Alice Roberts*

Political Responsibility for Climate Change

Abstract

Global structural injustices are harms caused by structural processes, involving multiple individuals, acting across more than one state. Young develops the concept of 'political responsibility,' to allocate responsibility for structural injustice. In this paper, I am going to argue that when considering the climate crisis Young's model needs to be adapted— to have *agency* as a basis for allocating political responsibility instead of *contribution*. This is a more intuitive way to allocate responsibility for the climate crisis given its nature as a threshold problem, and the subtle structural positions occupied by the individuals involved.

Keywords

The Climate Crisis, Responsibility, Structural Injustice, Agency, Iris Marion Young

Introduction

The question of how to allocate responsibility for the climate crisis is a serious issue in environmental justice. How the concept of 'responsibility' is constructed will have a bearing on which individuals are responsible and the sort of actions they must undertake to discharge this responsibility. Most approaches to this problem consider it to be an ethical issue (Jamieson 2002; O'Neil 1992). In this paper, I will be using a political approach,[1] considering the climate crisis as a global structural injustice that certain individuals have a political responsibility to mitigate.

---

[1] A political approach is advocated by Vanderheiden (2008), among others.

* City University of New York
  Philosophy Department
  Email: alice.roberts21@gmail.com

_____

In *Responsibility for Justice*, Iris Marion Young creates a model to allocate 'political responsibility'[2] for the harms caused by the sweatshop industry. The sweatshop industry is a paradigm example of a global structural injustice; it involves the participation of a large number of dispersed individuals, many of whom do not violate legal or moral requirements, but whose actions nevertheless end up harming other individuals. In Young's model, responsible individuals are identified based on their *contribution* to the sweatshop industry.

Young then extends this model to the climate crisis, on the basis that it is also an instance of global structural injustice. While I agree that the climate crisis is an instance of global structural injustice, I will be disagreeing with Young's uncritical extension of the model she uses to allocate responsibility for the sweatshop industry to the climate crisis.

In this paper, I will argue that when considering the climate crisis, Young's model should be adapted to have *agency* (the ability a person has to change oppressive structural processes), not *contribution* (a person causing, perpetuating or reinforcing oppressive structural processes) grounding the allocation of political responsibility.[3] This paper has two main aims:

(1) To adapt Young's late work on political responsibility to apply to the climate crisis;

(2) To argue for an agency-based model of responsibility for the climate crisis using the concept of political responsibility.

First, in S1, I will present Young's concept of political responsibility and the social connection model. I will also draw attention to a principle underlying Young's social connection model, the C-H relationship, which allocates responsibility based on contribution. In S2, I will show some problems that arise with the social connection model when a more detailed analysis of social-structural positions is considered. In S3, I will propose an alternative agency-based prevention model. However, before analyzing the concept of political responsibility, it is important to note how the climate crisis differs from other types of global structural injustice.

_____

[2] Political responsibility is broadly defined by Young (2011) as forward-looking and shared by individuals, with the aim to rectify injustice. I will give a more detailed definition in Section 1.

[3] Other arguments for agency being primary include: the argument from capability (Vanderheiden 2008) the Ability to Pay Principle (Caney forthcoming).

_____

How is The Climate Crisis Unique?

Other global structural injustices, such as the sweatshop industry, are spatially targeted; individuals in the developed West have economic demands that give rise to harms to individuals in the global south, namely through the creation of sweatshops. The sweatshop industry also predominantly involves injustices arising from relationships between human agents. However, the climate crisis has markedly different features to the sweatshop industry, it is:

− Temporally targeted: injustices are directed at a future set of entitles and are caused by the actions of past and current generations, who have contributed to structural processes that involve emitting large quantities of greenhouse gasses (GHG).

− Agents-Agents+: Jamieson (2015, 24) describes the harms that arise from the climate crisis as 'vast damages to much that we care about: human lives, […] species, natural ecosystems.' This encompasses significant harm to more than just human agents (as in the sweatshop industry) meaning that harmed entities in the case of the climate crisis must be extended to encompass things like species and natural ecosystems.

− A threshold problem: it is currently very difficult to prevent, and will after a certain time be more difficult to rectify, the harms to harmed entities *qua sufferers of the climate crisis*. Empirically, this is because climate change is a threshold problem; once a certain atmospheric concentration of greenhouse-gasses has been emitted, there is nothing that can be done (considering our current technology) to reverse its effect (Jamieson 2015, 30-34).

These features make the climate crisis different from other global structural injustices and are important to consider when modeling responsibility. In the rest of this paper, I am going to argue that political responsibility should be used when allocating responsibility for the climate crisis, but that Young's specific social connection model should be adapted, based on the features of the climate crisis just outlined.

_____

S1. Contribution and the Social Connection Model

S1.1. Political Responsibility

The concept of political responsibility is used by Young to allocate responsibility for the sweatshop industry, the climate crisis, and other global structural injustices. According to Young, political responsibility has three important features. One of these is being forward-looking; political responsibility allocates duties or actions to relevant individuals to rectify an injustice (Young 2011, 93). Young intends for this to directly contrast with the predominantly backward-looking nature of moral responsibility, which seeks to allocate blame for a moral wrong. Young believes that since precise blame is so difficult to allocate in cases of global structural injustice, it should be replaced with the allocation of a responsibility to rectify the relevant injustice.

The second feature of political responsibility is that it falls on individuals. It is specifically the responsibility of formally unassociated individuals to organize to bring about change. This could involve changing one's own carbon-emitting actions while convincing others to do so too or organizing pressure groups to change company or governmental policy.

The final feature is that it is shared. Young follows Larry May's definition of shared responsibility as 'personal responsibility for outcomes or the risk of harmful outcomes, produced by a group of persons' (May, Strikwerda 1994, 34). Shared responsibility distributes through a collection of individuals in a specific way (Young 2011, 14): It is a responsibility that an individual personally bears, but which comes with the awareness that others bear it too. It involves acknowledging the collective of which one is a part and can only be discharged through collective action (Young 2011, 110).

The applicability of political responsibility to a group-action problem like the climate crisis is clear; an individual bears the responsibility to organize, to prevent the climate crisis from reaching a certain severity, with the awareness that others have this responsibility too.

S1.2. The Social Connection Model and the Liability Model

So, after we have established the concept of political responsibility, the next question is, which agents possess political responsibility? Young uses the 'social connection model' to identify these agents.

She argues that her social connection model differs in important ways from the 'liability model,' which is frequently used to allocate legal and moral responsibility (Young 2011, 96). The liability model (traditionally construed) determines responsibility for injustice along the following lines:

_____

LM: A is responsible for a harm to B iff A has harmed B on the normative standard of legal/moral responsibility.[4]

The liability model connects a 'person's deeds linearly to the harm for which we seek to assign responsibility' (Young 2011, 96). However, if the features of structural injustice mentioned previously are considered, it is clear that this way of allocating responsibility does not work. Since moral/legal wrongs are not necessary for the harms arising from global structural injustices to occur, it is possible that in certain cases the moral and legal normative standards will fail to pick out any agents at all. Similarly, the causal connection between any particular A and B is not straightforward in cases of global structural injustice and may be impossible to determine, especially in the case of climate change (Jamieson 2015, 23). When considering responsibility for global structural injustice, the liability model, therefore, does not allocate responsibility in a useful way.

For cases of global structural injustice, Young proposes the social connection model of responsibility, which is based on the normative standard of political responsibility. The social connection model sees the multiple agents contributing to certain structural processes as responsible for the agents that are harmed by these processes. Due to the conceptual tool of political responsibility, the social connection model can distribute the demands of responsibility without appealing to the notions of blame, guilt, or fault. It does not isolate perpetrators, instead, the responsibility of individual agents is to organize into groups and discharge their political responsibility through collective action (Young 2011, 95). After the allocation of responsibility, the specific actions each individual is supposed to take are shaped by Young's four parameters of agency: power, privilege, interest, and collective ability (Young 2011, 103).

S1.3. The C-H Relation

It is important to note that the focus on contribution means that the social connection model is not entirely forward-looking in approach. Although it is free of backward-looking notions of blame, it is still backward-looking insofar as it relies on causal responsibility in determining which agents to allocate political responsibility. Young states that the social connection model:

_____

[4] Here C can be an individual, corporation or nation.

_____

> Shares with the liability usage [...] a reference to causes of wrongs in the form of struc-
> tural processes [...] that individuals bear responsibility for structural injustice because
> they contribute by their actions to the processes (Young 2001, 105).

According to the social connection model, the attribution of political respon-
sibility to an agent is grounded in that agent's past contribution to structural
processes. Specifically, Young sees the two groups of agents implicated in
global structural injustice as standing in a contributor-harm relation (Young
2011, 53):

> *C-H Relation*: Where H are agents harmed, and C are unassociated individual agents
> who contribute to the structural processes that give rise to harms.

However, Young is vague about what counts as a contribution (Barry,
Ferracioli 2013, 253).[5] She describes contribution as causing harm 'indi-
rectly, collectively, and cumulatively through the production of structural
constraints on the actions of many and privileged opportunities for some.'
Young (2011, 97, 125) further states that all contributors should have the
same amount of responsibility and should not try to divide and measure it.

Considering this, the social connection model can be formalized as fol-
lows:

> Social Connection Model: iff 1) an injustice inflicted on A & A_1 & ... & A_n is an outcome
> of structural processes and 2) B & B_1 & ... & B_n contribute by their actions to structural
> processes that give rise to this injustice, then agents A & A_1 & ... & A_n have a political
> responsibility to transform structural processes in order to rectify the injustice in-
> flicted on B & B_1 & ... & B_n.[6]

In the next section, I am going to argue that some issues arise from this
grounding in contribution which makes the social connection model unsuit-
able to allocate responsibility for the climate crisis.

S2. Issues with the Social Connection Model

Three problems arise with Young's social connection model: some individu-
als in more subtle social-structural positions[7] are not taken into account,
some individuals who intuitively seem to have political responsibility are not

_____

[5] Also referred to as 'participation' (Young 2011, 106), 'passive support' (Young 2011,
81, 87) or 'connection' (Young 2011,106-107).

[6] Here all C and H are individuals.

[7] Schiff (2013) criticises Young's account of power as 'thin and instrumental' for not
considering the complex ways that different types of power (and agency) can arise from
structural processes.

_____

allocated political responsibility, and some individuals are allocated political responsibility that is almost impossible to discharge. In the next sub-section, I will focus on the first problem, and employ Haslanger's discussion of social structures to bring out some of the subtleties in an individual's position that challenge the C-H Relation.

S2.1. Haslanger's Analysis of Social Structures

Haslanger (2015, 415) describes social structures as having two dimensions: schemas and resources. Schemas are virtual patterns of thought and behavior that provide scripts and constraints for agents in their interactions with each other and their environment. Resources are defined as the material objects, actions, and knowledge that actualize these schemas and give them a material dimension.

Young (2011, 56) describes the tendency of individuals to 'reify' structural processes; to see them as unchangeable and objective. Haslanger (2015, 3) provides a more detailed account of how this comes about, through the ability of schemas and resources to reinforce each other and the tendency for individuals to reproduce these reinforced structures. Her analysis also draws attention to an important difference between contributors and harmed-contributors. Consider the following scenario:

> Two island nations, called Helios and Ogygia, rely heavily on fossil fuels. Their industries and infrastructure are set up to use coal and crude oil. Both have been emitting similar amount of GHGs for a similar period of time. Grocery shops sell food in plastic bags, electricity is produced in coal-fired plants, petrol cars are common, and there are only minimal recycling policies in place. Most residents of Helios and Ogygia use fossil fuels, do not recycle, and consider this to be normal.
>
> Since neither are large nations, Helios and Ogygia do not make up a significant portion of global emissions. They are also both middling in terms of per-capita emissions when compared to other nations.
>
> For the past twenty years, Helios has been experiencing severe hurricanes and tornadoes. As a result, its income from tourism and its crop yields have radically decreased, and Helios is having trouble remaining economically afloat. There is significant evidence that the hurricanes and tornadoes are due to human-induced climate change. Meanwhile, Ogygia, has a comfortable, stable climate. Crops grow well, it gets a lot of income from tourism, and its economy is booming.

In the above example, the resources that residents of Helios and Ogygia have access to, like petrol cars and plastic bags, reinforce the schemas that normalize GHG emitting behavior. The schemas involved are those of aspiring to

_____

high living standards and economic progress/profit, regardless of the environmental cost. The residents of Helios and Ogygia themselves reproduce these schema-resource structures through their everyday actions, for example basing choices on what is easy, profitable, or efficient, reifying the structural process and making the emission of GHGs appear normal and unchangeable.

However, despite both contributing to GHG emissions, there are significant differences between residents of Helios and residents of Ogygia. Helios is a harmed-contributor, while Ogygia is an unharmed-contributor. This results in the two islands having different policies available to them; Ogygia can use its economic wealth to shift its industries to rely on renewable fuel, while Helios cannot. Young's allocation of responsibility, purely based on contribution, fails to make this subtle distinction between Ogygia as a contributor and Helios as a harmed-contributor.

In the next sub-section, I will examine three other examples that highlight similar issues in more detail. I will argue that the social connection model is not subtle enough to take into account the specific social-structural positions of agents, fails to attribute responsibility in certain circumstances when it should and attributes responsibility that is impossible to discharge.

S2.2. Considering Agents

1. Innocent, moderately powerful agents

Some individuals contribute only a negligible amount to the global structural processes that give rise to climate change, but for certain reasons have moderate levels of agency. Currently, rural Fijians fit this description.

As a country, in combination with many others, Fiji makes up a vanishingly small amount of emissions.[8] Young does not give clear conditions for what counts as enough of a 'contribution' to structural processes to give rise to responsibility. But if viewed in these terms, based on their almost non-existent emissions, it is unlikely that individual Fijian's would be considered contributors (Moore 2013, 37). Nevertheless, the Fijian government has used the agency they have to open Fiji's borders to members of other islands if their homes are destroyed by rising sea levels, something which no other country has done (Weiss 2015).

_____

[8] Fiji emitted 2.9MT in 2010. The USA emitted 6.1GT. There is an even larger difference between their cumulative historical emissions. See: https://www.climatewatch data.org.

_____

Although not as powerful as larger countries, in virtue of their proximity to these islands, Fiji can be seen as having moderate power in preventing an unjust state of affairs (individuals on sinking islands becoming stateless).

Consider the following case: a family that lives in a rural part of the island who are not currently under the poverty line. As a result of the Fijian policy to take in refugees from other Islands that are sinking, they allow a person from another island to live on or near their land. This involves the rural family and wider community working together to re-structure the allocation of land in their area of the island. This would be an instance of the family taking political responsibility due to their moderate amount of agency (being close to the sinking islands, having the means to take on an extra person, the inaction of other states), despite hardly contributing to structural processes.

It intuitively seems like the Fijian family has a political responsibility to take on the extra person or to organize with other members of the community to make space for another person. A model grounded in agency would allocate political responsibility to the family/community, while one grounded in the *C-H Relation* would not.

One possibility for the Social Connection Model is to say that the rural Fijians are in fact contributors, despite their minimal emissions, and therefore allocate responsibility to them. However, if extended to all minimal pollutants like the rural Fijians, the *C-H Relation* would allocate the same level of responsibility to almost everyone on earth (since individual pollutants do not get much lower than the Fijians), as Young defines responsibility as something that should be divided equally between all contributors. This is too wide and coarse-grained of an allocation of responsibility to be useful.

2. Almost innocent, powerful agents

Some individuals could have a lot of power to mitigate the climate crisis without being significant contributors. Consider a scientist who for her whole life has been careful to not let her carbon footprint go over the level that is required to be a contributor to climate change. She runs a lab in New Zealand (a low per-capita pollutant) that has been similarly careful. She and her scientific community have discovered a chemical synthesis that will significantly help mitigate current emissions.

Intuitively, having sufficient agency seems to be enough to give these scientists in New Zealand a responsibility to use their research and organize to help mitigate the climate crisis despite their lower contribution.

_____

According to Young's social connection model, which is grounded in the *C-H Relation*, the scientists would not have a political responsibility to mitigate the climate crisis, as they have not really contributed. However, if political responsibility were grounded in agency, political responsibility would be allocated to these individuals. The allocation grounded in agency seems much more intuitive, and in-keeping with the conceptual focus that political responsibility has on rectification.

Indeed, Young's grounding of political responsibility in contribution seems like an appeal to a principle of fairness: that it would be unfair for a collection of individuals to bear the burden of mitigating climate change if they have not contributed to it. However, when the climate crisis is considered, the principle of fairness is outweighed by other concerns.

Karenin (2014, 607) makes a useful distinction between an individual's responsibility to their co-responsibility bearers, and to the third party that is owed responsibility. In the case of the climate crisis, the moral weight of the potential harms to the third party (permanent harms to all life on earth) in this case outweigh the moral weight of fairness between countries and organizations.

To emphasize this point about fairness, a parallel can be drawn between the climate crisis and a large meteor strike. Both will irreversibly change the climate (although the meteor is likely to have added damage to a particular area). In the case of the meteor strike, it seems clear that nations and organizations have got their values wrong if they argue about fairness or equal distribution in mitigating or preventing the meteor strike. The countries with the ability to do so have a responsibility to prevent the meteor strike and take up the slack if other countries default. The climate crisis is occurring on a much slower scale; however, the damages are similar in many ways, and the same principles of agency as primary should be employed.

3. Not so innocent, powerless agents

Agents in this group would be people living under the poverty line in the US. They are likely to be fairly significant polluters, using inefficient central heating, plastic, maybe an old petrol car. However, it doesn't seem like responsibility should fall on them in virtue of their contribution alone, as they are constrained by poverty.

Recall Young's (2011, 125) description of political responsibility as 'something all contributors bear and should not try to divide and measure.' Using the *C-H Relation*, impoverished agents would be allocated the same

_____

amount of political responsibility as other more able agents. However, due to their lack of agency, they will be far less able to use the four parameters of agency, (power, privilege, interest, or collective ability) to discharge this responsibility. This is also a problem based on the values built into Young's account. In Young's account, after the allocation of political responsibility based on contribution, the four parameters of agency (mentioned in Section 1) are used to allocate the actions required of an individual. However, enabling action and rectification of injustice is what political responsibility itself, by definition, wants to do. It seems like the political responsibility determined by contribution is not doing much here, even by the standard of Young's account itself.

This identifies the third problem with the *C-H Relation*; the 'not so innocent, powerless agents' will be allocated political responsibility that is almost impossible to discharge. Furthermore, when the climate crisis is considered in general, there will be increasingly large numbers of individuals in this position in the future. Before a certain point in time, most or some agents are only contributors to the climate crisis, while after a certain point in time all agents will be both harmed and contributors to that very harm. This leads to an impasse in terms of mitigating the climate crisis: as harmed-contributors tend to have less agency, it would be even more difficult for them to rectify or prevent further harms from happening to them.[9] If these contributors are allocated responsibility, as they would be in Young's model, their responsibility would also be impossible to discharge. If responsibility was allocated to individuals based on agency rather than contribution, this problem could be avoided.

S3. Agency and the Prevention Model

As previously stated, there are reasons to move away from the *C-H Relationship* when considering responsibility for the climate crisis. Firstly, having contribution as a basis does not distinguish between contributors and harmed-contributors. It also fails to allocate responsibility to individuals who intuitively seem to have responsibility, and it can lead to responsibility that is impossible to discharge. In this section, I will attempt to give a positive account of political responsibility allocated based on agency. First, I will say some more about the position of agency within social structures.

_____

[9] This is accentuated by the fact that climate change is a threshold problem.

_____

S3.1. More on Agency within Structures

Agency and responsibility are closely linked concepts. Agency can be further analyzed into internal and external agency, with external agency being the physical actions one is capable of doing, and internal agency being the courses of action of one is capable of realistically envisaging oneself doing. Resources place constraints on external agency while schemas place constraints on internal agency. Different structural injustices will place constraints on external and internal agency to differing extents. However, within a structure's tendency to reproduce there is also some potential to use agency to bring about change. Sewell (1992, 4) states:

> If enough people or even a few people who are powerful enough act in innovative ways, their action may have the consequence of transforming the very structures that gave them the capacity to act.

This has clear consequences for an account of responsibility. Indeed, the combination of agency and structural injustice can be seen as what gives rise to responsibility. Agency and responsibility also work to reinforce each other. A model of responsibility can increase an individual's internal agency, as it gives a concrete direction in which they can channel their agency. Once this more concrete conceptual direction is established, it could also make an individual aware of specific aspects of their external agency. For instance, going back to the two islands mentioned previously, Ogygia and Helios, awareness of responsibility may make them aware of their ability to organize with others—residents of Ogygia could start a petition to prevent the use of plastic bags.

S3.2. The A-H Relation

Agency is a good candidate for allocating political responsibility, as it has a more immediate relation to an individual's ability to act to change processes that give rise to structural injustice.[10] Similarly, the aspect of Young's political responsibility as the responsibility to rectify injustice is also closely linked to agency, as agency is more important than contribution in determining a person's ability to rectify injustice.

Therefore, the *A-H Relation* is a better distinction to use when allocating political responsibility:

_____

[10] Scheffler (2003) endorses an account of responsibility based on individual agency.

_____

> *A-H Relation:* Where H are the agents harmed, and A are the unassociated individual agents who possess the relevant agency to transform structural processes.

If agency were the grounds for political responsibility, a large amount of political responsibility would be allocated to the scientists in New Zealand, some would be allocated to the Fijian family, and far less would be allocated to impoverished Americans. These three cases suggest that agency should be the primary consideration when allocating political responsibility. While in many cases of structural injustice contribution and agency will overlap, these three groups of agents demonstrate that this is not always the case. Therefore, when speaking about cases of global structural injustice like the climate crisis, a better way of grounding responsibility is the *A-H Relation*. Next, I am going to propose a specific model that applies the *A-H Relation*.

S3.3. The Prevention Model

> PM: iff 1) an unjust state of affairs S is an outcome of structural processes and 2) A v A v ... v A_n could contribute to the prevention of S and 3) this contribution to the prevention of S does not involve excessive cost to any particular A, then agents A v A_1 v ... v A_n have a political responsibility to transform structural processes in order to prevent unjust state of affairs S.

By using political responsibility as a normative framework, this model still possesses three essential features of political responsibility: being forward-looking, held by an individual, and shared. The focus on 'prevention' (as opposed to rectification in Young's account) intends to be a focus on a future state of affairs. This avoids some of the issues that come with ascribing responsibilities to future agents. A 'state of affairs' includes species and ecosystems, which is relevant to the harms given rise to by the climate crisis. It is also more in line with how international climate crisis policy is adopted. Due to recent improvements in climate modeling, there is a much clearer sense of the harm that we are responsible to prevent. For instance, the focus of the Paris Agreement was to prevent a rise in temperature above 2°C (essentially to prevent a certain state of affairs). Lastly, focus on a state of affairs allows for political responsibility with a single aim, which would help enable agency.

'Excessive cost' is a limiting factor on an agent's responsibility to contribute to prevention. This takes into account more subtle features of an individual's situation and type of agency, as it varies from agent to agent what

_____

would count as excessive cost.[11] It is also an empirical question to a certain extent. For instance, the Fijian family should not take an extra member, or re-organize their land to do so, if it would push them below the poverty line.

While the social connection model would attribute political responsibility in line with the *C-H Relation* in the three cases above, the prevention model would attribute political responsibility in line with the *A-H Relation*. The latter attribution is favorable because it offers more intuitive attributions of political responsibility in the first two cases and it does not allocate political responsibility that is almost impossible to discharge in the third case.

As a final note, with Haslanger and Sewell's account of structure in mind, a more detailed specification of political responsibility for the climate crisis can be given. The specific political responsibility of many individuals (who do not have sympathetic governments like Fiji) is to organize to influence governments and corporations to transform resources. This would involve exercising external agency.

Many individuals who continue to reproduce the structural processes that give rise to the climate crisis already have internal agency: they are aware of the fact that the climate crisis is occurring and have some awareness of the economic-progress and high-standard-of-living schemas that guide this, even if they would not articulate it in these terms.[12] The problem is therefore more likely to be located in the resource dimension; the fact that the resources to act in ways that do not reproduce these structures are unavailable. This suggests that Young's second type of political responsibility, to organize to influence government and corporate policy is the more pressing aspect of political responsibility to be taken up. I have argued that this specific political responsibility should be allocated to individual agents based on their degree of agency.

A purely forward-looking model of responsibility, such as the prevention model is controversial for not acknowledging climate debt. However, due to the climate crisis being a threshold problem, allocating responsibility based on agency to prevent a certain state of affairs perhaps outweighs these considerations (Pickering, Barry 2012, 667).

_____

[11] The idea of excessive cost as a limiting factor is taken from Jameson's (2015, 38) 'Intervention Model.'

[12] For instance, using the UK as a case study: 95% of adults in the UK think that the climate crisis is at least partly due to human activity. 35% think it is mainly due to human activity (Phillips *et.al.* 2018).

_____

Conclusion

The framework of global structural injustice is particularly useful for analyzing the climate crisis. Young's concept of political responsibility is more appropriate to the specific features of structural injustice than other concepts of responsibility. However, Young's grounding of political responsibility in the *C-H Relation* runs into problems when more subtly implicated agents are considered. This is in turn a problem for her social connection model. As a result, in the case of the climate crisis, the *A-H Relation* and PM are a better way to allocate responsibility. This is because grounding political responsibility in the *A-H Relation* takes into account the subtleties of the position of an individual in the structural processes that give rise to the climate crisis.

Bibliography

1. Arendt Hannah (1994), *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, New York: Penguin.
2. Barry Christian and Ferracioli Laura (2013), "Young on Responsibility and Structural Injustice", *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 32, pp. 247-257.
3. Caney Simon (forthcoming), "Distributive Justice and Climate Change", [in:] S. Olsaretti (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Distributive Justice*.
4. Cudd Anne E. (2006), *Analysing Oppression*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Climate Watch: "Fiji, U.S. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, 2018", [online] https://www.climatewatchdata.org [accessed: 12.03.2019].
6. Fricker Miranda (2007), *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Haslanger Sally (2012), *Resisting Reality: Social Construction and Social Critique*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Haslanger Sally (2015), "Distinguished Lecture: Social structure, narrative and explanation", *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 45, 1, pp. 1-15.
9. Jamieson Dale (2015), "Responsibility and The Climate Crisis", *Global Justice: Theory Practice Rhetoric*, 8, 2, pp. 23-42.
10. Karnein Anja (2014), "Putting Fairness in its Place: Why There is a Duty To Take Up The Slack", *The Journal Of Philosophy*, 11, pp. 593-607.
11. Levy Marc (2014), "Trends in Climate Stress: Implications for Instability over the Coming Decade", Paper prepared for Political Instability Task Force conference, "Over the Horizon".
12. Moore Margaret (2013), "Global Justice and the Connection Theory of Responsibility", [in:] M. Johnson (ed.), *Political Responsibility Refocused*, Toronto: UTP, pp. 21-41.
13. May Larry and Strikwerda Robert (1994), "Men in Groups: Collective Responsibility for Rape", *Hypatia*, 9, 2, pp. 134-151.

_____

14. Meyer Lukas H. and Roser Dominic (2010), "Climate Justice and Historical Emissions", *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 13, 1, pp. 229-253.

15. Okin Susan Moller (1989), *Justice, Gender and the Family*, New York: Basic Books.

16. Pickering Jonathan and Barry Christian (2012), "On the concept of climate debt: its moral and political value", *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 5, pp. 667-685.

17. Phillips D. Curtice *et al.* (2018), "The climate crisis: Social divisions in beliefs and behavior", *British Social Attitudes. The 35th Report, London: The National Centre for Social Research*, [online:] http://www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/media/39251/bsa35_climate_change.pdf [accessed: 12.03.2019]

18. Scheffler Samuel (2003), *Boundaries and Allegiances: Problems of Justice and Responsibility in Liberal Thought*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

19. Schiff J.L. (2013), "Power and Responsibility", [in:] M. Johnson (ed.), *Political Responsibility Refocused*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp.42-62.

20. Sewell William H. (1992), "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation", *American Journal of Sociology*, 1, pp. 1-29.

21. Singer Peter (1972), "Famine, Affluence, and Morality", *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 3, pp. 229–43.

22. Strawson Peter F. (1962), 'Freedom and Resentment', [in:] G. Watson (ed.), *Proceedings of the British Academy: Volume 48*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-25.

23. Vanderheiden Steve (2008), "Equity, Responsibility, and Climate Change Mitigation", [in:] *Atmospheric Justice: A Political Theory of Climate Change*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 222-258.

24. Weiss Kenneth R. (2015), "The Making of a Climate Refugee", *Foreign Policy*, [online:] https://foreignpolicy.com/2015/01/28/the-making-of-a-climate-refugee-kiribati-tarawa-teitiota/ [accessed: 12.03.2019].

25. Williams Bernard (1997), "Moral Responsibility and Political Freedom", *Cambridge Law Journal*, 56, pp. 96-102.

26. Young Iris Marion (2011), *Responsibility for Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

27. Young Iris Marion (2003), "Political Responsibility and Structural Injustice", *Lindley Lecture,* University of Kansas: University of Kansas Press.