Education

Rethinking climate change: a theoretical perspective on global environmental transformation

Abdul Alim

Nur Mohammad Smriti Mahavidyalaya, Dhulian, Murshidabad, West Bengal, India

*Corresponding author: Abdul Alim

Received 14 Oct 2021; Accepted 9 Dec 2021; Published 18 Dec 2021

DOI: https://doi.org/10.64171/JAES.1.2.97-102

Abstract

In contrast to being solely a scientific or ecological issue, this research rethinks climate change as a broad process of global environmental transformation. It contends that a variety of theoretical stances that link the environment, society, economy, and politics are necessary to comprehend climate change. The study looks at how global inequality, governance structures, and development patterns are all altered by climate change. Additionally, it examines the ethical aspects of sustainability, justice, and accountability, demonstrating how climate change poses grave moral concerns regarding equity between countries and generations. The study also examines the role of political economy and power structures, emphasizing how dominant interests and economic systems affect climate policies and frequently impede effective action. The study goes on to address the significance of knowledge and discourse, elucidating how narratives, beliefs, and communication practices, in addition to scientific facts, influence climate change. The paper provides a thorough theoretical framework for comprehending climate change as a complicated and interrelated global issue by combining these many viewpoints. It highlights that combating climate change necessitates more than just technology fixes; it also calls for significant structural adjustments, moral consciousness, and inclusive development strategies. In order to create transformative futures that are both socially just and environmentally sustainable, the paper suggests that rethinking development and sustainability is crucial. This integrated approach contributes to a better understanding of the problems caused by climate change and lays the groundwork for future responses that are more equitable and successful.

Keywords: Climate change, Environmental transformation, Sustainability, Climate justice, Political economy, Global inequality, Development theory

Introduction

Climate change is now a major issue of global environmental transformation, social fairness, and political responsibility, much beyond a solely scientific concern. Today, climate change is a multifaceted challenge that affects not just rising temperatures but also economic institutions, ecological systems, and human life itself. Human effect on the climate system is "unequivocal," according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. This represents a significant change in the theoretical and scientific understanding of environmental change. This realization forces academics to reconsider climate change as a transforming global phenomenon rather than just an environmental problem. Theoretically, modernity and risk can be used to understand climate change. Ulrich Beck contends that manufactured hazards are increasingly defining modern society, pointing out that these risks are "socially produced uncertainties" (Beck, 1992, p. 21) [1]. Understanding climate change as a result of industrial activity rather than a purely natural event depends on this concept. In a similar vein, Anthony Giddens draws attention to the paradoxical character of climate politics, arguing that despite the significant effects of climate change, it is challenging to address due to its lack of immediate visibility (Giddens, 2009, p. 2). When taken as a whole, these viewpoints present climate change as a characteristic of late modernity, in which human activity causes environmental changes on a worldwide scale that are frequently challenging to understand and control.

Ecological philosophers also stress how social and natural systems are intertwined. Bruno Latour challenges the division of nature and civilization and calls for a more comprehensive view of environmental change, arguing that "we have never been modern" (Latour, 1993, p. 47). In this sense, climate change is firmly ingrained in human culture rather than existing outside of it. Similarly, Dipesh Chakrabarty argues that humans must be viewed as a geological force due to climate change, claiming that "humans have become a geological agent" (Chakrabarty, 2009, p. 207) [4]. This realization shifts humanity's place in the Earth system and emphasizes the scope of contemporary human activity. Scientific methods characterize climate change as a complex, nonlinear system in addition to these philosophical viewpoints. According to climate science, the Earth's climate is a "complex and heterogeneous system" that is impacted by both natural and man-made variables (Ghil & Lucarini, 2019, p. 2). This intricacy highlights the unpredictability and uncertainty present in climate systems, highlighting the necessity of interdisciplinary theoretical frameworks that combine social theory and physical research.

Furthermore, the ethical aspect of climate change has grown in importance. Academics contend that basic issues of accountability, justice, and intergenerational parity are brought up by climate change. Deep disparities both inside and between countries are revealed by global warming, which

disproportionately impacts vulnerable groups. According to the American Psychological Association, coordinated worldwide action based on scientific knowledge is necessary because climate change poses serious hazards to human well-being (APA, 2021). In a world that is changing quickly, this ethical urgency necessitates reconsidering development, sustainability, and governance. Therefore, reconsidering climate change necessitates a change in perspective from considering it as a unique environmental issue to comprehending it as a transforming global situation influenced by ethical, social, and scientific factors. This study aims to offer a thorough framework for analysing climate change as a process of global environmental transformation by interacting with a variety of theoretical viewpoints, from risk society and modernism to Earth system science and environmental ethics. This method not only broadens our comprehension of the situation but also creates new avenues for a more comprehensive and long-term solution.

Climate change as a structural transformation

Today, climate change must be viewed as a significant structural shift in global civilization rather than just an environmental issue. It challenges established institutions and calls for new forms of collective organization, reshaping the fundamental relationships between the economy, politics, nature, and human life. Climate change is not a slow or isolated shift, but rather what Ulrich Beck refers to as a profound "metamorphosis" of the planet, where transformation is systemic rather than partial. According to Beck, this kind of development involves a "epochal change of worldviews" and is "more than... an evolutionary path" (Beck, 2016, p. 5) [2]. This realization emphasizes how climate change affects not ju st the physical surroundings but also the institutional and intellectual frameworks that govern societies. According to this viewpoint, the traditional structure of contemporary society particularly the nation-state's centrality is disrupted by climate change. A move toward global interdependence is indicated by Beck's observation that "climate risk teaches us that the nation is not the center of the world" (Beck, 2016, p. 6) [2]. Therefore, structural transformation entails a shift from nationally limited systems to internationally integrated frameworks of accountability and governance. Climate change calls for new cosmopolitan kinds of cooperation and highlights the shortcomings of current political frameworks. The inherent nature of climate danger, which cuts across national boundaries and impacts all communities, necessitates this change.

Additionally, economic and social systems can be used as a lens through which to view the idea of structural restructuring. Economic development can result in "social dislocation of stupendous proportions," according to Karl Polanyi's theory of industrial transition (Polanyi, 1944, p. 135) [13]. Globally, livelihoods, migration patterns, and societal stability are all being disrupted by climate change. But unlike previous industrial changes, climate change affects human institutions and natural ecosystems at the same time on a global scale. It calls into question the ingrained connection between the environment and the economy, necessitating a re-evaluation of development paradigms predicated on ongoing growth and extraction. Furthermore, critical academics contend that the structural dynamics of capitalism and modernity are fundamental to climate change. Naomi Klein emphasizes the crucial significance of fossil fuels in forming contemporary economic systems by persuasively stating that "coal was the black ink" of capitalism's history (Klein, 2014, p. 175) [9]. This implies that climate change is an internal conflict of the existing economic system rather than an external crisis. Climate change is a structural result of the global capitalism system since the reliance on fossil fuels and extractive industries has led to both economic expansion and environmental deterioration. As a result, combating climate change necessitates not just technology fixes but also a shift in production methods and economic reasoning.

Moreover, the notion of the Anthropocene, in which humans function as a geological force, is intimately related to the idea of structural transformation. Dipesh Chakrabarty contends that as human activity now fundamentally alters Earth systems, climate change forces us to reconsider human agency on a global scale. This change makes it harder to distinguish between nature and society, proving that social and environmental change are inextricably linked. As a result, climate change becomes a situation that redefines human life within the Earth system, necessitating the development of new political and ethical frameworks. Academic debates also highlight how profound shifts in social institutions, such as power dynamics and cultural norms, are necessary for transformation. Transformation may entail "radical change of the social structures... underpinning a capitalist economy," according to research on global environmental change (Brooks *et al*., 2009, as cited in O'Brien *et al*., 2014, p. 2) [3, 15]. This demonstrates that structural transformation involves rearranging society's fundamental structure rather than just adapting. It encompasses changes in collective ideals, economic priorities, and governance toward resilience and sustainability. Consequently, a thorough reorganization of global systems is reflected in climate change as a structural shift. It redefines the relationship between humans and nature, exposes the shortcomings of existing economic models, and challenges established institutions. This understanding of climate change makes it evident that effective responses need to encompass broader structural changes rather than just incremental adjustments. This viewpoint offers a more thorough framework for examining climate change as a process of transformation that alters the fundamentals of world civilization.

Ethical dimensions: responsibility, justice, and sustainability

The ethical aspects of climate change, including sustainability, justice, and accountability, have become major issues in current theoretical discussions. Climate change is now seen as more than just a scientific or environmental problem; it is essentially a moral dilemma that calls into question how human behaviour affects people over time and space. Climate change raises "profound questions about responsibility, justice, and

intergenerational equity," according to one philosophical study (Hossain, 2014, p. 1) [8]. This ethical framing changes the focus of the conversation from what climate change is to what should be done and by whom. The concept of responsibility is central to this ethical discussion. Human activity, especially industrialization and the widespread use of fossil fuels, is primarily responsible for climate change. This calls into doubt moral responsibility, particularly for the countries and organizations that have made the biggest contributions to greenhouse gas emissions. According to Cass R. Sunstein, "lives matter equally whether" in rich or impoverished countries, or in this century or the next, climate change must be viewed as a moral concern (Sunstein, 2009, p. 12) [18]. The universalist ethical idea that all human beings, regardless of location or generation, should be given equal consideration is highlighted in this phrase. According to this viewpoint, accountability transcends national boundaries and necessitates collaboration and group effort.

The idea of justice, especially climate justice, is closely tied to accountability. Vulnerable groups are disproportionately impacted by climate change, including future generations who have made the least contribution to the issue, indigenous people, and poorer countries. Climate justice entails "fair distribution of environmental and climate burdens" and making sure that marginalized people do not incur disproportionate risks, as current ethical scholarship highlights (O'Brien *et al*., 2014, p. 2) [15]. Distributive justice, which aims for equity in the distribution of environmental benefits and harms, is reflected in this concept. Furthermore, recognition justice relies on upholding the identities and rights of marginalized communities, whereas procedural justice requires all impacted groups to participate in decision-making processes. When taken as a whole, these aspects show that justice in the context of climate change is a multifaceted ethical framework rather than a single concept. Additionally, intergenerational responsibility—a crucial component of sustainability is included in the ethical discussion. The rights of future generations, who will bear the repercussions of our activities, must be taken into account due to climate change. Meeting current demands "without compromising the possibility of future generations" to meet their own is a common definition of sustainability (Rodríguez-Madariaga, 2018, p. 4) [16]. According to this view, moral obligation encompasses not just the present but also future human life, adding a temporal dimension to ethics. It demands long-term ecological equilibrium and questions short-term economic thinking.

Furthermore, ethical principles like human dignity, solidarity, and environmental protection are closely linked to sustainability. According to ethical viewpoints on sustainability, human behaviour must uphold "dignity and solidarity" and refrain from behaviours that harm the environment (Rodríguez-Madariaga, 2018, p. 6) [16]. This implies that sustainability is a moral commitment to living ethically within ecological bounds rather than just a technological or financial idea. It necessitates adjustments to institutional priorities, consumer habits, and lifestyle in order to balance environmental protection with human progress. Furthermore, critical thinkers contend that justice and sustainability are inextricably linked. "We cannot solve the climate crisis without addressing injustice and inequality," as Varshini Prakash correctly notes (Prakash, 2020, p. 1). This realization supports the notion that social justice and environmental sustainability are related. Without addressing fundamental disparities, any effort to combat climate change is likely to be insufficient and ineffectual. As a result, the ethical aspects of climate change show it to be a highly normative problem that calls for new moral frameworks and challenges those that already exist. Sustainability necessitates long-term ethical obligations to both current and future generations, responsibility necessitates admitting the unequal contributions to climate change, and justice needs a fair sharing of its effects and solutions. When combined, these elements provide a thorough ethical framework for comprehending climate change as a worldwide environmental shift. In addition to enhancing academic comprehension, this viewpoint offers a moral basis for group action in tackling one of the most important issues of our day.

Political economy and power structures

The political economy of climate change shows how power, capital, and global inequality are all intricately linked to environmental change. Climate change is influenced by the structure of economic systems and the concentration of power inside corporate and governmental institutions rather than being just the product of individual conduct or isolated policy failures. Naomi Klein makes the compelling case that "our economic system and our planetary system are now at war" (Klein, 2014, p. 21) [9], pointing out a basic conflict between the growth-oriented logic of modern capitalism and ecological sustainability. This viewpoint moves the emphasis from environmental symptoms to the structural causes of ecological deterioration. The connection between capitalism and climate change is central to this analysis. The three pillars of modern capitalism are profit maximization, resource extraction, and constant expansion. These ideas, however, frequently clash with ecological constraints. According to Klein (Klein, 2014, p. 18) [9], significant climate action is opposed because it "fundamentally conflict[s] with deregulated capitalism." This realization implies that climate inaction is structurally created rather than accidental as powerful economic actors work to uphold systems that serve their interests. Financial institutions, multinational firms, and the fossil fuel industry have a big say in politics, influencing laws that frequently put economic expansion ahead of environmental preservation.

In this situation, the results of climate change are largely determined by power hierarchies. Decision-making is rarely neutral; rather, it reflects the interests of dominating groups, according to political economy theories. According to recent research, established sectors aggressively oppose environmental reforms, delaying or undermining climate measures through a variety of tactics. To safeguard their financial interests, these players frequently use institutional influence, lobbying, and disinformation, which prevents revolutionary change. "The losers of the transition tend to

deploy... tactics to obstruct change," according to political economy study (Srivastav & Rafaty, 2014, p. 3) [17]. This shows that climate policy is a contentious political process influenced by conflicting interests rather than just a technical matter. Furthermore, a crucial aspect of the political economy of climate change is global inequality. While many nations in the Global South continue to suffer from the effects of environmental degradation without having made an equivalent contribution to the issue, industrial economies in the Global North have historically relied significantly on fossil fuels. This unequal allocation of accountability is a reflection of larger trends of political and economic dominance. Critical viewpoints point out that global capitalism frequently depends on the extraction of cheap labour and natural resources from less developed areas, which perpetuates unequal power relations. As a result, climate change becomes both a cause and an effect of global inequality, exacerbating already-existing differences between countries.

Furthermore, the production of information and ideology have a critical role in maintaining current power systems. Narratives that minimize environmental concerns or emphasize market solutions are frequently used to justify climate denial and policy delays. These narratives are influenced by commercial interests rather than being impartial. According to one theoretical model, voters and political actors may disregard evidence of serious climate dangers because of "motivated beliefs," which could result in poor policy responses (Denter, 2011, p. 2) [5]. This demonstrates how power functions through influencing public opinion and political discourse in addition to controlling the economy. Additionally, the political economics viewpoint highlights that structural change, not incremental reform, is necessary to solve climate change. The predominance of market-based strategies, like carbon trading, frequently fails to address the fundamental causes of environmental deterioration. Rather, radical change entails enhancing democratic governance, redistributing power, and reconsidering production systems. The climate catastrophe necessitates "restructur[ing] the global economy" and rethinking political systems, according to more general criticisms (Klein, 2014, p. 25) [9]. This implies that issues of power, ownership, and resource control must be addressed in order to effectively combat climate change.

Thus, the political economics of climate change exposes it as a profoundly structural and political problem influenced by global inequality, economic systems, and power dynamics. In addition to being an environmental emergency, climate change also reflects the structure and use of power in the contemporary world. This viewpoint offers a vital framework for comprehending why climate action has been limited and what types of changes are required by examining the intersections of capitalism, governance, and inequality. It emphasizes that significant solutions necessitate not only technology innovation but also a realignment of economic goals and power structures in favour of more equitable and sustainable forms of growth.

Knowledge, Discourse, and Epistemological challenges

Grasp climate change as a worldwide environmental transition requires a grasp of knowledge, discourse, and epistemology. In addition to being a physical reality, climate change is a field of study influenced by political agendas, social narratives, and scientific methods. This presents significant epistemological issues with the creation, verification, and dissemination of climate knowledge. Human understanding is never entirely objective; rather, it is influenced by beliefs and interpretations, as early epistemological thoughts indicate. Humans behave "not on the basis of fact and reality as such, but on the basis of opinions and beliefs about facts," according to Frank Knight (Knight, 1925, p. 373) [11]. This realization is especially pertinent to climate change, because political action and public opinion frequently rely on how knowledge is understood rather than just scientific facts. According to this viewpoint, information about climate change must be viewed as socially created and mediated through discourse. A strong foundation for examining this process is offered by Michel Foucault's theory of discourse. He emphasizes the interdependence of knowledge and power by arguing that "there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge" (Foucault, 1977, p. 27) [6]. This means that, in the context of climate change, institutional structures, political interests, and cultural norms all influence the production of scientific knowledge. Whether they are political, scientific, or media-based, climate discourses are vital in determining what is true, what dangers are highlighted, and what remedies are deemed appropriate.

Furthermore, discourse actively creates reality rather than just reflecting it. According to Foucauldian analysis, discourse refers to linguistic and knowledge systems that influence our perception of reality and define what is acceptable or normal. Different discourses, such as scientific consensus, economic rationality, and climate skepticism, contend with one another in climate change arguments. These conflicting narratives frequently cause conflict and uncertainty by influencing public perception and policy actions. As an illustration of how information may be disputed and politicized, climate denial, for instance, is not just ignorance but a structured discourse backed by certain ideological and financial interests. Furthermore, the intricacy and ambiguity of climate science provide epistemological difficulties. Climate systems are dynamic, nonlinear, and challenging to fully forecast. Philosophical debates over climate science show that knowledge in this area must frequently be stated in probabilistic ways, reflecting inherent uncertainties, rather than being entirely deterministic. Because society and policymakers frequently look for conclusive answers, this leads to a conflict between scientific knowledge and public expectations. Uncertainty does not undermine climate science; rather, it emphasizes its intricacy and the necessity of cautious interpretation. Furthermore, language and rhetoric play a critical role in forming our understanding of the climate. Persuasive narratives that present threats and solutions in specific ways are frequently used in climate communication. Knowledge claims are impacted by "the art of persuasion," which influences how

people and societies react to climate challenges, as research on rhetoric and epistemology indicates. This implies that the communication and comprehension of scientific facts is just as important as the evidence itself when it comes to climate change. The way that climate change is framed—as a crisis, a risk, or an opportunity can have a big impact on how the public feels and how policies are implemented.

The predominance of some types of knowledge over others is another significant epistemological problem. Natural sciences have long dominated climate discourse, frequently marginalizing indigenous, local, and experiential knowledge systems. Recent research, however, highlights how crucial it is to incorporate various types of knowledge in order to comprehend and combat climate change. Discourses are "socially constructed through... collective or social groups," implying that a more inclusive and thorough understanding requires a variety of viewpoints. Acknowledging this diversity creates room for many perspectives and experiences while challenging the notion of a single authoritative knowledge. As a result, the epistemology of climate change shows it to be a complicated topic influenced by discourse, knowledge creation, and power dynamics. Climate knowledge is constantly created, disputed, and changed through social processes; it is neither neutral nor stable. Addressing the issues of misinformation, denial, and ambiguity around climate change requires an understanding of these relationships. This viewpoint offers a more thorough theoretical basis for reconsidering climate change as a worldwide environmental change by critically analysing the creation and dissemination of information. It emphasizes that in addition to scientific innovation, successful answers necessitate critical engagement with the discourses that define our knowledge of the climate catastrophe as well as epistemological awareness.

Toward transformative futures: rethinking development and sustainability

In light of climate change, the concept of transformational futures necessitates a fundamental rethinking of sustainability and development that goes beyond conventional models of economic growth. The constraints of development paths that put short-term gains ahead of long-term ecological balance are revealed by climate change. Therefore, sustainability must be viewed as a revolutionary vision that alters how societies define development, prosperity, and well-being rather than as a modification to current institutions. According to the Brundtland Report, "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" is the fundamental definition of sustainable development (World Commission on Environment and Development [WCED], 1987, p. 43) [19]. This definition emphasizes intergenerational responsibility as a fundamental principle and adds an ethical and temporal dimension to growth. But modern research contends that sustainability needs to go beyond these basic criteria in favour of more revolutionary strategies. According to the Brundtland Report itself, "development involves a progressive transformation of economy and society" (WCED, 1987, p. 45) [19], implying that structural change rather than merely continuity is necessary for sustainability. Transformative futures, then, entail rethinking development as a process that incorporates social justice, ecological constraints, and economic resilience. It offers an alternative growth model that balances human activity with the Earth's capacity for regeneration, challenging the prevailing model that depends on resource exploitation and environmental degradation.

Furthermore, sustainability needs to be viewed as a multifaceted idea that incorporates social, environmental, and economic aspects. The identification of these "three pillars" emphasizes that progress cannot be sustainable if any one of these elements is overlooked. In order to effectively address the intricate and interrelated problems caused by climate change, an integrated approach is essential. For example, even if economic progress produces short-term growth, it cannot be deemed sustainable if it exacerbates inequality or degrades the environment. Therefore, a comprehensive framework that balances these aspects and encourages inclusive and equitable growth is necessary for transformative futures. Furthermore, researchers stress that sustainability involves changing current systems to solve global challenges rather than just preserving them. According to Jonathan Porritt, sustainable development is "the only intellectually coherent... concept" that can deal with the scope and urgency of today's problems (Porritt, 2002, p. 18). This viewpoint emphasizes the need to reconsider growth in light of climate change, realizing that little adjustments will not be enough to solve structural environmental issues. Rather, transformative approaches entail a change in ideals toward sustainability and accountability as well as innovation in technology, governance, and social behaviours. Moreover, the notion of altering the quality of growth is intimately associated with the idea of transformative futures. According to the Brundtland Report, development must become "less material- and energy-intensive and more equitable in its impact" in order to be sustainable (WCED, 1987, p. 52) [19]. This suggests that future development must prioritize better resource allocation and lessening the impact on the environment in addition to raising productivity. In order to reduce waste and maintain ecological balance, it advocates for a shift toward renewable energy, sustainable consumption, and circular economic systems.

The focus on international collaboration and shared accountability is another crucial aspect of transformational futures. Individual countries cannot solve the global issue of climate change on their own. Global initiatives like the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) demonstrate that sustainable development necessitates international cooperation and collaborative action. These frameworks seek to promote a coordinated response to environmental concerns by bringing national policies into line with global sustainability goals. Transformative futures must, however, be inclusive, guaranteeing that all parts of society gain from progress and that the perspectives of excluded people are heard. Rethinking development also entails a change in priorities and values. Economic growth is frequently given precedence over social and environmental concerns in traditional development

models. Sustainability, on the other hand, places a strong emphasis on ecological balance, equality, and well-being. In order to do this, cultures must undergo a cultural and ethical shift in which they acknowledge the inherent worth of nature and the significance of protecting it for coming generations. Additionally, it entails reframing success in terms of life quality rather than material wealth. As a result, the idea of transformational futures emphasizes the necessity of fundamentally reconsidering sustainability and development in light of climate change. It advocates for a change from growth-centered paradigms to more inclusive, holistic strategies that incorporate social, economic, and ecological aspects. Societies can face the difficulties of climate change and ensure the well-being of current and future generations by adopting this revolutionary vision and moving toward a more sustainable and equitable future.

Conclusion

In summary, this work has attempted to reconsider climate change as a complicated process of global environmental transformation that alters the fundamentals of contemporary civilization rather than only as an environmental problem. It is evident from combining insights from structural, ethical, political, and epistemological perspectives that our economic organization, power dynamics, knowledge production, and development visions are all profoundly impacted by climate change. It is a condition that affects daily living, global inequality, and the planet's future rather than a remote or isolated problem. According to the analysis, climate change is both a result of and a problem for current systems. It shows how power structures affect environmental decision-making, draws attention to unequal duties and vulnerabilities, and underscores the limitations of growth-driven development. It also brings up significant moral issues of accountability, justice, and the rights of future generations. Together, these aspects show that deeper structural and mental transformation is necessary to address climate change; technical remedies are insufficient. The study also highlights the critical role that language and information play in influencing how people perceive and respond to climate change. It is crucial to critically analyse how climate knowledge is created and disseminated since conflicting narratives, uncertainties, and power dynamics affect public opinion and policy responses. An approach to climate action that is more inclusive and reflective is made possible by acknowledging these difficulties. In the end, reconsidering climate change entails heading toward revolutionary possibilities that put sustainability, justice, and shared responsibility first. It demands a reinterpretation of development that balances ecological constraints with human advancement. We can only hope to effectively address the continuing environmental transformation and create a more equitable and sustainable world by adopting such an integrated and critical perspective.

References

1. Beck U. *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. London: Sage, 1992.
2. Beck U. *The metamorphosis of the world: how climate change is transforming our concept of the world*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016.
3. Brooks N, Grist N, Brown K. Development futures in the context of climate change: challenging the present and learning from the past. Dev Policy Rev. 2009;27(6):741–65.
4. Chakrabarty D. The climate of history: four theses. Crit Inq. 2009;35(2):197–222.
5. Denter P. Motivated reasoning and the political economy of climate change inaction. arXiv, 2011.
6. Foucault M. *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.
7. Foucault M. *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.
8. Hossain MN. The ethics of climate change: a philosophical analysis of the moral obligations of individuals and nations. Res Rev Int J Multidiscip. 2014;10(8):1–5.
9. Klein N. *This changes everything: capitalism vs. the climate*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2014.
10. Kivle B, Espedal G. Values in climate discourse. Front Commun. 2019;7:1.
11. Knight FH. *Risk, uncertainty and profit*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1925.
12. Lucarini V. Towards a definition of climate science. arXiv, 2004.
13. Polanyi K. *The great transformation: the political and economic origins of our time*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1944.
14. Porritt J. *Breaking new ground: mining, minerals and sustainable development*. London: Earthscan, 2002.
15. O'Brien K, *et al*. Social transformation in response to global environmental change. Ambio. 2014;43(4):376–90.
16. Rodríguez-Madariaga M. *Ethics and sustainability: human dignity and solidarity*. Vatican City: Pontifical Academy of Sciences, 2018.
17. Srivastav S, Rafaty R. Political strategies to overcome climate policy obstructionism. arXiv, 2014.
18. Sunstein CR. *Climate justice: what rich nations owe the world—and the future*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 2009.
19. World Commission on Environment and Development. *Our common future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.