



# CLIMATE CHANGE, HUMAN ACTIVITIES AND REMEDIES

Hemant kumar

Shayam lal college, University of Delhi

**INTRODUCTION:** Global communities are taking notice of the environmental degradation caused by greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions into the atmosphere. This is a necessary cause for concern, as various global meetings have been held to discuss how to reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emitted into the atmosphere. The Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change is one example. Similarly, various measures have been implemented by various nations to mitigate the climatic change that is causing global warming. Among the measures are the construction of green buildings and the implementation of programmes such as reforestation.

Environmental economics strong emphasis on climate change concerns suggests that the problem of global warming is a real threat to the sustainability of global populations. However, there are mixed feelings about climate change and global warming. Nations, for example, disagree on whether the Kyoto Protocol should be enforced. Concerns have also been raised about the commitment and role of various global actors in mitigating the two challenges. Climate change economists, for example, must consider whether they are actively keeping up with climate change. Regardless of the differing viewpoints, the paper contends that humans are the worst environmental enemies, and that the Kyoto Protocol and the concept of green buildings are the two major interventions to climatic change and global warming.

**Human Activities and Global Warming:** Human activities that destabilise natural flora and fauna significantly contribute to global warming and climatic change.

These two terms refer to rising global average temperatures. According to Nordhaus (2007), the increase is caused by increased greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). For example, exposing green materials or wastes generated by people to air causes them to be broken down by anaerobic bacteria in collaboration with other organisms, resulting in wastes and carbon II oxide (Galle, Samuelsson, & Borjesson, 2001). These two products naturally contribute to the greenhouse effect (Hiramatsu, Hanaki, & Aramaki, 2003).

Increased levels of GHG emissions increase the risk of global warming, which leads to increased melting of polar ice caps. The overall effect of this situation is rising ocean water levels, resulting in submerged coastal regions (Nordhaus, 2007). Furthermore, GHG emissions contribute to weather-pattern disruptions, which have resulted in catastrophic storms, flooding, and increased drought incidences around the world. These issues have an impact on local, national, and international relations because they have economic, social, and political implications (Richard Ivey School of Business, 2013).

When people's natural green wastes accumulate in landfills, the lack of oxygen causes anaerobic bacteria to break down the material into methane, carbon II oxide, mulch, and water. Carbon II oxide and methane have roughly equal magnitudes (Bogner & Matthews, 2003). Methane is then further decomposed to produce water and carbon II oxide. All of these components of green waste decomposition contribute to climate change and global warming.

. Climate changes as the planet warms. However, it should be remembered that greenhouse gases are important in trapping heat so that it does not escape into space, which can cause the earth to become colder. The issue arises when these gases build up to such high levels that more energy is trapped than is necessary. This phenomenon reduces the earth's habitability for both animals and plants, including humans.

**Laxity of Climate Change Economists, Scientists, and Other Bodies:** Climate change and global warming are two phenomena that have environmental costs. Smith (2016), in his article 'Economists are Out of Touch with Climate Change,' calls on climatic economists to actively participate in the fight against climate change, including global warming. He claims that climate change economists have been dormant to the point where their involvement in addressing the critical issue of climate change is not felt at all, despite the urgency of the situation and the need for policies to address it.

Smith (2016) demonstrates how proper understanding of the trend in climatic changes and the impact such changes have on the environment necessitates the participation of multiple stakeholders. Climate economists, climate scientists, and environmental organisations such as the UNEP are among the stakeholders. These parties must work together to keep the issue of climate change under control. However, for this collaboration to take place, scientific research on the effects and implications of global warming on the world's flora and fauna is required. Smith (2016), on the other hand, reveals a gap between climate science and economics. He claims that economists have abandoned the importance of science in their analysis of climate change, to the point where they only include out-of-date scientific facts that make no sense in the current debate over global warming. Is the situation now hopeless as a result of this discovery?

Smith (2016) demonstrates how most economists climate change publications fail to cite natural science opinions. This case calls into question the use of scientific facts in climate-related issues. The scientific viewpoint on climate issues entails the general consensus among scientists regarding the extent to which global warming is occurring, as well as the underlying causes and potential consequences. As a result, deliberate ignorance of the role of science in climate change implies a failure to consider the positive relationship between economic trends and natural occurrences. Scientific facts have been made available for use in substantiating claims by all disciplines. As a result, now is the time for global populations to use evidence derived from scientific research in climatic change and global warming to fight the phenomenon that threatens global sustainability collectively.

Furthermore, climatic change and global warming continue to worsen due to the laxity of nations around the world. They have failed to demonstrate commitment to the agreements made to address the problem. For example, the United States decided not to support the Kyoto Protocol in 2001 due to public concern that maximum emission limits would raise production costs. Canada claimed that it would not agree to the costly Kyoto Protocol regulations if the United States, its closest competitor, did not comply. Canada was concerned about its ability to compete in both domestic and international markets with the United States. Regardless of any nation's argument for refusing to support any pact that seeks to address the two problems, questions arise about nations' commitment to address the challenge of global warming. This is a valid concern, especially in light of the increased greenhouse gas emissions that explain the phenomenon of global warming and climatic change.

The Kyoto Protocol: The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) requested that all of its member countries reduce their GHG emissions in 1992. The goal was to manage the climatic effects of global warming. The UN was concerned that this issue would have negative consequences for global populations, such as hunger. This concern prompted the UNFCCC to convene in Kyoto, Japan. The goal was to reach an agreement that would require industrialised nations to set and meet targets for reducing GHG emissions. The Kyoto Protocol was the name given to the resulting agreement from the 1997 convention, which was signed by 160 UN member states (Richard Ivey School of Business, 2013).

The protocol does not require nations to have the same GHG reduction targets. In the 1997 agreement, which went into effect in 2005, nations were challenged to meet their own unique target for reducing emissions. The completion dates for this agenda were set between 2008 and 2012. The overall goal was to reduce global emissions by at least 5.2% of their 1990 levels. For example, Canada pledged to reduce emissions by 6% (equivalent to 270 megatons), while the United States pledged to reduce emissions by 7%. The EU has promised an 8% reduction. This plan meant that the world would drastically reduce greenhouse gas emissions, which had exacerbated the issue of climatic change and global warming.

The Kyoto Protocol also required countries to plan how they would meet their targets. However, when the time came for ratification in 2001, the United States and a number of developing countries failed to sign the pact. More emphasis was placed on the recruitment of additional nations into the treaty during the 2009 Copenhagen meeting, the Cancun conference in 2010, and the 2011 Durban gathering, including seeking more clarity on the intentions of various signatories.

The strategy is one of the most certain ways of dealing with climate change and global warming. It has, however, encountered difficulties. For example, many countries had not provided significant information by 2013. As a result, it is unclear how the protocol will effectively call on all nations to mitigate the problem of climate change and global warming.

### **CONCLUSION:**

Considering that some countries support and others ignore the problem of global warming, the emerging question is whether all countries act as good international citizens. If all nations are to continue operating as good international citizens in the absence of any pact that protects global populations from the effects of global warming and climatic change, they must positively contribute to the resolution or prevention of problems associated with global warming. However, given the positions taken by key stakeholders on the issue, including the United States and Canada, such a possibility remains a question. Nonetheless, despite some countries taking hardline positions and arguments for the positive involvement of all stakeholders in easing the problem, the global population must remain aware that climatic change and global warming are real threats to the world's sustainability.

As a result, appropriate action, such as re-adoption of the Kyoto Protocol by nations such as Canada and the United States, which abandoned the pact, is required. The full implementation of the agreement is critical for nations that remain committed to the pact in order to save the global population from the threat of climatic change and global warming.