Volume : 2 | Issue : 3 | Received-06-05-2026 | Accepted-14-05-2026 | Published-21-05-2026

UAI JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS, BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT (UAIJEBM)

Abbreviated Key Title: UAI J Econ Bus Manag.
ISSN: 3049-2777 (Online)
Journal Homepage: https://uaipublisher.com/
Volume- 2 Issue- 3 (May-June) 2026
Frequency: Bimonthly

A Comparative Study of Environmental Justice in the East and West: A Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Norms, Political Economy, and Governance

Jheng-Yu Yin[1*], Wen-Chuan Ke[2], Ho Yin Gary YEE[3]

[1] Ph D., Fu Jen Catholic University; Visiting Professor, Normal College, Hubei Polytechnic University.

[2] Ph D. Researcher Fellow, School of Technology Management, National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University; Adjunct Associate Professor, Department of Industrial Engineering and Management, National Taipei University of Technology; Adjunct Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration, National Open University; Visiting Professor, School of Intelligent Construction, Wuchang University of Technology.

[3] Ph D., East China Normal University; Chairman, Silk Road Cultural Society

Corresponding Author: Jheng-Yu Yin

ABSTRACT

Against the backdrop of an accelerating global environmental crisis, the concept of "environmental justice" has evolved from a grassroots activist slogan into a central theme in international politics and public policy. However, a significant chasm persists between Eastern and Western societies in the conceptualization, attribution of responsibility, and policy implementation of environmental justice. This divergence is increasingly magnified in climate diplomacy, supply chain governance, and the politics of standards-setting. This article adopts a comparative perspective, integrating three analytical lenses—normative ethics, political economy, and governance institutions—to critically examine the tensions and potential compatibilities between the prevailing Western narrative of "historical responsibility and capability" and the East Asian, particularly Chinese, emphasis on the "right to development, stage-based differentiation, and state capacity."

The analysis reveals that contemporary debates on environmental justice are not merely moral contests but are deeply enmeshed in the politics of emissions accounting (production vs. consumption), the systemic transfer of environmental costs through the global division of labor, the politicization of technology and standards, and the differential impacts of policy instruments such as ESG, carbon border mechanisms, and renewable energy transitions. The article concludes that transcending the East-West binary to forge a viable global environmental governance mechanism requires simultaneously addressing the legitimacy of responsibility allocation, the equitable distribution of transition costs, and the procedural rights of communities affected by these policies. Only by operationalizing the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities" into tangible institutional arrangements can a sustainable and just global environmental future be achieved.

KEY WORDS: environmental justice, climate justice, global division of labor, environmental costs, politics of standards, policy instruments, global governance

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20323129

1. Introduction: Reframing Environmental Justice through a Comparative Lens

The discourse on environmental justice (EJ) has undergone a profound scalar and conceptual expansion over the past several decades. Originating in the United States as a response to the disproportionate siting of toxic waste facilities in racial minority and low-income communities, its core concern was the maldistribution of environmental "bads" (Bullard, 1990). As environmental challenges have globalized, particularly with the existential threat of climate change, the EJ framework has been scaled up to the international level, evolving into the concept of "climate justice" (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014). This expanded frame interrogates not only the unequal distribution of climate impacts but also the historical responsibility for emissions, the allocation of resources for mitigation and adaptation, and the procedural fairness of global climate negotiations.

However, as environmental justice has globalized, its meaning has become increasingly contested. The normative principles that underpin the discourse, often rooted in Western liberal-democratic traditions emphasizing individual rights, procedural transparency, and civil society participation, do not always translate seamlessly into different political-economic contexts. This is particularly evident in the growing divergence between "Western" and "Eastern" perspectives on what constitutes a just environmental order. While this East-West dichotomy is an oversimplification that masks significant internal variations, it serves as a useful heuristic for understanding fundamental differences in how responsibility is framed, how development is prioritized, and how state power is conceptualized in environmental governance.

Western narratives, particularly from the European Union and North American activist networks, frequently foreground the principle of historical responsibility. This perspective argues that nations that industrialized earliest, and thus contributed the most to cumulative greenhouse gas concentrations, bear a greater moral and financial obligation to lead decarbonization efforts and support developing nations (Caney, 2010). Conversely, many East Asian nations, led by China, counter with a narrative centered on the "right to development," arguing that their per capita emissions remain lower than those of developed nations and that they require "carbon space" to achieve economic modernization and eradicate poverty (NDRC, 2021). This view reframes justice not as a matter of historical penitence but as a function of developmental stage, national circumstance, and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR).

This normative clash is not merely a philosophical debate; it has profound material consequences. It shapes negotiating positions in international forums like the UNFCCC, influences the design of policy instruments like the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), and fuels geopolitical competition over the control of green technologies and their supply chains. The very definition of what is "green" or "sustainable," as codified in taxonomies and ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) standards, is becoming a site of political contestation, reflecting underlying differences in industrial structure, energy systems, and governance philosophies.

Therefore, a comparative analysis is essential not to declare one perspective morally superior, but to deconstruct the political, economic, and institutional logics that animate each position. This article seeks to move beyond a simple description of these differences by employing a multi-dimensional framework. **First**, it undertakes a normative ethical analysis to compare the core principles of responsibility attribution. **Second**, it applies a political economy lens to examine how the global division of labor facilitates the externalization and transfer of environmental costs. **Third**, it adopts a governance perspective to dissect the power dynamics inherent in the choice of policy instruments, technological pathways, and the setting of international standards. By integrating these three dimensions and drawing on comparative case studies of the United States, the European Union, China, and Japan, this article aims to provide a more nuanced understanding of the structural barriers to a globally accepted framework for environmental justice and to identify potential pathways for building a more equitable and effective system of global environmental governance.

2. Theoretical Framework: Justice, Emissions, and Power

To analyze the East-West divide in environmental justice, this study builds on a tripartite framework that integrates three core analytical dimensions: the facets of justice, the metrics of responsibility, and the politics of governance.

2.1 The Three Faces of Environmental Justice: Distribution, Procedure, and Recognition

Contemporary environmental justice scholarship distinguishes among three interrelated dimensions of justice, moving beyond a narrow focus on the allocation of goods and bads (Schlosberg, 2007; Fraser, 2009).

2.1.1 **Distributive Justice**: This is the most traditional dimension, concerned with the equitable distribution of environmental risks (e.g., pollution, climate vulnerability) and benefits (e.g., clean air, green spaces, access to renewable energy). In the international context, this translates into debates over the fair allocation of the remaining global carbon budget, the distribution of adaptation funds, and compensation for loss and damage. The core tension here is defining "fairness"—is it based on equality, per capita rights, historical responsibility, or capacity to pay?

2.1.2 **Procedural Justice**: This dimension focuses on the fairness and inclusivity of decision-making processes. It asks whether all affected parties have a meaningful voice in the governance of environmental resources and risks. Key elements include access to information, transparency in decision-making, public participation, and access to legal recourse. At the global level, procedural justice questions the power imbalances in climate negotiations, where the voices of small island states or indigenous communities may be marginalized relative to major economic powers.

2.1.3 **Recognition Justice**: This is the most fundamental dimension, concerning the respect for and acknowledgment of the distinct cultures, identities, and vulnerabilities of different social groups. It challenges dominant cultural and political norms that may render certain groups invisible or devalue their ways of life (Honneth, 1995). In the climate context, this involves recognizing that climate change impacts are not uniform but are mediated by social factors like gender, ethnicity, and indigeneity, and that

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20323129

development pathway that are deemed "universal" may in fact threaten culturally specific forms of existence.

Applying this three-dimensional framework allows for a more comprehensive analysis. A policy might appear distributively fair (e.g., a carbon tax that funds a universal dividend) but be procedurally unjust if implemented without public consultation, or fail the test of recognition if it disproportionately burdens a community whose livelihood is tied to a targeted industry without acknowledging their cultural identity.

2.2 Accounting for Responsibility: Production versus Consumption-Based Emissions

A central point of contention in the global climate justice debate is the methodology used to account for greenhouse gas emissions. The standard UNFCCC framework is based on production-based accounting (also known as territorial emissions), which attributes emissions to the country where they are physically produced (Peters & Hertwich, 2008). This metric places a heavy burden on manufacturing-heavy economies, particularly those that function as the "workshop of the world."

An alternative and analytically powerful metric is consumption-based accounting, which attributes the emissions embodied in traded goods and services to the country where they are ultimately consumed. This approach reveals the "offshored" carbon footprint of high-consumption nations, which have effectively outsourced their emissions-intensive production to other countries while maintaining high levels of material consumption (Davis & Caldeira, 2010). The gap between a country's production and consumption emissions is a quantifiable measure of the international transfer of environmental burdens. This distinction is not merely technical; it is deeply political. Shifting the accounting frame from production to consumption fundamentally alters the narrative of responsibility, implicating the consumption patterns of affluent societies as a primary driver of global emissions.

2.3 The Politics of Governance: Standards, Technology, and Power

Environmental governance is often presented as a technical exercise of setting scientifically-derived standards and deploying optimal technologies. However, this perspective masks the inherent politics of these processes. The setting of environmental standards is a powerful act of governance that has significant distributional consequences (Falkner, 2003). For instance, stringent product standards set by a major economic bloc like the EU can function as non-tariff trade barriers, locking out producers from developing countries who lack the capital or technical capacity to comply. This is often termed the "California Effect" or "Brussels Effect," where a large market externalizes its regulations globally (Bach & Newman, 2010).

Similarly, the choice of technological pathways for decarbonization is not neutral. A focus on capital-intensive technologies like large-scale solar farms or advanced nuclear reactors may benefit established corporations and engineering firms, while a focus on decentralized, community-owned renewable energy may empower local actors. Furthermore, as the world transitions to green technologies, new forms of geopolitical dependency are emerging around the control of critical minerals (e.g., lithium, cobalt, rare earths) and the manufacturing capacity for solar panels, wind turbines, and batteries (Bradsher, 2021). Thus, environmental governance must be analyzed as a site of power, where actors compete to define problems, set rules, and control the material basis of a new energy economy.

3. The Normative Divide: Historical Responsibility versus the Right to Development

The most fundamental cleavage in the East-West environmental justice debate is normative, rooted in conflicting interpretations of fairness and responsibility. These are not abstract philosophical positions but deeply held political narratives that justify national interests and policy choices.

3.1 The Western Narrative: Emphasizing Historical Responsibility and the Capability Principle

The dominant narrative in Western Europe and among many environmental NGOs is grounded in two ethical principles: historical responsibility and the capability principle.

The historical responsibility argument, often referred to as the "polluter pays principle" applied across time, posits that nations that have contributed the most to the stock of atmospheric greenhouse gases since the Industrial Revolution have a moral obligation to bear a greater share of the mitigation burden (Shue, 1999). This argument is compelling because it links the current climate crisis directly to the historical economic development of the West, which was powered by fossil fuels. From this perspective, the wealth and technological advancement of developed nations were built, in part, on the unconstrained use of a shared global commons—the atmosphere. Therefore, climate action is not an act of charity but a matter of rectifying a historical injustice.

Complementing this is the capability principle, which argues that responsibility should be proportional to the capacity to act. Wealthier nations possess greater financial resources, technological expertise, and institutional stability to undertake ambitious climate action without jeopardizing the basic needs of their citizens (Caney, 2005). This principle underpins the commitment made by developed countries in the Paris Agreement to provide financial and technological support to developing nations.

The EU has been the most prominent champion of this narrative. Its aggressive decarbonization targets, its leadership in promoting international climate agreements, and its pioneering of policies like the Emissions Trading System (ETS) and the CBAM are often framed in the language of global leadership and responsibility. However, this narrative faces critiques of hypocrisy. Critics point out that while advocating for global action, Western nations have historically been slow to meet their financial pledges, have protected their own industries, and have consumption patterns that continue to drive global emissions, albeit indirectly through imports (Roberts & Parks, 2007).

3.2 The East Asian Narrative: Prioritizing the Right to Development and Differentiated Responsibilities

In contrast, the narrative advanced by China and supported by many other developing nations centers on the right to development. This principle, enshrined in the 1986 UN Declaration, asserts that development is an inalienable human right. From this perspective, environmental protection cannot be pursued at the expense of poverty alleviation, industrialization, and improving living standards (Wang & Wiser, 2012). This narrative does not deny the reality of the environmental crisis but argues that the pathway to addressing it must be differentiated according to national circumstances.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20323129

This leads to a strong emphasis on per capita emissions as a more equitable metric of responsibility than absolute national emissions. Chinese officials frequently argue that while China is the largest absolute emitter, its per capita emissions are still significantly lower than those of the United States and other developed countries. Moreover, they argue that a significant portion of China's emissions is generated in the production of goods for export to the West, a point directly challenging the production-based accounting framework (Guan et al., 2014).

This narrative strongly upholds the principle of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC), a cornerstone of the UNFCCC. It interprets CBDR-RC to mean that while all countries have a common responsibility to protect the climate, the primary burden of deep and rapid emissions cuts falls on developed countries. Developing countries, in this view, should be allowed a more gradual transition, supported by finance and technology transfer from the West. China's dual role as the world's largest emitter and a leader in renewable energy manufacturing creates a complex position. It leverages its green tech dominance to position itself as a solution provider, while simultaneously using its status as a developing nation to argue for differentiated timelines and responsibilities in decarbonizing its domestic economy.

3.3 Japan's Ambivalent Position: Technological Prowess and Political Passivity

Japan occupies a unique and often ambivalent position in this normative debate. As an early industrializer and a member of the developed world, it is expected to align with the Western position on historical responsibility. Indeed, Japan has long prided itself on its advanced environmental technologies, particularly in energy efficiency and clean coal combustion. Its high per-capita emissions efficiency is often cited as a model.

However, in international climate politics, Japan has often been more cautious than the EU. Its policy has been shaped by a strong focus on energy security—a vulnerability acutely exposed by its reliance on imported fossil fuels and the 2011 Fukushima nuclear disaster—and a desire to protect its industrial competitiveness. This has led to a more pragmatic, technology-agnostic approach that includes continued investment in high-efficiency fossil fuels and a slow restart of its nuclear fleet, drawing criticism from environmental groups. Furthermore, Japan's reliance on global supply chains, many of which are centered in China, places it in a delicate position, caught between its security alliance with the United States and its economic interdependence with China. This often translates into a less vocal and more passive role in the normative debates, preferring to focus on technological solutions rather than grand pronouncements on justice.

4. The Political Economy of Environmental Cost-Shifting

The normative divide over responsibility is underpinned by the material reality of the globalized economy, which has created systemic mechanisms for shifting environmental costs from high-consumption core economies to production-focused peripheral and semi-peripheral economies.

4.1 The "West Consumes, East Pollutes" Paradigm: Evidence from Consumption-Based Accounting

The shift from production-based to consumption-based emissions accounting provides stark evidence of this cost-shifting. Studies consistently show that developed nations in North America and Western Europe are significant net importers of embodied emissions (Peters et al., 2011). The United States, for instance, has a consumption footprint that is substantially larger than its territorial emissions, meaning it effectively offshores a significant portion of its environmental impact. The inverse is true for China, whose production emissions are much higher than its consumption emissions, confirming its role as the "world's factory."

This creates a structural injustice. The consuming country benefits from low-cost goods and a cleaner domestic environment (having deindustrialized many polluting sectors), while the producing country bears the environmental and health costs of pollution, resource depletion, and carbon emissions. This global division of labor creates an "environmental unequal exchange," where the environmental costs associated with production are not fully reflected in the price of traded goods (Jorgenson & Clark, 2012). This system allows the West to maintain high levels of consumption while appearing to make progress on domestic environmental goals, a phenomenon that has been termed "environmental load displacement."

4.2 The Rise of Supply Chain Governance: A Double-Edged Sword

In recent years, there has been a growing recognition of this problem, leading to a new wave of governance initiatives focused on global value chains (GVCs). Policies like the EU's proposed Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive and regulations on deforestation-free products aim to make corporations legally responsible for the environmental and human rights impacts of their entire supply chain. Similarly, the proliferation of private governance schemes, such as ESG ratings and green certifications, seeks to leverage investor and consumer pressure to drive sustainability improvements upstream.

On the surface, these initiatives represent a positive step towards internalizing externalized costs and promoting a form of global distributive justice. They shift the burden of proof onto corporations in the Global North, forcing them to look beyond their factory gates.

However, these tools can be a double-edged sword. From a critical perspective, they can also function as new forms of green protectionism. The compliance costs associated with complex auditing, certification, and reporting requirements can be prohibitive for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in developing countries, effectively excluding them from lucrative Western markets (Nadvi, 2008). Furthermore, the standards themselves are often designed in the West, reflecting Western priorities and methodologies, which may not be appropriate for different local contexts. This raises questions of procedural justice and recognition: who gets to define "sustainability," and whose knowledge counts? There is a real risk that supply chain governance, if not implemented with a strong focus on capacity building and partnership, could simply reinforce existing power asymmetries under a green veneer.

5. The Politics of Policy Instruments and Standards

The choice of policy instruments to address environmental problems is never purely technical; it is deeply ideological and political. The tools favored by the East and West reflect their different governance models, economic structures, and geopolitical interests.

5.1 Carbon Pricing and Border Adjustments: The EU's Regulatory Power Play

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20323129

The EU has championed market-based mechanisms, with its Emissions Trading System (ETS) as the flagship policy. The recent introduction of the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) is a logical extension of this approach. The CBAM is designed to prevent "carbon leakage"—the migration of carbon-intensive industries from the EU to countries with weaker climate policies. It will require importers of certain goods (e.g., steel, aluminum, cement) to purchase carbon certificates corresponding to the carbon price they would have paid had the goods been produced under the EU's rules.

The EU frames the CBAM as a matter of fairness and environmental integrity, ensuring a level playing field for its domestic industries and incentivizing other countries to adopt stronger climate policies. However, for many countries, including China, the CBAM is viewed as a unilateral and protectionist measure that violates the spirit of the CBDR-RC principle by imposing the EU's climate policy on its trading partners (Disdier & Marette, 2021). It is seen as an attempt to leverage the EU's market power to enforce its regulatory preferences globally—a clear example of the "Brussels Effect." The debate over the CBAM encapsulates the core tension: is it a legitimate tool for preventing leakage, or is it a coercive instrument of green imperialism that unfairly penalizes developing countries for their different developmental stage and industrial structure?

5.2 State-Led Industrial Policy: China's Green Technology Dominance

In contrast to the EU's market-oriented approach, China's environmental and climate policy is deeply intertwined with its state-led industrial strategy. China's remarkable rise to dominance in the manufacturing of solar panels, wind turbines, and electric vehicle batteries was not an accident of the market but the result of deliberate state planning, massive subsidies, and strategic investments (Gallagher, 2014).

This approach has had globally significant, albeit paradoxical, effects. On one hand, China's industrial scale has dramatically driven down the cost of renewable energy technologies, making the global energy transition more affordable and feasible for all countries. In this sense, China has made a monumental contribution to global climate mitigation. On the other hand, this has created new geopolitical vulnerabilities. The heavy concentration of green tech supply chains in China raises concerns in the US and Europe about economic dependency and supply chain resilience. This has prompted retaliatory measures, such as the US Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), which includes massive subsidies for domestic green manufacturing, and EU proposals for a "Net-Zero Industry Act." The result is an escalating "green tech race," where climate policy becomes a proxy for geopolitical competition.

5.3 The Battle over Standards: The Case of ESG

The field of sustainable finance, particularly ESG investing, has become another key battleground. ESG frameworks, largely developed by Western financial institutions and rating agencies, aim to channel capital towards companies with better environmental, social, and governance performance. Proponents see ESG as a powerful market-based tool for driving corporate change.

However, from an Eastern perspective, ESG is often viewed with suspicion. Critics argue that ESG rating methodologies are opaque, culturally biased, and often fail to account for the different operating contexts of emerging market firms (Li & Zhou, 2022). For example, a state-owned enterprise might score poorly on Western governance metrics ("G") but could be a key instrument for implementing national environmental policy. Similarly, metrics for social performance ("S") may not adequately capture the different ways companies contribute to social welfare in a non-Western context. This has led to efforts in China and other countries to develop their own "ESG with Chinese characteristics" or other localized frameworks, leading to a potential fragmentation of global standards. The struggle over who defines and measures ESG is ultimately a struggle over who sets the rules for the global green economy.

5.4 Case Study: The Geopolitics of Rare Earth Elements (REEs)

The transition to green technology is critically dependent on a range of minerals, including REEs, which are essential for permanent magnets used in wind turbines and electric vehicle motors. China currently dominates all stages of the REE supply chain, from mining to processing and magnet production. This dominance is not due to geological luck alone; it is the result of a long-term industrial strategy that involved tolerating significant environmental costs. For decades, the unregulated and often highly polluting extraction of REEs in China provided cheap inputs for global electronics and defense industries. The environmental costs—including water and soil contamination and radioactive waste—were largely borne by local communities in China, a classic case of internalizing environmental bads for geopolitical and economic gain (Lee, 2012).

Today, as the West scrambles to build its own "mine-to-magnet" supply chains to reduce its dependency on China, it faces a profound justice dilemma. Replicating these supply chains domestically will require opening new mines and processing facilities, which will inevitably face strong local opposition due to their environmental impact—the classic "Not In My Backyard" (NIMBY) problem. This situation starkly illustrates the hypocrisy at the heart of the global system: the desire for clean energy in the West is predicated on a supply chain whose environmental and social costs have long been outsourced. True environmental justice would require not just diversifying supply chains but also ensuring that the "clean" energy transition does not simply create new sacrifice zones, whether at home or abroad.

6. Conclusion: Beyond the Binary towards a Pluralistic Global Governance

The comparative analysis of environmental justice in the East and West reveals a complex landscape of conflicting norms, structural inequalities, and competing political-economic interests. The simplistic binary of a "responsible West" versus a "recalcitrant East" collapses under scrutiny, replaced by a more nuanced picture of shared, but differentiated, complicity in a global system that systematically displaces environmental costs.

The Western emphasis on historical responsibility and procedural justice offers a powerful moral framework, yet it can be undermined by consumption patterns that perpetuate the very problems it decries and by the unilateral imposition of standards that can function as protectionist barriers. The Eastern emphasis on the right to development and state-led solutions has demonstrated an impressive capacity to mobilize resources and scale up green technologies, yet it can risk marginalizing procedural rights and internalizing severe environmental costs in the name of national progress. Japan's position highlights the predicament of technologically advanced nations caught between competing geopolitical blocs and constrained by domestic energy security concerns.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20323129

Moving forward, a viable and just global environmental governance system cannot be built on the universalization of a single normative model. Instead, it requires a more pluralistic approach that seeks to bridge these divides through concrete institutional mechanisms. This study offers three concluding pathways:

First, there is a need to operationalize "differentiated responsibility" beyond rhetoric. This means developing a more sophisticated and multi-metric framework for allocating burdens that goes beyond simple production-based emissions. Such a framework could include a weighted index that accounts for historical emissions, consumption-based emissions, technological capability, and per capita wealth. Policies like the CBAM, if they are to gain legitimacy, must be redesigned to include significant revenue recycling mechanisms that directly fund decarbonization efforts and capacity building in developing nations, transforming them from a punitive tool into a cooperative one.

Second, procedural justice must be institutionalized at the heart of supply chain governance. Instead of top-down, one-size-fits-all standards, new models of "co-governance" are needed, where standards are co-developed with producers and stakeholders in the Global South. This requires investing in capacity building, facilitating knowledge exchange, and ensuring that SMEs are supported, rather than excluded, by the transition to sustainable supply chains. The goal should be empowerment, not just compliance.

Third, the narrative must shift from one of blame and moral accusati on to one of shared risk and mutual dependency. The COVID-19 pa ndemic and recent supply chain disruptions have starkly illustrated t he fragility of our interconnected global system. The climate crisis is a threat multiplier of unparalleled scale. Recognizing that the failure to manage the climate transition equitably will result in systemic ris ks for all—from supply chain collapse and resource conflicts to mas s migration and financial instability—can create a more pragmatic b asis for cooperation. True environmental justice is not a zero-sum ga me or a moral luxury; it is a precondition for a stable and prosperous shared future. It demands moving beyond the East-West binary and forging a new global compact based on the difficult but essential wo rk of negotiating fairness in an unequal world.

Literature

1. Bach, D., & Newman, A. L. (2010). The European regulatory state and global public policy: Micro-institutions and macro-influence. *Journal of European Public Policy, 17*(6), 827–846. https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2010.493033
2. Bradsher, K. (2021, September 22). China's dominance of the green energy supply chain is a growing concern. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/22/business/china-green-energy.html
3. Bullard, R. D. (1990). *Dumping in Dixie: Race, class, and environmental quality*. Westview Press.
4. Caney, S. (2005). Cosmopolitan justice, responsibility, and global climate change. *Leiden Journal of International Law, 18*(4), 747–775.
5. Caney, S. (2010). Climate change and the duties of the advantaged. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy, 13*(1), 203–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230903326333
6. Davis, S. J., & Caldeira, K. (2010). Consumption-based accounting of CO2 emissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 107*(12), 5687–5692. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0906974107
7. Disdier, A. C., & Marette, S. (2021). The carbon border adjustment mechanism: A review of the literature. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, 43*(4), 1645–1662. https://doi.org/10.1002/aepp.13170
8. Falkner, R. (2003). Private environmental governance and international relations: Exploring the private–public interface. *Global Environmental Politics, 3*(2), 72–87.
9. Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. Columbia University Press.
10. Gallagher, K. S. (2014). *The globalization of clean energy technology: Lessons from China*. MIT Press.
11. Guan, D., Meng, J., Reiner, D. M., Zhang, N., Shan, Y., Mi, Z., ... & Liu, J. (2014). China's CO2 emissions: A review of the past, present and future. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 103*, 111–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.07.037
12. Honneth, A. (1995). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. MIT Press.
13. Jorgenson, A. K., & Clark, B. (2012). The environmental consequences of the global division of labor: A cross-national study of the metabolic rift. *Organization & Environment, 25*(3), 273–289. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026612456956
14. Lee, J. (2012). *Rare earth elements: A review of production, processing, recycling, and environmental impact*. Springer.
15. Li, J., & Zhou, X. (2022). ESG in China: The path to sustainable development. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, 12*(3), 450–475.
16. Nadvi, K. (2008). Global standards, global governance and the organization of global value chains. *Journal of Economic Geography, 8*(3), 323–343.
17. National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC). (2021). *China's policies and actions for addressing climate change*. State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China.
18. Peters, G. P., & Hertwich, E. G. (2008). CO2 embodied in international trade with implications for global climate policy. *Environmental Science & Technology, 42*(5), 1401–1407. https://doi.org/10.1021/es072023k
19. Peters, G. P., Minx, J. C., Weber, C. L., & Edenhofer, O. (2011). Growth in emission transfers via international trade from 1990 to 2008. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 108*(21), 8903–8908. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1006388108
20. Roberts, J. T., & Parks, B. C. (2007). *A climate of injustice: Global inequality, North-South politics, and climate policy*. MIT Press.
21. Schlosberg, D. (2007). *Defining environmental justice: Theories, movements, and nature*. Oxford University Press.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20323129

22. Schlosberg, D., & Collins, L. B. (2014). From environmental to climate justice: Climate justice in the activist discourse. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 5*(3), 359–374. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.275

23. Shue, H. (1999). Global environment and international inequality. *International Affairs, 75*(3), 531–545.

24. Wang, Y., & Wiser, R. H. (2012). China's wind energy policy: A review. *Energy Policy, 49*, 718–729. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.07.037

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20323129