food, and occidental way of life influences the social lives in underdeveloped countries. The fourth dimension relates to the acutely underdeveloped countries' close relations with the Metropole.

These closest countries were the source of primary raw materials for metropolises. Once these resources were abstracted, these countries were left over by the metropolises (Frank, 1967).

Studies done by Raul Prebisch, Furtado, and A.G Frank focused on Latin American countries. However, a similar theory of unequal exchange in other parts of the world is also carried out by thinkers like Walter Rodney, who analysed how Europe has accumulated wealth and underdeveloped Africa since the 18th century from its control over Africa in his book *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Rodney has used historical analysis to elaborate on how Europe has underdeveloped the entire African region economically and politically. He perceived underdevelopment to be related to exploitation. He maintained that the underdevelopment in the African areas is the result of multiple exploitation by capitalist and imperialist forces. He also applied Frank's model of Metropole and satellite to link the underdevelopment of African countries by colonial masters. Malcolm Caldwell applied this underdevelopment study in Asia in his seminal work *The Wealth of Some Nations*.

Samir Amin analysed unequal exchange and dependency from a Marxist perspective. He gave a new class struggle dimension in his work *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment (1974)*. Amin traced the roots of underdevelopment in Marxist theory, where Marx laid down that colonial masters could not prevent the development of capitalism in the periphery countries. However, this capitalism would only partially develop and remain dependent upon the external markets of the developed capitalist countries. Amin further states that in the wake of unequal exchange and exploitation between the periphery and the core, this shall not be termed a class struggle between the periphery and the core countries. In a way, he laid down that class struggle and possibilities of revolution shall no longer be studied within the individual state; instead, in the decolonisation period, class struggle has been shifted from a national to an international scenario where periphery countries are proletariat and core are performing the role of the bourgeoisie. He also analysed a situation where the proletariat of the core also started parting with the bourgeoisie and maintaining the status quo as they also benefitted from the profit accumulated from the exploitation of the periphery countries. He also suggests that the poor economic conditions of underdeveloped countries should not be confused with the early stage of their development as production forces at world levels are unevenly distributed in favour of the developed core, and that is the reason he prefers to term it as uneven development rather than the theory of underdevelopment (Amin, 1976).

Immanuel Wallerstein is another prominent scholar of the theory of development. He has improvised the underdevelopment theory through

his concept of 'World System' in his book *Modern World System* (1974). He begins with the premise that global history is a history of the rise and downfall of the world system. He recognises two major world systems, first 'World Political Empires' and second 'World Economic Empires'. He states that the flow of resources from the periphery to the core is a common phenomenon in the world system. He states that in the 16th century, the accumulation of resources from the periphery to the core was done through the political route. He gives the example of the Roman Empire, where resources flowed from the periphery to Rome through political control. However, this transfer of resources in the World Economic Empires is done through the economic route. This is facilitated by capitalism. He maintains that capitalism is an economic model of selling the product in the open market and collecting the profit individually or collectively. He further states that the world economic system is rooted in Europe and spread globally from the 16th century onwards.

Wallerstein improvisation in the dependency theory lies in introducing the concept of semi-periphery. According to Wallerstein, the periphery plays a seminal role in the world system. It is a hybrid of core and periphery. Semi-periphery, on the one hand, provides trained labourers to the core, like Business Processing Outsourcing (BPOs) and Knowledge Processing Outsourcing (KPOs) in India. On the other hand, it also facilitates the relocation of industrial production from the core, for example, Industrial set-up in China and India (The Hindu, 2021). In addition to the economic significance, semi-periphery also plays an important political role as a stabilising political system of the world, a role played by the middle class in the national political system (A D Tocquile). However, he also believes that every system has a life cycle marked by beginning, maturity and demise, after which it is replaced by another world system (Baylis, 2004, pp.205-209).

Principle of Equity and Climate Justice

The Earth can be divided by humans on political grounds, but the environment is indivisible. Climate change is not a problem for any one country but for all humanity. However, in this regard, it is important to understand that not all countries are equally involved in the problem of climate change. In the Rio Earth Summit, the responsibilities were debated after "The First Assessment Report" of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in 1990 stated that "developed and developing countries have a collective responsibility to meet the challenge of climate change" (IPCC, 1990, p. 141). India and other developing countries opposed such efforts, saying they were against the principle of natural justice. The mutual consensus between developing and developed countries was established as the principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibility and respective Capabilities. In the successive negotiations on the global

governance of climate change, it has been argued by developing countries that the developed countries of the Global North are primarily responsible for this problem because their contribution to climate change is much more significant than that of the Global South. Apart from this, developing countries are in the stage of development which developed countries have completed. Based on these arguments, developing countries laid the foundation of their climate change policy, in which these countries gave priority to its development in international negotiations and presented the argument in the context of principles like equity and climate justice that every country should contribute according to its contribution.

In contrast, the Global North encourages equal responsibility in developed and developing countries. Especially in the context of India and China, it is argued that America, China, and India are the largest contributors of greenhouse gases (IEA, 2021). Based on these arguments, pressure is built on global south countries to participate equally and take responsibility in climate change negotiations. Researchers have attempted to analyse the discourse of equity and climate justice through three broad issues between the global North and global South: climate finance, the market for carbon credit, and banning fossil fuel use.

a) Global Climate Finance

Time and again, it is argued by the Global South that because of historical responsibility for emitting greenhouse gases, developed countries of the Global North must provide finance and technology to help developing countries cope with climate change. Even article 4.4 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) provides that developed countries should financially assist in adaptation, particularly the vulnerable developing countries (UNFCCC, 1992). However, this issue has been long pending, and developed countries should have endorsed it in climate change negotiations. It was at the 13th Conference of Parties (COP) in Bali that the importance of International Adaptation Finance was discussed and recognised. Finally, action for mitigation and adaptation and financial assistance was adopted in the 'Bali Action Plan 2007'. This issue of financial aid was further negotiated in the COP-15 at Copenhagen. Demand and supply were focused and debated in the COP-15 for finances. It discussed the needs of the vulnerable developing countries that require financing. Secondly, on the supply side, concern was raised concerning the quantum of the new financial requirements and how to generate and deliver these. These two concerns were also further negotiated on three grounds: first, how to generate predictable and sustainable financial funds; how these funds can be governed in terms of day-to-day global management; and third, how to ensure proper and targeted delivery of these funds (Personn, 2009, pp.8-22). In response to developed countries' concerns over the generation, governance, and delivery of adaptation

funds, developing countries have cited many principles like polluter pays, intra-generational equity, and precautionary principles to ensure that the global North does not run away from its responsibilities. Finally, in 2009, developed countries pledged to mobilise at least \$100 billion each year by 2020. This promise was reaffirmed during the Paris Agreement, where Global South negotiated to increase this amount from 2025. The 2020 deadline passed long ago, but the promise of \$100 billion has yet to be fulfilled. In COP-24 onwards, the Global North said it will arrange this amount from 2023 onwards.

While the global climate fund did not materialise between COP-27, Global North and South have decided to initiate the 'Loss and Damage Fund'. Establishing a Loss and Damage Fund is likely a successful decision of the Sharm el-Sheikh climate meeting. This decision has earned it an important place in the global response to climate change (UNDP, 2023). Nevertheless, the decision to establish a Loss and Damage Fund was made at Sharm el-Sheikh, but this fund still needs to be created. Finally, at the beginning of COP-28 in Dubai, the Loss and Damage Fund was operationalised, and many countries, along with the host UAE, made funding commitments. The combined efforts resulted in a commitment of approximately US\$700 million. The fund is supposed to be utilised to provide financial aid to nations attempting to recover from climate-induced disasters (MoEF&CC, 2023).

b) Carbon Credit

Carbon trading started with the Kyoto Protocol. The parties of the Kyoto Protocol had a legal binding to reduce their emission through national measures. However, they have been provided with an option where these parties may purchase the carbon credits from the market-based mechanism. This market-based mechanism has facilitated developing countries like India and China to accumulate a good amount of carbon credit. However, these could not be redeemed as the Kyoto Protocol failed (Victor, 2001). However, article 6 of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change also provided for the carbon market to facilitate achieving their nationally determined contributions. The rulebook of the Paris Agreement was worked upon in COP-24 at Katowice. It was in the CoP-24 that the issue of carbon credit was raised by developing countries like India and Brazil. These countries argued that they had accumulated carbon credits in the past and that a system should be established for their sale under the Paris Agreement. However, due to the opposition of developed countries, there is no provision for the sale of carbon credits in the law book. Hence, no system could be established in COP-24.

COP-25 was held in Madrid from 2-13 December 2019 under the chairmanship of Chile. This conference could have been more effective from many points of view because developed countries continuously tried

to postpone effective decisions on climate change. Article 6 of the Paris Agreement, the international carbon market, and developed countries' financial assistance for climate change were postponed in this conference for the following year. An important decision of COP-26 is related to the market system of carbon credits. A carbon market existed under the Kyoto Protocol. However, the protocol expired last year and is no longer available. There is a provision for a new market under the Paris Agreement, but this market has yet to become operational. Developing countries such as India, China, and Brazil have many carbon credits left due to the lack of demand, as many countries have left the Kyoto Protocol. Developing countries wanted their unused carbon credits to be transferred to the new market, which developed countries opposed based on the quality of these credits. The impasse on this issue could have been better in the finalisation of the rules and procedures of the Paris Agreement on a market mechanism for carbon credits. In this regard, the Glasgow Treaty (COP-26) relieved developing countries with certain conditions. COP-26 provides that these carbon credits can be used to meet countries' first Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) targets.

Nevertheless, these cannot be used to meet targets in the upcoming NDC. If a developed country wants to buy carbon credits to meet its emissions reduction targets, it can buy them only till 2025 (UNFCCC, 2021). The carbon credit market mechanism created, stalled, and reinitiated on the terms of the global North, grossly ignoring the principles of equity and climate justice.

c) Fossil Fuel

At the beginning of the global discourse on climate change, developing countries have insisted that poverty is more polluted, and their ambition is to address poverty and development first rather than the environmental cause. Gradually, the Intergovernmental Panel's Assessment Reports on Climate Change and the planet's warming have initiated the global North to reduce the use of fossil fuels. In contrast, the global South still depends on fossil fuels for its development. Two major issues were debated in COPs 26 and 28. One was for the phasing out of coal, and the second was the phasing out of fossil fuels, including natural oil. However, while the global North has moved towards cleaner forms of energy, the global South still requires cheaper energy sources like coal and natural oil to generate economic growth. These issues were negotiated and debated in the climate change negotiations.

This issue was initiated in the COP-26 in Glasgow, Britain. This conference is known for two important decisions. First is the declaration of the Net Zero Emission year by various countries. The European Union has set a target of net zero emissions by 2040. America declared 2050 as its net zero emissions year, China declared 2060, and India declared 2070 as its net

zero emissions year. The second decision is related to phasing out the use of coal. It was the first time coal had been explicitly mentioned in a COP decision. The conference entered into major negotiation, with a group of countries led by India and China strongly opposing the "phase-out" of coal as it contributes significantly to the energy supply in these countries. As cheap energy sources were considered essential for the countries of the global South, the term was later amended to "phase-down" (Indian Express, 2021).

COP-28 was held in Dubai, United Arab Emirates in 2023. The conference was seen as possibly the last chance for the world to have some hope of staying within the 1.5°C warming limit. The main agenda at COP-28 was to advance the Global Stocktake (GST), a comprehensive assessment of where the world is in its fight against climate change and what more needs to be done to meet climate objectives. Among the important decisions taken in COP-28, the first one is the provision for the degradation of fossil fuels. After much deliberation, the final agreement called on countries to contribute towards "transitioning away" from fossil fuels to achieve net zero emissions by 2050. However, neither any timetable was prepared to achieve this, nor was any decision made regarding achieving the target. Some countries were extremely disappointed that the term "fossil fuel phase-out" was not used (UNFCCC, 2023).

Conclusion

The global North and global South have multidimensional and deep-rooted historical relations. In the past, industrialisation, colonisation, unequal exchange, and economic model, along with the Brettonwoods order, were produced by the global North and consumed by the global South. The analysis through historical and structural-functional approach in the paper reveals that the advent of Industrialisation in Europe was accompanied by colonisation, which broadly had three objectives: first, raw materials in the form of minerals and agricultural products, a workforce that is required for laying down railways, agricultural activities, expansion of colonies and third as a market to sell industrial products. One of the offshoots of this Industrialisation is the generation of global warming for which the global North is mainly responsible. It is for this reason that, on the one hand, the global South has demanded space for its development.

On the other hand, it also demanded financial assistance to adapt to climate change's and global warming's adverse impacts. The principles of equity and climate justice promote this. In addition, many other principles are followed within the global North and rightfully promote the global South's claim of equity and climate justice. In most global North countries, polluter pays, and precautionary principles are followed. Polluters pay to ascertain that the entity responsible for generating pollution should be responsible for paying for it. It reminds me of Garret Harding's concept of

'Global Commons', where every party seeks to reap the benefits from the common resources while it knows that all share the cost.

Similarly, global warming is principally caused by a few affluent and industrial countries of the global North while the rest of the world bears the cost of it. Precautionary principles exist in the USA and most Western European countries. Even article 3.3 of the UNFCCC provides that actions that carry the risk of irreversible damage to the environment, lacking scientific evidence, should not be a reason for avoiding the corrective measures. Similarly, intra-generational equity is another major principle that calls for intra and interstate parity of climate finance adaptation. These principles, in addition to Common but differential responsibilities and differential responsibilities, call for equity and climate justice. However, these principles mentioned in the UNFCCC articles 3.3 and 4.4 and within the developed countries were not converted into actions. The 2020 deadline has already been missed, and a new deadline of 2023 already passed, and the promised fund was converted into a localised version of Loss and Damage funds in CoP-28. The research in the paper indicates that the principles of equity and climate justice should not be seen as a distinct issue but rather as a continuum from the Industrialisation, unequal exchange, and an ecological debt that the global North owes to the global South and need to repay it by mechanisms of global climate finance and transfer of green technologies for addressing their past injustice done to the entire globe by compelling global South to consume what it produced in the form of Industrialisation, global warming, and capitalist economic model.

References

Agency, International Energy (2021). Global Energy Review: CO2 Emissions in 2021. Online retrieved from chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/c3086240-732b-4f6a-89d7-db01be018f5e/GlobalEnergyReviewCO2Emissionsin2021.pdf

Amin, S. (1976). *Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Transformations of Peripheral Capitalism*. New York: *Monthly Review Press*.

Anyanwu, T. C., & Ani, K. J. (2020). The Roots of Postcolonial Conflicts in Africa. *World Affairs: The Journal of International Issues*, 24(1), 132–141. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48622912>

Baylis, J., & Steve Smith Ed. (2004). *The Globalisation of the World Politics*. New York: *Oxford University Press*.

Bortscheller, M. J. (2010). Equitable But Ineffective: How The Principle Of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities Hobbles The Global Fight Against Climate Change. *Sustainable Development Law & Policy*, 10(2).

<https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1036&context=sdlp>

Change, Intergovernmental Panel on (1990). First Assessment Report of IPCC Climate Change: The 1990s and 1992. Canada: *United Nations Environment Programme*.

Chilcote, Ronald (1994). *Theories of Comparative Politics*. New York: *Routledge*.

Frank, Andre Gunder (1966). "The Development of Underdevelopment." *Monthly Review*, 18 (September), 17-31.

Frank, Andre Gunder (1967). Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil. *New York: Monthly Review Press*.

Furtado, Celso (1963). Economic Growth of Brazil: A Survey from Colonial to Modern Times. Berkeley: *University of California Press*.

Gonzalez, C. G. (2015). Bridging the North-South Divide: International Environmental Law in the Anthropocene. *Pace Environmental Law (PELR) Review*, 32. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2672460

Guerrero, D. (2023, August 4). Colonialism, climate change, and climate reparations. *Global Justice Now*. <https://www.globaljustice.org.uk/blog/2023/08/colonialism-climate-change-and-climate-reparations/>

Hindu, The (2021). BPO India: KPO Moves into the Spotlight. National Edition, *The Hindu*. Online Retrieved from <https://www.thehindu.com/brandhub/pr-release/bpo-india-kpo-moves-into-the-spotlight/article38047778.ece>.

Hogan, E., & Patrick, S. (2024, May 20). A Closer Look at the Global South. *CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE*. <https://carnegieeurope.eu/research/2024/05/global-south-colonialism-imperialism>

Kenton, W. (2024, February 26). What Is Mercantilism? *Investopedia*. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/mercantilism.asp>

Kolmaš, M. (2023). The Failure of CBDR in Global Environmental Politics. *Global Environmental Politics*, pp. 23, 11–19. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00681

Lees, N. (2020, November 23). The Brandt Line after forty years: The more North-South relations change, the more they stay the same. *British International Studies Association*. <https://www.bisa.ac.uk/articles/brandt-line-after-forty-years-more-north-south-relations-change-more-they-stay-same>

Light, M. (2020, July). Colonialism, Hegemony, and the Environment.

Climate Just Collective. <https://www.climatejustcollective.co.uk/colonialism-hegemony-and-the-environment#:~:text=Colonialism%20%26%20the%20Environment&text=Extraction%20and%20exploitation%20of%20people,the%20colonial%20powers%20replaced%20them>.

Lindwall, C. (2022, October 24). What Are the Effects of Climate Change? *NRDC*. <https://www.nrdc.org/stories/what-are-effects-climate-change#weather>

MoEF&CC (2023). Major outcomes of the 28th session of the United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 28). Delhi: *Press Information Bureau*. Online Retrieved from <https://pib.gov.in/PressReleaseIframePage.aspx?PRID=1987760>.

Mohammed, R. (2023, June 26). Climate and Colonialism. *Save the Children*. <https://www.savethechildren.org.uk/blogs/2023/climate-and-colonialism1>

Nations, The United (1992). United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Report. Online Retrieved from <chrome-extension://efaidnbmninnibpcjpcglclefindmkaj/https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/conveng.pdf>

Nations, The United (2023). COP 28: COP28 Agreement Signals "Beginning of the End" of the Fossil Fuel Era. *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*, online retrieved from <https://unfccc.int/news/cop28-agreement-signals-beginning-of-the-end-of-the-fossil-fuel-era>.

Ole, N. (2021). Understanding the Principle of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities and its Manifestations in Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAS) 11 *Nnamdi Azikiwe Journal of Public and Private Law* 262. 11, 284.

Patnaik, U., & Patnaik, P. (2021, February 1). The Drain of Wealth. *Monthly Review*. <https://monthlyreview.org/2021/02/01/the-drain-of-wealth/>

Patrick, S., & Huggins, A. (2023, August 15). The Term "Global South" Is Surging. It Should Be Retired. *CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE*. <https://carnegieendowment.org/posts/2023/08/the-term-global-south-is-surging-it-should-be-retired?lang=en>

Person, A. (2009). Adaptation Finance under a Copenhagen Agreed Outcome. *Stockholm Environment Institute*.

Rajan, M. G. (n.d.). The Environment & North-South Relations: A View from the South. *Development Alternatives*.

Retrieved June 9, 2024, from https://www.devalt.org/newsletter/jun93/of_3.htm

Salmon, B. (2017, February 20). The legacy of colonisation on the domestic and international policy of nations in the global South. *Medium*.

<https://medium.com/@brittanysalmon1/the-legacy-of-colonization-on-the-domestic-and-international-policy-of-nations-in-the-global-south-9eb5e16f423b>

Sinha, Amitabh (2021). Explained: What COP26 achieved did not. *The Indian Express*. Online Retrieved from <https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/explained-agnipath-scheme-opposition-9379715/>

Suri, S. (2023, June 28). It is time for climate justice- A Global South perspective on the fight against the climate crisis. *Observer Research Foundation*. <https://www.orfonline.org/research/a-global-south-perspective-on-the-fight-against-the-climate-crisis>

Uddin, M. (2017). Climate Change and Global Environmental Politics: North-South Divide. *Environmental Policy and Law*, pp. 47, 106–114.

Ulgen, S. (2021, October 6). How Deep Is the North-South Divide on Climate Negotiations? *CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE*. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2021/10/how-deep-is-the-north-south-divide-on-climate-negotiations?lang=en¢er=europe>

UNDP. (2021, October 29). How large are inequalities in global carbon emissions – and what should be done about them? *UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME*. <https://hdr.undp.org/content/how-large-are-inequalities-global-carbon-emissions-and-what-do-about-it>

UNFCCC (2021). COP26 outcome: market mechanisms and non-market approaches (Article 6). Online Retrieved from <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-glasgow-climate-pact/cop26-outcomes-market-mechanisms-and-non-market-approaches-article-6>

Victor, D. G. (2001). *The Collapse of the Kyoto Protocol and the Struggle to Slow Global Warming*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7t8pq>

Voskoboynik, D. M. (2018, October 18). Colonialism cannot be forgotten – it is still destroying people and our planet. *Open Democracy*. <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/opendemocracyuk/colonialism-can-t-be-forgotten-it-s-still-destroying-peoples-and-our-pl/>