CLIMATE CHANGE AND LAW: A GLOBAL CHALLENGE FOR LEGAL EDUCATION
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Climate change is a global problem. This characterisation has major consequences for international law, domestic law and legal education. Drawing on legal developments, scholarship and pedagogy, this article has three main claims. First, it argues that lawyers dealing with climate change require proficiency across different areas of law, not just the law that seeks to limit greenhouse gas emissions. Secondly, to better understand how these areas of law fit together, and how they should fit together, the article points to relevant theories, including ideas relating to fragmentation and regime interaction within international law. Thirdly, the article examines ways in which legal education can encourage ethical and moral evaluations as well as strategic awareness, especially to ensure that legal action to address climate change does not perpetuate inequalities and injustice within the community of states. Legal education and law have important roles in mitigating climate change and in fostering a sensibility that recognises the unequal burdens between and within countries. In training the arbiters of global destiny, today’s law schools must continue to critique the law’s relationship with modern production and consumption patterns.

I Introduction

It is timely to consider the subject of climate change, law and legal education. We do so at a moment of heightened popular, intellectual and academic engagement. Youth are striking from their schools and filing legal challenges.¹ Scientists have been leaving their laboratories to join protest movements.² Writers ‘wonder
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¹ Three cases are of particular note: (1) Sharma v Minister for the Environment (2021) 391 ALR 1 (see also Sharma v Minister for the Environment [No 2] [2021] FCA 774) ('Sharma'); (2) O'Donnell v Commonwealth [2021] FCA 1223; (3) Waratah Coal Pty Ltd v Youth Verdict Ltd [2020] QLC 33 ('Waratah Coal'). See also Waratah Coal Pty Ltd v Youth Verdict Ltd [No 2] [2021] QLC 4. These cases follow international leads such as Juliana v United States of America, 339 F Supp 3d 1062 (D Or, 2018). Cf Juliana v United States of America (9th Cir, No 18-36082, 17 January 2020). See also Laura Schuijers and Margaret A Young, ‘Climate Change Litigation in Australia: Law and Practice in the Sunburnt Country’ in Ivano Alogna, Christine Bakker and Jean-Pierre Gauci (eds), Climate Change Litigation: Global Perspectives (Brill, 2021) 47.

whether books are still an appropriate medium to convey the frightening speed of environmental upheaval”.

Medical professionals acknowledge climate change is a health emergency. Eminent judges call for ‘climate conscious lawyering’ as part of daily professional and ethical duties. Diplomats affirm the importance of education, training and public awareness in the global response to climate change. Legal academics, responsible for shaping research, societal outreach, curriculum and epistemic priorities, must consider our disciplinary responsibilities.

Law is defined by, and operates within, a social and political context. It is one of the most rudimentary goals of legal education to show that this is so. As Australian jurist W Jethro Brown discussed in 1902, law schools should guide the student to pay attention to the ends which law serves, the ideas and wants out of which law develops, the economic relations from which it draws its chief meaning. … [The student] will seek to gain, moreover, some intelligible idea of the evolution of legal systems.”

Over a century later, when the structure and excesses of modern-day production and consumption have led to an average temperature rise in Australia of 1.44 degrees, it is imperative to understand how law might support climate change mitigation and adaptation or, conversely, how it might impede it.

Education has a special role for law and society, as Brown was well aware. Noting the general responsibilities of teachers, he called attention to their enhanced responsibilities in the modern state: ‘the teacher in a democratic community is not merely training citizens’, he wrote ‘[the teacher] is training the arbiters of the national destiny.’ While many of the problems Brown was confronting resonate with our times (from the challenge of monopolies to the welfare of children), others are out-dated. And even as many of the problems Brown identified were the result of global pressures, the focus for him (and the academy at that time) was domestic law and the nation-state. Nowadays, as climate change causes temperature rises around the world, and collective

---

8. See, eg, the framing of racial issues, ibid 283–329, which does not fit comfortably with modern Australia.
responses have taken the form of international law, transnational law and practice, national law and subnational law, how should legal education respond? This article confronts the dilemma for law and legal education posed by the ‘global’ nature of climate change. In Part I of the article, I draw on my decade-long experience in teaching a legal subject on ‘Climate Change Law’ at the University of Melbourne Law School, together with broader research, scholarship and pedagogical trends.\(^\text{11}\) I describe the global nature of the problem, and the tendency for responses to flow from different legal orders: domestic, international, transnational, national and subnational. Climate change mitigation alone involves a dizzying mix of treaties, private directives from transnational task forces, legislation and declarations from local councils, as well as case law from international tribunals and domestic courts. In Part II, I make three claims. First, I offer an argument about substantive law. Lawyers dealing with climate change — either in teaching, research, practice or broader advocacy — require proficiency across different areas of law, not just law seeking to limit greenhouse gas emissions. Secondly, to better understand how these areas of law fit together, and how they should fit together, there is a need to engage with theory — including but not limited to theories of fragmentation and regime interaction in international law.\(^\text{12}\) Students should be encouraged to ask fundamental questions about the functions of legal rules, institutions and constitutional orders. Thirdly, legal education must incorporate a critical perspective, which encourages ethical and moral evaluations as well as strategic awareness. Engaging with critical perspectives also enables us to ensure that legal action to address climate change does not perpetuate structures within the international legal system that have historically marginalised and disadvantaged some members of the international community.

II THE GLOBAL PROBLEM OF CLIMATE CHANGE

On the first day of the subject Climate Change Law, which I have taught as an elective for over 10 years at the Melbourne Law School, I situate our studies in the context of scientific developments — including the latest reports of the


\(^{12}\) See generally Margaret A Young (ed), Regime Interaction in International Law: Facing Fragmentation (Cambridge University Press, 2012) (‘Regime Interaction in International Law’).
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (‘IPCC’) — and I inevitably include an arresting set of images of the latest climate-related disaster. In fact, I have a growing ‘powerpoint slide pack’ of bushfires (though a picture cannot show three billion animals that died or were displaced by the Australian fires last year), floods (Queensland’s experiences of 2017 will be replaced by New South Wales in 2021) or mass coral bleaching in the Great Barrier Reef. The visual display of catastrophic loss is not limited to Australia, of course. Although Australia is particularly vulnerable to climate change, such impacts are occurring everywhere. This year, I will probably include the Texan deep freeze that led to deaths and billions of dollars of damage in the United States. A ubiquitous image is of the polar bear, a species most Australians will never see, but whose plight is representative of biodiversity loss and individual suffering in faraway places. Climate change is happening around the globe. The problem results from many ongoing activities which we think of as ‘sectors’: energy, agriculture, transport, building, and so on, that occur in many places, especially the most industrialized nations with their massive legacy of fossil fuel use. Climate change is a global problem. But what does this mean for legal solutions?
The closest we have to global law in the contemporary moment is public international law, or the law of nations. As all law students know, international law governs the relations between states, who are in turn expected to represent the needs and welfare of their citizens and those in their territory. It is to be found primarily in treaties and custom. And indeed, both treaties and custom include obligations of states to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (‘UNFCCC’) and the 2015 Paris Agreement contain express obligations of states, including a collective obligation to hold the increase in global warming to 1.5 or 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels, and the achievement of a net zero of greenhouse gas emissions by the second half of this century. Customary international law, such as the obligation to prevent transboundary environmental harm, has long been confirmed by international courts and tribunals, and a range of other international norms and institutions are climate-focused or climate-related, as will be discussed later in this article.

Does this mean climate change law operates solely within the international realm? That a legal subject on climate change is confined to public international law and the narrow set of laws and institutions we know as the climate regime? That domestic litigation on climate change — now compiled in Australian and international databases — is misplaced? Was Alsup J of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California correct when he dismissed a lawsuit against BP, Chevron, Exxon Mobil and others for their historic complicity in...
climate change? He reasoned that ‘everyone has contributed to the problem of global warming and everyone will suffer the consequences — the classic scenario for a legislative or international solution’. The dangers raised in the plaintiffs’ complaints, he found, were ‘very real’, but he concluded that as ‘those dangers are worldwide … [t]heir causes are worldwide … [a]nd [t]he benefits of fossil fuels are worldwide … [T]he problem deserves a solution on a more vast scale than can be supplied by a district judge or jury in a public nuisance case.’ It is my contention, by contrast, that law addressing the global problem of climate change operates not only at the national and international level, but also at the subnational and transnational one. What is more, it is developed by courts, lawmakers and administrators at each of those levels. These issues have profound implications for legal research, practice and education.

III Legal Research, Practice and Education

The question for law and legal education cannot be answered through the example of one single (elective) law subject. It is imperative to consider the structure and conditions of legal education as a whole, as well as broader societal conditions (as I learned when delivering a series of international law lectures at the State University of Saint Petersburg, Russia, in 2017). Yet, it is also instructive to consider what is taught when one seeks to teach ‘Climate Change Law’. In this Part, I make three arguments relating to the substance, theoretical context and critical engagement relevant to climate change law. By addressing these areas, scholars and practitioners will have tools to evaluate whether the framing of a climate problem as a question for another forum, as was done by Alsup J, is judicious deferral or audacious deflection.
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31 City of Oakland v BP PLC (ND Cal, Nos C WHA, No C 17-06012 WHA, February 27 2018) (‘City of Oakland’).
32 Ibid 12.
33 Ibid 15.
35 For a current survey of courses, degree programmes, teaching material, teaching methods and interdisciplinary approaches, see Mehling et al (n 11).
A We Are All Climate Lawyers Now

A decade ago, my syllabus for Climate Change Law featured international and domestic climate-focused legal developments. The UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol\(^{36}\) and its associated market mechanisms, including the ‘clean development mechanism’, occupied the first few sessions. As for any topic of international law, the relevant set of international legal obligations is not limited to treaties, and we considered custom as well as emerging principles.\(^{37}\) Theoretical assumptions about sovereignty and collective action problems have been a constant point of debate.\(^{38}\) How to translate scientific conceptions of a carbon budget (which globalise the question of how much carbon is left to burn)\(^{39}\) with legal conceptions of territorial emissions and permanent sovereignty over natural resources is another. The learning would then move to a comparative analysis of domestic responses, which included carbon trading and carbon taxes.\(^{40}\) The integrity of carbon markets has been an important focus of study for lawyers, as we referred to fraud and the risk of double-counting of credits.\(^{41}\) We have spent a good deal of time studying the leading jurisdictions — British Columbia’s revenue-neutral carbon tax\(^{42}\), the European Union’s carbon trading scheme\(^{43}\) — before circling back to Australia’s response. The yearly updates of lecture notes to record the fits

---


\(^{38}\) Whether the atmosphere is a ‘commons’ has been an important question that I have enjoyed discussing with Damien Lockie, with whom I co-taught between 2013 and 2017. See further Margaret A Young, ‘International Adjudication and the Commons’ (2019) 41(2) University of Hawai’i Law Review 353 (‘International Adjudication and the Commons’). On theory, see below Part III(B).

\(^{39}\) Scientists have modelled the carbon budget in terms of planetary capacity, showing how much oil, coal and gas can be burned until the limit of two degrees Celsius. See, Yann Robiou du Pont and Malte Meinshausen, ‘Warming Assessment of the Bottom-up Paris Agreement Emissions Pledges’ (2018) 9(1) Nature Communications 4810.


\(^{41}\) Damien Lockie’s work remains the leader in the field. See, eg, Clean Energy Law in Australia (LexisNexis, 2012).


and starts of Australia’s clean energy package has been a grim but necessary task.\textsuperscript{44}

Over time, the syllabus has been revised to include laws outside the conceptual framework of climate-focused greenhouse gas emission reduction and carbon trading.\textsuperscript{45} Climate change is legally disruptive, forcing legal doctrines to respond and evolve.\textsuperscript{46} The current situation can be summed up by the title of a roundtable at the 2021 Annual Meeting of the American Society of International Law: ‘We Are All Climate Lawyers Now’.\textsuperscript{47} Legal developments in just the last few months demonstrate the point, and I will list just eight:

1. Human rights lawyers are climate lawyers. The current and former United Nations Special Rapporteurs on Human Rights and the Environment have reportedly filed an amicus brief\textsuperscript{48} in support of the group of Torres Strait Islanders who have challenged Australia at the Human Rights Committee for its failures to address climate change, submitting that these amount to violations of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.\textsuperscript{49} This follows an earlier Human Rights Committee ruling on climate displacement in 2020, brought by a national of Kiribati against New Zealand.\textsuperscript{50}

2. Trade lawyers are climate lawyers. Notwithstanding ongoing efforts by Australia to reach a free trade agreement with the United Kingdom and the European Union, both of which have made net-zero commitments,
Australia is facing the prospect of increased tariffs being applied to its exports if it fails to improve its climate response. So-called ‘border carbon adjustments’, which could be imposed by the European Union as early as next year, are discussed at a time when the United Nations Secretary-General, together with President Biden, has called for new disciplines on fossil fuel subsidies, which, like fisheries subsidy reform, can address the perverse incentives that make the production of oil, gas and coal far cheaper than it should be.

3. Environmental lawyers are climate lawyers. Proposals for a new environmental treaty are gaining momentum, with the Coalition for the Global Pact for the Environment, supported by Laurent Fabius, Chair of the Paris Climate Conference, seeking a stronger and broader set of international protections. I note also that a move towards ‘rights for nature’ is recognised in the legal orders of countries such as New Zealand and Colombia, which have granted legal personhood to rivers and mountains. We may ask whether the preambular reference to ‘Mother Earth’ in the Paris Agreement aligns sufficiently with the laws and customs of indigenous peoples, whose traditional knowledge and cultures are far removed from the extractive, emissions-intensive


*Paris Agreement* (n 6) Preamble.
modern economies, and whose sacred reserves might provide a model for ecological restoration.\textsuperscript{57}

4. Tort lawyers are climate lawyers. Eight young Australians have alleged that the Federal Minister for the Environment has breached a duty of care in approving the Whitehaven coal extension in northern New South Wales.\textsuperscript{58} The case forces a legal appraisal of the relationship between the Minister and the teenagers, who will be strongly impacted by climate change but who have no voting rights.\textsuperscript{59} This litigation operates alongside the claim brought by Bushfire survivors alleging breaches of duty by the NSW Environment Protection Authority.\textsuperscript{60} The NSW Land and Environment Court has recently ruled that the applicants are permitted to adduce evidence on global warming and the Paris Agreement target from Australia’s former Chief Scientist in their claim.

5. Corporate lawyers are climate lawyers. The challenge to superannuation fund Rest brought by Mark McVeigh has settled, with the fund agreeing to make changes toward a net-zero portfolio and report in line with the transnational Taskforce on Climate and Financial Disclosures.\textsuperscript{61} Other recent developments in corporate law and climate change include the increasing use of shareholder resolutions to hold major companies to account for the climate impacts of their activities,\textsuperscript{62} and the 2021 update of a series of legal opinions authored by Noel Hutley SC and Sebastian

\textsuperscript{57} Report of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of Human Rights Obligations Relating to the Enjoyment of a Safe, Clean, Healthy and Sustainable Environment, UN Doc A/HRC/37/59 (24 January 2018) 16–20. I note too that indigenous practices such as traditional fire burning techniques are demonstrated to mitigate climate change and are now used as partial fulfilment of Australia’s international climate pledges while also benefiting cultural rights. See Maureen F Tehan et al, The Impact of Climate Change Mitigation on Indigenous and Forest Communities: International, National and Local Law Perspectives on REDD+ (Cambridge University Press, 2017) 31. For other examples of traditional knowledge, see, eg, David M Forman, ‘Applying Indigenous Ecological Knowledge for the Protection of Environmental Commons: Case Studies from Hawai‘i for the Benefit of “Island Earth”’ (2019) 41(2) University of Hawai‘i Law Review 300.

\textsuperscript{58} Sharma (n 1); Schuijers and Young (n 1) 63–4.

\textsuperscript{59} Laura Schuijers, ‘These Aussie Teens Have Launched a Landmark Climate Case Against the Government. Win or Lose, It’ll Make a Difference’, The Conversation (online, 10 September 2020) <https://theconversation.com/these-aussie-teens-have-launched-a-landmark-climate-case-against-the-government-win-or-lose-its-all-make-a-difference-145830>.

\textsuperscript{60} Bushfires Survivors for Climate Action Inc v Environment Protection Authority [2020] NSWLEC 152.


Hartford Davis on the implications of climate change for Australian company directors’ duties.\textsuperscript{63}

6. Government lawyers are climate lawyers. Policy responses to build back better after COVID–19, as suggested by domestic bodies,\textsuperscript{64} as well as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the World Bank, and others,\textsuperscript{65} seek to align long–term emission reduction goals, resilience to climate impacts and a halt to biodiversity loss. In Australia, it is State governments that have often led the way on climate policy — for example, in September 2020 the Victorian government announced a market sounding process as part of its second Victorian Renewable Energy Target (‘VRET’) auction. The first VRET auction in 2018 supported 928 megawatts of new renewable energy projects in Victoria while aiming to contribute to capital investment and job creation.\textsuperscript{66}

7. Local government lawyers are climate lawyers. A recent ranking of declarations of climate emergencies by Melbourne City Council and other local councils in Australia estimates over 35% coverage of such declarations by population.\textsuperscript{67} Binding declarations now number over two thousand around the world.\textsuperscript{68} With physical climate adaptation responses including protection (including through engineered structures such as seawalls), accommodation (including through building codes) and


\textsuperscript{66} Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (Vic), *Second VRET Auction* (Consultation Paper, September 2020).

\textsuperscript{67} ‘Climate Emergency Declarations in 2,307 Jurisdictions and Local Governments Cover 1 Billion Citizens’ *Climate Emergency Declaration* (Web Page, 30 October 2021) https://climateemergencydeclaration.org/climate-emergency-declarations-cover-15-million-citizens/. Note that the exact figure cited on the spreadsheet is 37.53%.

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid: the figure is given as 2,307 local governments. See, eg, City of Melbourne, ‘Future Melbourne Committee Minutes’, *City of Melbourne* (Meeting Number 60, 16 July 2019) <https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/about-council/committees-meetings/meeting-archive/MeetingAgendaitemAttachments/864/JUL19%20FMC%20CONFIRMED%20MINUTES.PDF>. Note that the City of Melbourne declared, inter alia, that ‘climate change and mass species extinction pose serious risks to the people of Melbourne and Australia, and should be treated as an emergency’: at 5.
local councils have recognised the need to be front-footed in planning and community engagement.

8. Law of the sea specialists are climate lawyers. The International Law Commission has released an issues paper on the legal and jurisdictional implications of sea-level rise, which has advanced over 15 cm during the 20th century. The IPCC has demonstrated that the ocean is already ‘warmer, more acidic and less productive’. A ruling on the obligations of states and organisations for the protection of the oceans could be meaningfully pursued at the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (‘ITLOS’). Meanwhile, nature-based solutions, including ‘blue carbon’ sequestration, promise mitigation opportunities, merging aspirations for the blue economy and climate mitigation.

These rapid developments are just a sample. I could also have mentioned the expansion of refugee law, disaster responses, practices of central banks, and national security arrangements, but I know that this dizzying array is fatiguing for my students and overwhelming for non-lawyers. We cannot hope to cover all of this in one legal career, let alone one law degree! Yet it is also clear that legal education must retain an agility to operate in international, comparative, domestic and subnational domains, across diverse areas of public and private law.

B Theory about Law and Legal Orders

The need for agility and proficiency takes me to my second claim, which might be presented in contrast as a need for slow engagement with theory. It is not enough to keep track of these developments — a true engagement requires a deeper
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69 2019 IPCC Special Report (n 13).
71 2019 IPCC Special Report (n 13); see also United Nations Secretary-General, Oceans and the Law of the Sea, UN GAOR, 72nd sess, Preliminary List Item 78(a), UN Doc A/72/70 (6 March 2017).
74 A separate point also notes that this is just within the law — there is a need to work across disciplines such as science and economics, as sought by the just-launched Melbourne Climate Futures, headed by my Melbourne Law School colleague, Professor Jacqueline Peel.
understanding of the pluralities of legal orders and their underlying foundations, which helps develop normative approaches.

There are many examples of different areas clashing, deferring, cooperating or becoming co-opted on climate change issues. This phenomenon can be thought through in terms of legal pluralism, polycentric governance, systems theory, earth–systems jurisprudence, theoretical and historical accounts of the commons and common–pool resources, and many other contributions, but let me focus specifically on theories relating to the fragmentation and diversification of international law. We understand that law and institutions tend to isolate around functional objectives such as trade liberalisation, human rights, the law of the sea, and so on. At times, there is a sense of ‘all hands on deck’. Yet, the regimes are sometimes quite astoundingly divergent: witness the United States’ challenge to India’s solar cell program at the World Trade Organization (‘WTO’), launched at a time when countries were trying to convince India to join the Paris Agreement. There have been deferrals, such as the World Heritage Committee’s aversion to imposing mitigation obligations on states parties to the World Heritage Convention after climate petitions on behalf of the heritage–listed Great Barrier Reef. There have also been avoidance, negotiated by powerful states, such as the decision to exclude fossil fuel subsidy reform from the Paris Agreement. Methodological and conceptual problems may emerge when human rights treaties designed to protect individuals within a party’s territory or jurisdiction are invoked to ground generalized mitigation obligations.

Theoretical engagement with fragmentation and regime interaction demonstrates that collisions between norms are inevitable within the international legal system. As Martti Koskenniemi has shown, regimes are often hegemonic, in the sense that they are both operationally closed, and expansively

---

75 See further Young, ‘International Adjudication and the Commons’ (n 38).
76 See generally Young (ed), Regime Interaction in International Law (n 12).
81 Meinhard Doelle, ‘The Paris Agreement: Historic Breakthrough or High Stakes Experiment?’ (2016) 6(1–2) Climate Law 1, 14.
imposing their particular outlook and epistemic preferences on the world. The trade regime, for example, with its compulsory dispute settlement and strong institutions, is more powerful than the multilateral environment agreements seeking to conserve biodiversity or safeguard migratory species. (The historic reasons for this, such as the hope and belief that free trade will lead to perpetual peace, need to be understood, especially at a time when sanctions on Australian coal by our powerful trading partners might be perceived as either threateningly nationalistic or environmentally enlightened). Understanding these dynamics is important for understanding processes of regime interaction and whether regime encounters are likely to lead to integration, or whether such integration will be resisted, and the competing norms unresolved.

Theoretical engagement demonstrates that international regimes are ill-equipped to allocate priority between norms, because they are limited to a functional orientation that often leads to ‘tunnel vision’ (in the words of Gunther Teubner) and environmental blindspots. This is one reason to support the Global Pact for the Environment (‘Global Pact’). Its proposed right of every person ‘to live in an ecologically sound environment adequate for their health, well-being, dignity, culture and fulfilment’ supports enhanced implementation and enforcement in domestic settings. Moreover, by centralising fundamental principles of international environmental law in a single instrument, the Global Pact is intended to counteract the proliferation of environmental law that has led to its fragmentation and a lack of coherence in competing environmental commitments. While a sectoral approach to environmental law allows for some flexibility and efficiency in dealing with environmental issues, the existing approach to environmental regulation has led to a lack of clarity with respect to overlapping and inconsistent legal obligations. This is exacerbated by bilateral, regional and multilateral bases of regulation. The Global Pact represents an
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87 ‘Where Are We Now?’, Global Pact for the Environment (Web Page, 2021) <https://globalpactenvironment.org/en/the-pact/where-are-we-now/>. I note that I have been contributing as a member of the expert working group since 2017. See also above Aguila and Vifuales (n 54).
attempt to address these issues of fragmentation, by consolidating key principles of international environmental law in a binding, unitary instrument.  

More generally, the phenomenon of fragmentation invites us to think critically about the role and function of international law. How do we reconcile our participation as consumers and concerned citizens in a global economy with the foundations of international law, which are so often disconnected from direct citizen engagement? How do we — as Australians — account for the carbon footprint of the goods and services that we import and consume, and the fossil fuels that we export and profit from? Could we justify seeking a territorial extension — in the sense used provocatively by Joanne Scott — to our regulatory power?  

Can trade measures to address climate change be made consistently with the rules on jurisdiction and extraterritoriality that have been developed to placate sovereign states and preserve peace? The ongoing search for global constitutionalism — for a polity and morality that guides global relations — remains fundamental to climate change.

For the domestic constitutional context, too, climate change demands close theoretical engagement with established theories of sovereignty and public law, as well as new ideas around ecocentric governance, wild law, rights for nature (including non-humans), and so on. To take one concept grappled with in the very first semester of a law degree: what does federalism mean for climate change law? Understanding the federal responsibilities for our 2020 calamitous bushfires, as investigated by the Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements, may require an historic understanding of the functional orientations — or ‘tunnel vision’ — of the Australian colonies, which behaved perhaps more like modern day WTO members in their interstate commerce and relations. The Commission concluded that ‘Australia needs a national approach to natural disasters’, in the form of a “whole-of-nation”, “whole-of-government” and “whole of society” cooperation and effort. While the states should retain their primary responsibility for disaster response, a national response, coordinated by the federal government, would mean enhanced cooperation, resource sharing, and availability of skills, technology, data and information. Understanding the respective roles and competencies of the

---


92 Margaret A Young, ‘Trade Measures to Address Climate Change: Territory and Extraterritoriality’ in Panagiotis Delimatsis (ed), Research Handbook on Climate Change and Trade Law (Edward Elgar, 2016) 329.

93 Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements (Report, October 2020).

94 Ibid 23 [30].

Advance Copy
Australian federal and state governments is particularly relevant to climate change in the light of the disjunct between the approaches of the federal government and state governments on the issue, as state governments adopt more ambitious emissions reduction targets without the backing of federal government policy.

What of the separation of powers? That concept has underpinned many of the dismissals of climate claims by Australian and other courts in the past. For instance, in dismissing the plaintiffs’ claim in *City of Oakland v BP PLC*, Alsup J held that ‘courts must also respect and defer to the other co–equal branches of government when the problem at hand clearly deserves a solution best addressed by those branches’.95 However, it may be that the efficacy of this fundamental tenet needs renewed attention.96 An assumption that courts lack the democratic legitimacy that necessarily supports the law–making functions of other branches of governments may not be strictly correct.97 ‘International lobbying law’ is an area of study that documents, for example, the two–prong approach of the World Coal Association in targeting domestic and international law–making.98 Factoring in the voice and access of fossil fuel lobbyists within the executive branch99 may well displace the theoretical assumptions behind the separation of powers and alter a judicial sensibility whose due reticence can legitimately be replaced by due responsiveness.

### C Critical Engagement

This brings me to my third claim: that climate change demands critical engagement in legal education. Recognising that law functions as a system of beliefs that make certain inequalities seem natural has been a key contribution of feminist legal studies by scholars such as Hilary Charlesworth.100 In the climate context, expecting that climate change mitigation should be advanced without

95 *City of Oakland* (n 31) 16.
96 Schuijers and Young (n 1) 56. To be clear, I do not mean to support any erosion of the independence of the judiciary. Such erosion is occurring through other means, as depicted by Stephen Gardbaum, ‘The Counter–Playbook: Resisting the Populist Assault on the Separation of Powers’ (2020) 59(1) *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law* 1. Rather, my focus here is on the ability of an independent judiciary to act within law, based on evidence, in the context of a lack of legislative and executive climate policy.
regard to underlying inequalities and impacts would be a misstep that critical
engagement can expose. In our work on ‘reducing emissions from deforestation
and forest degradation’, or REDD+, my Melbourne Law School colleagues
Maureen Tehan, Lee Godden, Kirsty Gover and I found that climate change
mitigation has disparate impacts on indigenous and forest communities.101
REDD+ policies promoting carbon sequestration risk displacing the very people
who have made the least contribution to the problem of climate change. We show
how the risk differs depending on the local context of REDD+ implementation, the
quality of free prior and informed consent, the protection of rights, the access to
benefits and the practices of the international funding institutions. From an
international perspective, we also show that a recipient state’s membership of a
regime, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity,102 the Nagoya Protocol103 or
the International Labour Organisation’s Convention (No. 169) Concerning
Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries,104 alters that state’s legal
obligations and protections, and thus tempers any overarching evaluation of
REDD+.

Critical engagement can also maintain pressure for the implementation of
principles that are often forgotten by states, such as the principle of ‘common but
differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different
national circumstances’, and the principle of ‘intergenerational equity’.105 These
principles may well find articulation in Australian cases such as Sharma v Minister
for Environment106 and the Youth Verdict challenge to Waratah Coal’s Galilee Coal
Project.107 A motion by Waratah Coal to strike out the challenge has been
dismissed by the Queensland Land Court.107 The members of ‘Youth Verdict’ call
attention to the fact that they will be the most impacted by climate change. In line
with my comments on theoretical engagement, the plight of young people
demands a critical and philosophical assessment of the beneficiaries of our law
and legal system. The Youth Verdict case is also seeking to protect the Bimblebox
Nature Refuge. In this way, it can be said to resonate with the NGO-led global

101 Tehan et al (n 57). See also Julia Dehm, Reconsidering REDD+: Authority, Power and Law in the Green
102 Convention on Biological Diversity, opened for signature 5 June 1992, 1760 UNTS 79 (entered into
force 29 December 1993).
103 Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising
from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity, opened for signature 29 October 2010,
UN Doc UNEP/CBD/COP/10/L.43/Rev.1 (entered into force 12 October 2014).
104 Convention (No. 169) Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, opened for
105 Paris Agreement (n 6) Preamble. See also art 2(2).
106 Sharma (n 1); Waratah Coal (n 1).
107 Waratah Coal (n 1).
‘Declaration on Human Rights and Climate Change’, which aims to protect the rights of ‘all human beings, animals and living systems’.108

The Youth Verdict case will play out differently from others around the world, such as the Dutch Urge pada Foundation v Netherlands litigation,109 but could mark an important turning point in the development of rights-based approaches to climate change in Australia. Although the Australian constitution includes only weak protections, the extension of human rights in Australian jurisdictions by the development of human rights charters in Victoria, the Australian Capital Territory, and, most recently, Queensland,110 marks this case as particularly important.111 The Youth Verdict case is the first in which a state human rights instrument (in this case, Queensland’s Human Rights Act) has been used as a basis for climate objections to a mining application. The Queensland Human Rights Act came into effect on 1 January 2020. If the claim is successful, it could lead to a broader trend of human–rights–based climate claims in other Australian jurisdictions.112 Rights–based approaches to climate change can help reframe the issue as a human one, with human, not just environmental, ramifications.113 This reflects global and international trends towards recognising human–rights dimensions of climate change, and ideas of ‘climate justice’.114

Aside from honing in on rights, critical perspectives acknowledge all environmental problems to be human ones, ‘from the planet to the parish’, as historian Tom Griffiths emphasises.115 The proliferation of the term ‘Anthropocene’ in science and the humanities shows that the academy acknowledges this point.116 Tim Stephens has argued that the Anthropocene has made clear that a distinction between the human and natural worlds can no longer


110 Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006 (Vic); Human Rights Act 2004 (ACT); Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld).


113 Bell–James and Collins (n 111) 9.


be maintained, and that this interdependence and integration requires ‘a wholesale re-examination and re-imagination of international environmental law’s objectives’, drawing on other disciplines such as Earth system science and Earth systems governance literature.\textsuperscript{117} A critical perspective of climate law here in Australia recognises that our legal and political foundations have contributed to the global problem of climate change. The displacement of indigenous lore and culture, and the logging by settlers that saw drastic removal of carbon sinks, are examples from Australian history that are often hidden from legal practice. Maintaining our interrogation into the source and origin of our law is as important as our ongoing quest for future legal solutions.

\textbf{IV Conclusion}

Climate change is a global problem but solutions must not be limited to international law. There are no immediate answers to the question of which form of authority can provide a solution to the global problem of climate change. Nor are there clear boundaries around what is appropriate and just in addressing climate change at the local, national and international level. I have identified three areas of focus for legal education. First, we must embrace the relevance of different areas of legal specialisation to legal solutions and work hard in understanding how different norms and legal orders fit together. It is not enough, alas, to identify climate law from a five-word proximity search of the acronym ‘GHGs’. Secondly, we must revisit theoretical foundations of our legal orders, while recognising that these were laid during a time when climate change was unknown and other injustices were wilfully ignored. When working within a system to find solutions to the problem, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the system may be structured in a way that privileges certain views and approaches. Thirdly, we must maintain a critical perspective that allows us to decide where limited resources and energies are best-directed, and offers different ways of thinking through the appropriateness of proposed responses.

Critical perspectives also help us identify the use and misuse of jurisdictional conflicts. Mandate creep of international organisations can often be justified due to the urgency of the conditions I outlined at the beginning of this article. Yet, the globalising impulse may need to be checked if it obscures highly localised sources of the problem and the solution. Attention must be also given to the risk of derailing legal responses, not only the hoped-for cooperative steps that will be taken as states ratchet up their commitments under the Paris Agreement, but also

the domestic litigation that is seeking to bring state and non-state actors to account. Recognising that many different actors, at many different levels, have a role to play in addressing climate change is a key contribution of scholarship. By way of example, I welcomed the reasoning of Preston CJ of the NSW Land and Environment Court in Gloucester Resources Ltd v Minister for Planning,\(^\text{118}\) when his Honour ruled against arguments that his refusal to approve a coal mine would mean it would be built elsewhere, the so-called ‘market substitution defence’. With deftness and integrity, Preston CJ called for evidence of this substitution. None was forthcoming, and the order of the Court was to refuse the coal mine licence, inter alia because of its potential contribution to climate change.\(^\text{119}\)

Is there not a defensible approach in deferring to a different legal regime or rule only if that other regime — such as the Paris Agreement — is proving effective in mitigating climate change? Even if each country’s ‘nationally determined contribution’ under the Paris Agreement was fully complied with, the world would still be on track for a warming of at least 3 degrees Celsius.\(^\text{120}\) Though we need to continue to support the ratcheting-up approach, we should not unwittingly tie our hands if other legal solutions are available. I like to think our lawyers, when confronting arguments about the interaction of legal regimes, or the priority of conflicting norms, can demand evidence, engage in rigorous analysis, and identify the best approach.

Today’s lawyers, educated in substance, theory and critical engagement, should be able to evoke, understand and rank legal developments. In so doing, we help mitigate the global problem of climate change, but also help promote a safe and just society within and across national polities. Climate change is the imperative to start to train the arbiters of global destiny.

---
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\(^\text{120}\) United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of the Parties, Aggregate Effect of the Intended National Determined Contributions: An Update, 22\(^\text{nd}\) sess, Provisional Agenda Item X, UN Doc FCCC/CP/2016/2 (2 May 2016) 12 (Figure 2). At the time this article was going to press, parties to the Paris Agreement were meeting at COP 26 in Glasgow to improve upon their nationally determined contributions after considering, inter alia, Nationally Determined Contributions under the Paris Agreement: Synthesis Report by the Secretariat, UN Doc FCCC/PA/CMA/2021/8 (17 September 2021).