

Working Paper

on

**Anthropology of Future Global Politics of Climate Change**<sup>1</sup>

**1. Introduction: -**

The climate change is unequivocal truth and one of the major issues in the contemporary global politics of the 21st century. The global warming or climate change is directly or indirectly attributed to an anthropogenic activities, and no longer remains as a myth forever because it have been scientifically proved by leading scientists, climatologists, intellectuals in their various reports, including the recent report of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) justifies that climate change is the consequence of human interference with the ecosystem. The extreme rise of temperature, terrific accumulation of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) in atmosphere, depletion of Ozone layer, greenhouse effect, extensive deforestations, massive melting of icecap in the polar regions of Antarctic of South Pole and across the countries of Northern Hemisphere, the change in precipitation patterns, extreme weathers like drought, blizzard, snowfall and hurricanes are some of the causes or indicators of the climate change or global warming. However, it is the utmost important requisite to understand what is meant by climate change, or change in ecosystem, environmental degradation or global warming. There are a number of definitions and concepts given by the different environmental scholars, climatologists, academicians, and intellectuals. But, the following definition appears to be aptly and lucidly articulates the meaning of climate change. Climate change has defined by the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) as “a change of climate that is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity, that alters the composition of the global atmosphere, and that is in addition to natural climate variability over comparable time periods”. However, according to the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate

---

<sup>1</sup>. Mr. Sidhananda Pradhan, PhD Research Scholar at American Studies Programme, Center for Canadian, US and Latin American Studies, School of International Studies (SIS), Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi- 110067. Email-siddhujnu@gmail.com., Mobile- +918826259692, +919968508518.

Change (IPCC), climate change broadly implies “any change in climate over time, whether due to natural variability or as a result of human activity”.

The genesis of modern climate change movement has been quietly undercurrent since the publication of phenomenally seminal work of Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* in 1962, which raised the concerns of widespread use of pesticides and environmental pollutions. As a result of Industrial Revolution and scientific & technological innovations, men-made machine’s brazen exploitative imperialism over the nature has magnified the scale of impacts of global warming or climate change in the life of flora and fauna across the globe. The publication of “The Tragedy of the Commons” (1968) by Garrett Hardin has profound impacts on the climate change studies and environmental related works across the globe. The *Brundtland Report* (1987) on sustainable development negates the human beings’ habituated attitude of mindless exploitations of natural resources and proposed for alternative mechanisms for imminent human actions to maintain equilibrium between men and nature, an idea that was germinated during the Earth Summit of Stockholm in 1972. The Rio Summit of UN Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 reiterated and emphasized to prevent this attitude of dangerous anthropogenic interference with climate system. The major question arises that, why and how politics of climate change come into play an enormously role among the countries either it may be developed, developing or under developed one across the world? The politics of climate change is significant; because, it is the common of problem having common interest of the world and needs a strong conviction for collective actions of nations to solve the menace. The global politics of climate change has surfaced right from the issue of equitable distribution of limited resources and opportunities, sharing the responsibilities and burden of global pollutions or emissions among the nations. In one side of the globe, the industrial or developed countries are mindlessly exploiting nature to fulfill their greed, and polluting environment for centuries; on other side of earth, the people are dying like insects without getting their basic needs. The developing or poor countries, which has been in the state of chronic poverty, hunger and social or economic crisis for centuries and just started ameliorating the socio-economic conditions of its people. In this complex scenario, the significant issue or question is how to bring equilibrium between the competing interests of countries that comprises “have” and “have not” to address the multifaceted problem of the

world? And why do the “have not” countries which are just started developing and many of them are under developed, or remain in poverty for generations would take ‘risk or burden’ of responsibility of industrial developed countries’ centuries renege environmental pollutions or emissions? This intertwined circumstances germinated the enormous debate and an issue of “equity” in the various international negotiations of climate change to tackle the global environmental crisis. Due to the historical role of polluting the earth since the Industrial Revolution, the developed countries are compelled to take actions for reduction of emissions of Green House Gases (GHG). So, the concept of “common but differentiated responsibilities” came in the Conference of the Parties (COP1) of Berlin Mandate. But, the United States of America (USA) which is the only country in world has failed to fulfill the promise or obligation of this mandate, demanding ‘meaningful participation’ of developing countries. The US has been alleging that this “common but differentiated responsibilities” mechanism has discriminatory in nature because it exempted to some of the developing countries which are considered as the major environmental polluters in the contemporary world like China and India.

This paper intended to analyze and discuss on following major questions: - what would be the anthropological nature of future global politics of climate change? Why the developed countries led by the US has created huge new market or business platform (which values more than \$6 trillion dollar market that had never ever existed in human history(John Kerry, 2013)) in the third world countries in the name of carbon mitigation or sequestration, clean technology transfer, renewable energy or innovative technology? Is it to sustain their economy or promote and protect national interest or maintain their crony capitalism and imperial status quo? Or really they do concerns to address the complex problem like global climate change? What would be the future anthropology of the climate change negotiations mechanism and international agreements in the ever changing world politics?

## **2. The Kyoto Protocol and Climate Change Regime**

In order to understand the anthropology of future global politics of climate change, it’s essential to know the important of historical background, especially the formidable regulations which are

now reigning the international climate change arena. The most pragmatic and legally driven international climate change regulation as of now is the Kyoto Protocol. Therefore, it better to discuss and understand briefly about the Kyoto Protocol as follows before proceeding to main area of analysis and debate.

The Kyoto Protocol negotiated in 1997 and entered into force in the year 2005 which has four main Provisions in Kyoto Protocol: firstly, that sets quantitative targets for industrialized countries for 2008-2012 and the agreement also targets cap of aggregate 5 per cent below 1990 emissions. Secondly, countries have discretion for domestic policies. Thirdly, there are provisions for international emission trading. Finally, the Clean Development Mechanism which is project based trades system. The Kyoto Protocol is a legal binding mechanism of UNFCCC that sets a legal binding target for 37 developed or industrialized countries and European Union (EU) for reduction of Green House Gases (GHG) emissions. The Kyoto Protocol supposed to be expired in 2012 and but it was extended till 2020 by the Doha Summit of COP18th talks, that designed a new binding mechanism which is essential for GHG emission reduction. The Doha Summit legally compelled for the first time to industrial nations to compensate poor countries for losses due to climate change impacts. The Kyoto Protocol considered as the main achievement of the global climate change negotiations, still the U.S. rejected it and the only country in the world which has not been signed yet, because the US considered that the Protocol didn't impose any legal binding commitments from the developing countries like China and India. For several years, the U.S. has been at odds with the Kyoto countries in its climate policy position. The U.S. reluctance to endorse the Kyoto approach has been one main cause of the slow progress in international climate negotiations since the U.S. withdrew from the Kyoto process in 2001. The U.S. opposition to the Kyoto approach seemed to reach a climax when the U.S., together with Australia, was instrumental in setting up the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate (APP) in 2005-an approach some observers viewed as a main alternative and competitor to the Kyoto process (Skodvin and Andresen: 2009). The Kyoto Protocol like international regime aimed to address crisis of climate change, and also must solve problems of participation, effectiveness, and compliance of all the nations including the US.

## **2. (A) The Outcome of Kyoto Protocol**

The opinions in favour of Kyoto Protocol mechanism are as follows. It is based on firstly; Market Mechanism- the market based approach is potentially cost-effective, flexibility for the nations to comply with its commitments and obligations. Secondly, on the question of “Fairness” and “Equity”, it focuses on the wealthiest industrial developed countries which are responsible for current GHG emission concentrations in atmosphere. These are some of the mechanisms that are considered as strengths of Kyoto Protocol and have been implemented. Nevertheless, there are many lacunas for which it has been criticized and evaded by some countries. Some of the major weaknesses of Kyoto Protocol are as follows: some of the largest cumulative emitters of the world are not constrained and obligated to comply with protocol mechanism. The Major and largest emitter or polluter in the world, the US has not ratified it yet. The Potential for emission leakage drives up costs, and pushes developing countries on to more carbon-intensive growth. It is the UN Process and under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The complementary processes are big economies like US has to play a major role lead by its President. The Group of Eight (G8) + 5 Gleneagles Process is as very important as G8 and G20 Hokkaido talks. The post- Kyoto Protocol global agreement offers variety of opportunities and visions for world leaders of climate talks.

## **3. Future Politics of Climate Change Mechanism**

The anthropology of future global politics of climate change is mostly determined by the domestic political behavior and international mood of vicinity absolutely driven by domestic politics. The domestic politics of particular country means, its political system, culture, values, tradition and history. And the role of domestic actors and the interest groups, and their relationships with other institutions plays very significant role in this context. The assumption and perspective would be that in the process of deciding on national policy and climate change negotiation positions, policymakers have to take into account and weigh the considerations of interested domestic political actors. The domestic political debate among actors and groups both inside and outside the government influences climate change policy, especially since the issue

has domestic consequences and concerns significant for domestic political interests. The assumption is that understanding domestic politics: the distribution of power and influence among domestic actors, as well as their preferences is critical for understanding climate change policymaking. Two main sets of assumptions are drawn, allowing a focused analysis of their respective explanatory power: 1) public demand and support for climate change policy influences the policy process; and 2) the governmental supply of policy alternatives influences the policy process.

In the democratic or pluralist societies, people expect that politicians and government agencies to be concerned with public opinion regarding policy issues they face, including the case of global warming. The level of knowledge and interest about climate change in different groups of the society plays crucial a role, specifically with regard to the willingness of people to make economic welfare or sacrifices to achieve a better environment and avoid the potential dangers of global warming.

The domestic politics is very important for any particular country, which also comprises public demand and support that determines how proactive climate change policy of a country. The country must show strong public pressure to employ proactive climate policy and be characterized by the unambiguous presence of the following three features: high levels of public concern about global warming, a low degree of special interest lobbying, and strong Environmental Non-Governmental Organization (ENGO) activism with actual influence on government policy positions. This type orientation and attitude would lead to a very high level of proactive climate change policy.

The general public concern about the degradation of the environmental condition of the country or any irreversible damages must be taken into account by the policymakers and weighted against the concern of domestic actors who would suffer from heavy costs of GHG mitigation measures. The degree of pressure from proactive versus reactive interest groups in society would determine what politicians perceive to be the most pressing issues. But countering or more likely

combined with such pressure is the relatively more powerful and influential actors, more than that, economically strong actors tend to have more influence on the policymaking process than merely pressure groups. So, even if a government would want to implement for instance a comprehensive climate policy strategy, it may be unable to go through with its plans because of domestic, socio-political and economic constraints.

The flexibility mechanisms carry the message that their use must be supplemental to domestic actions. This has led to the open debates on interpretations of these supplementary provisions. The final declaration of the Bonn Agreement, reaffirmed in the Marrakech Accords, is that “domestic action shall thus constitute a significant element of the effort made by each Party included in Annex 1 to meet its quantified GHG emission limitation and reduction commitments.” This indicates that a domestic climate politics has an important role to play in the countries’ GHG emissions commitments to mitigate climate change (Assunção and Zhang: 2002).

In a passionate *Rolling Stone* article, environmental champion Al Gore criticised the US climate policies for failing to demonstrate the “magnitude of the climate crisis” to the American people and for inaction nationally in Congress, internationally in the UNFCCC process, and in combating scientific naysayers in the media (Bahouth: 2011). According to Mr. Gore, “We are destroying the climate balance that is essential to the survival of our civilization. This is not a distant or abstract threat; it is happening now. The United States is the only nation that can rally a global effort to save our future. And the president is the only person who can rally the United States” (Gore: 2011). The president of the Pew Center on Global Climate Change, Eileen Claussen says Congress might pass U.S. climate legislation, and stresses the importance of U.S. domestic policy for making progress on global climate talks at Copenhagen in December 2009. “Everything globally is dependent upon the U.S. domestic legislation before all the other pieces can fall into place, which might take a considerable amount of time. But until you at least get this, it's not clear that you can get any of the other pieces.” The final and major significant stake lies with the domestic action of a country to climate change mitigation or reduction, both at domestic as well as the international level. For example:- with reference to the U.S’ policy on

climate change, Johnson mentioned the significance of domestic politics that “not to beat a dead horse, but when it comes to tackling climate change, why is one country’s domestic politics acted as an obstacle” (Johnson: 2009). The argument of big issues as such as climate change and the future energy mix have to enjoy some measure of popular support at domestic before being codified at global summits. Take this typical pronouncement about climate change with regarding to the importance of domestic politics:

“We have to take up bold new responsibilities that we have evaded so far. But if we want durable political consensus, then it has to be rooted in domestic legislation and not in an international agreement”.

That’s the India’s environment minister Jairam Ramesh’ statement and not the President of the United States of America as says by Jonson. One can assume the importance of domestic politics as explained in *The Washington Post*: “The cuts would be a national goal; they would be neither an internationally binding commitment nor open to international verification. The U.S. domestic proposals for curbing greenhouse-gas emissions fall well short of what some scientists and lots of environmentalists are urging. Still, politics remains the art of the possible (Johnson: 2009).

#### **4. Pandora’s Box and Future Global Politics of Climate Change**

Greek mythology is always fascinates, the story of ‘Pandora’s Box’ is one of them. The main theme of the story is fortunately synchronously with the context of present global climate change crisis. According to Greek mythology, Pandora was the first woman on earth created by the Greek Gods. She was stunning and she was created by Zeus to take revenge on the mankind. As a wedding gift a beautiful box was given to Pandora by the Gods and instructing her never to open it. However, unrestricted inquisitive arises, after pondering over it; finally Pandora does open the box. Result of it was releasing disease, despair, greed, malice, jealousy, pains, old age, hatred, violence, sufferings, war, death and all other evils, vices and all the misdeeds mankind know in the world. Pandora shocked and felt guilty, had closed the box as soon as possible to

ensure nothing else came out of that box to destroy the world. But, one gift remains inside the box, that's the 'gift of hope', while Pandora closes the box. Zeus wanted Pandora to open this box, so she could bring sufferings into this world.

It is said that the moral of this story explains the world we live in today, the world where we are consumed by jealousy, anger, selfishness, hatred, greed, violence, war and many more. However, Greek myth story also suggests that, while the box was closed and still something was left there, and that was the gift of *Hope*. Greek myths never explained further as to why hope was left in the box, if hope should be taken in absolute sense or narrow sense. There may be N-number of interpretations of this story. Archaic and classic Greek literature went further to explain the concept of hope. One thing that came out of the mythography's message was that 'hope' was not gone. 'Hope' was inside that box, intact, to ensure that mankind has the ability to live through all the odds that life has stored in the world.

In congruence with the proposition of the "Pandora's Box's" implication on the contemporary problem of climate change, urgently required to address, instead of allegation or buck passing responsibility on the part of some countries, saying it is costly affair, big or complex problem, and harmful; and let it be other take action is suicidal attitude. However, according to Paul G. Harris, "the number of actors is not the end of it; the U.S. Constitution created a contentious, multi-branch government that does not resolve issues quickly, smoothly or easily. This complex democratic system is compounded by the number and complexity of the problems themselves. Thus, foreign policy on climate change that emanates from Washington is almost inevitably unsatisfactory to all those involved" (Harris, 2001:35). Thomas L. Friedman, in a provocative and genuinely innovatively argues that there are two biggest challenge in present world and particularly the US faces, one is the global environmental crisis and another is the American's contemporary scenario in the post 9/11 era. He posed with great questions linking to address these problems, such as 'where we stand now, and shows us how the solutions to these two big problems are interconnected with how we can restore the world and revise American at the same time'. He lucidly explained that how climate change or global warming occurred by the

remittance of globalization process resulting an earth 'hot, flat, and crowded' and cautioned for immediate action to address the menace by the seer commitment and leadership of the United States of America (Friedman: 2008). Much like the sins in Pandora's Box, once carbon dioxide is out, it's not going away anytime soon. And it has real and quantifiable impacts. "The climate change that is taking place because of increases in carbon dioxide concentration is largely irreversible for 1,000 years after emissions stop" said Susan Solomon, of the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (USNOAA). Research report of the US National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration says that "to substantial and irreversible decreases in rainfall in some areas and "unavoidable inundation of many small islands and low-lying coastal areas". Solomon of the USNOAA reveals that, "It has long been known that some of the carbon dioxide emitted by human activities stays in the atmosphere for thousands of years," and "the new study advances the understanding of how this affects the climate system."

In his critically acclaimed book, *The Uses of Pessimism and the Danger of False Hope*, Roger Scruton talks about the dangers of that gift of hope remaining in Pandora's Box. Unscrupulous optimism or false hope is a danger warns Scruton, while looking back now at the world's hopes to avert climate change. Roger Scruton however says that, acceptance of changes in environment crisis and works resolutely, formidable to mitigate the climate crisis. Then only mankind would be luckier to survive from holocaust of climate change, which human beings has the advantage of being able to think ahead, and to prepare to face for any changes that come and ready to fight for the same.

## **5. The Climatizens Address the Problem**

If the human beings are keen to work together for this common cause which affects irrespective of regions or religions, nations or states, countries or continents by adopting, advancing or developing from smart ideas like 'Greenovative' technology. The Greenovative connotes that an innovatively created or advanced phenomena, idea, things or products by the green science or technology that must be environmental friendly, sustainable and possible has best harmony with the nature.

The word 'Climatizens' has fundamentally envision value laden and has intrinsic moral responsibilities as human beings to address the climate change problem with very sincerely, passionately and persistently till the last breath of their life. The 'Climatizens' is an action or performance driven and result oriented phenomena, which entrust those all human beings who are aware and conscious about the climate change crisis and ready to give their contributions or sacrifices, however a little it may be, to the fight against the global warming or climate change, in their own ways of daily life.

The concept of Climatizen and domestic politics are mutual inclusively and interrelated with each other. When the domestic political actors a country consciously plan, executes or work for climate change related programme to create public awareness and when the citizens of that country actively involves, then citizens automatically become the 'Climatizens'. The movement of Climatizens would also influences and reflects on the policy and programme of government to accelerate the climate change actions. It is expected to create a new wave of Climatizens that would influence foreign policy behavior of countries. Because, the 'foreign policy is the out come of domestic politics' (Kissinger, 1969). Explaining the significance of domestic politics, Harrison and Lisa (2010) has rightly and very lucidly analysed domestic political compulsion and influences, which explains international action of a particular country's behavior on climate change from the domestic political perspective of that country. For example, take the US domestic politics while trying to understand about what progress done so far and why the US having handicapped by the domestic politics in deciding not to ratify the Kyoto Protocol as of now the only country in the world to do so and would pursue its own national and domestic climate change mitigation policies independently (Harrison and Sundstrom: 2010). From the 'Greenovative' technology to making 'Climatizens', a collective and inclusive action by converting 'demographic dividend' into a 'Climatizenographic Dividend', would definitely solve the climate change problem, because there is still "hope" remains in Pandora's Box.

## **6. Leading US Legislations and Future Politics of Climate Change**

It utmost is to mention about the US, because as one of the leading architecture of global climate negotiations, and vehemently influence global climate talks. So, it demands a special focus on its climate policies and mechanisms are required. Some of the leading are following: Economy-wide Mandatory Emissions Caps proposed in US Congress. US Greenhouse Gas Emissions: McCain-Lieberman (S.280), Olver-Gilchrest (H.R. 620), and Lieberman-Warner Proposal. Bingaman-Specter(S.1766), Kyoto Target- Sanders-Boxer(S.309), Kerry-Snowe(S.485), Waxman (H.R. 1590). The goal of these Acts is to inform the design of scientifically sound, economically rational and politically pragmatic post-2012 international climate policy architecture. Because of their great advantages, most attention has been focused on market-based instruments. Most US proposals have featured tradable permit system- “cap and trade”, partly because of assumption, but largely because of experience. Cap-and-trade system is where GHG or carbon rights trading led gasoline phase-out in the year of 1980s. So, allowance trading program started since 1995. Some examples of the trading are European Union Emission Trading Scheme, California’s emerging proposal (AB 32), Carbon taxes, Hybrids of price and quantity mechanisms. At the domestic level in US, the increasing motivations for domestic cap-and-trade system to provide meaningful emissions reductions. The cost effective mechanism meant for the reducing GHG emissions from atmosphere. The informal means of compensating for the inevitably unequal burdens imposed by the climate change policy. It is uncertain that the degraded in terms of environmental performances and cost effectiveness by political forces.

## **7. Future Global Climate Change Politics**

The future prospects of global climate change politics would be based on an architecture that designed in such a way which is scientifically sound, economically rational, and politically pragmatic in future international policy architecture for global climate change, drawing upon leading thinkers from academia, private industry, government, and non-governmental organizations. First, there would be ambitious national level emissions targets for advanced economy nations. These are likely to take the form of commitments to limit national

emissions by defining annual quantified emissions limits, probably expressed as a percentage reduction from a historical reference point. Second, there would be a wide variety of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for all other nations. These form the basis of national commitments made by least-developed, developing, and emerging nations. Third, substantial amounts of financial and technological support for both mitigation and adaptation would be an integral part of any agreement. The details of these support mechanisms remain to be determined, but negotiators are looking to establish a global climate fund with a number of funding opportunities. These avenues of opportunities enhance capacity building, planning, research, technology transfer, sharing of best practices, direct funding of adaptation activities, and direct funding of mitigation actions. The money for the global fund will come from advanced nations, through levies, and possibly through contributions from emerging nations. Fourth, there would be mechanism of an institutional framework to support the next global agreement. The shape that this framework would take which is currently unclear, though it is expected to be much less centralized than the current framework, under which the UNFCCC coordinates activities, the Global Environment Facility provides some funding, and the CDM Executive Board regulates the credits that form the basis of global carbon trading markets. Although these organizations would be remained in place and continue to play a role, and there would be institutionally activities in terms of countries and commitments would be occurred at the national level, based on countries' individual circumstances (Pennell and et.: 2009).

The use of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) as a basis for countries' commitments provides a consistent global platform while allowing flexibility for individual countries. Some examples of NAMAs include proposed by Pennell and et.: (2009) are following:

1. Specific activities such as the introduction of feed-in tariffs, the liberalization of energy markets, R&D related to carbon capture and storage, waste and recycling regulations, and minimum efficiency performance standards for appliances.
2. Projects and programs that have a direct bearing on emissions reductions and could perhaps be registered under the CDM, including the upgrade of industrial facilities or the distribution of energy-efficient light bulbs.

3. Broad-scale initiatives such as the implementation of an energy efficiency crediting program or the introduction of a sector specific emissions trading system-for instance, for cement or steel production.
4. An important aspect of NAMAs is their funding sources. Each country, as it develops its low-carbon development strategy, would identify the incremental costs associated with implementing each NAMA and divide its NAMAs into three groups:
  4. (A) Self-funded NAMAs, which a country would implement with only minor assistance from international sources, primarily in the form of enabling activities such as capacity building or sharing of best practices.
  4. (B) Co-funded NAMAs, which would be implemented with international assistance, in the form of financing, technology transfer, or capacity building.
  4. (C) Carbon market NAMAs, which are eligible for support in the form of credits for emission reductions achieved and are likely to be funded by the private sector. These credits are used by companies and advanced economies to meet their emissions compliance obligations. The credits have a financial value that would be determined by trading in international carbon markets (Pennell and et.: 2009).

Pennell and et.: (2009) also proposed about harmonized Domestic Policies to tackle future global climate policy. Focus more on policy actions instead of goals, Countries agree on similar or interlinked domestic policies. Novel ideas presented in proposals: countries adopt similar national level cap-and-trade programs. Promote regional-level “carbon clubs” that could evolve like regional trade agreements.

According to Sheila Olmstead and Robert N. Stavins, there are three significant elements of effective future international climate policy architecture. Primarily, there should be a mechanism or means to ensure that key industrialized and developing nations are involved in differentiated but meaningful ways in the global climate change agreements. The next very important point is to be given on extension of time path of targets be determined; and finally, the inclusion of flexible market-based policy instruments to keep costs down and facilitate international equity and fairness in the mechanism of climate talks. Olmstead and Stavins emphasized for the global

architecture which consistent with fundamental aspects of the science, economics, and politics of global climate change while addressing some specific flaws of the Kyoto Protocol that builds upon the foundation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (Olmstead and Stavins: 2010).

## **8. Major Themes of Future Global Politics of Climate Change**

Focus on policy infrastructure instead of goals: - get institutions right, then aim for ambitious goals. Market-based implementation support- harmonization of emission prices can occur through international cap-and-trade; - coordination of domestic cap-and trade policies; - emission taxes. Need for “fair” climate policy- progressive targets for developing countries; - integrate with development, trade policies; - adaptation merits additional attention. Promoting participation, Engage domestic constitution, focus on effort, not outputs, through pledge and review, Expand negotiations to integrate development, trade, Narrow negotiations to small number of key nations.

## **9. Exploring Strategy for Future of Global Politics of Climate Change**

Search for new avenues and strategies for future global politics of climate change which would be universally acceptable and implemented across the world without any discrimination or favour. And that would definitely help to identify key design elements that scientifically sound, economically rational and politically pragmatic that would be the future anthropology of international policy architecture for global climate change. Drawing upon research & ideas from leading thinkers around the world from the academia i.e. economics, political science, law, international relations and so on. The cooperation and collaboration of all stakeholders, including the role of private industry, NGOs, civil society, individuals, and PPP model that collaborates with the governments to address this menace are also very significance in this context.

## **10. Developing Insights for Future Global Politics of Climate Change**

Interim Report builds upon lessons emerging from 26 research initiatives. Key principles for a new international agreement, Promising global climate policy architectures, Key design issues and elements, Negotiating countries can and should create their own hybrids from the architectures and design elements. There are 26 major research initiatives in Europe, United States, China, India, Japan, & Australia. Outreach with governments, NGOs, and business leaders throughout the world that working with heads of governments & ministers in many countries.

## **11. Key Principles for a New International Agreement**

Climate change is a global commons problem. Cooperation of countries is essential, whether through UNFCCC, G20, or bilateral negotiations. Since sovereign nations cannot be compelled to act, treaties must create incentives for participation and compliance. New international policy architecture will need to address several particularly important design issues and elements. Such as the Burden Sharing Criteria and Mechanisms; Technology Transfer Policies and Institutions and so on. Reforming or Replacing the Clean Development Mechanism, Addressing Deforestation Worldwide.

## **12. Mechanism for Emission Targets for All Countries**

Industrialized nations should accept responsibility for historic emissions. Key rapidly growing, developing countries will need to take on increasingly meaningful roles. In both cases, the scope of attention and action should include all greenhouse gases, not only fossil CO<sub>2</sub>. Formula used to set national emission caps to 2100 using three key elements. Progressivity factor: richer countries make more severe cuts. Latecomer factor: nations that did not achieve targets under Kyoto make gradual emission cuts to account for post-1990 emissions. Equalization factor: moves targets of all countries in direction of global average per capita emissions. Developing countries are not

asked to bear any cost in early years. Developing countries are not asked to make any sacrifice different from sacrifices of developed countries, accounting for differences in income. No countries have targets costing more than 1% of GDP. International trading links national & regional systems. Every country contributes no more than its fair share.

According to Robert O. Keohane, and Kal Raustiala, any international regime aimed at the mitigation of global climate change must solve three problems: 1) secure sufficient participation; 2) achieve agreement on meaningful rules; and 3) ensure compliance with those rules. That is, it must solve problems of participation, effectiveness, and compliance. The proposed future mechanism compliance system that is based upon emissions trading coupled to buyer liability. The trade-off between participation and strictness of rules by proposing which is known as 'economy of esteem' for climate change. The mechanism of only a cap-and-trade architecture is likely to make it politically possible to secure sufficient participation to get a climate change mitigation regime up and running. The problem of compliance and argues that, contrary to the current provisions in the Kyoto Protocol, a system of buyer liability is essential (Keohane and Raustiala: 2008).

The climate change regime complex has some advantages over any politically feasible comprehensive regime, particularly with respect to adaptability and flexibility, which are very important in climate change policy. The most challenging international commitments are interdependent, however generally governments have many contradictions in their interest and ability to implement them (Victor and Keohane: 2010).

The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) allows for nations that do not qualify as economically advanced to get credits in the form of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs) for any projects that lower the level of greenhouse gas emissions. These credits have economic value and can be sold to companies in advanced nations, which can use them to satisfy their own emissions obligations. The creation and trading of these certificates has spurred the development of a global carbon market, which is drawing financial institutions into the area, creating backing for low-carbon technologies, such as solar, wind power, and energy efficiency. The significant

amounts of financial and technological support for both mitigation and adaptation are an integral part of any agreement.

### 13. Conclusion:-

In the epilogue, the predictions for an effective global climate change policy must be the inclusive and flexible mechanisms in nature along with taking forwards previous mechanisms of emissions trading, joint implementation and so on. The post-Kyoto Protocol Mechanism must also encourage with an approach for truly and meaningful participation by all the developing countries which are considered as leading global emitters in the contemporary world. Though, anthropology of future global politics of climate change would expect to be widely dominated by market mechanism of greenovative technologies and it would create an avenue for closer cooperation among the nations for a better world. The prospective of American's deeper and proactive involvement are seemed to be greater in the global politics of climate change. In long term, the US would expected to work for establishing cost effective and affordable interim measures, combined with a renewed effort to better measure the costs and benefits of the protocol obligations and a search for effective and innovative domestic policy tools to address the menace of climate change. The prioritized Climate Change policies of Obama Administrations would show a new lustrous path for post- Kyoto global climate change in rest of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The greenovative technology, climatizens, future new research, discovery and studies with scientific temper of human spirit would address the problem of climate change crisis along with the formidable domestic political actions pursued by all the countries across the globe.

-----XXX-----

## REFERENCES:-

Aldy, Joseph E. and Stavins, Robert N. (2007), *Architectures for Agreement: Addressing Global Climate Change in the Post-Kyoto World* (ed.) New York: Cambridge University Press.

Aldy, Joseph E. and Stavins, Robert N. (2010), *Post- Kyoto International Climate Policy: Implementing architectures for Agreement*, (ed.), New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bernstein, Steven. (2001), *The Compromise of Liberal Environmentalism*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Bodansky, Daniel. (2004), *International Climate Efforts Beyond 2012: A Survey of Approaches*. Arlington, Virginia: Pew Center on Global Climate Change, December.

Brundtland, Gro Harlem (1987), *Our Common Future: The World Commission on Environment and Development* (ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carson, Rachel. (1962), *Silent Spring*, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Claussen, Eileen. "A New Climate Treaty: US Leadership after Kyoto", [Online: web] Accessed 30th December 2013, at <http://www.c2es.org/newsroom/articles/new-climate-treaty-us-leadership-after-kyoto>.

Conca, Ken. And Geoffrey D. Dabelko, (2010) *Green Planet Blues: Environmental Politics from Stockholm to Johannesburg*, Washington D.C: Penguin Books.

Friedman, Thomas L. (2008), *Hot, Flat, and Crowded: why the world needs a green revolution and how we can renew our global future*, New York: Penguin Group.

Giddens, Anthony (2009), *The Politics of Climate Change*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gore, Al (2006), *An Inconvenient Truth: The Planetary Emergency of Global Warming and what we Can Do About It*, Washington DC, Rodale Press.

Gore, Al. (2013), *The Future: Six Drivers of Global Change*, Random House, New York.

Hardin, Garrett. (1968), "The Tragedy of the Commons", *Science*, New Series, Vol.162, No. 3859 (Dec.13 1968), 1243-1248.

Harris, P.G., (2009), *The Politics of Climate Change: Environmental Dynamics in International Affairs*, (ed.); London: Routledge.

Harris, P.G., (2011), *China's Responsibility for Climate Change: Ethics, Fairness, and Environmental policy*, (ed.); London: The Policy Press.

Hawken, Paul. (2007), *Blessed Unrest: How the Largest Movement in the World Came into Being and Why No One Saw It Coming*, New York: Viking Press.

Heller, Thomas C., and P.R. Shukla (2003), 'Development and Climate: Engaging Developing Countries', in *Beyond Kyoto: Advancing the International Effort Against Climate Change*; Published by Pew Center on Global Climate Change, [Online: web] Accessed 30th July 2010 at: [http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/20860/Development\\_and\\_Climate.pdf](http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/20860/Development_and_Climate.pdf).

Keohane, Robert O. And Raustiala, Kal. (2008), *Toward a Post-Kyoto Climate Change Architecture: A Political Analysis*, [Online: web] Accessed 24th August 2013, at [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1142996](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1142996).

Lomborg, Bjorn. (2010), *Smart Solutions to Climate Change: Comparing Costs and Benefits* (ed.), New York: Cambridge University Press.

Olmstead, Sheila. and Stavins. Robert N. (2010) "Three Key Elements of Post-2012 International Climate Policy Architecture" Discussion Paper 2010-37, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Project on International Climate Agreements, June.

Pennell, Nick. and et. (2009), "Climate Change after the Kyoto Protocol A New Architecture for Global Policy", Booz & Company Inc., Denmark.

Nordhaus, William D. (2005), 'Life After Kyoto: Alternative Approaches to Global Warming Policies', *NBER Working Paper* 11889, National Bureau of Economic Research, December.

Pachauri, Rajendra K. (2008), "The IPCC: Establishing the Evidence." In *Global Warming: Looking Beyond Kyoto*, (ed.), Ernesto Zedillo, Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Globalization, Yale University and Brookings Institution Press.

Schelling, Thomas C. (2002), 'What Makes Greenhouse Sense? Time to Rethink the Kyoto Protocol', *Foreign Affairs* 81 (3): 2-9.

Victor, David G. and Keohane, Robert O. (2010), *The Regime Complex for Climate Change*. , [Online: web] Accessed 15th November 2013, at [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1643813](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1643813).