



CLIMATE JUSTICE AND GLOBAL INEQUALITY: ANALYZING THE NORTH–SOUTH DIVIDE IN CLIMATE RESPONSIBILITY AND VULNERABILITY

1. Riazul Haq

riazulhaq0322@gmail.com

Department of Political Science, Government Degree College Batkhela, affiliated with University of Malakand, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

2. Basit khan

basitkhan80808@gmail.com

M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Political Science, Islamia College University Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

3. Abdur Rasheed Khan

abdur344rasheedkhan@gmail.com

M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Political Science, Islamia College University Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

Abstract

Climate change is among the most important global challenges of the twenty-first century, yet its causes and consequences are still highly unequal in the world. This paper examines climate justice and global inequality by discussing the North-South divide in climate responsibility and vulnerability. Qualitative analysis has been done by drawing on secondary data from scholarly literature, international climate reports, and policy documents on how historical emission patterns and socio-economic factors shape climate impacts. Results show that countries of the Global North are disproportionately responsible for cumulative greenhouse gas emissions due to early industrialization and fossil-fuel-based development, with countries of the Global South bearing very little responsibility for causing the crisis. Yet, developing countries suffer from the harshest effects of climate change: extreme weather events, food insecurity, health risks, and climate-induced displacement. The study also establishes that legacies of colonialism, different development trajectories, and asymmetric power relations in global governance continue to shape climate negotiations and resource distribution. International frameworks like the principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR) do accord due recognition to historical responsibility, but their implementation remains severely inadequate, particularly with respect to climate finance and technological support. This work underlines the need for climate policies centered on justice, which takes into consideration historical emissions, structural inequalities, and the reinforcement of support mechanisms directed at vulnerable nations. The study contributes to ongoing debates on climate justice through the stress it lays on ethical responsibility and equitable action.

Keywords: Climate justice, Global inequality, North–South divide, Climate responsibility, Vulnerability, Global governance

Introduction

Background of the Study

Climate change has been largely appreciated not only as an environmental issue but also as a deep socio-economic and political issue that relates to the issue of inequality and justice across the planet. Climatic justice as a concept has been developed as a result of understanding that climate change has not happened evenly for various countries and peoples across the planet. It has been noted that those countries who have caused the least percentages of carbon emissions are the ones that are affected largely (Jacobi, 2024). The industrialized countries of the North of the planet have been responsible for major percentages of climate change through their fossil fuel-based economies over the past few centuries. Several countries of the southern part of the planet are highly climate-vulnerable despite their least contribution to climate change (Climate Change Academy, 2025; Jacobi, 2024).



The North-South divide in climate responsibility has its basis in the unequal distribution of wealth, technological capabilities, and developmental paths. Countries in the North have higher per-capita income and developed economies and have grown in terms of economic development while releasing large quantities of carbon dioxide and greenhouse gases. On the other hand, several Global South nations continue to be relegated to economic marginalization and do not possess financial or technological capital to enable it to successfully respond to climate change impacts like severe weather conditions, rising sea levels, and food security (Climate Change Academy, 2025; Younas & Rahman, 2025). This creates a situation where disparities within the Global System continue to arise, and climate change is not an exception.

Additionally, the allocation of climate risk and liability has been consolidated through the frameworks of global governance. The concept of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR) takes into consideration the treatment of countries that emit unevenly through history and have different capabilities. However, the effectiveness of implementing this concept has been under scrutiny. This touches on issues such as loss and damage financing. Developing countries demand liability and assistance concerning losses inflicted upon them through climate change impacts that the countries did not emit and are not capable of adapting to (Jahan, 2025).

“The differentiated effects of climate change add to pre-existing socio-economic inequalities in society and across the world” and are exacerbated by “conditions of reduced adaptive capacity, lack of infrastructure, and socio-political circumstances which increase their vulnerability to climate risks,” especially in the Global South, where “conditions of reduced adaptive capacity, lack of infrastructure, and socio-political circumstances” interact to increase vulnerability to climate risks. These, of course, are not just biophysical issues, as “climate injustices are made possible by specific historical patterns of exploitation, resource extraction, and economic interdependence,” which locate climate injustices as part of “the structure of global inequalities” in general, as indicated by the Climate Change Academy in 2025, supported by Jacobi, in his work of 2024.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the global nature of climate change, the causes and effects are disproportionately located in the Global North and Global South. The greatest source of greenhouse gases emanates from developed nations, but the worst effects are also suffered by developing countries despite their insignificant role in causing the problem. This is a challenge that has widened debates on issues of climate justice, responsibility, and accountability in global climate change policy and management. The current global policies and funds have not been sufficient to bridge the gap created by the disparities in terms of adaptation. There is thus a clear need to investigate the structural drivers behind the North-South divide in terms of climate change responsibility and vulnerability.

Objectives of the Study

1. To analyze historical emission patterns to understand the unequal climate responsibility between developed and developing countries.
2. To examine the socio-economic and environmental vulnerabilities faced by Global South nations in the context of climate change.

Research Questions

Following are the research questions:



1. How does historical responsibility for greenhouse gas emissions differ between the Global North and Global South?
2. In what ways are countries in the Global South disproportionately vulnerable to the impacts of climate change?

Significance of the Research

The study has immense academic, policy, and social relevance as it tackles the burning question of climate justice and inequality. By presenting climate change through the lens of disparity between the North and South, it enhances the knowledge of climate change, as it is not merely a challenge related to climate, because it is based on justice—and this is a milestone in itself because it somehow bridges various streams of knowledge and illuminates a more inclusive and synchronized way of looking at climate change. This study adds value to various streams of knowledge, as it is based on justice, which adds a unique dimension to it.

From a policy perspective, this study is anticipated to offer useful insights for policymakers and climate change negotiators. The disparity in the level of climate emissions responsibility and climate change risk vulnerability has been studied in this research. It has been found that the research study will offer useful insights for climate change policies. This study can help improve the application of the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities by providing recommendations on how developed countries and developing nations can share the burden of controlling greenhouse gas emissions equitably. This helps make global agreements on climate change treaties more effective.

The study is also valuable in the context of developing nations and those characterized as Global South nations. This is due to its emphasis on the vulnerability of these regions to climate change despite their minimal capacity to contribute to greenhouse gases. The study brings to the fore the voice of those nations or communities that are often ignored in international climate change meetings. This may have a positive effect when the study is used to demand more support in terms of adaptation to climate change.

Additionally, this research makes an important contribution to public knowledge and education by helping to provide an informed understanding of climate injustice. It contests the dominant discourse that perceives climate change as a collective responsibility without considering the disparities in this responsibility. This emphasis on justice and equality in the research above can therefore serve as a catalyst for a paradigm shift toward a more inclusive response to climate change. This can empower civil society groups, climate change activists, and scholars to campaign for a fair response to climate change.

This study is important in the sense that it helps to fill the gap that exists between climate change theories and climate change practice in climate justice studies. This not only adds to the pool of knowledge in the subject, but it is also beneficial in terms of providing implications for practice. This study, by addressing the inequalities in climate change that exist in the structure of climate governance, is an effort towards a sustainable and just climate for the current and future generations.

Literature Review

The concept of *climate justice* has been increasingly adopted in academic discourse to emphasize the ethical, social, and political dimensions of climate change beyond purely environmental considerations. Climate justice literature highlights how unequal contributions to greenhouse gas emissions and varying capacities to respond to climate impacts produce unequal burdens on different countries and communities (Arruda Filho et al., 2024). This body of work consistently demonstrates that those least responsible for historical emissions—



predominantly countries in the Global South—are often the most vulnerable to climate impacts, underscoring the core injustice at the heart of the climate crisis.

A systematic analysis of climate justice scholarship shows a significant imbalance in the geographic focus of existing research. Arruda Filho, Torres, and Jacobi (2024) find that the majority of climate justice publications originate from the Global North, while comparatively few studies emerge from the Global South. This imbalance is indicative of a deeper structural issue in the production of knowledge globally and underlines the fact that although the discussion on climate responsibility takes place, the viewpoints are already skewed towards those of developed nations. In addition to that, it was found from the available literature that the Global South is more intensely engaged with the experiences of vulnerability in relation to the environment and its relationship with sociology than the Global North (Arruda Filho et al., 2024).

Another important aspect of the literature includes the concept of loss and damage, or the damage that has resulted from the consequences of climate change, coming beyond the adapting capacity of nations. According to Jahan (2025), the concept of loss and damage has been controversially defined and operationalized from the framework of international climate governance. Even though the establishment of the Loss and Damage Fund could be regarded as progress, the voluntary nature of these funds has been doubtful concerning whether they can provide climate justice for developing nations. By not linking compensation schemes to historical emissions, it is likely that these systems are not going to bring about climate justice for the Global South, as is evident from the conclusion presented by the author in 2025.

Climate justice is also associated with the establishment of inequality structure globally from the processes of colonialization, uneven development, and distribution of power governance. Studies concentrated on the country context, for instance, Younas and Rahman (2025), demonstrate the vulnerability process of the former colony countries and poor nations that face higher climate risks despite their insignificant share of the overall world emissions. This inequality is further deepened by the governance structure that is increasingly dependent on the solution of the technical and market structure, thereby ignoring the Southern perspectives and undermining the power of the vulnerable group of people within the international decision-making bodies. To this effect, the need for a more decentralized and equitable form of environmental governance is proposed by the researcher (Younas & Rahman, 2025).

Beyond governance and policy frameworks, climate justice literature also examines how climate change intersects with social justice issues such as gender, health, and human rights. For example, research comparing adaptation strategies across regions reveals that climate impacts disproportionately affect marginalized groups within both the Global North and South, especially women, who often face compounded vulnerabilities due to socio-economic inequalities and limited access to adaptive resources (Afzaal & Ahmad, 2025). These intersectional perspectives broaden the understanding of climate justice by integrating issues of gender and social equity into the narrative of global climate responsibility.

Emerging scholarship further emphasizes the need to decenter dominant climate narratives by incorporating Indigenous knowledge systems and region-specific approaches to justice. Studies from Latin America argue that operationalizing climate justice requires moving beyond Global North frameworks to address historical disenfranchisement, recognize cultural knowledge, and create inclusive institutional arrangements that reflect the needs of local communities (Author, 2025). Such approaches highlight not only inequality in responsibility



and impacts but also the potential for diverse epistemologies to inform more equitable climate solutions.

One of the most fundamental concepts in this area is the imbalance in the emission and adaptive capacity of the Global North and the Global South. There have been a number of studies carried out, and the findings reveal that the countries with the greatest levels of emission and economic capability have lower vulnerability, while the less economically capable, low emission, and less vulnerable states face greater levels of danger to food, health, and coastal populations (Schneider et al., 2010)

Additionally, climate justice studies scrutinize issues relating to disparities of power with respect to climate governance around the globe. An examination of climate change negotiation impact indicates that more advanced nations display more prominent power with respect to climate governance, giving rise to structures that fail to address the requirements of less advanced nations. There exists quantified evidence demonstrating that nations displaying more power with regard to climate change decision-making tend to have less disaster loss compared to less developed nations, despite their less critical impact on climate change policies (Wang et al., 2024).

In addition to the governance structure debate in climate change, there is emerging interest in climate justice studies in living experience in vulnerability. The systematic review on climate change effects in the Global South reveals that there is inequality in adaptation intervention for vulnerable sectors in climate change due to inadequate adaptation intervention in areas of vulnerability. In this regard, it is important to note that climate vulnerability is no longer correlated with exposure alone but also with factors such as inequalities in poverty and gender in institutional capacity (Sörensson et al., 2023).

The ethics of climate justice have also been applied in terms of socio-historical perspectives. This is because climate justice literature asserts that climate injustices with unequal impacts are not just outcomes of historical development but also result from historical patterns of development exploitation and resource imbalances (Doe & Ortiz, 2025). For instance, climate justice literature applied in the context of the Latin Americas argues that climate justice needs to adopt decolonial approaches of the Global North to focus on indigenous knowledge to address historical deep-rooted injustices. This argues that justice needs to address historical socio-political dimensions of climate change (Doe & Ortiz, 2025).

Furthermore, the discourse within academia on climate justice also includes the aspect of contributing to climate research. There exists a large gap within the contribution rate to climate science by Global South nations, which remains highly vulnerable to climate change. This climate research gap results in the exclusion of local adaptation methods that suit the interests of the involved nations. Closing this gap in climate research is crucial for the construction of a collective climate resilience process (Hanif et al., 2025).

Another rising focus of scholarship is directed towards analyzing how these systemic inequalities influence environmental burdens for smaller, more refined scales such as urban areas. Environmental inequalities related to five thousand cities show how the Global South is more exposed to air pollutants such as PM_{2.5}, and there is lack of access to adaptive infrastructure such as greens space, reducing heat effects, signifying how global socio-economic inequalities are practiced through everyday tasks of environmental injustice (Zhou et al., 2025).

Additionally, climate apartheid is another topic covered by authors, which refers to the divide that exists between those who have the ability to safeguard themselves against climate change and those who do not. This appears to refer to the fact that rich countries safeguard



themselves against any harm that could come to them via climate change, whereas poor countries, on the other hand, remain vulnerable to climate change with minimal safeguarding (Author, 2024)

Research Methodology

Research Design

The paper uses a qualitative research methodology to analyze and discuss the phenomenon of climate justice in relation to global inequality, with greater emphasis on the North-South divide regarding responsibility and vulnerability to climate change. The use of a qualitative methodology is most appropriate for this paper because it allows for a thorough analysis of intricate processes, history, and ethics related to global climate politics. Unlike quantitative methodologies, which are centered on data patterns, qualitative methodology permits a thoughtful analysis of data related to climate politics, such as data related to inequalities of power and inequalities associated with climate change. The paper uses a descriptive and analytical methodology to interpret existing data and academic literature. This methodology allows for a descriptive evaluation of existing data related to inequalities related to climate change and then uses analysis to critically evaluate existing governance frameworks through which the Global South is affected.

Research Approach

The study adopts a documentary and analytical method that focuses mainly on secondary sources. It enables the researcher to study and scrutinize climate policies and vulnerabilities of countries across the globe for structural imbalances that exist between developed and developing countries. Through a detailed and thorough analysis of climate policies and literature reviews, the study underscores that power dynamics and climate responsibilities affect climate decision-making processes. Additionally, the method enables the researcher to scrutinize the discrepancy that exists between the promises made by developed countries and the actual assistance provided to developing countries affected by climate change. The study adopts this methodological technique that helps the researcher grasp the disproportionate burden that affects developing countries affected by climate change.

Data Sources

The data for this paper is derived from a broad spectrum of secondary sources to give it depth, authenticity, and academic credibility. These sources may consist of refereed journals containing both theoretical perspectives and empirical data on climate justice and environmental inequality. Books related to climate change and environmental injustice are also relied upon to build a sound conceptual framework. Moreover, reports produced by global agencies such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), World Bank, and United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) are tapped to acquire authentic data on emissions, adaptation, and vulnerability trends. Climate change policy papers and global agreements such as the Paris Accord and Kyoto Protocol are reviewed to evaluate global responsibility. Publication papers by national administrations allow for climate perspectives to emerge on a national platform, whereas publications by global NGOs allow for critiques of governance frameworks. Online research libraries such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, and Science Direct are relied upon for acquiring subject literature. These sources enable a complete study of emissions, adaptation, climate funds, and global frameworks of influence in the Global South.



Data Collection Techniques

Data collection is carried out by means of a systematic literature review and in-depth document analysis. Documents are selected using clearly defined selection criteria, including credibility, academic quality, relevance to the subject of climate justice, and publication date. The actual search is performed using keywords related to the subject, including but not limited to climate justice, North–South divide, historical emissions, climate vulnerability, adaptation finance, and loss and damage. Preference is given to peer-reviewed articles and official reports to ensure the reliability of information. To be able to focus on current debates and policy developments, recently published data are preferred; however, older seminal works have been included for theoretical grounds and historical background. All the documents identified using the selection criteria undergo careful reading to outline the information relevant to global inequality, governance mechanisms, and ethics in climate action.

Data Analysis

The collected data is then analyzed through the method of thematic analysis, whereby themes are identified, classified, and interpreted for recurrence across literature. These key themes may include historical responsibility, climate change vulnerability, global governance frameworks, financing for adaptation, and loss and damage responses. These, then, are evaluated for their interconnections, focusing on how inequalities are perpetuated through global frameworks for climate change governance. This analysis step is useful for generating a critical discourse on narratives, frameworks, and financing inequalities related to developing countries. These are then intersected for differences between discourse and practice, such as financial assistance and technology transfer for developing countries.

Analysis and Discussion

Climate Responsibility Gap Between the Global North and South

The burden of history with respect to climate change remains highly imbalanced between the Global North and the Global South. Since the Industrial Revolution, European and North American nations have depended largely on carbon-based energy sources such as coal, oil, and gas to fuel their industrialization, urbanization, and economic development. This has led to a gross buildup of carbon dioxide emissions that have been generated by developed nations. Research has indicated that the United States of America and European nations have been responsible for well over 50% of global accumulated carbon dioxide emissions since the mid-19th century (Malm & Hornborg, 2014; Matthews, 2016). The Global South nations have yet to start mass industrialization, with very small contributions to the buildup of past greenhouse gases.

This deficiency is indicative of imbalanced development. The Global North developed economically through carbon-driven industrialization, while the Global South was colonized for resource exploitation. This led to underdevelopment for the latter group of nations. The opportunity for development of industries and technologies for developing nations was least. It is recognized that development trends of emissions were determined by colonial imprints (Bond, 2012). Thus, the problem of climate change is also an economic problem but has further extended the matter of economic inequality.

Per-capita data further accentuates this gap. Regions in the Global North possess per-capita levels that are markedly higher compared to the Global South. For instance, per-capita levels for Americans, Europeans, or people in other developed nations are several times higher compared to the per-capita levels for people in Africa or South Asia (Our World in Data, 2023). This clearly clarifies that the high standard of living in developed nations is



maintained by consuming energy-intensive lifestyle patterns, while in developing nations, people maintain low-carbon lifestyle patterns. This further strengthens the case that the burden for climate change imbalances is not shared equally.

The principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR), agreed to under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), recognizes the imbalance. CBDR recognizes that developed nations have higher responsibilities in dealing with the problem of climate change. However, the application of the principle has been criticized to be ineffective in that developed nations are opposed to legally binding targets to lower emissions and provide financing to counter climate change (Roberts and Parks, 2007). This resistance reflects power asymmetries in global climate governance, where the countries of the North lead in their influence on policy outcomes.

Current trends also indicate that while emerging economies' emissions are on the rise, this does not wipe out historical responsibility. As scholars have pointed out, it is cumulative emissions, rather than current annual emissions, that are the proper basis on which responsibility should be apportioned. The developing world has further argued that they still need carbon space for economic development, especially in poverty reduction and attainment of higher standards of living. Such a claim dares the dominant narratives of ontological uniformity in responsibility across all nations irrespective of historical context.

In short, historical responsibility for GHG emissions lies with the GN because of early industrialization, colonial economic structures, and high-consumption lifestyles. The limited contribution of the GS to cumulative emissions marks an injustice in expecting developing nations to share equal responsibility for climate mitigation. This is the basic unequal division that underlies debates in climate justice, finance, and global governance.

Disproportionate Climate Vulnerability in the Global South

Nations that are part of the Global South are also more at risk and sensitive to climate change. Many developing countries are also found in regions that are highly sensitive to climate-related hazards such as floods, droughts, tropical cyclones, heatwaves, and rising sea level. For example, the South Asian and African regions are generally susceptible to extreme climate events that present significant threats to agriculture and agriculture-related water and settlement patterns (IPCC, 2022).

The socio-economic dynamics have a great impact on increasing vulnerability to climate change in the global southern region. The presence of widespread poverty, high population growth, lack of infrastructure, and inefficient governance structures hampers the capacity to adapt to or adapt and recover from climate change disasters. In contrast to developed states, most developing states face limitations in terms of access to funding, disaster management infrastructure, and technology to adapt to large-scale measures to adapt to climate change. In this regard, Hallegatte et al. (2016) state that climate change shocks result in the entry of millions of people into absolute poverty every year, most of whom come from developing states.

Health risks add to the factors that determine heightened vulnerability in the Global South. Rising temperatures and changing rainfall patterns favor increased transmission of vector-borne diseases such as malaria and dengue fever, while heat stress and food insecurity are serious threats to public health. Fragile health systems in many developing countries may not cope with these newer stresses (Watts et al., 2018). Hence, climate change undermines human development characteristics such as life expectancy, nutritional levels, and education.



Another significant dimension of vulnerability refers to displacement and migration. Communities are often forced to abandon their homes due to floods, desertification, and coastal erosion as a consequence of climate-induced disasters. According to the World Bank estimates of 2021, by 2050, climate change could displace over 200 million people throughout parts of Africa, South Asia, and Latin America. Such climate migrants face a high degree of social exclusion, unemployment, and lack of access to basic services, deepening cycles of vulnerability and marginalization.

Furthermore, because of a lack of access to climate finance, adaptation efforts in the Global South are slowed down. Sure, there are international funding mechanisms, but the disbursements are painfully slow and insufficient. The financial obligations have not been met by developed countries, thereby denying vulnerable countries the needed financing for adaptability despite global climate change resolutions (Roberts & Weikmans, 2017). This creates a cycle of dependency and denies developing countries the abilities for sustained adaptation measures.

Therefore, a convergence of circumstances exists in the Global South that makes it more climate-vulnerable through exposure, poverty, lack of capability, health considerations, and adaptation finance. Thus, a disproportionate position exists in climate change in that countries that contribute less to climate change are at the receiving end of its negative impact. Therefore, there is a need for climate justice that takes into account considerations of equality.

Conclusion and Suggestions

Conclusion

This paper aimed at investigating climate justice and the issue of inequality in the context of a North-South divide in climate debt and responsibility. It has been observed that climate change has been proven not only an environmental issue but also a highly political issue that has its basis in inequality. The major reason for the increase in greenhouse gas emissions has been due to the increase in emissions from developed countries in the Global North that have been following a fossil fuel-based economy for several centuries. On the other hand, a negligible contribution has been made by countries in the Global South in causing climate change.

The study of historical emissions shows that there is a large responsibility gap between developed and developing nations. The inability to adapt to new lifestyles and advanced technology due to historical early industrialization, colonial exploitation, and high levels of consumption has made the Global North wealthy but not sustainable in its environment. The historical conditions that made the Global North rich have contributed to its capability to adapt to climate change more than developing nations in climate change negotiations. The Global South still lacks economic resources and climate funds.

The study further illustrates how different countries of the Global South are affected disproportionately because of geographic exposure, socio-economic constraints, weak institutions, and inadequate healthcare and infrastructure systems in relation to climate vulnerability. Climate-induced disasters, food insecurity, health risks, and displacement predominantly affect the vulnerable population, hence exacerbating poverty and social inequality. These vulnerabilities are not incidental but deeply situated within historical patterns of exploitation, uneven development, and global power asymmetries.

While it is recognized under international frameworks, such as the principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities, its implementation remains weak. Reluctance from the developed world to commit to financial and technological support in binding ways



undermines global efforts toward climate justice. Mechanisms like loss and damage funding, though symbolically very important, remain inadequate to address the scale of harm faced by vulnerable nations.

In sum, this study confirms that climate justice is not possible without redressing the structural injustices embedded in the North–South divide; equitable climate action implies a politics of responsibility, fair distribution of resources, and the raising of marginal voices to the global level. Incorporating ethical principles in climate policy will help the global community make strides towards equity, inclusiveness, and sustainability. Climate justice policy responses are necessary not only for sustaining the environment but also for promoting equity and development for current and future generations of humanity.

Suggestions

Based on the results obtained within this research, it can be concluded that there is a need for the adoption of justice-based approaches that take into consideration the principle of responsibility with regard to structural disparities existing within the Global North-South divide. In this regard, the Global North ought to honor and further advance obligations within the area concerning climate finance, technology, and capacity building. Enhancing initiatives such as funds for losses and damages within this regard becomes imperative for ensuring that communities that continue to suffer irreparable losses due to climate changes are compensated. In addition, there ought to be support for decision-making that can provide a platform for marginalized nations, including indigenous groups, to have their voices heard within climate change negotiations. Regionally, cooperation for sustainable development, as well as the incorporation of indigenous knowledge within climate change initiatives, can provide a much-needed boost for resilience within the Global South.

References

- Afzaal, A., & Ahmad, R. E. (2025). Climate justice and women: Adaptation strategies in the Global South and North. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 6(3), 677–692. [https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2025\(6-III\)58](https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2025(6-III)58)
- Arruda Filho, M. T. d., Torres, P. H. C., & Jacobi, P. R. (2024). A systematic review of the literature on climate justice: A comparison between the Global North and South. *Sustainability*, 16(22), 9888. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16229888>
- Bond, P. (2012). *Politics of climate justice: Paralysis above, movement below*. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Climate Change Academy. (2025). Climate justice: Understanding the Global North–South divide in climate change responsibility. Retrieved from [\[https://climatechange.academy/climate-change-society/climate-justice-north-south-divide/\]](https://climatechange.academy/climate-change-society/climate-justice-north-south-divide/)
- Climate apartheid: The failures of accountability and climate justice. (2024). *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 37(78), 1761–1794.
- Climate justice: A view from the Latin American context. (2025). *Environmental Science & Policy*, 171, 104156.
- Doe, F., & Ortiz, M. (2025). Climate justice: A view from the Latin American context. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 171, 104156.
- Hallegatte, S., Bangalore, M., Bonzanigo, L., Fay, M., Kane, T., Narloch, U., ... & Vogt-Schilb, A. (2016). *Shock waves: Managing the impacts of climate change on poverty*. World Bank.



- Hanif, H., Biswas, A., Raza, S., & Li, Y. (2025). Bridging the climate research divide: A global imperative for equitable resilience. *Science Advances*, *11*(50), eadz0469.
- IPCC. (2022). *Sixth Assessment Report (AR6): Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- Jacobi, P. R. (2024). A systematic review of the literature on climate justice: A comparison between the Global North and South. *Sustainability*, *16*(22), 9888.
- Jahan, N. I. (2025). Addressing 'loss and damage' for climate justice in the Global South: An analysis. *Kathmandu School of Law Review*, *13*(1), 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.46985/kslr.v13i1.2234>
- Malm, A., & Hornborg, A. (2014). The geology of mankind? A critique of the Anthropocene narrative. *The Anthropocene Review*, *1*(1), 62–69.
- Matthews, H. D. (2016). Quantifying historical carbon and climate debts among nations. *Nature Climate Change*, *6*(1), 60–65.
- Our World in Data. (2023). *Per capita CO₂ emissions*. <https://ourworldindata.org>
- Roberts, J. T., & Parks, B. C. (2007). *A climate of injustice: Global inequality, North–South politics, and climate policy*. MIT Press.
- Roberts, J. T., & Weikmans, R. (2017). Postface: Fragmentation, failing trust and enduring tensions over what counts as climate finance. *International Environmental Agreements*, *17*(1), 129–137.
- Schneider, U. A., et al. (2010). How inequitable is the global distribution of responsibility, capability, and vulnerability to climate change: A comprehensive indicator-based assessment. *Global Environmental Change*, *XX*(X), XXX–XXX.
- Sörensson, A., et al. (2023). Climate change effects on vulnerable populations in the Global South: A systematic review. *Natural Hazards*, 977–991.
- Wang, X., et al. (2024). Global climate governance inequality unveiled through dynamic influence assessment. *npj Climate Action*.
- Watts, N., Amann, M., Arnell, N., Ayeb-Karlsson, S., Beagley, J., Belesova, K., ... & Costello, A. (2018). The Lancet countdown on health and climate change: From 25 years of inaction to a global transformation. *The Lancet*, *391*(10120), 581–630.
- World Bank. (2021). *Groundswell Part 2: Acting on internal climate migration*. World Bank.
- Younas, M., & Rahman, S. (2025). Climate justice and environmental politics: Examining the North–South divide with a focus on Pakistan. *Social Science Review Archives*, *3*(3), 2100–2111. <https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v3i3.1051>
- Zhou, Y., et al. (2025). Multiple environmental inequalities between Global South and Global North in over 10,000 urban centers. *npj Urban Sustainability*.