

Sharon Lee: Welcome to Brotherhood Talks.

Jeremy Moss: The conception of justice has to be part of our thinking about climate transition from the very beginning. Not as an afterthought, not as a bonus that you might see at the end when you've done whatever you've had to do to reduce emissions, but right there at the very beginning, because my claim will be, if we don't do that, then we run all sorts of terrible risks of making a very bad situation worse, even if we do successfully reduce our emissions in various ways.

Sharon Lee: As a political philosopher, Jeremy Moss puts justice front and centre of our efforts to reduce the harmful impacts of climate change. He's professor of political philosophy and co-director of the Practical Justice Initiative at the University of New South Wales, where he leads the Climate Justice Research Program. He's also received the Eureka Prize for Ethics, and chaired the UNESCO working group on climate ethics and energy security. Jeremy Moss was a keynote speaker at Brotherhood Talks.

Jeremy Moss: What I wanted to talk about today is the kind of ways in which justice ought to shape our climate transition and why it ought to shape our climate transition. As was mentioned in the introduction, I'm a political philosopher. We focus typically on some of the more abstract issues, I guess, or some of the background issues that inform this kind of thinking about transitions and just transitions. The picture of my discussion will be at the level of what kind of principles and what kind of arguments can we make about the need for a just transition, and the substance of that just transition. That's where the talk will be pitched.

As we know, when we talk about climate transition, in general, there are all sorts of things, obviously, that are in the mix that we need to know about. We need to be aware of the best technology. We need to be aware of the kind of finance and cost that goes with any sort of transition, the climate transition. We also need to be aware of the political barriers or the political opportunities that we have to prosecute the transition. All that is incredibly important. But what I want to focus on today is the sense in which conception of justice has to be part of our thinking about climate transition from the very beginning. Not as an afterthought, not as a bonus that you might see at the end when you've done whatever you've had to do to reduce emissions, but right there at the very beginning, because my claim will be, if we don't do that, then we run all sorts of terrible risks of making a very bad situation worse, even if we do successfully reduce our emissions in various ways.

Now, in order to see the relevance of justice and in morality, more generally when we think about climate transition, I just want to take a step back for a moment and consider the kind of ways in which moral ideas inform our thinking about climate change from the very beginning, because if you think why you care about climate change, it's not because of this magical number, two degrees, that we're all trying to avoid. It's not. I put it to you that we care

inherently about the climate changing. I'm neutral on whether the climate should change or not. Why we care about climate change is because of the impacts that increasing temperature will have on us and other things that matter. We're unwilling to accept the kind of harms that will be forced on this society and many others if the temperature rises too much. That's fundamentally, in my view, a moral claim. We're saying that it's wrong to harm people in this kind of way as a result of what we're doing to make climate change happen. That's fundamentally a moral claim.

Kevin Rudd got it right when he claimed that it's the greatest moral challenge, climate change that is, of our time. He got it right in ways I suspect that he didn't fully understand, perhaps. Maybe that's unfair.

At any rate, there's moral values that appear at the start of our thinking about why climate change matters. When we think about what we have to do or the kind of things that we're often told that we have to achieve if we're going to avoid dangerous climate change, like keeping the temperature rise to a certain level, that also involve ideas about risk. We're not prepared to accept a certain amount of risk that goes with the kind of temperature increase that we're facing. Values are there at the start. That's one claim.

Values are also there at the second step of when we start thinking of climate change because, as you know, the world only has a certain amount of emissions that it can now put into the atmosphere and avoid dangerous climate change. That's called the carbon budget. When we decide on that carbon budget, we then have to divide those emissions, as you know, between the countries of the world. Again, when we undertake this task, of course, it's a political and economic task, but it's also, hopefully, one that's informed by principles of justice.

Is it fair, for instance, that all the countries that have done all the emitting to date get to a bit more in the future? That's a moral principle. That's a principle of justice, a historical responsibility principle. Or we try and make the countries that have the most resources pay for the cost of climate change and, therefore, have less emission rights. Again, these are moral ideas that should be in our thinking from the very beginning.

Just a note, an aside, if you like, about Australia's own responsibilities in this regard; we also ought to be thinking about moral principles when we think what we ought to do when we determine the size and the speed of our transition because, as you know, every country makes a pledge under the Paris Agreement agreed in 2015 to reduce its emissions. Australia has pledged to reduce its emissions by 26% to 28% against a 2005 baseline. That pledge is what determines how quickly we ought to transition. We've got a certain goal in front of us.

However, if we changed some of the moral parameters that inform our pledge, for instance, if we decided that we're the highest per capita emitters, which we

are, and we've been doing that for a very long time, that will mean, I think, that our pledge is likely to get more demanding. If we decide, for instance, that because we're the largest exporter of coal and gas in the world that that ought to change our thinking about our moral responsibilities and how much work we've got to do that will change the climate transition that we see ourselves as having to undertake. In fact, I think, that's true that we ought to do a lot more because of our responsibility in the past and, also, because of our complicity in harms in the present through our exports, we ought to actually transition a lot faster than we're currently proposing to do.

My point about all that is that moral ideas, ideas about justice, ought to inform our thinking from the very beginning. They're two examples in which I think that is true.

Let me now talk a little bit about the kind of moral ideas and the kind of considerations of justice that inform the actual climate transition that we are thinking about undertaking in Australia. Why ought we think about justice? Why do we think the justice matters from the very beginning or why do I think we ought to think that? Well, in one sense, I think, it's just inescapable. It's almost true by definition.

What are we doing when we're transitioning from a high carbon to a low carbon society? Well, one of the things we're doing is we're imposing costs on people, we're imposing burdens on them, and we're distributing benefits. What are some of the costs we're likely to impose on one another as a society as a result of the climate transition? Well, of course, someone's going to have to pay for it. Okay. Obviously, people are going to have to stop doing a lot of things that they're currently doing or, at least, reduce those things. People are going to have to change their behaviour. They're going to have to make sacrifices, and they may just be prevented from doing all sorts of things, whether it's flying, eating more meat, driving cars, having children, whatever it happens to be, or having less children. These are burdens.

Of course, as we know, there's benefits. There's cleaner energy. There's perhaps cheaper energy. There's better public transport, perhaps, if we do that. There's a range of benefits that go with any sort of climate transition. Now, that's exactly what justice is about. What justice is is fairly distributing the benefits and burdens of some sort of activity in society. If you like, a climate transition is a classic case where we have to talk about justice. We have to talk about how we distribute those benefits and burdens of moving from a high carbon to a low carbon society.

Now, the other reason, of course, and perhaps the primary reason why we have to talk about justice, is because if we don't get that distribution right, then people will suffer. One way of thinking about the injustices that are associated with climate change is that you think, "Well, there's the brute injustice of all the things that will happen if the climate changes; increased extreme weather events, shifting disease patterns, and so on." But the other crucial injustice that

we risk in association with climate change is the injustice of getting the response wrong. If we impose those burdens, in particular, or don't fairly share the benefits, then we're making the brute injustice of climate change worse. If we unfairly disadvantage, for instance, the already worse off, then, of course, we are adding to the injustice of increased heat waves or whatever it happens to be. We have to talk about justice because, if we don't and we don't get our responses right, then we risk making the brute injustice of climate change worse.

There's some brief reasons why we need to focus on justice — nothing particularly astonishing there, I think. What sort of justice-type goals ought we be talking about when we're talking about justice in this context? One way at a very abstract level to think about this is we can have minimal goals or goals such as not making anyone worse off. Lots of politicians say this in relation to the kind of policies they introduce, whether it be labour laws or tax changes or whatever it happens to be. They often say, "Let's make people at least not worse off than they currently are or people as a whole and, hopefully, important groups within in the whole."

That's what I call a minimal response, a minimal justice-type response to how we should organise our climate transition. We should also be aware, and this is what I'm going to argue for, that we need what I call a maximal response. That is a response that says that not only should our climate transition be one that seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, not only should it be one that mitigates in that respect, but it should also aim to make people better off in some way. That's a more maximal goal.

I want to argue that when we think about our climate transition, we should think about a dual goal structure. We should think that, certainly where possible and often as a priority, we should not only aim to reduce emissions, but we should aim to make people better off in a substantive sense. I'll say a bit more about what that means in a moment.

Just a couple of notes on this; as you may have already realised, these might be conflicting goals. Okay? It might be the case that you'll have a choice between a very effective way of mitigating, reducing, emissions, and making someone better off in some way. Okay? So, we have to be aware that if we're advocating, we actually are advocating, as I am, that people should be, in some way, better off under our climate transition. We'll have to be aware that these goals may sometimes conflict. That's a problem, I think.

You might also say, "Look, many people have been trying for over a decade to get climate change taken seriously, and the tide has now turned as I think it has. Let's not start talking about some other goal as well because it's been hard enough to get to this point. We're just risking what we've already achieved." I think there is some truth to that.

Nonetheless, I think that including justice-type goals in our thinking from the beginning, actually, are quite likely to make our task easier. I'd be interested in your responses to this because I think one way of making a very expensive, demanding transition as the climate transition will be... one way to make that more acceptable is that if it's fair. On the whole, people react very badly to enormous changes in society that are perceptively unfair and, actually, are unfair. I think that's one advantage to thinking about justice as we start to think about our climate transition.

Conny Lenneberg: I'm Conny Lenneberg, executive director of the national social justice group, the Brotherhood of St Laurence. I hope you're enjoying this episode of Brotherhood Talks. If you'd like to learn more about our work to find solutions to the complex challenges presented by poverty in our prosperous country, have a look at bsl.org.au.

Jeremy Moss: Now, the other problem that I'll try and address is talking about a maximal goal of justice that is making someone better off in some way as a result of our climate transition. That can be quite controversial. You might have one idea of what justice is; I might have another idea. If we start arguing about that, then we may be in trouble. It may be introducing all sorts of controversy and complexity to the task of transforming ourselves in the way that we have to if we're going to avoid dangerous climate change.

Now, I want to talk a little bit, again still at an abstract level, about the kind of substantive conception of justice that I think we ought to adopt or at least give you a hint of that if we are to have a just transition, that is a transition that reduces emissions, but also makes people better off.

I think it's necessary to talk about this because, in a way, if I was to say to you, "Do a little pop quiz," and say to you, "Look who's in favour of a just transition?" you probably all raise your hands. No one's going to stand up and say, "No, no, I'm in favour of an unjust transition. This is unfair and unequal as possible to everyone." No one's likely to say that but for obvious reasons. What that tells us is where the action is, is spelling out what it is to have a just transition.

Just very briefly, if I could introduce an idea without defending it at any great length, I think the kind of way in which we should make people better off is to construct and implement our just transition in a way that makes society a more equal place. So, at the same time as we are reducing emissions, we should strive to ensure that the ways in which we are reducing our emissions, through subsidies, through new types of energy generation, new types of social practices, that these practices should also, where possible, make society a more equal place.

There's been a lot of debate about equality; why it's important, what kind of equality or inequality matters most. I won't go into all that today because that's a very big topic. I actually think that we can go quite a long way with some very simple ideas about equality. Here, I'd like to borrow from the Human

Development Index, which is used by the UN and various other international bodies as offering some suggestions for some very, I think, basic ideas about what constitutes what you need to do to make society a more equal place. I think these are the sorts of things are things we can reasonably readily agree upon.

I think, for instance, that we should try and make a society a more equal place by ensuring that our climate transition measures ensure that people have long and healthy lives, that they are knowledgeable, and they have a decent standard of living. Now, in various ways, I go deeper into this in some of my about-to-be-published work and elsewhere, but I think those three things, long and healthy life, increasing knowledge and ensuring a decent standard of living, are measures, if you like, of how, if we observe them, we can make society a more equal place as we're implementing our climate transition. I think they are, if you like, a template that we ought to put on our climate transitions plans to ensure that they're not just increasing or decreasing emissions, but they're achieving these other goals as well where possible.

Now, I'm not saying that's the only thing we should do, partly because this is a short talk and I can get away with saying things like that but, in principle, I think, of course, it's not the only thing we should aim at but it's a very central and important thing. I'm not saying that it's not all that matters. I'm not saying that it's not controversial in some kinds of ways to have those kinds of goals but I do think that what the kind of thing that I think we ought to build a just transition around is a commitment to not only reducing emissions, but to making society a more equal place by ensuring those three things, and many other things, of course, a part of our transition.

I just wanted to test those ideas a little bit with you by briefly mentioning some case studies as a way of seeing what work they do and what difference they might make. The first case study I'd like to put to you concerns distributed energy and solar power. Now, I'm sure there's a lot of people in the room who know more about these things than I do, and I look forward to being corrected, should I say, anything needs correcting. As we know, now, 1.6 million households, and counting, in Australia have solar panels on their roofs. This has been an enormous success. I think it's the success that clearly ought to continue.

As we also know, these solar panels are being put there by, not all but in many cases, sometimes quite generous subsidies in the form of renewable energy certificates or feed-in tariffs and things like that. These subsidies, as we know, often go to people who have a certain amount of capital, perhaps they own their own home or, most likely, they do but they're paid for by taxpayers, including renters or the very poor.

As I said, I'm not trying to say that we shouldn't do these things, not at all, but I think including robust social justice goals at the start of our thinking at least forces us to ask whether the measures we're taking to decrease emissions, in

this case, by putting solar panels on people's roofs, are they making society a more equal place at the same time as reducing emissions? That means, if we find the answer is no, then we might look at alternatives or at least additional measures, whether that means putting on solar panels or giving subsidies to public housing or public schools or remote indigenous communities or wherever it happens to be. I think what makes the difference, what changes our policy there, is the social justice considerations. Whether you agree with the kind of social justice considerations that I've put forward, my point is that they do make a difference, and they ought to make a difference.

Another case study in a similar vein that I think illustrates the importance of talking about justice is transport. We know, for instance, that Australian cities, they're dominated by cars. Eighteen per cent of Australians emissions come from transport. That's not all cars, but we know we live in very car-centric cities; perhaps not in Fitzroy, but certainly in other places. We know that the kind of emissions produced by cars are very bad for our health and bad for our climate.

What's the obvious solution to cutting the emissions from cars? Well, there's lots of solutions, but one very obvious one that you don't need me to tell you about is increased and better public transport. Thinking about social justice considerations, when we're thinking about transport as a response it doesn't change the fact that public transport ought to be greater and better, but it might change how we implement public transport. If you want to reduce emissions that come from cars and people driving in cars, then you put public transport, heavy rail, for instance, in the areas where there's a lot of people. That's a very easy and obvious way in which you would reduce emissions.

If you also have social justice goals as part of your matrix for how your climate transition would work, maybe you do that but you also put them in suburbs that have less population density, outer suburbs perhaps that have health issues such as obesity, for instance, where increased public transport would also have a positive health impact.

If you spend your money doing that, and I'm not necessarily suggesting you do, you'll reduce emissions by a lesser amount, but you may gain health benefits. I don't have an answer to what you should do in that situation. My point is merely that by including robust measures of equality in your matrix when you're trying to understand how it is you transition from a high carbon to a low carbon society, you'll need to face those kinds of choices and will need to make a decision about the kind of justice or mitigation goals that our money buys us. It does make a big difference, and it should make a big difference.

Just very quickly then, one other case study — obviously, we've had some bad climate news in the last week with the various further approvals for the Adani mine. Whether or not that goes ahead, and so on, I'm not going to comment on that but, obviously, as we do more and more to reduce our emissions, certain industries, such as the coal industry, will inevitably decline, perhaps even decline drastically. In fact, they have to if we're going to have any chance at all

of avoiding dangerous climate change. It's clear there that there will be a very unholy grab for compensation from all the agents involved, whether it's the miners, the local councils, who are dependent on revenues, state governments, the banks, the people who own shares in banks, superannuation funds and, of course last but not least, the people who work and live in those communities.

It seems to me that it's no less relevant, obviously, to talk about social justice considerations when we're deciding who want to share in the benefits and the burdens of closing down industries. There, I think that it's very clear, perhaps the most clear case of why justice matters. We want to get that right. We want to understand who are the people, the agents, the groups who deserve the most assistance, funded, after all, most likely by taxpayers.

My overall point here is that justice ought to make a difference. It must be part of our thinking when we think about the kind of transition we're going to have. It will, inevitably, alter the choices we make. It must alter the choices we make. It pushes it in one direction, rather than another. It will also, as I said, alter the kind and speed of the transition that we undertake. If we, as a country, were to miraculously accept more responsibility for the harms to which we've contributed by being extremely high per capita emitters and exporters of coal and gas, then that will mean that we'll transition a lot quicker, and that will make a huge difference.

Just to conclude then, is it the case that talking about justice in the context of climate transition makes our job difficult and more complex? Well, the answer is, yes, it does. It does make our job more difficult and more complex. But think of the alternative. If we don't include justice considerations in our thinking about climate transition, then I think that it will be less likely to succeed. We'll actually have less chance of avoiding dangerous climate change because the solutions we come up with will be unfair. They won't work, they won't gain acceptance, and they'll make the wrong kinds of people worse off in the wrong kinds of ways.

However, as I said, if we adopt this kind of maximal goal, that is we adopt the goal of making society a more equal place, then, to some degree, transition becomes not just a challenge, but a positive opportunity, an opportunity to make people's lives better in various tangible and important ways. I think aiming to create a more equal society, even if it's only slightly more equal, is the right way to go. That should be our goal, as well as reducing emissions.

Thanks.

Sharon Lee:

This is Brotherhood Talks, a podcast by the Brotherhood of St Laurence. We've been listening to Jeremy Moss, professor of political philosophy and co-director of the Practical Justice Initiative at the University of New South Wales.

Damian Sullivan is the Brotherhood of St Laurence Senior Research Manager of Energy, Equity and Climate Change. He invited questions from the audience.

Damian Sullivan: Thank you very much, Jeremy. It's really useful to have an intervention that provides a framework for how we think about a just transition, but also how to implement it and that discussion of a robust set of measures for its impact on inequality, something that we'll certainly look at how we operationalise that in our work that we do here at the Brotherhood of St Laurence. I want to open it up for discussion from the floor.

David Ramsey: David Ramsey from Jesuit Social Services. You briefly touched on, at the end, the issue of the speed of the transition. To me, that's one of the things that makes this just transition qualitatively different from other things we've experienced. It's got to operate in an incredibly tight timeframe. A lot's got to happen in 10 years. It's a bit I think of the Industrial Revolution having to happen in sort of 35 years or something. What do you think the implications are for justice in in such a tight time-constrained situation?

Jeremy Moss: To be blunt, not good, not good, I think. Certainly, what I was proposing is a very different way of going about things to the ways that I think that will probably come up with by governments and so on, even if they want to do more, which many of them do. I do think that makes it more difficult. Look, that just means I think one has to push all the harder for these kind of considerations to be there at the start to make that claim.

The climate change debate has been dominated by science, and there's nothing wrong with that. Of course, it has to be scientifically informed, but I don't think that's the barrier or the key information anymore. We know enough. We should know more. It's good to know more, but I think there's two things that now ought to dominate debate. One is a set of political issues about how we can get what we want. Secondly, we have to ask, is it fair? I just think that has to be up front now.

Keith: Keith [inaudible], physics teacher. We have solar panels we put in quite a while ago. We have high feed-in tariffs, so energy bills are virtually zero. Had our solar panels been put in a more efficient place, like up in north, in Victoria, they would have been producing something like 20-30% more energy than they are on our roof, and the benefit would have been going to everybody instead. The reason we had them, and basically a whole lot of other people have got them, is because the capitalist system says that has to be all done by private industry. Had we had a more enlightened government at that time, which had put the money that it gave us and other people into establishing larger solar farms that were more effective and producing energy for everyone's benefit would have been a whole lot better. Is capitalism the basic problem?

Jeremy Moss: Thanks, Keith. Thanks. Well, look, let's just say it doesn't help with those kinds of decisions. I'm not going to take the bait about capitalism and say, "That's what we have to do first." Sorry about that. But, look, I suppose I would just say

that whatever you think the cause is, then the standard by which we use to judge whether it's good or bad ought to be the kinds of things, or something like, what I was saying, which is a justice lens, I suppose. I think that kind of comment reinforces the need for us to talk about the ways in which we implement our climate transition, that do make sure that it accords with the kind of principles you were suggesting, which is that everyone should benefit from a public subsidy perhaps or that we get as close to that as we possibly can. That's why I think it should have been there, as you're suggesting, at the start rather than the sort of grab bag policy that it has been.

Julie: Thank you. Hi, I'm Julie, from the Brotherhood of St Laurence. I had three questions. I hope I remember them. The first one was about a really early comment you made which was about the moral salience of climate change being determined really self-referentially. I wanted to ask you about that. I think that's a debate in the environment movement.

The next one was that when I think of justice, there's kind of justice, as you've described, about the distribution of burden and benefit, but there's also justice in the sense of participation in the decisions that affect you. I was curious if you could speak to that.

Finally, as you progressed, I was more and more interested in the potential conflicts over the nature of justice that you described. For example, do we think of justice in individual or communal terms when we have that debate about who gets compensated if Carmichael doesn't go ahead? Do we have reference to Australia as a community or the international community? I'm just really curious like you've given us three guideposts with respect to ultimate outcomes, presumably that accrued individuals. I'm just wondering about how the just management of conflict takes place?

Jeremy Moss: Well, that's four questions really, but it's all right. There's never just three. It's always three plus. Anyway, thank you very much, Julie, for those. They are things about which I need to say more.

What I was trying to get out when I said that, "Look, it's almost definitionally a case of justice," I was saying, "Well, look, one of the key components of justice is fairly distributing the benefits and burdens of living in a society together." In so far as we're creating benefits and burdens by going from a high to a low carbon society, we are engaged in a kind of an activity of distributing things. Whether we do it justly or not, well, that that's our challenge. That's what I meant by it's sort of a definitional or classic case.

As you rightly pointed out, there are very many different dimensions of justice. I was focusing mainly on the distributional one. Of course, being part of the process and having the say is something that we also expect, and are often disappointed about, I suppose, but it's something that we expect should also be part of things. I just didn't talk about that because I only had 25 minutes. But I think that is absolutely crucial although that makes things worse in a way

because, of course, people disagree about things. But I agree that it needs to be front and centre.

Number 3, sorry.

Julie: Something about how you operationalise the principles of justice, like vis-à-vis Australia or the globe vis-à-vis individuals or communities, and then how you deal with conflicts.

Speaker 1 Or even vis-à-vis, exercising the microphone bearer's prerogative here, First Nations people and environmentalists.

Jeremy Moss: All right, so, look, just to make this worse, I don't think it's obvious, for instance, that if you think that a country like Australia has obligations to try and prevent the harms of climate change. I actually don't think it's obvious that we should conduct climate transition here. I think we should, but I think, actually, because of the role we played in causing harm to everyone on earth, our major obligations are, in fact, to people elsewhere. I just think that's politically impossible to achieve but, actually, I think that the people that will be harmed by the emissions that we've put in the atmosphere via our exports and via our everyday living, they won't harm us particularly. Well, they won't harm us nearly as much as they will harm people elsewhere. I think, our primary obligation is, in fact, to help other societies transition. I just didn't discuss that. I would, in fact, prioritise that if I was ruler of Australia, and you all didn't object so much, that's what I would do because I think that is a moral priority because of our relationship to causing those people harm. They will suffer more than more than we do. Ultimately, a just transition, thought about globally, would include our obligations to others.

I'm not sure I'm going to answer everything, but in respect to, say, indigenous communities, for instance, then having as part of your conception of what a climate transition is that it will make society a more equal place as well, I think that gives a clear priority to rolling out measures that will not only reduce emissions, but help people who need help to live in a better way or to live in a way that is better-resourced, better-supported, and so on. I think that having a conception of equality is part of your idea of what a transition is, makes it more likely that you will direct resources to disadvantaged communities which, in some cases, will include indigenous communities.

This is a very clear example because it might be far more costly and get less bang for your buck in terms of emissions to provide renewable energy resources, particularly to remote indigenous communities, but it seems like a clearly desirable thing to do from the perspective of decreasing inequality. That's the kind of choice we'll have to make, I think. Do we reduce the emissions a bit less, but make people's lives, whose lives need to be made better, as a focus of our choice?

Speaker 2: Hi, Jeremy. My question is: you touched on personal sacrifice and behaviour change a little bit and, in light of the animal rights protests, recently urging people to eat less meat in regards for both environmental consequences and also ethical consequences, how seriously, as individuals, should we be taking our personal consumer choices, when it comes to climate change?

Jeremy Moss: On the personal commitment front, I actually think your duties to not eating meat, having one less child, not getting on the plane or not driving a car or indeed owning a car, they're all things that will reduce your emissions. I don't think that's what you should do at all. I think your primary duty, if you think you should do something about climate change, is to convince others, that may be by your own example, because those activities make no difference. As an individual, I can reduce my emissions all I like. It's a tiny drop in the ocean, but if I can convince others and join in with what other people are doing, then that's one good thing.

There's another reason to do that in that, for many of you, this will be true. But when I was a kid, there was always water restrictions. People get very angry about people hosing their lawns or their driveways or what have you. One of the reasons we get angry at that sort of behaviour — it's not that the individual person will be draining the dam when they do that, it's because we've all agreed to make a sacrifice and do something together, and you're not doing it. You're not participating in something that we all ought to do. That's what I think is the duty we all have. It's let's all participate together and achieved this goal rather than just me acting alone by reducing my own personal carbon emissions.

On the last question, because it was last, I remember the least. Sorry about that. Look, I do think we have to be able to address all the winners and losers in a climate transition. The industries and the communities that depend on them that are going to suffer most under a climate transition are fossil fuel industries. I don't think that that should just be a "Oh, we don't care about that at all." I don't think that. I do think, because it's going to have such a serious impact on a reasonably large group of people, that we have to guide our response by what we think is fair. I think there's, in fact, no clear a case of why justice matters, then what happens to people who are going to be, if you like, on the wrong end of bearing the burdens. I think that should be front and centre of our thinking for sure. I don't think it should be excluded or we shouldn't be looking for bad guys or anything like that. But I do think it's the clearest case, if you like, of why we need to talk about justice.

Damian Sullivan: Well, if you can all join me in thanking Jeremy, I'm sure you all agree it was a wonderful presentation.

Sharon Lee: This talk took place in April 2019. Brotherhood Talks is a podcast by the Research and Policy Centre of the Brotherhood of St Laurence working towards in Australia free of poverty. Find us online bsl.org.au/brotherhoodtalks, and join the conversation on social at #BSLTalks.

Brotherhood Talks — Climate justice: the ethics and politics of responding to climate change

Production by Aysha Zackariya and, me, Sharon Lee. Music by Lee Rosevere.

Join us again for another episode of Brotherhood Talks, conversations that matter.