

# APPEAL TO SOCIAL JUSTICE



# APPEAL TO SOCIAL JUSTICE

**“Climate actions will generate large costs. Vulnerable members of our society will be burdened; people cannot enjoy their holidays”**

This argument focuses on the costs of climate action and ignores the benefits. It assumes the costs must fall on the most vulnerable and lowest-paid members of society.

- The costs of *not* acting on climate change are much higher than acting. A London School of Economics study has found that, combined, the net-zero transition (estimated to cost a maximum of 2% of UK GDP) is expected to have a net benefit of around 4% of GDP
- Who pays for the transition is entirely a political choice. Just like any other policy, governments can choose who and what to apply taxes to
- The obvious taxes to apply would affect higher-income people more; for example a frequent flier levy would mean those flying several times a year would pay more than the average person who flies abroad once a year for a holiday
- It may not be necessary for governments to tax anyone at all to pay for climate action – look up Modern Monetary Theory
- Many of the policies needed for a transition away from fossil fuels would benefit everyone, including ‘hard-working people’; safer, well-paid jobs in renewable energy, healthier waterways, cleaner air, better health, greater well-being and greater happiness

