



Universiteit Utrecht

Applying the Five Faces of Oppression to Climate Justice:
Analysing discussions of climate justice with the help of Iris Marion Young's theory
of oppression

by Juanita Hernández González



Source: FRIDA Young Feminist Fund, 2020.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MA Applied
Ethics Utrecht University

Student number: 5936381

Supervisor: dr. Matthias Kramm

Second reader: prof. dr. Frans Brom

Utrecht University, Faculty of Humanities

June 2, 2021

Word count: 20777

“Soy, soy lo que dejaron
 Soy toda la sobra de lo que se robaron
 Un pueblo escondido en la cima
 Mi piel es de cuero, por eso aguanta cualquier
 clima
 Soy una fábrica de humo
 Mano de obra campesina para tu consumo
 Frente de frío en el medio del verano
 El amor en los tiempos del cólera, ¡Mi
 hermano!

El sol que nace y el día que muere
 con los mejores atardeceres
 Soy el desarrollo en carne viva
 Un discurso político sin saliva
 Las caras más bonitas que he conocido
 Soy la fotografía de un desaparecido
 La sangre dentro de tus venas
 Soy un pedazo de tierra que vale la pena.

...
 Soy lo que sostiene mi bandera
 La espina dorsal del planeta, es mi cordillera
 Soy lo que me enseñó mi padre
 El que no quiere a su patria, no quiere a su
 madre
 Soy América latina
 Un pueblo sin piernas, pero que camina.

Tú no puedes comprar al viento
 Tú no puedes comprar al sol
 Tú no puedes comprar la lluvia
 Tú no puedes comprar el calor
 Tú no puedes comprar las nubes
 Tú no puedes comprar los colores
 Tú no puedes comprar mi alegría
 Tú no puedes comprar mis dolores.

Tengo los lagos, tengo los ríos
 Tengo mis dientes pa' cuando me sonrío
 La nieve que maquilla mis montañas
 Tengo el sol que me seca y la lluvia que me
 baña
 Un desierto embriagado con peyote
 Un trago de pulque para cantar con los coyotes
 Todo lo que necesito
 Tengo a mis pulmones respirando azul
 clarito.” (Calle 13, 2010).

“I am, I am what they left behind,
 I am the leftovers of what they stole
 A town hidden on the peak
 My skin is made of leather that's why it stands
 any climate
 I am a factory of smoke
 Country hand labor for your consumerism
 A cold front in the middle of the summer
 Love in the times of cholera, my brother!

The sun that is born, and the day that dies
 with the best sunsets
 I am progress in flesh and blood
 A political speech left without breath
 The prettiest faces I have ever known
 I am the photograph of a missing person
 The blood in your veins
 I am a piece of land that is worthwhile.

...
 I am what holds up my flag
 The planet's backbone is my mountain range.
 I am what my father taught me
 He who does not love his homeland does not
 love his mother
 I am Latin America
 A nation without legs that walks nonetheless.

You cannot buy the wind
 You cannot buy the sun
 You cannot buy the rain
 You cannot buy the warmth
 You cannot buy the clouds
 You cannot buy the colours
 You cannot buy my happiness
 You cannot buy my pains.

I have the lakes, I have the rivers
 I have my teeth for when I smile
 The snow that paints my mountains
 I have the sun that dries me and the rain that
 bathes me
 A desert drunk with peyote
 A drink of pulque to sing with the coyotes
 Everything I need
 I have my lungs breathing clear blue air.”
 (Calle 13, 2010).

Summary

This research aims to fill the academic gap between Iris Marion Young's "Five Faces of Oppression" and climate justice literature. As Young's theory has not been applied to this academic field yet, this research is a first attempt of bridging her notions of oppression and injustice with climate justice. This research accordingly relies on a conceptual analysis, in order to demonstrate the conceptual overlap between the two matters and to understand climate injustice from Young's theoretical framework's point of view. Additionally, this research also relies on a non-ideal approach towards understanding climate justice and a normative analysis by providing recommendations towards climate justice that are based on Young's theoretical toolbox.

The conceptual analysis shows that all Five Faces are applicable and relevant to climate justice, especially since they provide new insights regarding the nature of injustices in the context of the causes and consequences of climate change, while the implicit and/or explicit recommendations that follow from Young's Five Faces are generally in accordance with climate justice literature. Consequently, Young's notions of oppression and injustice provide a toolbox to climate justice scholars that could help to identify climate injustices in new ways. A particular focus throughout this research is the notion of intersectionality, in order to demonstrate how multiple factors of oppression are at play that can make one worse off than another in relation to climate change. Since this is a recurring theme in Young's Five Faces, this theory's conceptual overlap with climate justice also provides new and meaningful tools for analysing climate justice's intersectional nature.

Table of contents

Summary	2
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Thesis structure	6
2. Historical background	8
2.1 A new ontology of oppression	8
2.2 Climate justice	8
3. Methodology	11
3.1 Main questions of this research	11
3.2 Why apply the Five Faces to climate justice?	13
4. Literature review	15
4.1 The aim of Iris Marion Young's project	15
4.2 What are social groups?	15
4.3 The Five Faces of Oppression	16
4.4 Criticisms	18
4.5 Socialist feminist philosophy	22
4.6 Applying the Five Faces: examples from literature	23
4.7 Climate justice: intersectional, pluralistic and inclusive	25
4.8 Climate justice and the Five Faces: preliminary remarks	27
5. The First Face: exploitation	29
5.1 What does it mean to be exploited in a world impacted by climate change?	29
5.2 Conceptual overlap between exploitation and climate injustice	29
5.3 Intersectionality and climate injustice: exploitation	32
6. The Second Face: marginalisation	33
6.1 What does it mean to be marginalised in a world impacted by climate change?	33
6.2 Conceptual overlap between marginalisation and climate injustice	33
6.3 Intersectionality and climate injustice: marginalisation	36
7. The Third Face: powerlessness	38
7.1 What does it mean to be powerless in a world impacted by climate change?	38
7.2 Conceptual overlap between powerlessness and climate injustice	38
7.3 Intersectionality and climate injustice: powerlessness	41
8. The Fourth Face: cultural imperialism	42
8.1 What does cultural imperialism mean in a world impacted by climate change?	42
8.2 Conceptual overlap between cultural imperialism and climate injustice	42

8.3 Intersectionality and climate injustice: cultural imperialism	45
9. The Fifth Face: violence	47
9.1 What does violence mean in a world impacted by climate change?	47
9.2 Conceptual overlap between violence and climate injustice	47
9.3 Intersectionality and climate injustice: violence	49
10. Reply to critiques	50
11. Recommendations for scholars and policy makers	54
12. Conclusion	57
Bibliography	60

Introduction

1

Currently, one of the greatest threats to humankind are the consequences of human-induced climate change. For some peoples, the consequences are already being felt: an increase in hurricanes, prolonged droughts, disturbed weather patterns and food scarcity already have become severe and impactful issues for some. For other peoples, it seems that the consequences will be felt only in the far future. In addition, the consequences will be more severe for some than for others. For example, socioeconomic circumstances and geographical details matter heavily when it comes to adapting oneself to the consequences of climate change. Some peoples are more vulnerable due to geographical locations, such as coastal areas or grasslands. Some are economically dependent on their land for agricultural purposes and food supply, to which a loss of biodiversity and rising temperatures pose an immediate threat. Other peoples or nations are financially not able to protect themselves against current and future threats, leaving groups of people extremely vulnerable.

Here, I want to point towards the fact that the causes and consequences of climate change are matters of *intersectionality*: there are different factors at play that could make one worse off than another, and these factors could also overlap. One factor is poverty, and another factor is dependency on agricultural land that does not produce harvests anymore due to rising temperatures and droughts. To these factors of vulnerability also belongs one's geographical location: whether one lives in coastal areas vulnerable to sea level rise or in areas where hurricanes are becoming more frequent and extreme are important factors that could make one worse off than another. Additionally, we could also add a factor of gender, or a factor of race: being a woman, a person of colour or a woman of colour in these situations could exacerbate your already existing vulnerability to social injustice.

Therefore, there are different factors to the threat of climate change that affect peoples in different ways. It is this awareness of intersectionality that I argue to be important to recognise when introducing the field of climate justice, which has made climate change an issue of political justice: the consequences of climate change are

not being felt or distributed equally across the globe, and therefore we should aim to understand why this is the case and how we can address these injustices.

This notion of intersectionality is the starting point of this research. I will specifically focus on answering the following question: “How can Iris Marion Young’s “Five Faces of Oppression” be applied to climate justice?” The aim of this project is to apply Young’s theory to investigate to what extent Young’s approach can supplement discussions of climate justice. In the same way that Young discusses for example racial or gender injustices in the light of her theory, and the ways in which these injustices intersect according to the social groups that one belongs to and the different faces of oppression to which these groups are subjected, so I will analyse climate related injustices. This is because Young’s theory could provide an additional comprehensive and substantive theoretical framework for questions of climate justice from which we can identify injustices and oppression that are related to climate change. To my best knowledge, her theory has not been applied yet to the field of climate justice literature, which makes it worthwhile to analyse climate-induced injustices by making use of the Five Faces. In addition to the main question and aim, there are different sub questions that are relevant to this project. Namely, how are oppressed groups disproportionately affected by the causes and consequences of climate change, and how does an analysis through the faces of oppression change the way in which we should address climate injustice for a particular group? By analysing climate justice with the help of the theoretical framework of the Five Faces, I expect that this research can provide answers to these questions. These findings could also provide directions for further research, for example whether or not there are additional faces that can be identified within the context of climate justice, whether these faces could be applied to other contexts than climate justice too, and whether Young’s recommendations for addressing injustice could contribute to recommendations formulated by climate justice scholars.

1.1 Thesis structure

The project is structured as follows. Chapter 2 will provide background knowledge that will familiarise the reader with the subject, specifically focused on the background against which Young has developed her theory: social movements in the United States in the 1960s and ‘70s that challenged the ontology and

conceptualisation of oppression, after it appeared that lived equality did not necessarily follow from legal equality. Chapter 3 will lay out the methodology that will be used in order to answer the research question, which consists of a conceptual analysis, a non-ideal approach, and a normative analysis, in order to bridge Young's notion of oppression and notions of climate injustice, non-ideal theory, and a normative analysis towards recommendations. In chapter 4, a literature review will engage with Iris Marion Young's theory of the Five Faces of Oppression, a number of critics, and climate justice literature. In this chapter, I aim to provide a comprehensive overview of the nature and debate surrounding her theory, of the relation between her theory and climate justice literature, and preliminary remarks or sub questions that arise from this overview. These will be later addressed in chapter 10, but before that, chapters 5 to 9 will each engage with a Face of Oppression and seek application to and intersectionality within the field of climate justice. Throughout these assessments, I make use of concrete examples of instances of climate injustice in order to provide more detailed, vivid and concrete analyses of Young's theory. In chapter 10, I will go over the critiques and limitations as identified in chapter 4's literature review in order to reflect on the research and see whether these critiques and limitations are valid, and whether they undermine or rather supplement her theory. This consequently provides fuel for further research. Next, in chapter 11, I will engage with recommendations that follow from addressing the fourth Face of Oppression, which is that of cultural imperialism. Since the recommendations converge with those of climate justice scholars, it highlights the relevance of Young's theory and additionally the novel ways that her theoretical framework provides for understanding the nature of climate injustices for developing recommendations. Finally, we will conclude this research in chapter 12 with a brief summary.

Historical background

2

2.1 *A new ontology of oppression*

In 1964 the Civil Rights Act was installed in the United States of America, after years of protests and social movements aiming to end discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, and sex. The Civil Rights Act endorses for example voting rights for everyone, as well as equal employment opportunities and the desegregation of public education. However, even though the installment of the Act did mean *legal* equality of all citizens, it did not necessarily lead to *lived* equality of all citizens, since the social norms and (negative) stereotypes did not change immediately with the Act (Stainback 2012, 28). As an example, black people still faced racism in their everyday life, just as women continued to face sexist practices. As such, more people became aware of how the ontology of the notion ‘oppression’ was inadequate: oppression used to refer to intentional and conscious oppression, performed by agents such as a tyrant, or a tyrannical ruling group (Young 1988, 271). How could oppression and injustice then take place when the law dictates that everyone is equal? New left social movements in the 1960s and ‘70s have challenged and changed the understanding of this notion towards a concept of oppression that refers to injustices that arise from “everyday practices of a well-intentioned liberal society” (Young 1990, 41). This background on the new ontology of oppression is important to take into account for this project, since it has fuelled Young’s aim to investigate how oppression can take place structurally as well as unintentionally and unconsciously in different ways and within different structures, along the lines of different social groups. This ontology and Young’s aim are therefore at the very base of this project, in which we seek to identify climate change-induced injustices and oppression. These do not have to stem from conscious and intentional oppression, but rather emerge within everyday practices, even if law dictates that everyone is equal.

2.2 *Climate justice*

In order to familiarise the reader with the field of climate justice, I will provide a short overview in this section before heading into the methodology and my

argument. Climate justice is a field of philosophical research that focuses on the causes and consequences of climate change in terms of a just distribution of burdens and benefits, just procedures, or other forms of justice (Shue and Kanbur 2018, 1; Sinnott-Armstrong 2005, 127). An example of such distribution with regard to the *causes* of climate change relates to greenhouse gas emissions (GGE) that contribute to the rise of temperatures and all its consequences for the earth and the people and nonhuman animals that inhabit it. GGEs should be cut in order to stop or at least slow down this process, as has been agreed upon in international treaties such as the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 and the Paris Agreement in 2016. However, since climate change is a global phenomenon, and so also the mitigation of GGEs, there arise questions with regard to the distribution of the burdens of cutting these emissions. For example, should industrialised countries contribute more to the reduction of overall GGEs than nonindustrialised countries, or countries that are on their way to industrialisation, and why so? Some authors argue that polluters should pay for the pollution that they have caused, and that industrialised countries therefore should contribute more to global mitigation efforts (Caney 2009; Shue 1999). Other authors believe that that is not fair, since some polluters are no longer alive, and that current generations therefore cannot be held accountable. They therefore argue for basing the distribution on other principles, such as the 'beneficiary pays'-principle: current generations in industrialised countries have benefitted from these historical emissions and should for that reason contribute more than current generations in industrialising countries (Meyer 2010; Page 2012).

Not only questions regarding the distribution between nations and individuals of current generations are at play in climate justice, but also questions regarding future generations. We then speak of an intergenerational notion of justice. For example, do we actually have a duty to mitigate these GGEs and fight climate change with regard to future generations, and why so? Some authors argue that we do, for example, based a duty to provide future generations with a minimum of human rights to be respected (Philips 2016). Other authors discuss Derek Parfit's non-identity problem to illustrate that we are not able to have any duties towards future generations, since the specific future generations that are currently jeopardised by climate change will not exist if we will mitigate GGEs now (Hurka 2001, 587).

Just distribution with regard to the consequences of climate change is, among others, related to the burdens of adaptation measures, which are focused on decreasing

vulnerability of people and ecosystems in the face of rising sea levels, heavy tropical storms, or extreme droughts. The question here is who should carry the burden of financing adaptation measures when responsibility for the causes is disputed, as shown earlier, and when some countries or individuals are not able to afford these adaptation measures. For example, some islands are particularly vulnerable to these consequences of climate change, as hurricane Maria demonstrated in 2017 when it landed in Puerto Rico, leaving a trail of destruction (García-López 2018). Also extreme heat and drought are already negatively influencing people's harvests, income, and for some even their chances of survival. This will only worsen. An example is the nomadic Turkana people of Kenya, where temperatures have risen over the past 50 years by 2 to 3°C and rain seasons have become increasingly unpredictable. Consequently, pressure on water resources and extreme droughts pose an immediate threat to the survival of this nomadic tribe (Human Rights Watch 2015).

As such, the field of climate justice is extremely diverse with regard to its scope, with distributive questions on local, regional, national as well as on global scales, and each scale has its own 'winners' and 'losers' from the distributive question at hand.

Methodology

3

3.1 Main questions of this research

The main question that will be answered within this study is to what extent we can apply Iris Marion Young's "Five Faces of Oppression" to climate justice, in order to identify and define injustices and oppression that are at play within the philosophical field of climate justice in Young's terms. The main goal is therefore to supplement discussions on climate justice and provide recommendations based upon explicit and/or implicit recommendations that Young provides for addressing injustices, and accordingly to formulate new ways in which we should address climate injustice for particular groups. In order to do so, I rely on three general methods: a conceptual analysis, non-ideal theory, and a normative analysis. In this chapter I will elaborate on my methodology.

Firstly, I will rely on a conceptual analysis throughout chapter 5 until chapter 9, intending to apply Young's notion of oppression to instances of climate injustice and to demonstrate the conceptual overlap between both concepts, as well as the intersectionality of overlapping factors of vulnerability to climate change. As Olsthoorn describes, a strength of a conceptual analysis is that it is able "to sharpen our thinking by refining and enriching our vocabulary, structuring our theories and guiding moral judgement", which is the underlying aim of this thesis (Olsthoorn 2017, 153). We want to show conceptual connections between vulnerability to climate change and the Five Faces, and recommend a change in the way oppression is conceptualised within climate justice literature, by focusing on the nature and internal structure of instances of climate injustice (Idem., 161-2). Therefore, we will analyse climate injustices, by employing a non-ideal approach, in order to conceptualise injustice and oppression. Hence the second method used in this research, non-ideal theory, which is a method that will help us to identify what is *injustice* rather than identifying normatively *what would be (un)just*, following the distinction between "utopian" (ideal) and "realistic" (non-ideal) theory (Valentini 2012, 656-7). This means that we will take into account real world constraints such as politics and power structures, while ideal theory would reject taking into account

such constraints (Idem., 659). Specifically then, we will analyse the concepts of injustice and oppression from a non-ideal point of view by using Young's conceptual framework. In that way, we will draw conceptual connections and find overlap between Young's conceptual framework of oppression and the field of climate justice. This allows us to conceptualise "*what is climate injustice?*" according to Young's conceptual framework, by focusing on real world examples of climate injustice. To make the use of a non-ideal approach clearer, it is helpful to see how theorising from an ideal approach would be incompatible with our research aim: namely, this would require us to theorise *what would climate (in)justice look like?*, which is not helpful when we want to conceptually analyse Young's non-ideal theory of oppression.

This analysis will eventually enrich our vocabulary and help to structure (new) theories, since we will be able to provide an additional theoretical toolbox of analysing injustices to the field of climate justice. Additionally, this thesis focuses on the concept of intersectionality that Young's framework adopts. When applying Young's theory to the field of climate justice, this concept will play an important role. Namely, we want to articulate the ways in which intersectionality plays a role in climate justice, therefore aiming to strengthen the conceptual connections between intersectionality, injustice, oppression and the causes and consequences of climate change.

In order to apply the Five Faces to climate justice, the following chapters 5 until 9 will each be dedicated to one Face of Oppression. Firstly, I will explore what it means to be oppressed according to the particular face in a world impacted by climate change, and in this way set out Young's criteria for the oppression of a social group in the context of climate change. Secondly, I will demonstrate the conceptual overlap and intersectionality between the particular Face of Oppression and the impact of climate change. Within these analyses, I will make use of climate justice literature, as well as concrete examples and case studies that will be able to make the matter concrete and vivid. These will emphasise globally scaled injustices as well as nationally and/or regionally scaled injustices for each analysis.

Additionally, moving to the third method of this research, chapter 11 also includes a normative analysis. This is because I will provide recommendations for addressing climate injustices, specifically in the light of the fourth Face of Oppression within this chapter. These are based upon Young's explicit and/or implicit recommendations for

addressing this type of oppression. It should be noted however that due to the different nature, dynamics and roots of each Face of Oppression, the recommendations for addressing injustice are different for each Face of Oppression out of which the injustice arises. However, due to the scope of this research, I will only focus on this particular Face of Oppression.

Even though Young has recognised that her theory has not been developed for global distribution questions (see chapter 4.8), it is inevitable to take these questions into account while evaluating climate justice due to the global nature of climate change. Therefore, it should be noted that I am aware that this could become a limitation of my analysis. However, translating Young's theory to international settings is a huge question on its own and this does not fit within the scope of this research. For this reason, I will apply Young's approach without specifically or particularly focusing on its limitations with regard to the distinction between the national and the global level. Nevertheless and furthermore, after the conceptual analyses of each Face of Oppression, chapter 10 will engage with the critics referred to in the literature review, as well as reflect on this possible limitation regarding global questions of justice.

3.2 Why apply the Five Faces to climate justice?

Lastly, I want to justify my project and methodology. Firstly, due to the disastrous consequences that climate change has for nature and humankind, it is important to emphasise that identifying what qualifies as 'climate injustice' is of uttermost importance too in the context of climate justice literature that is mostly ideal by nature - in other words, climate justice literature focuses more on "*what would be just?*" without recognising real world constraints that could impede a normative and ideal theory of climate justice. This leads us to turn towards Young's non-ideal approach: rather than formulating what climate justice should look like, and consequently what a just distribution would be, this research will rather identify climate change-induced systemic injustices before we take the step towards redistribution and specifically Young's recommendations of other ways of dealing with injustices beyond redistribution. Additionally, this research will be able to contribute to the body of non-ideal climate justice literature, which is currently becoming increasingly important to develop further due to normative questions that the real world and international treaties, such as the Paris Agreement, pose

(Brandstedt 2017, 222; Caney 2016, 10-1). For example, how should the costs and benefits of a clean energy transition be distributed, taking into account real world constraints and feasibility? Non-ideal ethics, focusing on the reality of the situation rather than on abstract principles in an ideal world and without taking into account real world constraints, could contribute much to these debates. My research will be able to shed light on climate justice and oppression through non-ideal theory, by aiming to create a toolbox for understanding the nature of climate-induced injustices in the real world.

Further, as will be demonstrated later on, climate justice is characterised by a need for pluralistic and multi- and interdisciplinary approaches. This is because climate change itself is a matter of multi- and interdisciplinary research: physics, geology, social sciences, and humanities, among others, play a large role in researching different facets of the causes and consequences of climate change. Additionally, climate justice literature is characterised by pluralistic approaches, which refers to the idea that society exists out of a diverse range of groups with different interests and values which should be respected within a society (Nussbaum 2001, 886-7). This notion returns in climate justice literature for example due to the fact that combating climate change will take drastic measures, impacting different kinds of lifestyles, values and interests, and which, as an example, lead to political parties having a hard time in reaching a consensus in debates on what suitable measures to take against climate change. As pluralistic theory is a central component to Young's theory, due to her implicit and explicit focus on social groups with different identities, values and interests, it makes for an interesting application and analysis, especially in the context of the causes and consequences of climate change. In this context, as well as in Young's theoretical framework, different interests, lifestyles and identities play an important role as will become clearer throughout this research. Additionally, our main focus on the impacts of climate change as matters of intersectionality contributes to this requirement of climate justice discussions.

Literature review

4

4.1 *The aim of Iris Marion Young's project*

In her work “Five Faces of Oppression”, a chapter from her book “Justice and the Politics of Difference”, Iris Young’s aim is to articulate how the notion of oppression could be understood in modern day society. The reason for writing this chapter was that she noticed that the ontology of the notion of oppression had become mostly linked to intentional and conscious oppression, for example by a tyrant. However, new left social movements in the 1960s and ‘70s challenged and changed the understanding of this notion towards a concept of oppression that refers to injustices that arise from “everyday practices of a well-intentioned liberal society” (Young 1990, 41). It refers to the idea that legal equality does not directly equal lived equality, since oppression is here understood to be part of the basic fabric of a society, and so new policies and laws to tackle injustices and oppression are not sufficient (Ibid.). As such, oppression is not necessarily performed intentionally or consciously, nor by a specific person such as a tyrant. Rather, oppression takes place through a “vast network of everyday practices, attitudes, assumptions, behaviours, and institutional rules” (Idem., 45). With her analysis, Young fleshes out the ways in which oppression and domination occur in our modern day society, and as such lay the foundations for a theory of redistribution that takes into account the non-ideal structure of our society. In that way, her theory goes beyond a simple concern for a just redistribution, since it focuses on the underlying structures of oppression and domination that would hinder a just distribution. As mentioned before, legal equality does not directly entail lived equality. And in the same manner, an equal (re)distribution does not directly entail lived equality if underlying structures of oppression and domination persist.

4.2 *What are social groups?*

Young aims to understand the different forms of structural oppression that individuals experience by employing the notion of a ‘social group’. This focus comes from the idea that a person’s identity is defined by being part of a group: “a subject’s

particular sense of history, sense of identity, affinity, separateness, even the person's mode of reasoning, evaluating and expressing feeling are constituted at least partly by her or his group affinities" (Young 1990, 45). She adopts Heidegger's notion of "thrownness" in arguing that one finds oneself as a member of a group, rather than one actively joining a group (Idem., 46).

In addition to this, due to the norms, stereotypes and specific characteristics that are attributed to social groups, persons become more closely identified by others by group membership, which pushes further the idea that one is identified in terms of the social groups to which one belongs. It should also be noted that since an individual person usually belongs to several groups, "it follows that individual subjects are not unified, but multiple, heterogeneous, and sometimes perhaps incoherent" (Young 1988, 273; 1990, 48). An additional feature to this understanding is that groups themselves are fluid and dynamic, and in the spirit of modern times these undergo rapid changes. Her identity-constituting understanding of groups is therefore in contrast with an understanding of groups as aggregates, in which a group is no more than the aggregate of the individuals that constitute it, just as it is in contrast with an understanding of groups as associations, in which individuals join as 'formed' persons already (Idem., 275). This leads to Young's idea that an association is constituted by individuals, but individuals are not constituted by membership of an association. The individual's identity is formed by their social group membership, and so one's identity exists prior to joining an association.

4.3 The Five Faces of Oppression

The first Face of Oppression is exploitation. This refers to a more classical Marxist explanation of oppression, where the oppression is attributed to processes in which power is transferred. More specifically, especially within Marxist philosophy, the system of capitalism transfers power from the working class to the ruling capitalist class, whose power will be augmented. The capitalist class will gain power, whereas the working class suffers from deprivation and a lack of control. Power in this sense can be conceptualised as profit, which exists because the labour of the workers is appropriated by the capitalist. Therefore, the Marxist would argue, the working class is being oppressed and exploited, since the value of their labour is being appropriated by the capitalist class, which gains power in this manner. Young takes this approach regarding exploitation, but her conception of exploitation relies on

social groups. Within her theory, Young therefore refers to the process of the transfer of the results of the labour from one social group to benefit another (Young 1990, 49-53).

The second Face of Oppression is marginalisation. Young refers to this as a process of exclusion, based on social structures and a system of labour that cannot or does not employ certain groups of people, especially when people are regarded as incapable of being a 'functional' wage labourer. Marginalisation is an oppressive process, since it can exclude an entire social group from useful participation in social life and structures, which can lead to material deprivation as well as extermination. Examples of this process are the marginalisation of older individuals, racially marked social groups, and mentally or physically disabled people (Idem., 53-55).

The third Face of Oppression is powerlessness. This can be understood as injustice that arises from status rather than class, following Weber.¹ It means that some individuals have little or no work autonomy or authority, nor do they have the possibility to express themselves creatively at work. Often, these individuals do not have professional expertise. This also means that those that do have work autonomy, authority, and professional expertise, those who Young calls 'professionals', have privileges in life and experience more respectability relative to non-professionals. In this way, powerlessness refers to a lack of authority and a lack of sense of self (Idem., 56-58).

The fourth Face of Oppression is cultural imperialism. According to Young, dominant social groups "project their own experience as representative of humanity as such" (Idem., 59), and thereby universalise their experience and culture and establish it as the norm within a society. This also means that social groups who do not identify with these norms are reconstructed as deviant or inferior to the norm, and as such the dominant ideology marks these social groups as the Other. Here, Young speaks of a paradoxical oppression that the Other experiences, since the Other is both rendered invisible as well as marked out by stereotypes. This then also leads

¹ Max Weber makes a conceptual distinction between 'classes' and 'status groups'. Classes are wholly economically determined by property and lack of property, and Weber describes this as the most elemental economic fact: it is about the distribution of material property, and consequently the term 'class' covers any group of people that is part of the same class situation. They are not communities, for instance due to the differentiation that one finds within a class when looking further than the elemental economic distinction (Weber 2013, 181-2). Status groups, on the other hand, are communities and are socially estimated to have a certain social *honour* and a specific style of life that corresponds to the community (Idem., 187). Additionally, with a status group come privileges, which Weber describes as material monopolies, such as wearing special costumes, eating special dishes, and to play certain musical instruments (Idem., 191).

to a double consciousness that is experienced by the Other, which refers to the thought that an individual defines oneself by and experiences the world through both the dominant and a subordinate culture (Idem., 58-60). For example, women experience a world in which the dominant culture might actively portray them as being obedient and caring. Similarly, others might identify women according to these stereotypes that the dominant culture perpetuates. Yet, women themselves also view the world through their own perspective and their own subjectivity, according to which they might not identify as obedient or caring. Hence, women have to navigate their way in this world through their own subjectivity, as well as through the lens of the dominant culture: they might not identify as being obedient, yet others identify them as being obedient because of the dominant culture's stereotypes.

The last Face of Oppression is violence. Violence is directed against members of specific social groups simply because they are members of that social group. Therefore, it is systemic so that members of oppressed social groups live "with the knowledge that they must fear random, unprovoked attacks on their persons or property, which have no motive but to damage, humiliate, or destroy the person" (Idem., 61).

In addition to these five forms that oppression can take, it should also be mentioned that Young notes that relations between social groups are defined by oppression and privilege, rather than by oppressed and oppressors: as she argues herself, "for every oppressed group there is a group that is privileged in relation to that group" (Young 1988, 276). Hence, oppression is unconscious and unintentional, defined by power asymmetries of privilege and oppression between social groups. Rather than actively suppressing a social group or an individual, this understanding of oppression focuses on the process of power in which one social group benefits from the oppression of another. These benefits are then expressed in privileges that a group has in relation to another group.

4.4 *Criticisms*

Young's theory of oppression did not go without criticism. In this section I will explore different critiques regarding her theory, respectively by Nancy Fraser, Amy Allen, Tamara Zutlevics, and Matthew Kuchem. These concern the limitations of her pluralistic approach, her neglect of psychological oppression, and her ontological commitment to using groups. In this section, I will not reply to the critics yet. Rather,

this will be done in chapter 10, as part of a concluding reflection on the research. Such a reflection will make concrete how these criticisms relate to Young's theory, specifically when applied to climate justice. Additionally, it will also offer elaboration on whether they are supplementing or undermining her theory, and in that way it also provides directions for further research.

Firstly, in her work *Justus Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*, Nancy Fraser has set out an elaborate critique of Young's notion of oppression as well as her concept of the social group. She demonstrates what the limits and theoretical as well as political issues are with the theory, due to Young's focus on integrating redistribution as well as recognition in a single theory. Fraser argues that Young mixes elements of both paradigms in her definition of oppression, but fails to properly integrate them (Fraser 1997, 190). This tension could consequently lead to serious political consequences. This is because it appears that "the cultural face is a problem of undervaluation; the political-economic face, in contrast, is a problem of underdevelopment" (Idem., 194). As such, due to a lack of integration of these realms, recognition does not serve as a substitute for redistribution and could even interfere with it, since arrangements that could be positive for cultural recognition could be a very ineffective remedy for the political-economic face (Ibid.). According to Fraser, the same problematic and unresolved duality can also be found in Young's concept of a social group. This is because again, a single notion is supposed to cover different modes of collectivity: those rooted in culture alone, such as ethnicity, as well as those rooted in political economy, such as class. (Idem., 195). In sum, Fraser would reframe Young's "Five Faces of Oppression" into those oppressions that are economically rooted (exploitation, marginalisation and powerlessness) and those that are culturally rooted (cultural imperialism and violence), with their own broad category of remedies. Otherwise, Fraser argues, if we would try and encompass all such different modes of collectivity in a single concept, we will run the risk of not doing justice to them all (Idem., 196).

A second critique of the Five Faces is articulated by Amy Allen, and her critique starts exactly where Nancy Fraser left her critique: Allen believes that Fraser should have taken it further, by arguing that recognising "the culture of oppressed groups seems like a plausible remedy for the cultural faces of oppression only because Young has

not fully articulated oppression's cultural dimensions" (Allen 2008, 162). She therefore supports Fraser's proposal for a distinction between economically and culturally grounded oppressions in order to do more justice to the latter. She goes beyond Fraser's concern by referring to what she calls perhaps the most damaging cultural Face of Oppression, that Young has left unaddressed to the extent of its relation to cultural imperialism: psychological or psychic oppression. Allen thus supports Fraser's claim that Young is not successful in integrating both economic and cultural realms in a single concept. More specifically, Allen argues that the notion of double consciousness that Young uses to demonstrate how the oppressed experience both the beliefs and images of the dominant culture as well as of their subordinate culture, implies in Young's usage that the oppressed do not identify with negative stereotypes that are held by the dominant culture. However, this does not capture that the oppressed often do in fact identify with these negative images and beliefs that are related to their social group, which therefore also negatively influences their own self-image. According to Allen, issues such as these stem from Young's notion of power that is only focused on domination rather than empowerment. This is problematic for Young's relational theory, since Allen argues that it is not possible to theorise oppression and domination in isolation from empowerment (Idem., 166). Only recognising the oppression of a social group's culture, whilst leaving out psychological oppression, is not enough according to Allen. We have to recognise the oppression of a social group's culture, *and* take into account the role that psychological oppression plays herein. Consequently, it also becomes clear that a sole focus on dominance is only half of the story: social groups that do in fact identify with negative stereotypes stemming from cultural oppression, in contrary to Young's argument, need empowerment to become the other half of the story.

A third line of critique relates to the ones set out above, and comes from Tamara Zutlevics. She criticises both the pluralistic character of Young's theory, as well as the fact that it might miss or not adequately capture certain faces of oppression, such as psychological oppression (Zutlevics 2002, 82). As Allen also stretches the importance of psychological oppression, and the lack thereof in Young's theory, this is an important recurring critique. As a response, Zutlevics has set out a broader definition of oppression that is more general, as opposed to a pluralistic definition such as

Young's. In that way, Zutlevics argues that the risk of not capturing certain oppressions within an established set of categories is avoided (Zutlevics 2002, 92-101). Zutlevics starts off by arguing that while oppression is always unjust, injustices do not always have to be oppressive. Subsequently, she suggests a definition of oppression according to which injustice is oppressive when it curtails resilient autonomy - that is, when social understandings and political infrastructures inhibit the opportunity for one to continue to live their life according to their own lifeplans (Idem., 87). This definition is therefore future-oriented, and as such is able to overcome instances where injustices are not necessarily regarded to be oppressive, since injustices only become oppressive when they would curtail one's resilient autonomy. In that way, her definition of oppression is broader and more general than Young's, and according to Zutlevics, it should therefore be able to include instances of oppression that Young's theory could possibly fail to capture.

The last strand of criticism that will be discussed in this paper centers around Young's use of groups and stems from Matthew Kuchem. He has identified a few limitations of Young's notion of the social group. Kuchem mainly argues that the social groups on which the Five Faces are built are arbitrarily classified and not able to take seriously an individual's multifaceted character. This is because Young argues that associations are not social groups, since individuals constitute associations, while social groups constitute individuals. However, as Kuchem argues, it is not clear at all why associations would not be relevant for an individual's identity, since Young does not substantiate why some attributes and groups are more relevant than others in the formation of one's identity (Kuchem 2020, 743). Young specifically mentions that political parties are examples of an association that a person joins when 'formed', and accordingly do not contribute to the formation of one's identity (Young 1989, 186). However, as Kuchem demonstrates, a political party could be extremely relevant in the formation of one's identity, and it includes many of the elements that Young describes for social groups - shared ways of life, shared experiences, and shared ways of affiliating with one another. Since Young does not substantiate why such an association is less relevant than her definition of a social group, Kuchem regards this an arbitrary decision on which she bases her theory (Kuchem 2020, 742-3). Consequently, by leaving aside many other identity-forming factors, Young

runs the risk of essentialising and homogenising certain social groups, by overlooking and obscuring the differences that exist between groups (Idem., 747).

4.5 Socialist feminist philosophy

In addition to these lines of criticism, it is also important to stretch that Young's aim is to articulate this specific notion of oppression as understood from the perspective of the new left social movements. Even though the Five Faces remain widely applicable, as I will illustrate shortly in section 4.6, at least the very first three Faces discussed above - exploitation, marginalisation and powerlessness - rely on a strong focus on the social division of labour in relation to the occurrence of oppression. Cultural imperialism does not so, but still has the Marxist notion of (hegemonic) ideology at its core, in which the dominant social group would determine and construct the dominant ideology or belief system. Fraser's criticism of the culturally and economically rooted Faces of Oppression with which Young aims to cover all modes of collectivity returns here. This is because this criticism exposes to a certain extent Young's socioeconomic focus regarding oppression. This focus aligns with her more general socialist philosophy. It is therefore important to notice that such limitations as identified by critics could be related to the general theme of socialist feminist philosophy that Young applies to her work. This does not necessarily provide an answer to Fraser's line of critique, to which we will respond in chapter 10, however it does explain Young's motivation for her socioeconomic focus. For these reasons, a short sketch will be provided of main trends within socialist feminist philosophy, in order to make Young's background and school of thought clearer in the light of the abovementioned lines of criticism.

While socialism largely follows the Marxist tradition by focusing on oppression through an economic lens and by arguing that the social division of labour is the main base of oppression and inequality, socialist feminist philosophy has subjected traditional Marxist philosophy to scrutiny. It argues that the Marxist tradition is too narrow a theory of oppression, and therefore aims to incorporate the specific ways in which also categories such as gender contribute to oppression through capitalist relations and systems of power transfer (Young 1990, 278; Bartky 1990, 33). As such, the "oppressed" are not only defined by the class that they constitute or to which they belong, but also, for example, by the gender they identify with. Socialist feminist literature has illustrated how gender relations are also prone to exploitation,

especially with regard to the social division of labour. This school of thought therefore highlights the intersectionality of gender and class in theorising oppression. An example that Young herself gives is related to typical “feminine jobs”, such as waitressing or caretaking, that have gender tasks incorporated in them such as sexual labour or caring for another person’s body. This consequently means that “women’s energies are expended in workplaces that enhance the status of, please, or comfort others, usually men” (Young 1988, 279). Processes such as these enhance the unjust transfer of power to others, in this case men, and in that way facilitate exploitation and domination (Idem., 278). In the same way, some socialist feminists have argued how patriarchy as a system equals or intersects with the system of capitalism, and how both systems are exploitative and oppressive by nature.

4.6 Applying the Five Faces: examples from literature

As has been demonstrated in the previous sections, Young’s theory relies strongly on socialist feminist philosophy and other philosophers have identified flaws or limitations in her definition of oppression and usage of social groups. However, the theory has been applied to a wide range of oppressions in different studies within different fields. This section will shortly outline three different studies. In this way, I want to demonstrate that her theory has become a tool to analyse specific questions for a diversity of scholars and has enriched other bodies of literature and schools of thought. Studies such as these do not demonstrate that Young’s theory is flawless or without limitations. Rather, they show that the use of the notion of a social group as well as analysing a social group by using Young’s five criteria of oppression remains a useful tool to be used, since both notions provide a comprehensive theoretical framework, substantive conclusions, and new ways of thinking about and addressing injustices for wide variety of disciplinary perspectives.

Firstly, Mathieu Dubeau (2020) uses Young’s theory in order to provide a way of thinking about interspecies oppression. With regard to exploitation, he refers to the industrial animal production; marginalisation occurs for ‘unwanted’ or deficient companion animals; powerlessness and class return in cases of farm animals that should serve as food for companion animals; cultural imperialism occurs through not considering the moral status of species that have been Othered through a hegemonic ideology that is speciesist by nature; and for these reasons, some species also experience random attacks of violence. In this way, Young’s Five Faces have been

helpful for Dubeau's project since they made vivid and could help reimagine the relations of domination in modern society between non-human animals as well as between non-human animals and humans.

Secondly, Damian Milton (2016) uses the Five Faces in order to demonstrate in what ways autistic people are often victims of oppression. He focuses mostly on three Faces of oppression that autistic people suffer from. These are respectively marginalisation, since autistic people are often viewed to be incapable of full social personhood and interaction; powerlessness due to lack of autonomy or assigned authority; and cultural imperialism because of 'expert knowledge' being projected upon autistic people that undermines their own interpretations of themselves.

Thirdly and lastly, Dubrosky (2013) demonstrates how the profession of nursing is prone to oppression due to its gendered nature, arguing that all five criteria of oppression apply to nursing. According to Dubrosky nurses are exploited, for example because the profession of medicine dominates nursing and so nurses experience a lack of control and visibility which eventually benefits their employers and the dominating coworkers (Dubrosky 2013, 206). The face of marginalisation applies specifically to nurse managers and midlevel nurses, since they remain on the fringes of the oppressed group, while also working with the dominating group. Still being the oppressed group within deliberations, they are not able to change the balance of power in their working environment (Idem., 207). This is because within these deliberations with dominating groups, they are still subjected to the dominant ideology and therefore, even though they may partake in these deliberations, they will still face oppression. Regarding powerlessness, it is for example part of the nursing profession that they take orders from physicians, yet without having the opportunity to negotiate these orders. As such, they are bound to the higher class's power and authority (Ibid.). One example that Dubrosky gives regarding cultural imperialism is that medicine has come to dominate other forms of knowing and providing care so that it strongly influences the profession of nursing and has a negative impact on nurses' power to influence health and well being (Idem., 208). Lastly, regarding the face of violence, Dubrosky uses the notion of horizontal violence to explain how lack of self-esteem and self-hatred, due to the internalization of the oppressors' values, leads to instances of sabotage and bullying within the nurses' own social group (Ibid.). It is important to note here that Dubrosky's notion of intragroup violence is different from Young's notion of systemic violence that oppressed social

groups may suffer because of violence directed against them by other social groups. However, I will leave up for debate whether this is an invalid interpretation of Young's notion of violence or rather a supplementation to it.

4.7 *Climate justice: intersectional, pluralistic and inclusive*

Within climate justice literature, the five categories that Young has developed have to my best knowledge not been applied yet to philosophical questions or specific case studies. There are, however, a few preliminary core notions within climate justice literature that are important to mention due to their overlap with Young's aim, theory, and conclusions. These are respectively intersectionality, plurality and inclusivity.

First of all, climate justice literature in general recognises the intersectionality and pluralistic character of the different kinds of injustices that are related to climate change. To illustrate, there are studies focused on assessing the gendered impacts of climate change (UNFCCC; World Bank), as well as studies that study the global distributive aspects of climate change and how these relate to higher and lower income countries (Shue 1999; 2014; Mendelsohn 2006; Diffenbaugh 2019). There are studies that focus on the injustice of neglecting adaptation efforts that will disproportionately impact racially marked groups (Ariza 2020). And lastly, there are studies that assess the global procedural injustice of geoengineering methods, just as there are studies that argue that geoengineering is inherently Western and colonial, based on cost-benefit analyses (Hourdequin 2018; 2019).

In this way, climate justice literature extends itself to realms of race, gender, and class on national and global scales and examines how and when these interact and intersect. One of the reasons for this intersectional and pluralistic character of climate justice is linked to the character of climate change itself: a non-pluralistic approach is not able to do justice to the multi-disciplinary and multi-faceted character of climate change. Recognising the intersectionality and plurality in climate justice philosophy and literature is essential in order to gain a better understanding of how it relates to Young's theory of oppression. This is because the notion of intersectionality is at the core of understanding structural oppression and social groups, since Young's theory allows for an understanding in which a person can be oppressed in different ways, by virtue of the social group to which they belong, which further stresses the intersectional view that she endorses: identity-shaping

factors contribute to the extent to which one is oppressed. In addition to this, Young emphasises that subjects often belong to different social groups, and that our identities as such are fluid and heterogeneous. Belonging to different groups therefore means more factors that could increase one's oppression in a society.

Secondly, there is a growing part of climate justice literature dedicated to understanding the Western notions of nature, ecology, sustainability and economy and how these have taken over in many discourses of climate change, silencing other non-Western perspectives on the matter (Whyte 2018; Brondizio 2016). As such, we can witness an attempt within the literature to do justice to non-Western perspectives or to restore those, not least in order to gain new insights. In addition, there is also much literature to be found in climate justice that deals with rethinking our connection to the natural world. Here, I want to emphasise that such projects align with the general aim of Young's project to think outside of and beyond the dominant discourses of Western paradigms and in this way come to different and more inclusive conclusions, embracing cultural variation and differentiation. Young's project therefore fosters inclusivity within discourses on climate justice and climate change. This tendency within the field of climate justice is therefore also in line with what would be the exact opposite of the fourth Face of Oppression, cultural imperialism, which refers to dominant ideologies that silence other perspectives or regard these as inferior.

These notions - intersectionality, plurality and inclusivity - are by no means the only core notions to be found in climate justice literature or Young's work. However, they do represent an important overlap between the two, illuminating the nature of both projects: climate change is multi-faceted and therefore requires a multi-disciplinary and pluralistic approach, just as Young argues that this is the case for oppression. Due to this, as a preliminary remark, the nature of climate justice literature and Young's project align, and both projects work to incorporate views that are not already implicated as of yet by dominant belief systems, such as Western and neoliberal economic ideologies. This makes an application of the Five Faces increasingly interesting to investigate.

4.8 *Climate justice and the Five Faces: preliminary remarks*

From this overview of literature related to the Five Faces, as well as a short preliminary overview of the field of climate justice in the light of the Five Faces, there are a few preliminary remarks that should be addressed here and picked up for the analyses or further research. Regarding Young's focus on socialist feminist philosophy in her work, as discussed in section 4.5, one could ask whether climate justice and socialist feminist philosophy could align. More specifically, would a focus on the social division of labour and other Marxist notions, such as hegemonic ideologies, be relevant to apply to issues in climate justice? I will argue shortly here that climate change has and will continue to have stringent consequences for the social division of labour, and therefore the socialist feminist approach remains relevant for climate justice discussions. Examples that illustrate this are the energy transition to renewable forms of energy that asks for a reorganisation of economic affairs, or the consequences of rising temperatures on farming, such as droughts. Both of these examples have consequences on the social division of labour since such reorganisation requires a distribution of burdens and benefits across a society, financially impacting households, while (continuously) failing harvests are able to exclude whole communities from the labour market or render them increasingly vulnerable.

Regarding Young's use of the notion 'hegemonic ideology', we can expect to encounter an overlap with climate change and justice in the sense of neoliberal economic and political longstanding ideologies that have, for instance, partly contributed to the dangerous issue of climate change itself. An example of this is a neoliberal train of thought that is extractivist by nature and deeply embedded within the ruling global economic ideology. This ideology recognises that natural resources are finite, yet natural resources such as oil, minerals, and wood are globally appropriated whilst not taking into account and paying for the environmental costs of the extraction. However, we can imagine that this is by no means the only ideology from which injustices related to climate change can arise, and that the socialist Five Faces might have limitations in providing an adequate understanding of climate injustices, or could even have certain blind spots regarding climate injustices that could emerge within socialist contexts specifically. In chapter 8, we will deal with this particular subject more in depth. Since Young's Five Faces have not been applied yet

to the realm of climate justice, this field remains open for research, and this project aims to provide answers.

In addition to this, as already mentioned in chapter 3, it is important to mention again that the philosophical inquiry in climate justice literature often revolves around identifying what would be just or how a just distribution should look like, and as such what should be the philosophical substantiation for climate policy and action - for example, “industrialised countries *should* mitigate more GHGs than industrialising countries, because the polluter should pay”. This is different from Young’s general method in her work that we focus on, of which the main aim is to define what injustice is in order to determine what justice and a possible redistribution would look like. As such, Young’s work can be identified as non-ideal theory, whereas climate justice is often characterised by reasoning along the lines of an ideal theory and creating normative frameworks based on principles.

Lastly, in the epilogue of her book “Justice and the Politics of Difference”, Young admits that her theory is constructed within the context of the Western welfare society, specifically the United States, and as such cannot account for issues of justice in countries located for example in the Southern or Eastern Hemispheres. Such an application would require modification and rethinking of her categories, principles and arguments (Young 1990, 257). Therefore, as climate justice is a global issue, this might pose limitations to an application of Young’s theory. Young’s epilogue therefore opens up an area for further research into the international or other national contexts of justice. This research could contribute to the development of her theory and confront possible limitations of it within the context of climate justice. In chapter 10, this will be further reflected and elaborated upon.

The First Face: exploitation

5

5.1 *What does it mean to be exploited in a world impacted by climate change?*

Young argues that the first Face of Oppression refers to the process of the transfer of the results of the labour of one social group to benefit another (Young 1990, 49-53). It is based on a more classical Marxist explanation of oppression, in which the capitalist class will gain power by seizing profit, while the working class suffers from deprivation and a lack of control. According to Young, then, social groups that are exploited fall victim to a systemic process in which a relation of domination is reproduced between them and other social groups with the consequence that their labour benefits another group (Young 1988, 278). In a world impacted by climate change, understanding climate injustices overlapping with exploitation then requires us to seek for this systemic process of domination in which the results of the labour of one social group benefit another. This systemic process should consequently be sought in the context of the causes and consequences of climate change. The question therefore becomes how climate injustice overlaps with instances of exploitation.

5.2 *Conceptual overlap between exploitation and climate injustice*

In this section, I will demonstrate how the face of exploitation intersects with the causes and consequences of climate change by using case studies and academic climate justice literature. The case studies that will be used in this section focus on the violation of workers' rights that stand in direct connection to environmental concerns, specifically in the palm oil and mineral mining industries.

Within climate justice literature, there are different points of view from which exploitation is analysed. Due to the global nature of climate change, the exploitation is also analysed on a global level. This global analysis focuses on ways in which higher income countries exploit lower income countries, and I have identified broadly three ways from the literature in which high income countries are said to exploit low income countries. Firstly, natural resources of lower income countries have been exploited by multinationals that are most often based in higher income countries, through which the poor do not benefit from their own natural resources

while remaining economically dependent (Omeje 2008). In addition to this, global value chains tend to exploit workers in low income countries, such as how multinational apparel industries with their headquarters based in higher income countries make use of the low wages in poor countries, for instance by contracting Indian and Bangladeshi sweatshop labourers (Pickles et al. 2015, 13). Third, during the Industrial Revolution that has contributed to both the current global levels of GHGs as the current states of “development”, many of the countries that are currently still on their way to industrialisation have been under colonial rule, were exploited, and did not have the chance to industrialise as well. The exploitation that has occurred in the past therefore still has an impact on the present. These three manners of exploitation in the paradigm of high income countries exploiting low income countries are relevant to climate justice since they are connected to and intersect with environmental concerns, as the case studies later on will demonstrate more in depth. One aspect of the third manner regarding industrialisation and development that is extremely relevant to climate justice is that it poses questions as to whether or not it is legitimate to expect the industrialising countries to cut their emissions just as the industrialised countries have to do, or whether that would continue the process of exploitation. Regardless of the question whether or not high income countries are responsible for historical emissions, the ‘right to development’ is actually a human right, and so a right for individuals with matching duties attributed to states, which has been included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations General Assembly 1986).

A more direct way in which the economic power balance between high and low income countries can be viewed in terms of exploitation is therefore also related to a neocolonial perspective. Filomina Steady, for example, describes the process of colonization, in which colonizers that came predominantly from Europe have exploited African and South American peoples and lands, in order to acquire labour and resources. Steady argues that this process continues today, and the agents of exploitation are multinational corporations and international financial institutions (Steady 2009, 6). Her analysis, based on colonialism, therefore addresses the previously discussed ways of exploitation that are connected to climate justice. It is one example of a paradigm that is used by scholars in climate justice literature to point towards exploitation as a process that is part of climate injustice. Such a global process of exploitation that is connected to environmental concerns reveals

intersectionality too, for one's position in the world makes one more vulnerable to environmental injustices. The following regional examples will illustrate this point more concretely.

On a regional and local level, both climate justice literature as well as environmental NGOs address concretely the type of economic exploitation that Young describes. Here, the emphasis on labour exploitation, which is Young's primary focus, becomes more concrete than in the global paradigm that is more focused on the economic power balance between high and low-income countries. For example, the non-governmental organisations Amnesty International and the Rainforest Action Network (RAN) argue that environmental justice cannot exist without workers' rights, because the disregard that some industries have for nature goes hand in hand with a disregard for the fundamental rights of their workers (Amnesty International 2016; RAN 2021). The companies of this example operate in the rainforest of lower income countries in order to produce palm oil, of which the largest producers are Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand, whilst the headquarters of the companies themselves are most often based in higher income countries, such as Singapore (i.e. Wilmar International), France (i.e. L'Oreal) and the United States (i.e. Colgate Palmolive) (Greenpeace 2021). Vast amounts of rainforest are transformed by multinational enterprises into large palm oil plantations, in order to meet the global demand of palm oil and make profits out of that. However, the largest part of the profits do not remain within the palm oil producing countries, and so the enterprises benefit the most, while most often not paying or compensating for the environmental damage left behind. And so, through low wages, child labour, the continued use of banned toxic chemicals, and forced physical labour in order to meet targets, fundamental workers' rights are violated and the environment is destructed so that local inhabitants and ecosystems suffer (Amnesty International 2016).

An example of exploitation on a more national or even regional scale is that of mineral mining in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Congolese armed rebel groups are often in control of the country's mining areas, using force and violence on local populations to work in the mines (Rustad 2016). The minerals, which are natural resources and to a certain extent also finite, are an important part in the supply chain for industries of electronic devices and jewelry. Investigations have shown that a crucial amount of companies, based in higher income countries, have

their supply of minerals met from such conflicted mining areas, such as Sony, Walmart, and Samsung (Global Witness 2009). They are thereby said to fuel and incentivise conflict and the militarization of mines, accompanied by violence and the exploitation of the local population, while making profit of the supply and not compensating for social or environmental costs or the depletion of natural resources.²

This example as well as the case of producing palm oil in rainforests of lower income countries both demonstrate that one's economic position in the world can be a factor of vulnerability regarding the causes and consequences of climate change. Specifically, when one's position in global supply chains is characterised by processes of exploitation, one could be more vulnerable to instances of climate injustices too.

5.3 Intersectionality and climate injustice: exploitation

To conclude, then, both the regional and national examples that I have illustrated represent a larger phenomenon of industries that make profit through the exploitation of people and natural resources. The exploitation of persons and the environmental concerns that arise in these practices are inseparable in these instances. Here, very directly, we see Young's explanation of the first face of exploitation: there is a process in which the results of the labour of the workers are transferred from one social group to another, which benefits the ruling social group. While the ruling social group is benefitted, which are the large industries from the examples, the workers are being exploited and therefore can be regarded oppressed according to Young's terms. Additionally, in cases in which environmental concerns go hand in hand with the exploitation of workers, such as in the previously stated examples, the process of exploitation intersects with instances of climate injustice and the matter of intersectionality becomes clear. Namely, the impact of the causes and consequences of climate change that one experiences worsens when one is subjected to exploitation and occupies a low position in global supply chains.

² Yet, it should be noted that this is not the whole narrative of conflict in the DRC; as Laura Seay argues, "the militarized mineral trade is much more a symptom of the Congolese state's weakness and inability to govern than it is a cause of the violence" (Seay 2015, 131). Corporations should be held responsible, as Seay argues, but it is important to note here that holding corporations responsible will not solve the violence all together since it stems from more factors than that, such as weak government (Idem., 137).

The Second Face: marginalisation

6.1 *What does it mean to be marginalised in a world impacted by climate change?*

Young refers to the second Face of Oppression as a process of exclusion, based on social structures and a system of labour that cannot or does not employ certain groups of people, especially when people are regarded as incapable of being a “functional” wage labourer (Young 1990, 53-55). Therefore, according to Young, social groups that are marginalised are characterised by being excluded from social structures and systems of labour. Consequently, the marginalised experience blocked opportunities “to exercise capacities in socially defined and recognized ways” (Young 1988, 281). In a world impacted by climate change, understanding climate injustices overlapping with marginalisation then requires us to seek for this systemic process of exclusion from social structures and systems of labour. This systemic process should consequently be sought in the context of the causes and consequences of climate change. The question therefore becomes how climate injustice overlaps with one’s socioeconomically marginalised position, being excluded from social structures or systems of labour.

6.2 *Conceptual overlap between marginalisation and climate injustice*

Within climate justice literature, there is a vast number of studies dedicated to the ways in which the causes and consequences of climate change disproportionately affect marginalised communities. Marginalised communities are most often understood in these studies as communities of lower socioeconomic status, susceptible to poverty as well as social discrimination (Mathiarasan 2021, 2-3). This is therefore in accordance with what Young explains marginalisation to be, which we should take into account for this analysis. Within this section, I will present a short overview of case studies to illustrate this, which focus on air pollution on the one hand, which is a *cause* of climate change, and sea level rise in coastal areas on the other hand, which is a *consequence* of climate change. There is a significant amount of literature available that is dedicated to explaining climate injustices that arise from

air pollution and sea level rise, on different scales, which makes them eligible for this study. These case studies are related to marginalisation since socioeconomic status recurs within these cases as a factor that worsens the impact that the causes and consequences of climate change have. In addition, it should be emphasised that both have severe consequences. Air pollution increases the risks of respiratory illnesses and could even contribute to cardiovascular diseases and cancer (Rickenbacker 2019, 1; Mathiarasan 2021, 4). Rising sea levels in coastal areas increase the risk of floods which contributes to the global projected trends of displacement and migration for climate-induced reasons (World Bank 2018).

Firstly regarding air pollution, Anjum Hajat et al. have given a global review of studies that relate the exposure to environmental hazards, specifically air pollution, to populations of low socioeconomic status. They conclude that many studies carried out in different parts of the world consistently confirm this relation, in developing as well as in developed countries: marginalised communities are disproportionately exposed to environmental hazards at their places of residence. Hajat et al. discuss the negative implications for North American cities, as well as for European countries such as England, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Asian and African countries (Hajat et al. 2015, 443). Their review thus shows that air pollution is globally disproportionately distributed and that it disproportionately affects communities of lower socioeconomic status. In addition, as Mathiarasan and Hüls explain, air pollution concentrations are decreasing in high-income countries, located in Northern America and Western Europe, while they are increasing in low to middle-income countries due to rapid industrialisation. This disproportionately impacts the marginalised populations within these industrialising countries (Mathiarasan and Hüls 2021, 1-2). This points towards a global distribution of air pollution concentrations to which the global socioeconomic worst off are the most vulnerable.

To make this more concrete on a national scale, Fecht et al. have researched the extent to which population characteristics such as deprivation, ethnicity, proportion of children and elderly are related to exposure to air pollution in the Netherlands and England. Their findings consistently demonstrate that for both countries, concentrations of different hazardous air pollutants were higher in neighbourhoods that are inhabited by more than 20% non-White residents (Fecht et

al. 2015, 206-7). They therefore conclude that higher levels of air pollution in these countries are located in urban and ethnically mixed neighbourhoods, which makes concrete the national disproportionate distribution of air pollution among marginalised groups, i.e. marginalised along ethnic or socioeconomic lines.

Another example of a nationally disproportionate distribution of air pollution is India. Here, the gross domestic income of the country has doubled from the 1990s until 2010, which has been accompanied by, among others, a quadrupled pollution from industries and an eightfold increase of vehicles (Mukhopadhyay 2009, 11). In India are located 22 of the top 30 most polluted cities of the world (World Air Quality Report 2020, 22). Also here it is recognised that the poor or economically marginalised are more vulnerable to the pollution, due to poor housing and working conditions, and they often live closer to the sources of pollution (Idem., 14; 95). According to a World Bank report of 1992, particulate pollution in India has yearly caused at least 500,000 premature deaths and between 4 and 5 million new cases of chronic bronchitis (World Bank 1992). This, again, points towards a distribution of exposure to environmental hazards that disproportionately affects the economically marginalised. As these instances of climate justice overlap with Young's conception of marginalisation, the matter of intersectionality becomes clear. Namely, the impact of these causes of climate change, specifically air pollution, worsens when one is subjected to marginalisation, and additionally also when one belongs to the global worse off. In contexts like that of India, also belonging to the country's worse off worsens the impact of the causes of climate change.

Moving to the consequences of climate change, with regard to sea level rise in coastal areas, Edward Barbier explains that 38% of the world's population lives in coastal areas (Barbier 2015, 1). In developed countries, 13% of the inhabitants of coastal areas are rural, whilst in developing countries 46% of the inhabitants are rural (Idem., 3), indicating a larger dependence on the coastal land for agricultural purposes. Further, Barbier demonstrates that 90% of the global rural poor that live in coastal areas that are vulnerable to sea level rise - low-elevation coastal zones (LECZ) - live in 15 developing countries, among others India, Bangladesh, Senegal, and Thailand (Idem., 5). This points towards understanding vulnerability to sea level rise as something that is worryingly connected to developing countries, a dependence on agriculture, and hence to the globally economically marginalised. In addition,

Barbara Neumann et al. have found a distinctive trend of population growth within coastal areas: for example, the population of Bangladesh located in the LECZs has doubled compared to the national population growth levels between 1990 and 2000 (Neumann et al. 2015, 2). It is therefore important to understand that the developing and low-income countries are not only more vulnerable to sea-level rise, but also that the projected population growth will further reinforce this vulnerability.

An example on the national level to illustrate that is Bangladesh. Firstly, there has been a mass migration pattern due to the rise of sea levels, catastrophic cyclones intensified by rising temperatures and poor adaptation measures. For example, cyclone Amphan in 2020 displaced 2.5 million Bangladeshis, of which not all have been able to return home (IDMC 2020, 30). According to a World Bank report, it is estimated that 13.1 million Bangladeshis will have fallen victim to such environmental migration by 2050 (World Bank 2018, 89-97). A large number of Bangladeshis search for safety in the capital Dhaka, often ending up in slums with jobs in housekeeping or sweatshops (McDonnell 2019).

As these instances of climate justice related to the consequences of climate change overlap with Young's notion of marginalisation, the link of intersectionality becomes clear: the impact of the consequences of climate change, specifically sea level rise, worsens when one is subjected to marginalisation. Additionally, living in coastal areas is a factor of vulnerability, as well as a rural way of life and an economic dependency on agriculture. Here, following the findings of Barbier, it is important to take into account that these factors of vulnerability are globally unevenly distributed: inhabitants of lower income countries are more vulnerable to the consequences of climate change than inhabitants of higher income countries, and therefore one's socioeconomic marginalisation in the world is a factor that affects the ways in which the consequences of climate change impacts someone.

6.3 Intersectionality and climate injustice: marginalisation

Based on these instances of climate injustice, it has become clear how social groups can be affected both by marginalisation and climate injustices. Air pollution, a cause of climate change, is globally as well as nationally unevenly distributed, and being part of a marginalised community is one factor that makes one more vulnerable to being exposed to air pollution. Also vulnerability to sea level rise, a consequence of climate change, is globally unevenly distributed. It appears for example that

inhabitants of lower income countries are more vulnerable to sea level rise than are inhabitants of higher income countries. This consequently demonstrates how marginalisation and climate injustices overlap in these cases, and that being marginalised is a factor that contributes to being more impacted by the causes and consequences of climate change. In sum, therefore, globally as well as nationally marginalised communities are disproportionately affected by causes and consequences of climate change, specifically (but most probably not limited to) air pollution and rising sea levels.

The Third Face: powerlessness



7.1 What does it mean to be powerless in a world impacted by climate change?

Young refers to the third Face of Oppression as injustices that arise from status rather than class, following Weber. It means that some individuals have little or no work autonomy or authority, nor do they have the possibility to express themselves creatively at work. Often, these individuals do not have professional expertise. This also means that those that do have work autonomy, authority, and professional expertise, those whom Young calls ‘professionals’, have privileges in life and experience more respectability relative to non-professionals. In this way, powerlessness refers to a lack of authority and a sense of self (Idem., 56-58). In a world impacted by climate change, understanding climate injustices overlapping with powerlessness then requires us to seek for a systemic process that denies (members of) social groups work autonomy and sense of self, consequently generating privileges for other social groups that stand in a more dominant position (‘professionals’) in relation to them, in the context of the causes and consequences of climate change.

7.2 Conceptual overlap between powerlessness and climate injustice

Within the field of climate justice, we could relate the notion of powerlessness to certain jobs in which the characteristics that Young lists return, such as lack of professional expertise and limited to no work autonomy or authority. These jobs, in turn, can be linked to climate injustices. Within this section, we will therefore specifically focus on low-skilled jobs and additionally on the informal labour market that is vulnerable due to the absence of formal regulations.

First, low-skilled jobs are mostly available to workers that have little formal education or work experience, and they are jobs that often require physical abilities and mechanical skills rather than skills that relate to knowledge (Maxwell 2006, 1-3). Generally, youths and the economically disadvantaged hold low-skilled jobs. Whereas youths are mostly transitory workers, for example during their education,

the jobs are for the economically disadvantaged a way of life (Idem., 6). As such, the economically disadvantaged are more vulnerable to be subjected to Young's notion of powerlessness. Further, it should be noted that within climate justice, further details of low-skilled jobs matter. For instance, there exist so-called '3D jobs' - dirty, dangerous, and demeaning. Such jobs include mineral mining, oil drilling, construction work or even sex work (ILO 2021). These positions are often filled by migrants from lower income countries (Mucci et al. 2019, 2). In some countries, these migrants are in search of higher wages and nationals are often not interested due to the stigma associated with it that relates to low class. One example of such a country is Malaysia (Ahmad et al. 2018, 220-1).

To contextualise, Ashforth and Kreiner have set out that dirty work is physically, morally and socially tainted and stigmatised, due to "enduring and deeply embedded social perceptions of various types of work" (Ashforth & Kreiner 1999, 415; 417). They refer to the notion of occupational prestige, which is a "composite of status, power, quality of work, education, and income" that is generally low for dirty work, which leads to challenges with regard to the workers' positive self-esteem and their feeling of social validation (Ashforth & Kreiner 1999, 415). It is important to note that Ashforth and Kreiner's definition of dirty work does not necessarily have to be dirty, dangerous and demeaning (3D), however all 3D jobs do fit within Ashforth and Kreiner's definition. A concrete and contemporary example of a 3D job is that of the World Cup infrastructure projects in Qatar, where 6,500 migrant workers have died because of exposure to extreme heat, falling from height, and even electrocution because of electricity cables in a dorm that have come into contact with water (Guardian 2021). It shows that low-skilled labour, specifically construction work and especially 3D jobs, is excessively more vulnerable to exploitation and poor working conditions than high-skilled jobs are. This points to an intersection with Young's first Face of Oppression, exploitation, as discussed in chapter 5. Having clarified the notion of low-skilled jobs, I will now demonstrate how Young's notion of powerlessness further overlaps with instances of climate injustice.

Firstly, powerlessness in terms of low-skilled jobs and the informal sector is globally distributed along the lines of development. Both developing low-income countries and emerging economies have a greater low-skilled labour pool and informal sector than high-income countries do (Cazes and Verick 2013, 23). Labourers working in

the informal sector fall outside of the scope of labour regulations and social protection and are therefore vulnerable to exploitation, instability, poverty and health hazards (ILO 2015). In addition, low-skilled jobs in lower income countries are more vulnerable to health hazards than in higher income countries, for example due to rapid industrialisation and therefore also an increase of air pollution (Mathiarasan and Hüls 2021, 1-2).

Further, 3D jobs are often related to labour migration: they are positions that nationals do not want to fulfill due to the stigma, which leads to migrants from lower income countries filling these positions (European Parliament 2011, 82-3; 86-7).

Regarding climate injustice, many of these 3D jobs are prone to exploitation and go hand in hand with dirty industries that invest in mining, construction and deforestation. These jobs are therefore directly linked to environmental concerns, such as the extraction of natural resources and environmental degradation. Therefore, migrants are in a more vulnerable position regarding the negative environmental implications related to the 3D sector, and being a migrant therefore is a factor of vulnerability that should be taken into account when analysing the intersectionality of the causes and consequences of climate change.

As such, powerlessness on a global scale is connected to climate justice matters in the sense that lower income countries hold a larger share of the informal sector and low-skilled jobs, which are in turn vulnerable to low wages, exploitation by dirty industries, and few to no protections against environmental hazards. In addition, powerlessness is also connected to climate injustice due to the industrialisation in emerging economies which makes low-skilled, informal and 3D labourers more vulnerable to environmental hazards such as air pollution. Furthermore, since the 3D sector is often characterised by environmentally damaging practices and labour migration, labour migrants are particularly vulnerable in relation to climate injustice as well.

On a national scale, low-skilled jobs remain tied to a lower socioeconomic status in relation to high-skilled jobs, since wages have become increasingly determined by sets of skills (Maxwell 2008, 395; 2006, 13-14). In that way, this aspect of powerlessness intersects with the previously analysed aspect of marginalisation, as both put an emphasis on socioeconomic status. Low-skilled labourers are therefore to a certain extent exposed to the same vulnerability to the causes and consequences

of climate change as do marginalised communities. Air pollution as discussed in chapter 6 is one such example of environmental hazards that are disproportionately distributed along the lines of socioeconomic status.

7.3 Intersectionality and climate injustice: powerlessness

So far, it has become clear that Young's notion of powerlessness overlaps with some instances of climate injustice: low-skilled jobs in general are more vulnerable to environmental hazards, specifically 3D jobs that are mostly fulfilled by migrants from lower income countries and which are most often jobs in industries that are directly related to environmental concerns, such as oil drilling or mining. In addition, these stigmatised dirty jobs have severe consequences for positive self-esteem and social validation, reinforcing the notion of powerlessness. Intersectionality becomes clear in these instances, since one's position in the labour market is a factor that clearly contributes to one's exposure to environmental hazards and exploitation by dirty industries. Being a low-skilled labourer, a labourer in the informal sector, a 3D labourer, or a migrant therefore are factors that increase the impact that climate change has on one, and this is therefore a matter of climate justice.

The Fourth Face: cultural imperialism

8.1 *What does cultural imperialism mean in a world impacted by climate change?*

Young refers to the fourth Face of Oppression as a systemic process in which dominant social groups “project their own experience as representative of humanity as such” (Young 1990, 59), and thereby universalise their experience and culture and establish it as the norm within a society. Consequently, social groups that do not identify with these norms, or are not identified by others as conforming to these norms, are positioned as deviant or inferior to the norm. This marks these social groups as “the Other”, and they are rendered invisible as well as marked out by stereotypes (Idem., 58-60). In a world impacted by climate change, understanding climate injustices via cultural imperialism then requires us to seek for a systemic process in which a dominant ideology establishes norms and positions (members of) social groups as inferior or deviant to these dominant norms, in the context of the causes and consequences of climate change.

8.2 *Conceptual overlap between cultural imperialism and climate injustice*

Young’s notion of cultural imperialism can be traced back to studies within climate justice literature that focus on the ways in which cultural ideologies relate to nature and natural resources, especially regarding Indigenous or traditional views of nature that are dominated by a dominant, hegemonic ideology in which nature, land and resources are evaluated in economic terms. I will understand such an ideology within this assessment as twofold: the imposition of an ideology is always a cultural issue, but some ideologies are more or primarily driven by economic interests. Therefore, I distinguish here between cultural imperialism on the one hand, and economic motivations for cultural imperialism on the other.

Firstly, regarding hegemonic ideologies that specifically imply a certain cultural worldview, I will provide an example of the appropriation of land and resources that clearly demonstrates different cultural beliefs regarding nature and natural resources, connected to environmental concerns, and the process of domination of

one belief system over the other. This is a study of Michael Spencer et al. regarding the Pacific Islands, consisting of Polynesia, Melanesia, Micronesia, and Oceania. They set out the ways in which the US military occupation and the settler colonialism of the Pacific Islands has resulted in an ethnocide, which refers to the “deliberative, ongoing, and systemic destruction of the culture of a particular ethnic group” (Spencer et al., 48). Namely, the settler colonialist practices of commodifying land and damaging it in the pursuit of profits did not only limit Pacific Islanders’ access to natural resources, but it also damaged the cultural and spiritual connection between the Islanders and nature, as well as their traditional ecological knowledge (Idem., 50-51). As such, the Islanders were Othered and, rendered invisible in these practices, and regarded to be inferior to the hegemonic and colonial Western ideas of valuation of nature and property rights.

Connected to such Indigenous ecological beliefs is the deforestation of Brazil’s Amazon rainforest, due to which Indigenous communities have their immediate survival as well as their cultural beliefs threatened because of the commodification of land for agricultural purposes (Kimbrough 2020). The land is therefore cleared in order to use it economically, by using fires which destroy the Indigenous communities’ territories and food resources. Additionally, the smoke poses health risks for the communities. Most of these fires are illegally incited, but due to Brazilian president Bolsonaro’s cuts of Brazil’s environmental agency, there is not much that can be done to prevent these illegal fires or to extinguish them (Spring & Eisenhammer 2019). Even though the fires are mostly ignited by Brazilian farmers, the context of hegemonic ideologies is still important for the great demand that other (Western) countries have for these harvests on the one hand, and the economic dependency of Brazilian rural farmers on this demand on the other hand: for example, according to an OECD report, the export of soy represents 26% of all agricultural exports, and 82% of agricultural exports is represented by only ten products (OECD 2015, 69). As such, the global economic market system “pushes” Brazilian farmers to utilise agricultural land, having severe consequences for Indigenous communities residing in the forests. Their cultures as well as immediate survival are threatened, and due to a lack of governmental regulations in order to address these threats, this does not appear to be a concern for the local or national government. The Indigenous communities and their cultural beliefs and relations regarding the rainforest are therefore not taken into account in the process of

commodifying this land, they are not included in deliberations even though this process directly impacts them, and their cultural beliefs are positioned inferior to the hegemonic cultural norm according to which commodifying this land and appropriating it without regulatory or conservation efforts is fair.

This brings us to the notion of hegemonic ideology that implies a certain economic paradigm, or more accurately, cultural imperialism that is driven primarily by economic interests. There exists a share of studies that recognises how the current economic system is built on Western notions of growth and development, which have been mostly quantitative by nature and expressed in economic terms, leaving cultural aspects out of the analysis (Rabie 2016, 7). In history, lower income countries that were less industrialised or developed have been marked as the Other - underperforming or inferior. They were marked as such with reference to the hegemonic ideology of neoliberalism that existed - for example through the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) from the 1980s and '90s, in which a set of neoliberal economic policies in combination with loans from the International Monetary Fund were meant to industrialise and develop the underdeveloped and nonindustrialised, which in reality only increased the dependency of these countries and their debts (Collier and Gunning 1999). The neoliberal paradigm was expected to help the countries that were not performing according to the hegemonic economic norm - focused on quantitative growth and development -, and as such they were marked out as Other, deviant from the norm, and due to their 'underperformance' arguably also as inferior to the norm.

In the context of the causes and consequences of climate change this history of rendering lower income countries invisible and Othering them poses different challenges, such as stringent global climate mitigation and adaptation requirements that could undermine the socioeconomic development of low income countries, the sole attribution of monetary value to natural resources, and not taking into account severe environmental and social costs that some industries have. The neoliberal economic paradigm also ignores Indigenous and traditional knowledge, as we have seen in the case of the Pacific Islands, but also in Brazil's rainforest. Additionally, then, also ways of addressing climate change that are based on this paradigm - such as the cap and trade system for greenhouse gas emissions - will most likely benefit the higher income countries: larger and richer companies will most likely be better

able to innovate to technologies that emit less, and could therefore also sell their surplus emission permits, eventually making profits of selling their emission permits to less rich companies that are not able to innovate in the same manner. This could have consequences for the global development of innovation technologies and industrialisation, so that companies based in richer countries will benefit and companies based in low income countries could be hindered in their development towards sustainability.

In addition to this, Nancy Fraser, in her lecture “Against the environmentalism of the rich”, referred to the above mentioned notions of hegemonic ideologies - the more cultural by nature and the more economic by nature - as being intertwined. More specifically, she argues that there exists a variety of stances towards the environment and climate change, a variety that she labels eco-politics, of which some stances will eventually form a hegemonic bloc “in support of a shared project of eco-societal transformation” (Fraser 2021). Due to the hegemonic role of neoliberalism, it is likely that this hegemonic bloc will be neoliberalist (or capitalist) by nature. However, as Fraser argues, capitalism is at the very core of its system predatory, extractive, and thus destructive towards nature and the environment. Following Fraser’s train of thought, it is likely and crucial to note for this chapter that fighting climate change will most probably involve a capitalist hegemonic ideology that bases itself on capitalist ecological beliefs, thereby continuing to fail to recognise non-hegemonic ecological beliefs. Also here, using Young’s notion of ‘Othering’ and cultural imperialism is useful to describe and criticise this process in which some ecological beliefs are posited as inferior to the hegemonic capitalist beliefs.

8.3 Intersectionality and climate injustice: cultural imperialism

We see a direct impact that oppression in the form of cultural imperialism has on the way in which the causes and consequences of climate change are framed, following Nancy Fraser’s argumentation and for both ways of arguing. The latter are the hegemonic ideologies that imply a certain cultural worldview, specifically different beliefs regarding nature and natural resources, and the hegemonic ideologies that are driven mainly by economic interest that are expressed in an economic system with Western notions of growth and development. The direct impact of cultural imperialist oppression is expressed in the ways in which the hegemonic cultural

ideologies, sometimes driven primarily by economic interests, frame the debate on climate change and the distribution of burdens and succeed in rendering 'Othered' countries increasingly invisible within these processes, because they deviate from the hegemonic norms. In addition, the current economic system that attributes a monetary value to natural resources without including environmental and social externalities in the price of the product also points towards a disregard for the communities involved. This act of disregard can be understood as an act of Othering, because the involved peoples are rendered invisible since actors such as international companies do not take into account the costs that their activities impose on them. Hence, the social group that one belongs to is a factor that increases vulnerability to being Othered or rendered invisible in the context of the causes and consequences of climate change, such as is the case for the globally worse off and Indigenous communities. Therefore, cultural imperialism is a matter of climate justice, too.

The Fifth Face: violence

9.1 What does violence mean in a world impacted by climate change?

Young refers to the last Face of Oppression as violence that is directed to members of specific social groups simply because they are members of that social group. It is systemic because members of oppressed social groups live “with the knowledge that they must fear random, unprovoked attacks on their persons or property, which have no motive but to damage, humiliate, or destroy the person” (Young 1990, 61). In a world impacted by climate change, understanding climate injustices overlapping with violence then requires us to seek for this systemic process in which members of social groups fall victim to random attacks of violence. These attacks of violence occur to them due to their membership of a particular social group, and they take place in relation to the context of the causes and consequences of climate change.

9.2 Conceptual overlap between violence and climate injustice

Young’s definition of violence appears to relate directly to the realm of climate justice. As this section will show, the causes and consequences of climate change fuel the type of violence that Young describes, which is that of falling victim to random attacks due to membership of a particular social group. This consequently affirms the intersectional relationship between the oppressed and climate change.

I first want to point towards a very direct example of violence in relation to climate change, which is that of the attacking and even killing of environmental activists. In 2019 alone, 212 environmental activists have been killed across the globe for defending their land and environment, according to Global Witness (Global Witness 2020, 8). From these environmental activists, 40% belonged to Indigenous communities (Idem., 9). The causes and consequences of climate change fuel such violence, and additionally what social group you belong to appears to play a role regarding the risk of falling victim to this violence while defending the environment or your land.

Another example, which has also been mentioned in chapter 5 in relation to the First Face of exploitation, is the extraction of minerals in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) which goes hand in hand with violence, often sexual by nature. This violence is systemic as well as unprovoked, often used by armed groups active in the mining regions that are sometimes in charge of mining activities (Rustad 2016). Cobalt for example, which is the mineral necessary for rechargeable batteries in solar panels and electric vehicles, is for over 50% produced in the DRC's mining areas (Banza et al. 2018, 495). Therefore, not only is the extraction of minerals in itself connected to such systemic violence in this case, it can also be argued that efforts for climate mitigation elsewhere are to a certain extent linked to violent practices such as these, due to the type of demand that the mineral mining supplies. An example of this is the previously mentioned mineral cobalt, which is used for rechargeable batteries. Multiple opinion pieces have been written on the devastating link between the rising demand of electric vehicles, mostly in richer countries, and the demand for minerals in the DRC, of which the workers, including children, are not only exploited, but also subjected to systemic acts of violence (see Sanderson 2019; Amnesty 2016; Smith 2018). As the production of electric vehicles is becoming more popular and necessary for the transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources, this development simultaneously increases the pressure on the mining industry in the DRC, which contributes to and possibly exacerbates the exploitation of the workers and the systemic violence directed to them.

Another example of existing tendencies of violence that are exacerbated due to the causes and consequences of climate change is that of violence against women. Multiple studies indicate that since women have to walk longer distances to obtain water due to prolonged or intense droughts, they not only become more vulnerable to harsher weather conditions, but also to sexual assault. To put this into perspective, in almost two-thirds of developing countries it is women and girls that are primarily responsible for providing their households and communities with water. Sexual assault that takes place while obtaining water is already a regularly reported issue in these areas, and due to water scarcity and longer distances that women have to walk, this is likely to exacerbate (Roy 2018, viii; 79). In addition, a report by the Water Governance Facility on this topic has demonstrated that obtaining the access to water, when women have arrived at a water facility, often goes hand in hand with

‘sextortion’: women feel pressured to flirt with the utility workers or are even forced into sexual activities in order to obtain or ensure their water supply. Even though based on empirical research in Johannesburg and Bogotá, the report argues that it is a recurring theme for developing countries and this division of labour (Water Governance Facility 2017; Root 2020). Another example of climate-induced drivers of violence is the stress that poor harvests due to climate change pose on men as traditional financial ‘providers’, which has appeared to go hand in hand with mental health issues, alcoholism, and an increase of violence against their wives (Gevers et al. 2020).

9.3 *Intersectionality and climate injustice: violence*

It appears that climate injustices expose the vulnerability of social groups and exacerbates existing tendencies for this Face of Oppression. We notice that the face of violence intersects with different instances of climate injustice, and therefore that one’s oppression through systemic violence is exacerbated by the causes and consequences of climate change. Additionally, also the social group that one belongs to is a factor that increases vulnerability to the violence fuelled by the causes of consequences of climate change, such as is the case for women, Indigenous environmental activists, and the mine workers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Reply to critiques

10

In the literature review we have come across a number of critics regarding Young's theory as well as some limitations that could possibly have impacted this research. As far as the scope of this research went, these criticisms and limitations have not negatively impacted the research and could actually provide new and additional realms for further research. In this chapter, we will reply to these critiques as we reflect on the previous chapters of this project.

First of all, Nancy Fraser argues that Young failed to integrate both the cultural and economic grounds of oppression which would run the risk of not doing justice to certain kinds of oppression. Consequently, she argues for distinguishing between those kinds of oppression that are economically rooted and those that are culturally rooted. However, even though Fraser's critique might be valid to some extent and it might be possible to conceptually distinguish between economically and culturally rooted instances of oppression, the cases illustrated in the previous chapters have demonstrated that in the real world economic interests and cultural dimensions are intertwined. Concretely, as has become clear in chapter 8, the face of cultural imperialism would become problematic if it would only focus on culturally rooted oppression, due to the presence of economic interests that often drive instances of cultural imperialism. For this reason, implementing Fraser's idea of a strict dichotomy between cultural and economic domains could actually lead to missing out on certain forms of oppression.

Second, Amy Allen builds on Fraser's critique in arguing that Young is not successful in integrating the economic and cultural realms in a single concept. According to Allen, this particularly limits the face of cultural imperialism, since Young leaves therefore psychological oppression unaddressed. In addition, Allen argues that Young's usage of the notion of double consciousness implies that the oppressed do never identify with negative stereotypes that are held by the dominant culture, which Allen considers a mistake: these negative stereotypes do in fact negatively influence their self-image. Yet, as has become clear throughout chapter 7, the face of powerlessness actually partly overlaps with Allen's idea by its focus on the

lack of sense of self. Even though the lack of sense of self that occurs within this face has an economic basis, it could at least address partly what Allen wants to integrate in Young's theory, which is a negative influence on self-image because of negative stereotypes. A lack of sense of self overlaps with a negative self-image due to negative stereotypes, since it refers to stereotypes that are related to status and the ways in which these affect one's personal autonomy. Consequently, one experiences a lack of sense of self and powerlessness. Therefore, Young provides some resources in her theory to implement Allen's critique, and therefore it does not necessarily pose limitations to this research. In addition, adding psychological oppression to the face of cultural imperialism would not undermine Young's theory or her framework as such. Rather, it would enrich it. Further, the notion of psychological oppression could even be implemented in the face of violence, which would enrich it and enable it to address psychological violence in addition to physical violence. It should be mentioned here that I have included mental health issues within the analysis of the face of violence, stemming from the pressure that failed harvests pose on men as traditional financial 'providers', which also gives rise to physical violence against their wives. I have therefore aimed to integrate part of Allen's critique, and I believe that many more instances of injustice could be relevant to analyse along the lines of Allen's psychological oppression. In sum, Allen's critique, if implemented, would rather strengthen the framework than undermine it, and could make the Five Faces even more applicable to find intersections between different oppressed social groups.

Third, we have discussed Zutlevics' critique of Young's use of a set of categories of oppression that could fail to capture certain forms of oppression that do not fit within the fixed set. Zutlevics therefore developed a broad definition of oppression that should be able to avoid this limitation, arguing that oppression occurs when one's resilient autonomy is restricted. This refers to the idea that social understandings and political infrastructures inhibit the opportunity for one to continue to live one's life according to one's own lifeplans. However, even though Zutlevics might have a point, it would require an entire research project to find out whether there are actually instances of oppression that do not fit within the categories that Young provides in her theoretical framework, and this would therefore be up for further research since it falls outside of the scope of this thesis. Additionally, Zutlevics' definition does not have a place for intersectionality. As this research has demonstrated, Young's theory has the advantage of being able to

recognise intersectionality between the Five Faces - one could be oppressed in different ways -, as well as between topics such as climate justice and the Five Faces - the impacts of climate change are worse when one is being oppressed by one or more faces. We would lose this advantage with Zutlevics' theory. Since this research focuses on intersectionality, and has a limited scope, Zutlevics' critique of Young's theory has not been taken into account within this research and is therefore up for further research. If Zutlevics's critique is valid, this could pose limitations to the validity of this thesis, but also to further research into this domain.

Fourth, Matthew Kuchem argues that Young's notion of social groups is arbitrary. For instance, Young argues that individuals join political parties and associations as being already 'formed' individuals, and therefore that associations and political parties are not identity-forming. Kuchem believes that to be mistaken: Young does not substantiate why some attributes and groups are more relevant than others in the formation of one's identity, and therefore he deems it an arbitrary theoretical decision. Within this research, Kuchem's critique has actually been specifically helpful in order to distinguish more social groups than Young would have, especially with regard to globally scaled injustices - which is also something that Young's theory was not developed for. For example, some case studies of climate injustices in this research centred around workers in the palm oil or mining industries, and therefore regarded these workers as a social group, too. However, Young's definition of a social group would require these workers to have, among others, a shared sense of identity, history and mode of reasoning. It is debatable whether workers in the palm oil or mining industries, including migrant workers, meet these requirements that Young sets for constituting a social group, and researching this falls outside of the scope of this thesis. Therefore, this critique is rather supplementing than undermining her theory, especially for analysing social groups at the global level, and throughout this research it helped to enrich Young's toolbox so that I was able to identify more social groups and in that way broaden the applicability of her approach.

Last of all, Young argued herself that her framework was not constructed for an international application, nor for countries or instances of oppression outside of the Western hemisphere. However, this disclaimer of herself did not pose problematic limitations while researching climate justice. Her own definition of a social group would most probably work best within the context of which she

developed her theory. Yet, as mentioned before, I have taken into account Kuchem's supplementation to the notion of a social group, because of which I was able to overcome the limitations of Young's more specifically characterised definition of a social group. Yet, this research is not able to definitively argue that Young's framework is applicable to an international context, even though the application has so far not been problematic or limited. Research could be done, for example, to flesh out Young's theory to accommodate the oppression by transnational companies that I have referred to in multiple chapters. To what extent this is either valid or incompatible with her theory in the way that she developed it, is up for further research.

In sum, then, this research has faced several critiques and limitations that are up for further research. These have been Nancy Fraser's dichotomy of cultural and economic domains of oppression, Amy Allen's emphasis on psychological oppression, Zutlevics' concern that the Five Faces could miss out on injustices that do not fit within the established categories, Matthew Kuchem's argument that Young's definition of a social group is arbitrary, and lastly Young's own disclaimer that her theory is not developed for analyses on the global level. Not all these critiques have limited this research. For example, Kuchem's argument has been helpful to follow during the analyses to identify more social groups than Young's definition would allow, and additionally this also helped to overcome Young's own disclaimer regarding the incompatibility of her theory with global levels of analysis. Whether Fraser's critique of Young's failed integration of the cultural and economic domains is valid, and therefore whether a strict dichotomy between the two would be more valid, is up for further research. Allen's critique of Young's negligence of psychological oppression is a topic that could be implemented within Young's theory, since Young provides some resources that could accommodate this. I have aimed to integrate Allen's critique in the analysis of the face of violence, yet this is also a topic for further research to flesh out due to the limited scope of this research. Lastly, Zutlevics' concern regarding the limited set of categories that the Five Faces are, which could fail to capture some injustices, has not been taken into account within this research and is entirely up for further research. Even though it is a very important critique to take into account, it did not necessarily pose limitations to this research, which could be attributed to the limited scope of this thesis.

Recommendations for scholars and policy makers **11**

In this chapter, I will highlight a specific recommendation for addressing injustice which is implicitly formulated by Iris Marion Young. Due to the scope of this research, I will focus only on one recommendation, even though further recommendations could be derived from Young's framework. This is a recommendation that follows from the fourth Face of Oppression, which is that of cultural imperialism. I have chosen to specifically focus on this Face, since I believe that the implicit recommendations that Young gives highlight the notions of inclusivity and procedural justice, which are important notions within climate justice literature as well. Accordingly, providing a recommendation of mitigating climate injustice that follows from Young's theory, it becomes particularly clear that her theory provides the same recommendations as provided by climate justice scholars, even though they are based on a different theoretical framework and different analytical and conceptual notions of justice. It thereby not only highlights the relevance of her theory to the field of climate justice, it also demonstrates that the conceptual analysis of this research has been applicable to climate justice. This is because from this research, it appears that Young's analysis supplements analyses made by climate justice scholars and provides new and additional insights into the *nature* of injustice, especially regarding the notion of intersectionality, while the recommendations converge with climate justice literature. This thereby creates a greater and complementary understanding of the nature of the injustice, which could possibly lead to new ways of addressing this injustice. The conceptual analysis has therefore been successful in bridging the academic gap between Young's theory and climate justice literature, so that both supplement each other and provide a richer academic toolbox for understanding climate injustices and ways of addressing these.

Even though Young does not explicitly provide ways in which the face of cultural imperialism can be addressed, her definition of what it means to be reconstructed as the Other can help us to sketch an idea of what it would mean to address cultural imperialism. It would require efforts to not only recognise different perspectives, cultures, norms and experiences, but also to actively promote and treat

these as being equally valid. Additionally, the hegemonic culture should not universalise their experiences and project these experiences on those who do not identify with these. Rather, policies should be created in order to ‘diversify’ the hegemonic culture, so that it represents different experiences and ways of living. Consequently, when the hegemonic culture actively does this, it could actually stop being the *hegemonic* culture, since it would, at least on the outset, not function anymore to culturally empower certain social groups whilst culturally excluding others.

More concretely, recommendations that should be implemented to counter cultural imperialism that intersects with environmental concerns could focus on giving due weight to those different perspectives and fostering inclusivity on different levels of deliberation, such as national and international policy-making or corporate decision-making. An example of such a recommendation, in which Indigenous and traditional perspectives have played a role in environmental conservation, is that of the Whanganui River in New Zealand. In short, this river has become a legal person according to the Te Awa Tupua Act, and its guardians are a representative of the New Zealand Government, as well as a representative of the Whanganui Iwi, a Māori tribe (Kramm 2020, 308). The Whanganui Iwi consider the river as their ancestor, to which they refer as a person and to which they owe duties (Idem., 311). This act allows the tribe to “speak and act on behalf of the river and promote and protect its health and wellbeing” (Ibid.), and as such the environmental conservation of the river is at least partly based upon Indigenous knowledge of and relationships with the river. This is but one example of a way in which non-hegemonic and culturally oppressed beliefs can play a role in the context of climate change and environmental conservation, yet a very powerful one due to its judicial foundations. This example demonstrates how different perspectives and cultures can be included in themes related to climate change, such as environmental conservation. Additionally, giving equal weight to perspectives of marginalised communities within conservational matters or decision-making, that is in this case dedicated to the Whanganui River, provides new modes of thinking about addressing climate injustice. Therefore, by using our conceptual analysis of Young’s theory of oppression in the context of the causes and consequences of climate change, we arrive at conclusions and recommendations that are related to those addressed by climate justice scholars and that have already been implemented in some places. Yet, we have taken a different

starting point and have used a different theoretical framework in order to come to these conclusions. The different starting point and theoretical framework of this research consists, for example, of Young's focus on social groups rather than individuals or states that climate justice literature mostly focuses on. Additionally, the non-ideal approach applied within the research is different from climate justice literature that is often ideal by nature. Lastly, the starting point and theoretical framework of this research towards the conclusions drawn is different because of the use of five categories of oppression, specifically Young's Five Faces, which have to my best knowledge not been used yet in relation to climate justice. Yet, despite these differences to the academic turns generally taken by scholars within climate justice literature, the conclusions that this research draws regarding recommendations are not novel or surprising. Yet, the different process towards these conclusions could teach us new things about the nature of climate (in)justice.

Therefore, for both climate justice scholars and policy makers, it is recommendable to consult and further research Young's theoretical framework and recommendations and apply it to the context of climate change in order to supplement the climate justice literature and substantiate policy making.

Conclusion

12

Throughout this research, the aim has been to apply Iris Marion Young's theory of oppression to investigate to what extent this theoretical framework of oppression can supplement discussions of climate justice and provide an approach to identify different types of climate change-induced injustices. Chapters 5 till 9 have explored what it means to be oppressed by each Face of Oppression in a world impacted by climate change and how each Face of Oppression intersects with instances of climate injustice. In chapter 10, we have reflected upon both the criticisms on Young's theory that were set out in chapter 4, as well as on the research results. It appeared that most criticisms did not put limitations on this research's conceptual analysis, nor did they undermine it. Rather, they provide supplementations to the theory that could be used for further research. In chapter 11, we have focused on a specific recommendation that follows from Young's fourth Face of Oppression, which is that of cultural imperialism. In this chapter, it has become clear that this research's conceptual analysis did not necessarily provide new conclusions regarding recommendations as identified in climate justice literature. Yet, we have made use of a different theoretical framework in order to come to these conclusions (for example, the need to pay close attention to questions of inclusivity), which consequently creates a greater and complementary understanding of the nature of the injustice. This could possibly foster new ways of addressing the injustice too, and it is therefore recommended for both climate justice scholars as well as policy makers to research Young's recommendations further.

Regarding the intersectionality of the Five Faces and climate injustice, it has become clear that many instances of climate injustice can be characterised by the Five Faces of Oppression. For the first Face of Oppression, exploitation, the analysis demonstrated a clear intersectional link between the violation of workers' rights and environmental degradation - often because environmental and social costs are not accounted for or have not been respected sufficiently. Also one's belonging to a specific social group is a factor within exploitation that is linked to the impact of the

causes and consequences of climate change. For marginalisation, the analysis showed that there too is a direct intersectional link between the economically marginalised on the one hand, and vulnerability to the causes and consequences of climate change on the other. One's social group therefore works as a factor within marginalisation that worsens or softens the impacts of climate change. Thirdly, regarding powerlessness, our analysis centered around low-skilled jobs, 3D-jobs, and the informal sector. It appeared that the oppression that stems from Young's notion of powerlessness intersects with instances of climate injustice, especially due to the lack of regulations and worker rights' in these sectors and therefore also an increased vulnerability to environmental hazards. One's position in the labour market is therefore linked to the impact that the causes and consequences of climate change have on one. For cultural imperialism, our analysis of intersectionality focused on cultural and economic hegemonic ideologies, such as Western notions of ecology and neoliberalism, that have Othered other nations and peoples in the past and still do so today, by rendering other experiences of ecology and development invisible or inferior. This has consequences for debates on climate change and the distribution of burdens that follow from climate change and climate change mitigation. Examples of these consequences are invisibility within these debates, as well as measures to address climate change that are based on the hegemonic neoliberal paradigm, such as the cap and trade system. For the last Face of Oppression, violence, intersectionality also became clear through (increased) instances of violence that are related to the causes and consequences of climate change, where tendencies of systemic violence towards a social group is exacerbated by climate change's impact.

Directions for further research centre on the enrichment of Young's toolbox by making use of the critiques, such as implementing a broader definition of a social group and paying more attention to psychological oppression within the faces of cultural imperialism and violence, if not in all Five Faces. Additionally, it would be worthwhile to research more specifically the recommendations that Young provides for each face, especially with a focus on intersectionality. Regarding intersectionality, then, it has become clear how this plays a fundamental role for analysing the field of climate justice. For this reason, I encourage other scholars as well as policymakers to enrich their theoretical toolboxes with the concept of intersectionality if they have not done this already, and to pay close attention to it. For climate change impacts all

of us, but it impacts some more (directly) than others, in complex and intersecting dynamics - and this should be recognised in order to do justice to everyone. Without taking the intersectional nature of injustices rightfully into account or at least acknowledging them, a distribution cannot be fair.

Bibliography

Ahmad, M. N., D. Imaam Supaat, I. Wook, M. S. Tagoranao, and N. A. A. Rahman. 2018. "Malaysians' Reluctance to Work in Local 3D Sectors: A Preliminary Review." *Journal of Social Sciences Research* 2018 (Special Issue 4): 220–23.

Allen, A. 2008. "Power and the Politics of Difference: Oppression, Empowerment, and Transnational Justice." *Hypatia* 23 (3): 156–72.

Amnesty International. 2016. "Exposed: Child Labour behind smart phone and electric car batteries." Accessed May 27, 2021. <https://www.amnesty.nl/actueel/exposed-child-labour-behind-smart-phone-and-electric-car-batteries>.

Amnesty International. 2016. "Palm Oil: Global brands profiting from child and forced labour." Accessed March 10, 2021. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2016/11/palm-oil-global-brands-profiting-from-child-and-forced-labour/>.

Ariza, M. A. 2020. *Disposable City: Miami's Future on the Shores of Climate Catastrophe*. New York: Bold Type Books.

Ashforth, B. E., and G. E. Kreiner. 1999. "How Can You Do It?": Dirty Work and the Challenge of Constructing a Positive Identity." *The Academy of Management Review* 24 (3): 413–34.

Banza Lubaba Nkulu, C., L. Casas, V. Haufroid, T. De Putter, N.D. Saenen, T. Kayembe-Kitenge, P. Musa Obadia, et al. 2018. "Sustainability of Artisanal Mining of Cobalt in Dr Congo." *Nature Sustainability* 1 (9): 495–504.

Barbier, E. B. 2015. "Climate Change Impacts on Rural Poverty in Low-Elevation Coastal Zones." Policy Research Working Paper no. 7475. Washington DC: World Bank.

Bartky, S. L. 1990. *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*. New York: Routledge.

Brandstedt, E. 2019. "Non-Ideal Climate Justice." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 22 (2): 221–34.

Brondizio, E.S., and F.M. Le Tourneau. 2016. "Environmental Governance for All." *Science* 352 (6291): 1272–73.

Calle 13. 2010. "Latinoamérica." Track 7 on *Entren Los Que Quieran*. Sony Latin, Spotify.

Caney, S. 2009 "Human Rights, Responsibilities, and Climate Change." In *Global Basic Rights*, edited by C. Beitz and R. Goodin, 227-247. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Caney, S. 2010. "Climate change, human rights, and moral thresholds." In *Human Rights and Climate Change*, edited by S. Humphreys, 69-90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Caney, S. 2016. "The Struggle for Climate Justice in a Non-Ideal World." *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 40 (1): 9–26.

Cazes, S., and S. Verick. 2013. *The Labour Markets of Emerging Economies Has Growth Translated into More and Better Jobs?* Geneva: International Labour Office.

Collier, P., and J. W. Gunning. 1999. "The IMF's Role in Structural Adjustment." *The Economic Journal* 109 (459): 634–51.

Crenshaw, K. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241-1299.

Milton, D. E. M. 2016. "Disposable dispositions: reflections upon the work of Iris Marion Young in relation to the social oppression of autistic people." *Disability & Society*, 31 (10): 1403-1407.

Diffenbaugh, N. S., and M. Burke. 2019. "Global Warming Has Increased Global Economic Inequality." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 116 (20): 9808–13.

Dubeau, M. 2020. "Species-Being for Whom? The Five Faces of Interspecies Oppression." *Contemporary Political Theory* 19 (4): 596–620.

Dubrosky, R. 2013. "Iris Young's Five Faces of Oppression Applied to Nursing." *Nursing Forum* 48 (3): 205–10.

European Parliament. 2011. *Occupational health and safety risks for the most vulnerable workers*. Brussels: Policy Department Economic and Scientific Policy.

Fecht, D., P. Fischer, F. Léa, G. Hoek, K. de Hoogh, M. Marra, H. Kruize, D. Vienneau, R. Beelen, and A. Hansell. 2015. "Associations between Air Pollution and Socioeconomic Characteristics, Ethnicity and Age Profile of Neighbourhoods in England and the Netherlands." *Environmental Pollution* 198: 201-10.

Ferguson, A., and M. Nagel. 2009. *Dancing with Iris: The Philosophy of Iris Marion Young*. *Studies in Feminist Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fraser, N. 1997. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York: Routledge.

Fraser, N. 2021. "Against the environmentalism of the rich." Presentation at Utrecht Day of Philosophy, University Utrecht, April 18, 2021. Accessed April 18, 2021. <https://www.sg.uu.nl/agenda/2021/against-environmentalism-rich>.

FRIDA Young Feminist Fund. 2020. Accessed April 5, 2021. <https://youngfeministfund.org/harvesting-from-the-frida-climate-and-environmental-justice-media-fellowship/>.

García-López, G. A. 2018. "The multiple layers of environmental injustice in contexts of (un) natural disasters: The case of Puerto Rico post-Hurricane Maria." *Environmental Justice* 11(3): 101-108.

Gevers, A., T. Musuya, and P. Bukuluki. 2020. "Why climate change fuels violence against women." Accessed March 15, 2021.

<https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/blog/2020/why-climate-change-fuels-violence-against-women.html>.

Global Witness. 2009. "Faced With a Gun, What Can You Do?" Accessed March 11, 2021.

<https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/democratic-republic-congo/faced-gun-what-can-you-do/>.

Global Witness. 2020. "Defending Tomorrow." Accessed March 15, 2021.

<https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/environmental-activists/defending-tomorrow/>.

Greenpeace. n.d. "Ending Dirty Palm oil." Accessed March 10, 2021.

<https://www.greenpeace.org.au/what-we-do/protecting-forests/forests-indonesia/palm-oil/#:~:text=12%20global%20companies%20sourced%20from,PepsiCo%2C%20Reckitt%20Benckiser%20and%20Unilever.>

Hajat, A., C. Hsia, and M. S. O'Neill. 2015. "Socioeconomic Disparities and Air Pollution Exposure: A Global Review." *Current Environmental Health Reports* 2 (4): 440–50.

Hourdequin, M. 2018. "Climate Change, Climate Engineering, and the 'Global Poor': What Does Justice Require?" *Ethics, Policy & Environment* 21 (3): 270–88.

Human Rights Watch. 2015. "There Is No Time Left: Climate Change, Environmental Threats, and Human Rights in Turkana County, Kenya." Accessed March 11, 2021.

<https://www.hrw.org/report/2015/10/15/there-no-time-left/climate-change-environmental-threats-and-human-rights-turkana>.

Hurka, T. 2001. "Future Generations." In *Encyclopedia of Ethics*, edited by L. Becker and C. Becker, 586-589. Abingdon, etc.: Routledge.

International Labour Organization. n.d. "Hazardous Work." Accessed March 15, 2021.

<https://www.ilo.org/safework/areasofwork/hazardous-work/lang--en/index.htm>.

International Labour Organization. 2015. "Informal economy: a hazardous activity." Accessed March 15, 2021.

https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/safety-and-health-at-work/areasofwork/hazardous-work/WCMS_356344/lang--en/index.htm.

Kimbrough, L. 2020. "2020 fires endangering uncontacted Amazon Indigenous groups." *Mongabay*, October 28, 2020.

<https://news.mongabay.com/2020/10/2020-fires-endangering-uncontacted-amazon-indigenous-groups/>.

Kramm, M. 2020. "When a River Becomes a Person." *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 21 (4): 307–19.

Maxwell, N. L. 2006. *The Working Life: The Labor Market for Workers in Low-Skilled Jobs*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Maxwell, N. L. 2008. "Wage Differentials, Skills, and Institutions in Low-Skill Jobs." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 61 (3): 394–409.

Mathiarasan, S., and A. Hüls. 2021. "Impact of Environmental Injustice on Children's Health-Interaction between Air Pollution and Socioeconomic Status." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18 (2): 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18020795>.

McDonnell, T. 2019. "Climate change creates a new migration crisis for Bangladesh." *National Geographic*, January 24, 2019. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/article/climate-change-drives-migration-crisis-in-bangladesh-from-dhaka-sundabans>

Mendselsohn, R., A. Dinar, and L. Williams. 2006. "The Distributional Impact of Climate Change on Rich and Poor Countries." *Environment and Development Economics* 11 (2): 159–78.

Meyer, L., and D. Roser. 2010. "Climate Justice and Historical Emissions." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 13 (1): 229–53.

Meza, I., S. Siebert, P. Döll, J. Kusche, C. Herbert, Eyshi Rezaei, E. Nouri, H. Gerdener, H. Popat, E. Frischen, J. Naumann, G. Vogt, J. V. Walz, Y. Sebesvari, and M. Hagenlocher. 2020. "Global-scale drought risk assessment for agricultural systems." *Natural Hazards and Earth Systems Sciences*, 20: 695–712.

Mucci, N., V. Traversini, G. Giorgi, G. Garzaro, J. Fiz-Perez, M. Campagna, V. Rapisarda, E. Tommasi, M. Montalti, and G. Arcangeli. 2019. "Migrant Workers and Physical Health: An Umbrella Review." *Sustainability* 11 (1): 1-22. doi:10.3390/su11010232.

Mukhopadhyay, K. 2009. *Air Pollution in India and Its Impact on the Health of Different Income Groups*. New York: Nova Science.

Mullin, K., G. Mitchell, N. R. Nawaz, and R. D. Waters. 2018. "Natural Capital and the Poor in England: Towards an Environmental Justice Analysis of Ecosystem Services in a High Income Country." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 176: 10–21.

Neumann, B., A.T. Vafeidis, J. Zimmermann, and R. J. Nicholls. 2015. "Future Coastal Population Growth and Exposure to Sea-Level Rise and Coastal Flooding - A Global Assessment." *Plos One* 10 (3): 1-34. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0118571.

Nussbaum, M. C. 2001. "Political Objectivity." *New Literary History* 32 (4): 883-906.

Olsthoorn, J. 2017. "Conceptual Analysis." In *Methods in Analytical Political Theory*, edited by A. Blau, 153-191. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Omeje, K. C. 2008. *Extractive Economies and Conflicts in the Global South: Multi-Regional Perspectives on Rentier Politics*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

Page, E. A. 2012. "Give It Up for Climate Change: A Defence of the Beneficiary Pays Principle." *International Theory* 4 (2): 300-330.

Philips, J. 2016. "Human Rights and Threats concerning Future People: a Sufficiency Proposal." In *Human Rights and Sustainability: Moral Responsibilities for the Future*, edited by G. Bos and M. Düwell, 82-94. London, UK: Routledge.

Pickles, J., A. Smith, R. Burns Begg, M. Buček, P. Roukova, and P. Rudolf. 2015. *Articulations of Capital: Global Production Networks and Regional Transformations*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Rabie, M. 2016. *A Theory of Sustainable Sociocultural and Economic Development*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.

Rainforest Action Network. n.d. "Workers' rights and environmental justice." Accessed March 10, 2021. <https://www.ran.org/issue/workers-rights-and-environmental-justice/>.

Rickenbacker, H., F. Brown, and M. Bilec. 2019. "Creating Environmental Consciousness in Underserved Communities: Implementation and Outcomes of Community-Based Environmental Justice and Air Pollution Research." *Sustainable Cities and Society* 47: 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101473>.

Root, R. 2020. "When the price of water is sexual assault." *Devex*, October 22, 2020. <https://www.devex.com/news/when-the-price-of-water-is-sexual-assault-98307>.

Roy, S. S. 2018. *Linking Gender to Climate Change Impacts in the Global South*. Cham: Springer.

Rustad, S. A., G. Østby, and N. Ragnhild. 2016. "Artisanal Mining, Conflict, and Sexual Violence in Eastern DRC." *The Extractive Industries and Society* 3 (2): 475–84.

Sanderson, H. "Congo, child labour and your electric car." *Financial Times*, July 7, 2019. <https://www.ft.com/content/c6909812-9ce4-11e9-9c06-a4640c9feebb>.

Seay, L. 2015. "Conflict Minerals in Congo: The Consequences of Oversimplification." In *Advocacy in Conflict: Critical Perspectives on Transnational Activism*, edited by A. de Waal, 115-141. London: Zed Books.

Shue, H. 1999. "Global Environment and International Inequality." *International Affairs* 75 (3): 531–45.

Shue, H. 2014. *Climate Justice: Vulnerability and Protection*. Oxford, USA: Oxford University Press.

Singer, P. 2010. "One Atmosphere." In *Climate Ethics: Essential Readings*, edited by S. M. Gardiner, 181-99. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, P. "Strategic minerals: How electric cars are changing Congo." *The Africa Report*, November 19, 2018. <https://www.theafricareport.com/449/strategic-minerals-how-electric-cars-are-changing-congo/>.

Spencer, M. S., T. Fentress, A. Touch, and J. Hernandez. 2020. "Environmental Justice, Indigenous Knowledge Systems, and Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders." *Human Biology* 92 (1): 45–57.

Spring, J., and S. Eisenhammer. 2019. “Exclusive: As fires race through Amazon, Brazil's Bolsonaro weakens environment agency.” *Reuters*, August 28, 2019. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-brazil-environment-ibama-exclusive-idUSKCN1VI14I>.

Stainback, K., and D. Tomaskovic-Devey. 2012. *Documenting Desegregation: Racial and Gender Segregation in Private Sector Employment Since the Civil Rights Act*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Steady, F. C. 2009. *Environmental Justice in the New Millennium: Global Perspectives on Race, Ethnicity, and Human Rights*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Taylor, E. 2016. “Groups and Oppression.” *Hypatia* 31 (3): 520–36. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1111/hypa.12252>.

The Guardian. 2021. “Revealed: 6,500 migrant workers have died in Qatar since World Cup awarded.” Accessed March 11, 2021. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2021/feb/23/revealed-migrant-worker-deaths-qatar-fifa-world-cup-2022>.

United Nations General Assembly. 1986. *Declaration on the Right to Development: Adopted by the General Assembly*. Forty-first session. A/RES/41/128. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/righttodevelopment.aspx>.

Sinnott-Armstrong, W., and R. B. Howarth. 2005. *Perspectives on Climate Change: Science, Economics, Politics, Ethics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Valentini, L. 2012. “Ideal Vs. Non-Ideal Theory: A Conceptual Map.” *Philosophy Compass* 7 (9): 654–64.

Water Governance Facility. 2017. “Women and corruption in the water sector: Theories and experiences from Johannesburg and Bogotá.” *WGF Report No. 8*. Stockholm: SIWI.

Weber, M. 2013. "Class, Status, Party." In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, 180-95. Florence: Taylor & Francis Group.

Whyte, K.P. 2018. "Indigeneity in Geoengineering Discourses: Some Considerations." *Ethics, Policy and Environment* 21 (3): 289–307.

World Bank. 1992. *World Development Report 1992: Development and the Environment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Young, I. M. 1988. "Five Faces of Oppression." *Philosophical Forum* 19 (4): 270-90.

Young, I. M. 1989. "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship." *Ethics* 99 (2): 250-74.

Young, I. M. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Zutlevics, T. L. 2002. "Towards a Theory of Oppression." *Ratio* 15 (1): 80–102.