International Journal of Health Sciences and Research
www.ijhsr.org ISSN: 2249-9571

Review Article

Integral Conflict towards Climate Change

S. Banerjee[1], N. Gupta[2]

PhD Scholar (Public Health)[1], PhD Assistant Professor (Sr. Grade)[2]
[1,2]Shalom Institute of Health and Allied Sciences, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences (SHUATS), Allahabad-211007, India

Corresponding Author: S. Banerjee

ABSTRACT

From a general point of view credibility of the scientific evidence and theories are put up by scientists but policymakers and select few powerful organisations stake their aspect on the topic of climate change. This has brought the disturbing uncertainties on the evidence and impact of climate change on the world. The media presentation strongly influencing the public perceptions about the reality and seriousness of the issue has its own reliability. Human impact on the climate system is indistinct in responses to the issues as 'controversy 'as it has been created. Only through education and information on climate change along with moral conduct towards global climate, informed responsible decisions can be taken.

Keywords: *climate change, denial, controversy, scepticism, conflict.*

INTRODUCTION

Climate change has a series of characteristics which interacts with human causes and concerns. It is essentially challenging to comprehend the causes of the current weight of evidence for anthropogenic climate change. Individuals have a key role to play in public health adaptation in response to climatic changes, but there are competing assessments on what responsibilities and obligations this should include in different situations should they arise. [1] The presence of 'uncertainties' should not be subjected to denying the need for action when such doubts could underestimate the impact of climate change. [2]

Background

In 1990, IPCC produced its first assessment report which concluded that temperatures have increased by 0.3-0.6C over the last century, that human carbon emissions are adding to the atmosphere's natural balance of greenhouse gases, and that this addition would be expected to result in global warming. Climatological measurements had shown with significant warnings, an overall increase in precipitation with maximum deviations during every summer and winter months. Globally, substantial decadal-scale variability was present over many regions, these results had exposed serious signs of concern regarding climate. [3] The scientific community all around the world has been influential about scientific data and opinionated on climate change. The reasons for such opinion are still debatable on the grounds of denial and farfetched ideas on the impact of climate change.

METHODS

Scientific Literature Selection to identify the scientific literature in response to debatable climate change-related article, an assessment of peer-reviewed literature

was conducted using Google searches. The search was supplemented through the PubMed database, document reference and citation tracking, and keyword searches used - climate change, global warming, controversies, scepticism, uncertainties, and denial. The objective is to discuss the reported causes and consequences of climate change. The review is intended to represent the arguments for and against climate change.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In joint statements, worldwide nations have formally acknowledged in agreement that human activities are responsible for global climate change. There are certain organisations which claim that climate change is not a scientific fact. [4] Climate cooling as a fact is being challenged on the perception of an increase in cold temperature season in many parts of the world and that global warming term is considered as a misnomer. [5] To support their claim thirty thousand scientists rejected man-made anthropogenic climate change by signing a petition. Some observers state that climate change is not a man-made phenomenon, imputing on climatic events such as solar cycles (variations in the amount of energy reaching the earth from the sun) or volcanic activity for recent upsurges in temperature.

Differences in ways and views of understanding these climate-related phenomena occur between scientists and non-scientists. The data shows that work on climate change is being generated in the social sciences, but it is in fields that are generally viewed as peripheral to the central disciplines of business, economics, and political science. [6] Over the past centuries, temperatures, carbon dioxide and methane gas levels have gone up and down concomitantly through the major ice ages and interglacial periods, as seen in ice cores studies. But due to global warming, in terms of timeline, this cycle has been accelerated. Due to a combination of global warming and the phenomenon called "polar vortex" - extremely cold weather conditions have become more severe in recent years. [5] If governments took action to avert global warming, they would be jeopardizing the global economy for no good reason such statements are made by these organisations on climate change with an emphasis on contradictory science and deceiving scientist or environmentalists. [7]

Since the early 1990s, the IPCC had started raising concerns towards anthropogenic climate change. Regarding a study on the threats posed by anthropogenic global warming to polar bears and their Arctic-ice habitat, two groups took completely opposite positions on the "scientific uncertainty". Science deniers focused on the reservations regarding the effects of anthropogenic global warming on Arctic ice extent, suggesting that those reservations cast doubt on the present and future demographic trends of polar bears. [8] Because of mounting scientific evidence presented by the scientists, efforts to undermine the credibility of scientific research on man-made global warming has decelerated, it is becoming increasingly indefensible to deny the truth, which has led think tanks to modify their tactics. [9] Promoting scepticism is a key tactic of the anti-environmental counter-movement designed specifically to undermine the environmental movement's efforts to legitimise its claims through science. [10]

There are certain organisations which claim that carbon dioxide is plant food - "Global Greening". Thus, more carbon dioxide - greater is the food source for plants. There is a delicate balance between quantities of carbon dioxide, water, nutrients in the ideal growth of plants. Higher carbon dioxide means higher temperature - in this scenario, the plant needs more water to regulate itself. The question arises does due to agriculture there is a reduction in global warming or agriculture is increasing global warming. Arguably, rising carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere can be to some extent favorable for plants, it is also

the chief culprit of climate change. It is clear that aids of greening earth fall short compared to the estimated negative impacts of climate change (such as droughts, heat waves, and floods), sea level rise, and ocean acidification. [11] The media presentation of risk issues as a 'controversy' can strongly influence public perceptions about the reality and seriousness of an issue, along with the credibility of the scientific evidence and policy-making responses. Exaggerating green achievements through advertising to divert attention from actual ecological problems is seen as a marketing strategy. This has brought public relations to spending more money and conceiting about green behaviour than on actual deeds.

Studies on climate change showed that overall concern was not much different from the previous years. Approximately 54% of respondents do not believe that global warming would cause any problems. [12] Similar opinions were seen between people who expressed reluctance to make changes in their lifestyles and personal consumption practices; and those who articulate reservations about national or international measures to address climate change in order to reduce their carbon footprint. Most people continue to view climate change as a non-urgent issue and consistently rank it well below the economy, terrorism, health care, and a myriad of other issues. [13]

When people apply their conventional methods of understanding to climate change, they are likely to be misled. This approach passes over the role of citizens in wealthy nations, who as turn a blind eye to the impacts of high carbon lifestyles and lead a comfortable life, in spite the spread of environmental problems such as global warming. The disparity on the consumption of energy is a reason for denial which will draw attention to a new psychological dilemma for privileged people. [14] Denial remains as a barrier for social and climate scientists because behavioural change cannot occur as long as the problem is not seen as a problem. Communities need to be actively participating in the global fight against climate change. Effective low carbon enterprises at the ground level could generate innovations that can have wider economic and social benefits, in addition to motivating actions in other cities at a global scale. [15]

Household actions to reduce carbon emission are likely to be quite limited unless organisations at different levels take action in the interest of the public through education and social activities. Research shows that such efforts are usually weak at best because of non-informational barriers to behavioural change such as physical, psychological, and social factors. The urgent need to help and describe public understanding in the community not following scientific reasoning in regard to climate change has become a challenge.

Conclusion

Human influence on the climate system is indistinct in responses to the issues as 'controversy' has been created. If crucial and compulsory steps are not taken, the impact of climate change for the worst will be for future generations. [16] A convincing and possible case can be made for practical action in the next decades to bring about climate stabilization and appropriate management of health threats. [2] Providing the public with quality scientific information on climate and making them well-informed will bring the views of the public closer to those of scientists. Not only are the people who reject climate change neither less rational nor always less well-informed than those people who accept it. Only through the effect of education and information on climate change along with moral behaviour towards global climate-informed responsible decisions can be taken.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Stephanie E. Austin, Robbert Biesbroek, Lea Berrang-Ford, James D. Ford, Stephen Parker and Manon D. Fleury (2016). Public health adaptation to climate change in OECD countries. International Journal of

Environmental Research and Public Health, 13(9), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13090889.
2. Anthony Costello, Mark Maslin, Hugh Montgomery, Anne M. Johnson and Paul Ekins. (2011) 'Global health and climate change: moving from denial and catastrophic fatalism to positive action', Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 369, pp. 1866–1882. https://doi: 10.1098/rsta.2011.0007.
3. Mohammed H.I. Dore (2005) Climate change and changes in global precipitation patterns: What do we know? Environment International. 31 (2005) 1167 – 1181.
4. John Cook1, Dana Nuccitelli, Sarah A Green, Mark Richardson, B¨arbel Winkler, Rob Painting, Robert Way, Peter Jacobs and Andrew Skuce. (2013) Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature. Environ. Res. Lett. 8 (2013) 024024 (7pp) doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/2/024024.
5. Ethan Siegel (2019) This Is Why Global Warming Is Responsible for Freezing Temperatures across the U.S. https://www.forbes.com/sites/startswithabang/2019/01/30/this-is-why-global-warming-is-responsible-for-freezing-temperatures-across-the-usa/#21328659d8cf.
6. Goodall, A. H. (2008) 'Why have the leading journals in management (and other social sciences) failed to respond to climate change?' Journal of Management Inquiry, 17(4), pp. 408–420. doi: 10.1177/1056492607311930.
7. Monbiot, G. (2006). The denial industry. The Guardian, Section G2, p. 6. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2006/sep/19/ethicalliving.g2.
8. Jeffrey A Harvey, Daphne van den Berg, Jacintha Ellers, Remko Kampen, Thomas W Crowther, Peter Roessingh, Bart Verheggen, Rascha J M Nuijten, Eric Post, Stephan Lewandowsky, Ian Stirling, Meena Balgopal, Steven C Amstrup, Michael E Mann, Internet Blogs, Polar Bears, and Climate-Change Denial by Proxy, BioScience, Volume 68, Issue 4, April 2018, Pages 281–287, https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/bix133.
9. Jean-Daniel Collomb (2014). The Ideology of Climate Change Denial in the United States », European journal of American studies. 9-1 (2014), document 5, DOI: 10.4000/ejas.10305.
10. Peter J. Jacques, Riley E. Dunlap & Mark Freeman (2008) The organisation of denial: Conservative think tanks and environmental scepticism, Environmental Politics, 17:3, 349-385, DOI: 10.1080/09644010802055576.
11. Scientific Consensus: Earth's climate is warming. NASA. https://climate.nasa.gov/scientific-consensus/
12. Megan Brenan And Lydia Saad (2018) Global Warming Concern Steady Despite Some Partisan Shifts. https://news.gallup.com/poll/231530/global-warming-concern-steady-despite-partisan-shifts.aspx
13. Tanya Wyatt and Avi Brisman (2017) The Role of Denial in the 'Theft of Nature': Comparing Biopiracy and Climate Change. Critical Criminology. September 2017, Volume 25, Issue 3, pp 325–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-016-9344-5.
14. Norgaard, K. M. (2012) 'Climate Denial and the Construction of Innocence Reproducing Transnational Environmental Privilege in the Face of Climate Change', Race, Gender & Class, 19(1–2), pp. 80–103.
15. Andy Gouldson, Sarah Colenbrander, Andrew Sudmant, Effie Papargyropoulou, Niall Kerr, Faye McAnulla & Stephen Hall (2016) Cities and climate change mitigation: Economic opportunities and governance challenges in Asia. Cities. Volume 54, May 2016, Pages 11-19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2015.10.010.
16. Jessica G Fritze, Grant A Blashki, Susie Burke and John Wiseman (2008) Hope, despair and transformation: Climate change and the promotion of mental health and wellbeing. International Journal of Mental Health Systems 2008, 2:13. https://doi.org/10.1186/1752-4458-2-13.

How to cite this article: Banerjee. S, Gupta. N. Integral conflict towards climate change. Int J Health Sci Res. 2019; 9(5):416-419.

******