

MORAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLIMATE CHANGES: ETHICAL ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

Omprakash*

ABSTRACT

We need to answer the Ethical question which is largely connected with the idea of moral responsibility for climate change. But before any ethical enquiry is done, one has to be clear about what's meant by climate change. The nature and reasons for climate change as revealed by scientific studies are what raise ethical enterprises and thus ought to form the foundation for any moral study accepted regarding the climate. With this idea in mind, I believe it would be prudent to start on the wisdom of climate change. It may be said that we can calculate on scientific data to help reveal at least a kindly assured way what climate change and its underpinning are. Still, matters aren't so simple. There are those who believe that climate change isn't happening. However, also its set up that the wisdom of climate change itself struggles with indeed introductory questions like how does it be and what are its causes, if the substantiation for climate change is admitted. The process of climate change has led to division of the scientific community into two groups. There are scientists who misdoubt that the climate change is passing. They've come up with claims similar as climate change is a myth and it isn't passing at all. This research will be helpful in chancing out the ethical issues in managing the climate change and our responsibility. It also discusses about the backups and challenges involved in it.

Keywords: Ethical, Responsibility, Climate, Responsibility, Scientific, Challenges, Evidence, Resources.

Introduction

On the base of the scientific substantiation presented in this section there's no mistrustfulness that human conditioning are in a major way impacting the climate. There's a multitude of substantiation that climate change is a result of the human conditioning the most prominent and batted one being the hockey stick graph. Though the hockey stick has invited a lot of review from the scientific community none cannot fully render it unwarranted and reject it. The other independent studies (besides the hockey-stick graph) also indicate the same results as that of the hockey stick graph. One cannot deny that climate change is natural, but at the same time it isn't delicate to see that climate change is largely due to human conditioning. According to the arguments handed in this section human conditioning like burning of fossil energies, cutting down of trees, overuse of the natural resources are some of the causes for the release of heat enmeshing green house feasts into the atmosphere. Scientific findings don't limit themselves to just the causes of climate change. They also indicate that adding temperatures and green house gas attention would lead to numerous changes in the Earth system which includes the retreating of ice in mountain glaciers and polar regions, increase in ocean situations, changes in ocean chemistry, and changes in the frequency and intensity of heat swells, rush events, and famines. Unless we will be apprehensive about our liabilities in managing the climate change, we won't be suitable to manage the issue and this will continuously destroy the forthcoming generations.

What is Climate Change

Generally understood climate change is a shift in the rainfall patterns of a particular place, area or the entire Earth. This change is measured by variations in choreographies connected with normal rainfall conditions, similar as temperatures, wind patterns and rush. In simple words, climate change happens when a change is recorded between the rainfall patterns of a particular region or earth at two different ages of time. Therefore, climate change refers to the variations in downfall, temperature, or wind

* Associate Professor in Geography, M.S.J. Government PG College, Bharatpur, Rajasthan, India.

patterns that are over some ages. According to scientific inquiries, climate change generally happens when commodity changes the sun's aggregate energy absorbed by the Earth's face. This also occurs when commodity alters the volume of heat expiring from the face of the Earth that escapes into the atmosphere over a period of time. The Earth is getting hotter as a result of the some feasts which absorb sun's heat. This miracle of absorbing sun's heat by some feasts is called the green house effect. The name green house effect was given to the miracle in the 1890s by a Swedish scientific experimenter Arrhenius since he was the bone who projected that this miracle worked in the same way as a glass in a green house would serve. Just as a glass traps the heat and blocks it from escaping the Earth traps the heat from sun and doesn't allow it to escape with the help of heat trapping characteristics of some green house feasts. The green house effect is a usual arrangement that controls the temperature on the Earth. Commodity that's essential to comprehend about the green house impact is that there's a fragile equilibrium of the aggregate energy that rolls in from the sun and the volume of energy that's regressed into the space. The immersion and radiation of heat by the atmosphere which is the natural green house effect, is salutary for life on Earth. However, the Earth's average face temperature would be veritably chilly, if there was no green house effect. This balance of energy keeps the Earth's climate steady so that species can live. Matters get complicated when there's an addition of further green house feasts. Green house feasts absorb the radiations coming from the sun. An adding frequency of green house feasts in the atmosphere leads to an increase in the Earth's normal temperature because the heat that should be regressed into the atmosphere gets stuck on the Earth's face. Particular feasts which beget the green house effect in the atmosphere are water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, nitrous oxide and a magnitude of artificial feasts, basically chlorofluorocarbons. All these feasts are responsible for the green house effect and they've come more abundant in recent times. When scientists express an apprehension about the green house effect, they're basically concerned about the intensification of the volume of these green house feasts. This process warms up the Earth which further causes crucial variations in its climate.

Moral Responsibility for Climate Change

The conception of moral responsibility is abecedarian to any system of ethics. This conception is perplexing and is used else in different surrounds. But generally speaking, to impute moral responsibility to someone means that she's good of praise or blame for her conduct and deletions. There are numerous proponents who have reflected on the issue of moral responsibility. In the following section I essay to bandy some views of colorful proponents on responsibility along with its nature and compass. With this we will try to arrive at a general idea about the conception of moral responsibility. The following section contains a brief figure of moral responsibility in the western philosophical tradition. Generally accounts of moral responsibility start with the conception of moral agent. This idea plays a vital part in understanding moral responsibility. The moral agent is the one who's assigned praise or blame. In other words the agent is a reality who performs an act. A vast quantum of literature on moral responsibility suggests that this moral agent can be an individual person or a group of people. Thereby, when we bandy moral responsibility, we impute it to moral agents who are either individualities or a collaborative. For case, when governments, nations, pots, brigades, and other human groups are credited moral responsibility for any unwelcome practices or results, also it's a case of collaborative responsibility. On the other hand, if an existent is held reproachable for a certain reprehensible act also it's a case of individual responsibility. Moral responsibility can change between collaborative and individual agents. In this section I'll reflect on some philosophical arguments on the assigning of moral responsibility to individualities and moral responsibility to groups independently.

Who Shall Truly Take Responsibility for Climate Change

To impute moral responsibility to persons for the damages that affect from the conduct that they neither study about nor intended in anyway is the most delicate task. As argued before utmost of the traditional ethical propositions consider responsibility in terms of the intention of individual as well as that of groups. Generally speaking, according to the formerly being normative principles of deontology, consequentialism or virtue ethics it's veritably delicate to impute responsibility to people for their consequences or motives that they didn't intend. Climate change presents to us with a situation where dangerous results live but also nothing intended those results or allowed that similar results could do. I've done a careful examination of the ways in which an individual action matters in the last para. Individual action in a collaborative detriment similar as climate change may be inappreciable but it isn't inconsequential. Individual conduct does have some dangerous consequences. The idea of having just collaborative action and no individual action to combat climate change may be looked at as a case of insincerity. This is so because the commitment in the collaborative action has to have a base in the

individual and if the existent doesn't observe the same commitments in her particular life also it's insincerity. These two arguments show that there's a part of individualities in contributing or sharing in climate change. Although what should this donation or participation be grounded on still needs to be allowed off. The below two assertions may help in showing how Sinnott- Armstrong and Baylor Johnson's views warrant nearly. To impute moral responsibility to persons for the damages that affect from the conduct that they neither study about nor intended in anyway is the most delicate task. As argued before utmost of the traditional ethical propositions consider responsibility in terms of the intention of individual as well as that of groups. Generally speaking, according to the formerly being normative principles of deontology, consequentialism or virtue ethics it's veritably delicate to impute responsibility to people for their consequences or motives that they didn't intend. Climate change presents to us with a situation where dangerous results live but also nothing intended those results or allowed that similar results could do.

Challenges in Moral Responsibility

Whether moral responsibility in climate change is credited to a collaborative or to an individual there are certain problems which would be faced because of the veritably nature of climate change. On the base of moral doctrines in western tradition, three different conditions can be brought forth which need to be fulfilled for holding individualities responsible. But when these different conditions are applied to climate change there are numerous challenges that spring up. Also, when the condition for holding groups responsible is applied to climate change, numerous difficulties come to the fore. It isn't easy to explore responsibility in climate change because the moral propositions of collaborative or individual moral responsibility might not work well to address it. So this section would show how these moral propositions and the conditions they offer for attributing individual and collaborative moral responsibility lack in responding to climate change. A person acting freely may not have been bringing about an outgrowth freely. For example in the case of a targeted military bombing the intended outgrowth is to wipe out some strategic target but along with his some civilians will also die. The death of civilians can be a provisioned or an unlooked-for result. If provisioned it can be said that the bombers killed civilians freely but it's noticed then that the intention wasn't to kill the innocent civilians. Aristotle doesn't address similar voluntary acts and neither does Watson. Climate change is more like an unlooked-for result which might do when certain other regular conditioning are performed. Virtually speaking climate change is a large scale issue and to be directly a voluntary cause to such an enormous action is delicate for an existent. Although we can say that individualities may is freely doing other conducting which lead to climate change. At the same time no person's conduct alone causes climate change. Having said that it also has to be admitted that goods of an individual action on the overall climate change cannot be ignored moreover. This leads to the question of how an individual contributes to climate change. This requires an elaborate discussion and shall be taken up in the coming chapter. So for now I move on to the alternate condition. It may feel that this account of moral responsibility is relatively useful, but the operation of this principle isn't so simple. Imagine a person who's environmentally friendly. Upon seeing a person who always drives his auto to buy his grocery which is at a walkable distance, this environmentally friendly person would condemn the action and is likely to reply with some resentment and hold that person responsible and condemn her for performing an action that contributes to climate change on Strawson's account of moral responsibility. The traditional ways of attributing responsibility by including conditions of voluntariness, intentionality and reactive stations might not work well in climate change because climate change is a different kind of problem. Climate change is relatively complex, each- pervasive and operates on a large scale. In the case of climate change there are multiple stages that come between responsibility and the agent. That's why it's delicate to impute individual responsibility in climate change through the traditional moral propositions.

The Climate Responsibility – Dimension

It cannot be denied that climate change is an action caused by numerous individualities. No single individual causes climate change alone. Groups in climate change are large in number and frequently unshaped without generally having a deliberate intention to beget climate change. Nothing intends to beget climate change designedly. The problem thus is that there's no particular systematized collaborative like a nation or a state or a group in action. It's easy to identify the consequences of climate change and to believe that numerous people from around the globe caused climate change but these are hard to jut it down on a particular systematized group which is the kind of collaborative that Gilbert mentions. Another problem is that there's no participatory intention of these groups. Climate change isn't caused by some specific group which has a particular intention to beget it. There might be commodity useful in Held's account of responsibility for climate change. This comes out easily in her shelter

example where she maintains that a arbitrary group of people are responsible to at least inform the captain. According to Held similar arbitrary collections of people can be held responsible for not taking an action that could have prevented detriment in the cases where they could have done commodity to help it. If this is applied to climate change also seeing the bad goods of climate change in front of us the responsibility should rest on the arbitrary people who should organize themselves into a group and cooperate with each other to help climate change.

Conclusion

Climate change is a complex ethical issue. Since anthropogenic climate change would affect the over mentioned four areas numerous ethical issues similar as human rights, transnational and intergenerational justice and the concern regarding non-human world come connected with it which further opens door for the challenge of moral responsibility. An examination of these ethical issues was vital to my research and therefore formed the core of chapter two. Since climate change is girdled by numerous ethical issues the question of moral responsibility came veritably applicable. When the sundries of individual or collaborative responsibility were applied to the issue of climate change it was noticed that these traditional responsibility generalities didn't work well while catching on responsibility in climate change because of its complex nature. The moral wrong of separating individual responsibility from the collaborative or a representative responsibility were apparent when inconsistency was shown in separating a collaborative action from an individual action and this inconsistency was seen to be as insincerity which indeed is a serious moral failure. The knowledge grounded ethical relativist proposition would put an ethical obligation on every existent or a collaborative to know which rights of humans cannot be violated in the light of environmentally unfriendly conduct carried out by them and thereby would make them responsible if similar rights get violated. The theoretical debate regarding responsibility in climate change is at its original stages but is likely to gain heat as further and further proponents bestow consideration to this issue. Therefore the final influence of this can be far- reaching and I hope that unborn education does more meaningful research in this area.

References

1. Basu, CR. *Business Organization and Management*, New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Education Private limited, 2010
2. Bhattacharya, S. —European Heat wave Caused 35,000 Deaths,|| *New Scientist*, October 10, 2003.
3. Climate Change – Effects on Animals Birdlife and Plants|| available from [http://www. Climate and weather net/ global warming/effects_on_animals.htm](http://www.Climateandweather.net/global_warming/effects_on_animals.htm) (accessed 21st Jan 2013)
4. Gardiner, Stephen M., —A Perfect Moral Storm: Climate Change, Intergenerational Ethics and the Problem of Moral Corruption|| *Environmental Values* 15, 2006, 397–413
5. Ghatge, Shraddha —Marathwada's Drought: How Climate Change has Destroyed Agriculture and Ruined Farmers|| *Firstpost* Apr, 19 2016
6. Ghos, Abantika. —Chikungunya, Dengue on Twin Peaks|| *The Indian Express* Updated: September 5, 2016
7. J.B. Moyle (trans.) *Justinian, Institutes*, (Oxford, 1911), 4, available from <http://amesfoundation.law.harvard.edu/digital/CJCiv/JInst.pdf> (accessed 15th May, 2016)
8. Johnson, Baylor.—Ethical Obligations in a Tragedy of the Commons,|| *Environmental Values* 12, no. 3 2003, 271–287.
9. Mohan, Vishwa and Amit Bhattacharya, —UN Panel 95% Sure Humans Causing Global Warming||, *The Times of India*, Saturday, September 28, 2013, 1.
10. Reddy, P. Parvatha. *Climate Resilient Agriculture for Ensuring Food Security*, Springer: New Delhi, 2015.
11. Tripati, A.K. C.D. Roberts, and R.A. Eagle, 2009, —Coupling of CO₂ and Ice Sheet Stability Over Major Climate Transitions of the Last 20 Million Years|| *Science* 326, 1398, 2009. DOI: 10.1126/ science.1178296.

