

CHAPTER 12

Environmental Ethics, Climate Justice and Social Justice

Seyma IRMAK

Amasya University, Türkiye

To Cite This Chapter:

Irmak, S. (2023). Environmental Ethics, Climate Justice and Social Justice. In S. Erten & A. C. Atmaca Aksoy (Eds.), *Current Studies in Environmental Education* (pp. 248-267). ISRES Publishing.

Similarity Index

The similarity index obtained from the plagiarism software for this book chapter is 9%.

As we contemplate the future of our planet, exploring the intricate interplay between concepts like environmental ethics, climate justice, and social justice provides us with a vital compass not only for safeguarding nature but also for constructing a fairer future for humanity. These three pillars of thought not only converge at the intersection of sustainability but also hold the keys to addressing some of the most pressing challenges of our time. In the following pages, we will delve into the profound connections among environmental ethics, climate justice, and social justice, unraveling the complex tapestry that binds them together and shedding light on the pathways to a more just and sustainable world.

Environmental Ethics: Understanding Our Moral Relationship with Nature

Ethics, as a philosophical pursuit, revolves around the examination of values and the rationale behind morally correct and virtuous behaviors, drawing insights from the influential writings of philosophers such as Aristotle (who focused on virtue ethics), Kant (who emphasized duty-based ethics), and Bentham and Mill (pioneers in utilitarian and consequentialist ethics) (Horner, 2003; Shaw, 1998). Ethics, often described as ‘norms for conduct that distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable behavior,’ serves as the cornerstone of our understanding of morality (Resnik, 2015). It not only guides our judgments about what is right or wrong in human behavior but also shapes our collective values, fostering a shared framework for distinguishing acceptable actions from those that fall outside the boundaries of ethical conduct (Huang et al., 2019; Kraut, 2009). In this context, Brennan and Lo (2019) present two fundamental moral questions that have played a crucial role in shaping our ethical frameworks: (1) What kinds of

things are intrinsically valuable, good, or bad? (2) What determines the moral rightness or wrongness of an action? In exploring the first question, which concerns intrinsic value and the nature of things deemed valuable, we delve into the domain of values and moral worth. This inquiry fundamentally focuses on what humans and societies consider valuable, as values hold a significant role in shaping individuals' lives, behaviors, and decisions. Concepts such as human life, freedom, and equality often serve as examples of intrinsic value. The second question, addressing the moral rightness or wrongness of actions, forms the other facet of ethics. Here, we scrutinize moral actions and decisions, exploring how individuals, societies, or communities evaluate the ethical standing of specific actions. This examination encompasses an investigation into how ethical theories and principles assess and categorize actions based on their underlying moral values. Consequently, it involves the process of determining whether an action is just, honest, or unjust. These two questions are the cornerstones of ethical thought and are used to deeply understand moral thinking. Determining values and moral principles (the question of value) and evaluating which actions are right or wrong based on these values (the question of action) play a fundamental role in the development and application of ethical theories and approaches. Brennan and Lo (2019) argue that the answers to the question of action are derived from the responses to the question of value, emphasizing the interconnectedness of these two aspects in ethical reasoning.

Before delving into the realm of environmental ethics, it's worth noting that the vast field of ethics encompasses various specialized branches, each addressing unique ethical concerns and moral dilemmas. These branches include but are not limited to medical ethics, business ethics, and media ethics (DuBois et al., 2014; Painter-Morland & Deslandes, 2016; Schwartz, 2007), each with its own set of principles and ethical considerations. Environmental ethics is a branch of philosophy that explores the intricate moral and ethical dimensions of our interaction with the natural world (Callicott, 1989; Clegg, 2000; DesJardins, 2013; Rolston III, 1988). At its core, it prompts us to grapple with fundamental questions about the value of nature, our responsibilities towards the environment, and the ethical guidelines that should govern our actions in addressing pressing environmental concerns (Brennan & Lo 2019; Imran et al., 2011).

Environmental Ethics and Its Development

The emergence of environmental ethics in the second half of the 20th century was indeed closely tied to the increasing awareness of environmental problems and the impacts of human activities on the natural world. Several key factors contributed to the development of environmental ethics during this time (Light, 2000; Minter & Collins, 2008; Payne, 2005; Routley, 1973):

Industrialization: The rapid industrialization that occurred in many parts of the world led to increased pollution, deforestation, habitat destruction, and other

environmental issues. As people witnessed the negative consequences of industrialization on the environment, they began to question the ethics of these activities.

Technological Advances: Advances in technology, while offering many benefits, also had negative environmental impacts. For example, the widespread use of automobiles and the development of industrial processes were associated with air and water pollution.

Population Growth: The global human population was growing rapidly during this period. The increased demand for resources and space put additional pressure on the environment.

Resource Depletion: As more resources were extracted and consumed to support growing populations and industries, it became evident that some resources were finite and could be depleted.

This realization raised ethical questions about the responsible use of natural resources. However, it's important to note that "The Limits to Growth," (Meadows et al., 1972) published by the Club of Rome, significantly contributed to the formation of environmental ethics by introducing several crucial concepts:

Finite Resources: The book argued that natural resources on Earth are finite, and it introduced the concept that an unlimited growth model is unsustainable. This perspective challenged the prevailing notion of infinite economic and population growth.

Environmental Issues: The Limits to Growth warned that unchecked growth would result in environmental problems, including the depletion of natural resources and environmental pollution. This highlighted the urgent need for ethical considerations in how humans interact with the environment.

Rights of Future Generations: The book emphasized the rights of future generations to inherit a planet capable of sustaining life. It stressed that excessive resource consumption by current generations would threaten the well-being and even the right to life of future generations. This concept of intergenerational equity and environmental justice became a core principle in environmental ethics.

In addition to *The Limits to Growth*, other significant works have also contributed to the development of environmental ethics, such as:

Silent Spring-Rachel Carson (1962): This book focused on the environmental impacts of pesticide use and the conservation of natural life. It had a significant influence on environmental ethics and awareness.

The Ecology of Commerce-Paul Hawken (1993): This book examined the relationship between business and environmental sustainability, discussing the ethical responsibilities of businesses in environmental matters.

The Sixth Extinction-Elizabeth Kolbert (2014): This book addressed the increasing rate of species extinction on our planet and evaluated the impact of human activities on the natural world.

A Sand County Almanac- Aldo Leopold (1949): This work presented thoughts on the conservation of the natural world and ethical relationships between humans and nature.

The Nature of Things-Lucretius (B.C. 1st century): This ancient Roman work explored the value of nature and the ethical relationship between humans and the natural world.

These books and works, along with “The Limits to Growth,” have collectively contributed to the development and expansion of the concept of environmental ethics, encouraging individuals and societies to consider ethical dimensions when dealing with environmental issues and the sustainability of the planet.

To sum up, the late 1960s and the 1970s witnessed the rise of the environmental movement, significantly elevating the importance of environmental ethics. Key works like Rachel Carson’s “Silent Spring” played a vital role in shaping the discourse. During this era, literature increasingly emphasized the impact of human activities on the natural world and the urgency of conservation efforts. In the 1980s and beyond, environmental ethics continued to evolve, integrating intergenerational justice (justice for future generations) and social justice. Environmental ethics began to gain prominence as concerns over limited natural resources and growing environmental issues became more apparent. This mid-20th century shift in perspective led to a focus on the sustainability of natural resources and the intrinsic value of nature. Ethical theories within environmental ethics expanded to address justice not only among humans but also between humans and nature.

Harmonizing with Nature: Exploring the Depths of Environmental Ethics

Environmental ethics, as a complex field, encompasses a diverse spectrum of ethical frameworks that shape our understanding of humanity’s moral relationship with the natural world. In this context, environmental ethics’ discussion primarily centers around three fundamental paradigms: anthropocentrism, ecocentrism, and the often-overlooked but significant biocentrism (Norton, 1991; Samuelsson, 2013; Sovacool et al., 2017; Wapner & Matthew, 2009). These paradigms serve as pivotal axes around which ethical debates concerning humanity’s intricate and evolving relationship with the natural environment revolve.

Anthropocentrism, the first paradigm, positions humans at the very epicenter of ethical considerations. It places a primary emphasis on human interests, needs, and desires, often framing nature as a utilitarian resource designed solely for human

exploitation and benefit (Droz, 2022; Norton, 1991). In this view, the value of nature is primarily instrumental, contingent upon its utility to human beings. This anthropocentric perspective has historically guided much of our interaction with the environment, influencing policies and practices that prioritize human welfare.

Conversely, ecocentrism represents a fundamental shift in perspective. It adopts an ecosystem-centered approach, recognizing the intrinsic value of ecological systems as interconnected wholes. In this paradigm, nature is valued for its inherent worth, regardless of its utility to humans. Ecocentrism advocates for a holistic perspective on ethical responsibilities toward the environment, emphasizing the interconnectedness of all living and non-living elements within ecosystems (Brennan & Withgott, 2005; Lundmark, 2007; Norton, 1991). It questions the utilitarian use of the environment and advocates for a more equitable and peaceful cohabitation with the natural environment.

Notably absent from the detailed discourse is biocentrism, the third paradigm. Biocentrism posits that all living entities, whether human or non-human, possess inherent value and moral standing. It asserts that each life form has its own intrinsic worth, independent of its utility to others (Taylor, 1986; Varner, 1998). While biocentrism holds a significant place within the realm of environmental ethics, its omission from this discussion is not indicative of its lesser importance. Instead, it reflects a deliberate editorial choice to concentrate on the anthropocentrism versus ecocentrism dialectic, which frequently garners more prominent attention and debate within the field. Biocentrism, however, plays a critical role as an ethical bridge between the two dominant paradigms. It acknowledges the intrinsic worth of all life forms and champions a comprehensive moral standing for non-human entities. By recognizing the inherent value of each living being, biocentrism contributes to a more inclusive and balanced ethical framework, challenging the exclusive prioritization of human interests.

In summary, the omission of biocentrism from our discussion does not diminish its significance within environmental ethics. Instead, it reflects a conscious editorial decision to delve more deeply into the discourse of anthropocentrism versus ecocentrism, which lies at the heart of many ethical discussions in the field. These paradigms collectively offer a comprehensive lens through which we can evaluate and navigate our ethical responsibilities in the context of our evolving relationship with the natural world.

Ethical Challenges and Environmental Issues

Environmental ethics confronts a variety of ethical dilemmas in our interactions with the natural world. These ethical dilemmas include climate change, biodiversity conservation, resource utilization, and other environmental issues. Climate change questions how we should address the ethical implications of our carbon footprint and contributions to global warming. Biodiversity conservation addresses our moral obligations to protect endangered species and preserve biodiversity. Resource utilization challenges us to

balance the ethical use of natural resources with economic development. These ethical challenges reflect the complex issues we encounter in the practical applications of environmental ethics.

Environmental ethics helps us address these ethical challenges and establish a more ethical and sustainable relationship with nature. It offers the opportunity to recognize the intrinsic value and rights of nature, better understand our environmental responsibilities, and approach environmental issues with greater sensitivity. This encourages individuals to build a more ethical relationship with nature and take a step closer toward creating a sustainable world for future generations.

Ethical Imperatives of Climate Justice: Bridging the Gap between Environmental Ethics and a Sustainable Future

As we delve into the profound environmental ethics, we find ourselves at the intersection of moral philosophy and socio-environmental responsibility. In the preceding section, we explored the foundations of environmental ethics, recognizing the value and intrinsic worth of the natural world and the moral obligations we have towards it. Now, we embark on a journey to understand how these ethical principles intertwine with the pressing issues of climate change and social justice.

The relationship between environmental ethics and climate justice is multifaceted and interconnected. Environmental ethics provides a moral framework for understanding and evaluating human interactions with the environment, including climate change (Wardrope, 2020). It involves considering the ethical responsibilities and obligations that individuals and societies have towards the natural world. Climate justice, on the other hand, focuses specifically on the ethical dimensions of climate change and its impacts on vulnerable populations (Howard, 2023). It emphasizes the need to address the rights and needs of these populations, as well as the equitable distribution of resources and power in the face of climate change. Populations identified as vulnerable, like interstate migrant waste pickers in urban environments, are particularly exposed to the effects of climate change (Michael et al., 2018).

Environmental ethics and climate justice are closely related because they both involve ethical considerations and values in relation to the environment. Environmental ethics provides the philosophical and ethical foundation for understanding the moral implications of human actions on the environment, including climate change (Wardrope, 2020). It helps to shape the principles and values that underpin climate justice. Climate justice, in turn, applies the principles of environmental ethics to the specific context of climate change (Howard, 2023). It recognizes the ethical responsibilities that individuals, organizations, and governments have in addressing the impacts of climate change and ensuring that vulnerable populations are not disproportionately affected and seeks to rectify the inequalities and injustices that arise from climate change, guided by the

ethical principles of fairness, equity, and solidarity (Barnwell & Wood, 2022).

The relationship between environmental ethics and climate justice is further strengthened by the recognition of intergenerational justice (Howard et al., 2021). Both concepts acknowledge the moral obligations we have towards future generations and the need to consider the long-term consequences of our actions on the environment. Environmental ethics provides the ethical framework for understanding and promoting intergenerational justice, while climate justice applies these principles to the specific challenges posed by climate change.

Historical Context of Climate Justice

The historical context of climate justice is deeply rooted in a rich tapestry of social movement theory, activism, and ethical principles. It can be traced back to the emergence of social movement theory, which provides critical insights into the formation and evolution of the climate justice concept (Bevington & Dixon, 2005). This theory, grounded in the study of collective actions and advocacy, serves as the foundational lens through which we can understand the dynamics driving the climate justice movement.

One of the defining features of this movement is the flexible and inclusive criteria for membership, a characteristic strongly emphasized by social movement theory (Fominaya, 2010). This inclusivity has been instrumental in fostering a space where a wide spectrum of individuals and organizations, all united by a shared concern for the ethical dimensions of climate change, can actively engage. Furthermore, climate justice activists have been resolute in integrating social and ecological justice principles, addressing issues like racialization and environmental education (McLean, 2013). This recognition has driven them to challenge the historical bias within the environmental movement and advocate for a more diverse and inclusive movement. Learning and pedagogy have played a pivotal role in the climate justice movement, with activists viewing education as a means to transition toward a post-carbon energy system and address the ecological and social damage caused by climate change (Kluttz & Walter, 2018). This educational approach extends to amplifying the voices of the most vulnerable and recognizing the historical injustices and social inequalities that exacerbate the challenges of thriving within the context of climate change (Barnwell & Wood, 2022).

The climate justice movement aligns with key ethical principles, including the polluter pays principle and a broader understanding of historical international injustice. Climate reparations, a feature of global reparative justice, aim to address historical and ongoing climate change impacts on vulnerable communities (Tan, 2023). The movement has also intertwined with struggles for sovereignty and resource justice, pushing back against power dynamics that perpetuate inequality (Tramel, 2018). These injustices, arising from climate change and capital accumulation, have given rise to movements that strive to reclaim control over natural resources. In pursuing its goals, the climate justice

movement has cultivated global justice networks (Routledge et al., 2007), offering platforms for relationality, power-sharing, and mutual solidarity among diverse actors, while grounding their actions in sustainable forms of material resistance. Moreover, language and discourse have played a vital role in shaping the climate justice movement. Activists have engaged in discursive contestations of climate injustice, challenging prevailing narratives and advocating for a more equitable approach to addressing climate change (Fine, 2022).

In summary, the historical context of climate justice is deeply rooted in social movement theory and activism. The movement integrates social and ecological justice, challenges racialization, and promotes inclusivity. Learning, reparative justice, resource justice, and global justice networks all play pivotal roles in shaping the movement. Language and discourse are instrumental in contesting climate injustice and advocating for a more equitable approach to climate change. This historical context underscores the profound ethical concerns at the core of climate justice and its unwavering commitment to equitable climate solutions.

Key Principles of Climate Justice

Climate justice is underpinned by a set of fundamental principles that shape its ethical framework, guide policy development, and inspire action. These principles reflect the moral imperative to address climate change equitably and inclusively.

Solidarity: At the heart of climate justice lies the principle of solidarity, which unites diverse and distant communities in a shared commitment to addressing climate change (Chatterton et al., 2012). It fosters connections and alliances that transcend local and particular contexts, emphasizing that the responsibility for climate action extends beyond national borders.

Distributive Justice: Another core principle of climate justice is distributive justice, which underscores the fair distribution of resources and benefits, especially in the context of climate change impacts (Sabbagh, 2003). It seeks to rectify historical imbalances and ensure that the burdens and benefits of climate policies are shared equitably.

The Polluter Pays Principle: This widely discussed principle in the international climate debate holds that those responsible for greenhouse gas emissions should bear the costs and responsibilities associated with addressing climate change (Mayne et al., 2016). It places the onus on polluters to take action and make reparations for their contributions to climate change.

The Beneficiary Pays Principle: Complementary to the polluter pays principle is the beneficiary pays principle, which suggests that those who benefit from activities contributing to climate change should bear the costs of addressing its impacts (Portela,

2022). This principle recognizes the need to address historical and ongoing impacts on vulnerable communities.

Procedural Justice: Procedural justice is an essential principle in climate justice, emphasizing the importance of fairness and inclusivity in decision-making processes related to climate change (Swanson, 2023). It advocates for transparent and participatory planning processes that prioritize the voices and concerns of marginalized communities.

The Ability-to-Pay Principle: Recognizing that financial capacities differ among nations and entities, the ability-to-pay principle suggests that those with greater financial resources should contribute more to addressing climate change, taking into account their capacity to do so (Huseby, 2013).

The Principle of Equality of Opportunity: This principle acknowledges the differential impacts of greenhouse gas emissions and aims to restore fairness and equal opportunities for all parties affected by climate change (Pottier et al., 2017).

In summary, the key principles of climate justice encompass solidarity, distributive justice, the polluter pays principle, the beneficiary pays principle, procedural justice, the ability-to-pay principle, and the principle of equality of opportunity. These principles collectively guide efforts to address the impacts of climate change, promoting fairness, inclusivity, and accountability. They underscore the ethical imperative of climate justice and the shared responsibility for a sustainable and equitable future.

Upholding Equity: Vulnerable Populations, Climate Change, and the Imperative of Climate Justice

The impacts of climate change on vulnerable populations are significant and wide-ranging. Vulnerable populations, including marginalized communities, indigenous peoples, women, children, the elderly, people with disabilities, and those living in poverty, are disproportionately affected by climate change (Nelson et al., 2007; Fussel, 2007). These populations often face social, economic, and political disadvantages that exacerbate their vulnerability (Yadava & Sinha, 2020).

Climate change can lead to increased risks to the health of vulnerable populations. Rising temperatures can contribute to heat-related illnesses, while changes in precipitation patterns can affect the spread of vector-borne diseases and vulnerable populations may also face challenges in accessing healthcare and adapting to changing health risks (King & Gregg, 2021). In terms of livelihoods, climate change can have detrimental effects on agriculture, fisheries, and forestry, which are often the main sources of income and subsistence for vulnerable communities (Michael et al., 2018). Changes in rainfall patterns, temperature, and the availability of water resources can lead to reduced crop yields, loss of livestock, and decreased productivity, further exacerbating poverty and food insecurity (Michael et al., 2018). The impacts of climate change on vulnerable

populations are compounded by social and economic factors. Limited access to resources, infrastructure, and social support systems can hinder their ability to adapt and recover from climate-related shocks and stresses (Mehrad, 2020). Discrimination, inequality, and power imbalances can also exacerbate vulnerability and limit the capacity of these populations to cope with and respond to climate change (Terriquez et al., 2018).

Climate justice is closely related to the impacts of climate change on vulnerable populations. It emphasizes the need to address the rights and needs of these populations, as well as the equitable distribution of resources and power in the face of climate change (Gaard, 2015). Climate justice calls for inclusive and equitable approaches to climate action, ensuring that the needs and rights of vulnerable populations are at the forefront of decision-making and policy implementation (Riley, 2020). By addressing the impacts of climate change on vulnerable populations, climate justice aims to promote equity, fairness, and inclusivity in climate action. It recognizes the disproportionate burden that vulnerable populations bear and seeks to rectify the inequalities and injustices that arise from climate change impacts (Nelson et al., 2007). Climate justice also emphasizes the importance of empowering vulnerable communities and ensuring their meaningful participation in decision-making processes (Terriquez et al., 2018).

Climate Justice and International Climate Agreements

Climate justice is a central ethical concern in climate change discussions. It emphasizes the moral obligation to address climate change in a just and equitable manner. This means considering the rights and needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged populations, both locally and globally. Climate justice recognizes that historically, developed nations have contributed the most to greenhouse gas emissions, while the impacts are often felt most acutely by developing countries and marginalized communities (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014). Ethical dilemmas arise in determining how to fairly distribute the burdens and benefits of climate change mitigation and adaptation. This includes issues related to funding for adaptation projects, technology transfer, and compensation for climate-induced losses and damages.

Several international climate agreements have played significant roles in shaping the global response to climate change. These agreements include:

The Montreal Protocol (Protocol, 1987), adopted in 1987 in Montreal, Canada, and entering into force in 1989, aimed to limit the production and use of substances that deplete the ozone layer. This important environmental agreement not only protected the ozone layer but also contributed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions since ozone depletion can enhance atmospheric warming by increasing absorbed radiation in the stratosphere.

The Kyoto Protocol (Protocol, 1997), adopted in 1997 in Kyoto, Japan, and

entering into force in 2005, required developed countries (known as Annex I countries) to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions to specific targets. The protocol allowed countries with emission reduction commitments to use policy instruments such as carbon markets and flexibility mechanisms. However, the protocol ended in 2012, giving way to the more inclusive Paris Agreement.

The Copenhagen Accord, accepted during the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Conference, outlined common commitments for both developed and developing countries in addressing climate change. While it was not legally binding, the accord paved the way for subsequent climate agreements, including the Cancún Agreements and ultimately the Paris Agreement.

Adopted in 2015 (Agreement 2015), the Paris Agreement stands as one of the most significant international climate agreements. It establishes a worldwide framework with the aim of restricting global warming to significantly below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels, while striving to limit it to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Participating countries in the agreement present nationally determined contributions (NDCs) detailing their commitments to emission reductions and adaptation to climate change. While international climate agreements provide a framework for global cooperation, they also pose challenges in terms of enforcement and ensuring that countries meet their commitments.

In closing, climate justice isn't just a standalone concept; it's a vital thread woven into the rich tapestry of social justice. The ethical principles and values driving climate justice are deeply entwined with our broader pursuit of social equality and fairness. As we venture forth into our exploration of social justice, let us remember that addressing the impacts of climate change on vulnerable populations is an indispensable step in this shared journey. Our understanding of climate justice serves as a cornerstone, the foundation upon which we can construct a world that's not only more equitable but also sustainable for all. In the upcoming section, we'll embark on a compelling journey into the intricate dynamics of social justice, exploring how these principles intersect and breathe life into the lives of people across the globe.

Social Justice: Concept and Fundamental Principles

Social justice advocates for the fair and equal distribution of resources among individuals within society and the provision of equal opportunities. This concept includes respect for human rights, social participation, and the elimination of discrimination (Hibbert, 2017). Social justice is often closely related to the concept of social good because these two concepts complement each other (Kasper, 2007; Levin, 2020; Mor Barak, 2020).

The primary aim of social justice is to enhance the overall well-being of society.

Reducing inequalities, ensuring that everyone's basic needs are met, and improving the quality of life are contributing factors to social good (Dominelli, 2013; Segal, 2016). In a society where social justice is established, individuals are treated more fairly, which, in turn, contributes to the increase in social good. Social justice is rooted in values such as solidarity, empathy, and respect for human dignity. In an environment where all segments of society have equal opportunities, people can coexist more harmoniously. Therefore, social justice and social good are complementary concepts.

Examples of Social Justice Movements

Social justice movements encompass a wide range of causes and initiatives aimed at addressing various forms of inequality and oppression in society. These movements advocate for equal rights, fair treatment, and social change to create a more just and equitable world. Examples of social justice movements include:

1. **The Civil Rights Movement:** This movement, which gained momentum in the 1950s and 1960s, aimed to end racial segregation and discrimination against African Americans in the United States. It led to significant legal and social changes, including the desegregation of schools and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Kim, 2020).

2. **Black Lives Matter:** This movement emerged in response to police violence and systemic racism against Black individuals. It advocates for an end to police brutality, racial profiling, and the disproportionate targeting of Black communities. Black Lives Matter has sparked widespread protests and calls for criminal justice reform (Hoffman et al., 2016).

3. **Feminist Movement:** The feminist movement seeks to achieve gender equality and challenge patriarchal norms and structures. It addresses issues such as reproductive rights, equal pay, and ending gender-based violence. The movement has evolved over time, with different waves focusing on different aspects of gender inequality (Choi et al., 2020).

4. **LGBTQ+ Rights Movement:** This movement advocates for the rights and equal treatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer individuals. It has fought for legal recognition of same-sex marriage, protection against discrimination, and the promotion of LGBTQ+ rights and visibility (Vera & Speight, 2003).

5. **Environmental Justice Movement:** This movement addresses the disproportionate impact of environmental degradation and pollution on marginalized communities. It seeks to ensure that all individuals, regardless of race or socioeconomic status, have equal access to clean air, water, and a healthy environment (Kluttz & Walter, 2018).

6. **Disability Rights Movement:** This movement advocates for the rights and

inclusion of people with disabilities. It aims to eliminate discrimination, promote accessibility, and ensure equal opportunities in areas such as education, employment, and public accommodations (Ratts et al., 2016).

7. Indigenous Rights Movement: This movement focuses on the rights and sovereignty of Indigenous peoples. It seeks to address historical injustices, protect Indigenous lands and cultures, and promote self-determination and autonomy for Indigenous communities (Einwohner et al., 2019).

These examples highlight the diversity of social justice movements and the range of issues they address. While each movement has its unique goals and strategies, they all share a common commitment to challenging systemic inequalities and promoting social change.

Specific Challenges and Debates related to Social Justice

In the field of social justice, practitioners and scholars grapple with a range of complex challenges and engage in thought-provoking debates that shape the trajectory of social justice work. These challenges encompass a broad spectrum of issues, from theoretical foundations to the well-being of activists, and they underscore the intricate nature of the pursuit of justice and equality.

1. Theoretical Foundations: One challenge in the field of social justice is the lack of explicit theories of social justice in research. While there is a growing recognition of the importance of social justice, it is often not well-defined or integrated into the theoretical frameworks of various disciplines Rosenberg (2013). This lack of theoretical grounding can hinder the development of effective strategies and interventions for addressing social injustices.

2. Sustainability and Activist Burnout: Social justice movements face challenges in sustaining their efforts and avoiding burnout. Some movements may engage in unsustainable or exploitative practices, leading to activist burnout or the premature end of movements (Bivens, 2020). This highlights the need for strategies that prioritize self-care, collective well-being, and long-term sustainability in social justice work.

3. Alternative Forms of Justice: The concept of justice is not limited to traditional legal systems. There is a growing exploration of alternative forms of justice, such as transformative justice and restorative justice, particularly in response to gender-based violence (Kim, 2020). These alternative approaches challenge the dominant punitive justice system and offer possibilities for healing, reconciliation, and community accountability.

4. Structural Inequalities and Peacebuilding: Addressing social justice issues requires going beyond surface-level remedies and addressing the underlying generative mechanisms of injustices (Pherali, 2021). Transformative peacebuilding approaches aim

to address the root causes of structural inequalities and promote positive peace. This involves restructuring social, political, and economic systems to create more just and equitable societies.

5. **Affirmative vs. Transformative Remedies:** In the pursuit of social justice, there is a distinction between “affirmative remedies” that correct outcomes without changing structural frameworks and “transformative remedies” that aim to restructure the underlying generative framework (Cardozo & Shah, 2016). The debate lies in determining the most effective approaches to address social injustices and achieve lasting systemic change.

6. **Climate Change and Displacement:** Climate change poses significant challenges to social justice, particularly in relation to displacement and migration. Low-lying island nations, such as Kiribati and Tuvalu, face the threat of becoming uninhabitable due to rising sea levels, forcing their populations to seek refuge in other countries (Kirsch, 2020). This raises questions about the responsibility of nations and the rights of climate change migrants.

7. **Intersectionality and Inclusive Movements:** Social justice movements need to address the intersecting forms of oppression and privilege that individuals experience. Intersectionality recognizes that individuals may face multiple forms of discrimination based on their race, gender, class, sexuality, and other social identities. Building inclusive movements that center the experiences and voices of marginalized communities is crucial for effective social justice advocacy (McCann, 2006).

8. **Activist Well-being:** Engaging in social justice work can take a toll on activists' well-being. Burnout, overwhelm, and discouragement are common challenges faced by social justice and human rights activists (Chen & Gorski, 2015). Recognizing the emotional and psychological impact of this work and implementing strategies for self-care and support are essential for sustaining the efforts of activists.

These challenges and debates highlight the complexity and multifaceted nature of social justice work. They call for ongoing critical reflection, collaboration, and the development of inclusive and sustainable strategies to address systemic inequalities and promote social change.

The Changing Face of Social Justice

The concept of social justice has evolved and adapted throughout history in response to the changing needs, values, and challenges of societies. These changes have occurred as responses to the needs, values, and difficulties of societies. For instance, the definition and application of social justice today are different and more comprehensive than in previous years.

In the mid-20th century, social justice was often limited to economic equality (Marsden, 1978; O'Mahoney, 1952). However, today, social justice encompasses a broader

perspective that includes gender equality, environmental justice, and the recognition of ethnic and cultural differences (Barakos, 2020; Vicari, 2013). Additionally, social justice is not solely achieved through government intervention but also through an approach that encourages the participation of all segments of society. The rise of social media and increased global connectivity have raised awareness about social justice and opened new avenues for societal change. Therefore, the concept of social justice is an ever-evolving framework that will continue to adapt to the needs and values of societies.

In conclusion, social justice and social good are complementary concepts. Social justice is considered a goal to achieve social good and aims to enhance the overall well-being of society. The historically changing nature of this concept has allowed it to adapt to the needs and values of societies, ensuring its continued evolution.

The future of our world is shaped within a context where three fundamental concepts intertwine: environmental ethics, climate justice, and social justice. Environmental ethics advises us to recognize the inherent value of nature and preserve it for future generations, while climate justice presents itself as a crisis that prompts us to question these values and focus on our societal responsibilities. It's at this juncture that social justice, by bringing both concepts together, calls for considering the vulnerable communities most affected by environmental harm and ensuring equitable access to resources. The interconnectedness of these three concepts reflects not only our efforts to protect nature and humanity but also the choices we make in how we live and coexist as a global society. This underscores our commitment to leave a more sustainable and equitable world for future generations, serving as an opportunity to act as part of that commitment. Let's remember that these connections are a reflection of our power to shape our lives on this planet and life itself in a sustainable manner.

References

- Agreement, P. (2015). *Paris Agreement, Report of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (21st Session, 2015: Paris)*. December. Retrieved from <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement>
- Barakos, E. (2020). Linguistic and social justice: Towards a debate of intersections and disjuncture. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 24(2), 265-277.
- Barnwell, G. & Wood, N. (2022). Climate justice is central to addressing the climate emergency's psychological consequences in the global south: a narrative review. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 52(4), 486-497. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00812463211073384>
- Bevington, D. and Dixon, C. (2005). Movement-relevant theory: rethinking social movement scholarship and activism. *Social Movement Studies*, 4(3), 185-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742830500329838>
- Bivens, B. (2020). More just futures are possible: connecting post qualitative inquiry and social movement organizing. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 14(3), 398-411. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940844720968199>
- Brennan, A., & Lo, Y. (2019). *Environmental ethics*. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/>

[ethics-environmental/](#)

- Brennan, S. & Withgott, J. (2005). *Environment: The Science behind the Stories*. Pearson/Benjamin Cummings.
- Callicott, J. B. (1989). *In defense of the land ethic: Essays in environmental philosophy*. State University of New York Press.
- Cardozo, M. L. and Shah, R. (2016). A conceptual framework to analyse the multiscale politics of education for sustainable peacebuilding. *Comparative Education*, 52(4), 516-537. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2016.1220144>
- Chatterton, P., Featherstone, D., & Routledge, P. (2012). Articulating climate justice in Copenhagen: antagonism, the commons, and solidarity. *Antipode*, 45(3), 602-620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2012.01025.x>
- Chen, C. W. and Gorski, P. C. (2015). Burnout in social justice and human rights activists: symptoms, causes and implications. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 7(3), 366-390. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huv011>
- Choi, J. O., Herbsleb, J. D., Hammer, J., & Forlizzi, J. (2020). Identity-based roles in rhizomatic social justice movements on Twitter. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 14, 488-498. <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v14i1.7317>
- Clegg, J. (2000). Beyond ethical individualism. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 44(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2788.2000.00257.x>
- Copenhagen Accord (2009). *U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change*. United Nations. 18 December 2009. Retrieved from <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2009/cop15/eng/107.pdf>
- DesJardins, J. R. (2013). *Environmental ethics: An introduction to environmental philosophy*. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Dominelli, L. (2013). Environmental justice at the heart of social work practice: greening the profession. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 22(4), 431-439. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12024>
- Droz, L. (2022). Anthropocentrism as the scapegoat of the environmental crisis: a review. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, 22, 25-49. <https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00200>
- DuBois, J. M., Kraus, E. M., Gursahani, K., & Bakanas, E. (2014). Curricular priorities for business ethics in medical practice and research: recommendations from Delphi consensus panels. *BMC Medical Education*, 14(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-14-235>
- Einwohner, R., Kelly-Thompson, K., Sinclair-Chapman, V., Tormos-Aponte, F., Weldon, S., Wright, J., ... & Wu, C. (2019). Active solidarity: intersectional solidarity in action. *Social Politics International Studies in Gender State & Society*, 28(3), 704-729. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/ixz052>
- Fine, J. C. (2022). Language and Social Justice in US Climate Movements: Barriers and Ways Forward. *Front. Commun.* 7:920568. doi: 10.3389/fcomm.2022.920568
- Fominaya, C. F. (2010). Collective identity in social movements: central concepts and debates. *Sociology Compass*, 4(6), 393-404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00287.x>
- Füssel, H. (2007). Vulnerability: a generally applicable conceptual framework for climate change research. *Global Environmental Change*, 17(2), 155-167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.05.002>
- Gaard, G. (2015). Ecofeminism and climate change. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 49, 20-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2015.02.004>

- Gardiner, S. (2010) A perfect moral storm: Climate change, intergenerational ethics and the problem of moral corruption. In: Gardiner S, Caney S, Jamieson D, et al. (eds) *Climate Ethics: Essential Readings* (pp.87–100). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hibbert, N. (2017). Human rights and social justice. *Laws*, 6(2), 2-16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/laws6020007>
- Hoffman, L., Granger, N., Vallejos, L., & Moats, M. (2016). An existential–humanistic perspective on black lives matter and contemporary protest movements. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 56(6), 595-611. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167816652273>
- Horner, J. (2003). Morality, ethics, and law: introductory concepts. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 24(4), 263-274. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2004-815580>
- Howard, L. (2023). Breaking climate justice ‘silence’ in everyday life: the environmentalist killjoy, negotiation and relationship risk. *The Sociological Review*, 71(5), 1135-1153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00380261231159524>
- Howard, L., Howell, R., & Jamieson, L. (2021). (re)configuring moral boundaries of intergenerational justice: the uk parent-led climate movement. *Local Environment*, 26(12), 1429-1444. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2021.1973977>
- Huang, Y., Do, M., & Kumar, V. (2019). Consumers’ perception on corporate social responsibility: evidence from Vietnam. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 26(6), 1272-1284. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1746>
- Huseby, R. (2013). Should the beneficiaries pay?. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics*, 14(2), 209-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470594x13506366>
- Imran, S., Alam, K., & Beaumont, N. (2011). Reinterpreting the definition of sustainable development for a more ecocentric reorientation. *Sustainable Development*, 22(2), 134-144. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.537>
- Kasper, D. V. (2007). Privacy as a social good. *Social Thought & Research*, 28, 165-189.
- Kim, M. E. (2020). Transformative justice and restorative justice: gender-based violence and alternative visions of justice in the United States. *International Review of Victimology*, 27(2), 162-172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758020970414>
- King, M. M., & Gregg, M. A. (2021). Disability and climate change: A critical realist model of climate justice. *Sociology Compass*, e12954, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12954>
- Kirsch, S. (2020). Why Pacific islanders stopped worrying about the apocalypse and started fighting climate change. *American Anthropologist*, 122(4), 827-839. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13471>
- Kluttz, J. & Walter, P. (2018). Conceptualizing learning in the climate justice movement. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 68(2), 91-107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713617751043>
- Kraut, R. (2009). *What is good and why: The ethics of well-being*. Harvard University Press.
- Levin, L. (2020). Rethinking social justice: A contemporary challenge for social good. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 30(2), 186-195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731519854161>
- Light, A. (2000). Ecological restoration and the culture of nature: A pragmatic perspective. In P. Gobster & B. R. Hull (Eds.), *Restoring nature: Perspectives from the social sciences and humanities* (pp. 49–70). Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Lundmark, C. (2007). The new ecological paradigm revisited: anchoring the nep scale in environmental ethics. *Environmental Education Research*, 13(3), 329-347.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620701430448>
- Marsden, K. (1969). Towards a synthesis of economic growth and social justice. *Int'l Lab. Rev.*, 100 (5), 389-481.
- Mayne, R., Fawcett, T., & Hyams, K. (2016). Climate justice and energy: applying international principles to uk residential energy policy. *Local Environment*, 22(4), 393-409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2016.1206515>
- McCann, M. W. (2006). Law and social movements: contemporary perspectives. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 2(1), 17-38. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.2.081805.105917>
- McLean, S. (2013). The whiteness of green: racialization and environmental education. *Canadian Geographies*, 57(3), 354-362. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cag.12025>
- Meadows, D.H., Meadows, D.L., Randers, J., Behrens_III, W.W. (1972). *The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*. Universe Books, New York.
- Mehrad, A. T. (2020). Assessment of climate change impacts on environmental sustainability in Afghanistan. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 208, 01001. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202020801001>
- Michael, K., Deshpande, T., & Ziervogel, G. (2018). Examining vulnerability in a dynamic urban setting: the case of bangalore's interstate migrant waste pickers. *Climate and Development*, 11(8), 667-678. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2018.1531745>
- Minteer, B. A. and Collins, J. P. (2008). From environmental to ecological ethics: toward a practical ethics for ecologists and conservationists. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 14(4), 483-501. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-008-9087-0>
- Mor Barak, M. E. (2020). The practice and science of social good: Emerging paths to positive social impact. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 30(2), 139-150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731517745600>
- Nelson, D. R., Adger, W. N., & Brown, K. (2007). Adaptation to environmental change: contributions of a resilience framework. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 32(1), 395-419. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.32.051807.090348>
- Norton, B. g. (1991). *Toward unity among environmentalists*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- O'Mahoney, S. J. C. (1952). Problem of a Defense Economy: Pressure Groups vs. Social Justice. *Review of Social Economy*, 10(1), 1-8.
- O'Neill, O. (1997). Environmental values, anthropocentrism and speciesism. *Environmental Values*, 6(2), 127-142. <https://doi.org/10.3197/096327197776679121>
- Painter-Morland, M. and Deslandes, G. (2016). Reconceptualizing CSR in the media industry as relational accountability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 143(4), 665-679. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3083-0>
- Payne, P. G. (2005). Families, homes and environmental education. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 21, 81-95. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0814062600000975>
- Pherali, T. (2021). Social justice, education and peacebuilding: conflict transformation in southern Thailand. Compare: *A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 53(4), 710-727. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2021.1951666>
- Pottier, A., Méjean, A., & Godard, O. (2017). A survey of global climate justice: from negotiation stances to moral stakes and back. *International Review of Environmental and Resource Economics*, 11(1), 1-53. <https://doi.org/10.1561/101.00000090>

- Portela, L. G. (2022). Backward-looking principles of climate justice: the unjustified move from the polluter pays principle to the beneficiary pays principle. *Res Publica*, 29(3), 367-384. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11158-022-09569-w>
- Protocol, M. (1987). *Montreal protocol on substances that deplete the ozone layer*. 26, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, pp. 128-136.
- Protocol, K. (1997). *Kyoto protocol*. Available Online: UNFCCC Website. <https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/2018-10/ENG5%20REPERES%202010%20ENG-Partie%205.pdf>
- Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar-McMillan, S. C., Butler, S. K., & McCullough, R. (2016). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies: guidelines for the counseling profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 44(1), 28-48. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12035>
- Resnik, D.B. (2015). *What is ethics in research & why is it important?* <http://dspace.sic.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/15041/1/What%20is%20Ethics%20in%20Research%20%26%20Why%20is%20it%20important.pdf>
- Riley, K. (2020). A timely retrospective on the need and potential for change. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 47(12), 1677-1681. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854820958730>
- Rolston III, H. (1988). *Environmental ethics: Duties to and values in the natural world*. Temple University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. W. (2013). Health geography I: Social justice, idealist theory, health and health care. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(3), 466-475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513498339>
- Routledge, P., Cumbers, A., & Nativel, C. (2007). Grassrooting network imaginaries: relationality, power, and mutual solidarity in global justice networks. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 39(11), 2575-2592. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a38338>
- Routley, R. (1973). Is there a need for a new, environmental ethic? *Proceedings, 15th World Congress of Philosophy*, 1, 205-210.
- Sabbagh, C. (2003). The dimension of social solidarity in distributive justice. *Social Science Information*, 42(2), 255-276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018403042002005>
- Samuelsson, L. (2013). At the centre of what? a critical note on the centrism-terminology in environmental ethics. *Environmental Values*, 22(5), 627-645. <https://doi.org/10.3197/096327113x13745164553879>
- Schlosberg, D. and Collins, L. B. (2014). From environmental to climate justice: climate change and the discourse of environmental justice. *WIREs Climate Change*, 5(3), 359-374. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.275>
- Schwartz, M. S. (2007). The “business ethics” of management theory. *Journal of Management History*, 13(1), 43-54. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17511340710715160>
- Segal, E.A. (2016). *Social welfare policies and social programs: A values perspective* (4th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning.
- Shaw, W. H. (1998). *Contemporary Ethics*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Sovacool, B. K., Burke, M. J., Baker, L., Kotikalapudi, C. K., & Wlokas, H. L. (2017). New frontiers and conceptual frameworks for energy justice. *Energy Policy*, 105, 677-691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.03.005>
- Swanson, K. (2023). Equity and justice in climate action planning: the challenge of evaluation. *Canadian Planning and Policy*, 2023, 23-37. <https://doi.org/10.24908/cpp-apc.v2023i1.15813>
- Tan, K. (2023). Climate reparations: why the polluter pays principle is neither unfair nor unreasonable. *WIREs Climate Change*, 14(4), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/>

[wcc.827](#)

- Taylor, P. (1986). *Respect for Nature: A Theory of Environmental Ethics*. Princeton University Press.
- Terriquez, V., Brenes, T., & Lopez, A. (2018). Intersectionality as a multipurpose collective action frame: the case of the undocumented youth movement. *Ethnicities*, 18(2), 260-276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796817752558>
- Tramel, S. (2018). Convergence as political strategy: social justice movements, natural resources and climate change. *Third World Quarterly*, 39(7), 1290-1307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2018.1460196>
- Varner G. (1998). *In Nature's Interests? Interests, Animal Rights and Environmental Ethics*. Oxford Univ. Press
- Vera, E. and Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 31(3), 253-272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000003031003001>
- Vicari, S. (2013). Networks of contention: the shape of online transnationalism in early twenty-first century social movement coalitions. *Social Movement Studies*, 13(1), 92-109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2013.832621>
- Yadava, R. N. and Sinha, B. K. (2020). Vulnerability assessment of forest fringe villages of madhya pradesh, india for planning adaptation strategies. *Sustainability*, 12(3), 1253. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12031253>
- Wapner, P. and Matthew, R. A. (2009). The humanity of global environmental ethics. *The Journal of Environment & Development*, 18(2), 203-222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1070496509334693>
- Wardrope, A. (2020). Health justice in the anthropocene: medical ethics and the land ethic. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 46(12), 791-796. <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2020-106855>

About The Authors



Seyma IRMAK graduated from the Department of Science Education at Gazi University in 2011. She completed her master's degree in the same field at Amasya University in 2017, followed by her doctoral degree at Hacettepe University in 2023. Her doctoral research extensively focused on STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) education, employing sophisticated methodologies such as data mining and meta-analysis. Her expertise spans across Pedagogical Content Knowledge, STEM education, meta-analysis techniques, and data mining applications within the educational context.

E-mail: seyma.bardak@gmail.com

ORCID:  0000-0003-3831-8244