

## **Coding Climate Crisis Conundrum: Cosmetic Count & Colonial Conspiracy than Compounded Commitment**

**Dr. Atindra Dahal\***

### **Abstract**

*Climate discourse- despite being rendered as an issue of global concern- has been mere a cosmetic count than compounded commitment, thus deserves a strong revisit in principle and utmost honesty in practice. Efforts and attempts purported by lead countries are mere formal pretexts to showcase their luxury than fructifying any significant outcomes. World power countries are sucking and siphoning the possible most from the global resources; and, now are alarming the rest with note of climate change discourse and danger. Such a colonial conspiracy-now- ought to be challenged, abjured, condemned and confronted unless they heartily come into proportionate collaboration coupled with commensurate compensation. Based on eight sound logical stand points, ergo, this paper wills to argue that current concern on climate change discourse is mere a cosmetic count and colossal conspiracy from colonial countries than any due and genuine genesis to counter the compelling challenge. It is a soft-power tool in political landscape to extend and elongate their hegemony over other countries of the world.*

**Keywords:** Climate Change, Colonial, Cosmetic, Carbon Emission, Conspiracy

### **Meaning of Operational Terms**

For the purpose of this study, following major terms and phrases used throughout text refer the beneath explained meanings or situations.

- a) **Climate Crisis Conundrum:** Confusion and dilemma in regard to growing climate crisis of the world.
- b) **Cosmetic Count:** A call or initiation for pretention/ fake show than reality.

---

\* Professor, Kathmandu School of Law

- c) **Colonial Conspiracy:** An act of conspiracy/ betrayal or deception for extending colonial attitude or habit by power nations to others.
- d) **Compounded Commitment:** A duly collaborative effort for shared benefit.

### **Methodology**

This study solely takes a qualitative method of research assessment as only archival and doctrinal sources are only entertained. Being an explanatory in nature, data and inferences are derived from recent as well as valued scholarly works. Most of referred materials either in review or in purpose of in-text citation are recent to the extent possible and those are mostly prioritized from the time range of last 10 year publications. Sources openly accessible on most cited gateways i.e. Google Scholars, Science Direct, Academia, Research Gate and so on are considered. Three arch approaches i.e. critical analyses, reference to the ongoing global experience and deducing from recent literature are key bases for the final inference. Major eight logical standpoints unfold the colonial attitude that the power countries are remitting and ravaging the rest vis a vis climate change or climate crisis discourse.

### **Objective**

This write-up intends to disclose an underlying fact that discourse of climate change has never been a sincere attempt to work collectively for the secured earth. Rather, it is a tool of conspiracy caged by power countries to other tiny and developing nations despite the first never feeling tired of being vocal about climate crisis.

### **Background**

Climate change and environmental degradation has been one of most severe predicaments that the present world is helplessly facing. Mosoh et al. (2024) find this as ‘an accruing challenge to both human and non-human community’ (Page: 1) of the globe. Similarly, Guerra et al. (2020) coin a phrase ‘global vulnerability’ to encapsulate the extent of envisioned difficulty and hardship. As a discourse of chief global discussion, it has humongous control over almost intellectual forums, political plenaries, summits, academic plenums and research rigors/ attempts. This is a most pressing challenge and is forging the earth at an apocalyptic direction tending to invite an irreparable catastrophe over all humans at present including the coming generations too. Considering the gravity of seriousness, Zandalinas et al. (2021) regard it a recipe for multifactorial disaster as agony cum stress have been cemented in almost every field. The list includes from global warming to pollution, to loss of biodiversity

and plant communities (Burdon & Zhan, 2020), bird community (Frick et al., 2020), extreme rise on sea level (Tebaldi et al., 2021), to loss of sea lives (Alfonso et al., 2021) owing to rising temperature and many more climate-induced consequences. Even the impacts on agriculture are disheartening (Malhi et al., 2021) as production is noticed swiftly declining towards lower scale. Losing nutrient, impacts on multiple sectors or multilaterals effect or multilateralism, as KC (2020) pinpoints and elucidates, are obvious and no one is oblivious to the extremity of sordid reality.

Even though the situation seems scary and tellingly disastrous, the globe doesn't have any valid and valued solutions in order to defeat the deal. Given the severity of issues, the methods like meta-analysis of impacts as urged by Zhou et al. (2020) and regional scalable priorities as referred by Zhu et al. (2021) respectively may be the most urgent call. Negotiating the damage and minimizing it through collective actions as well as distancing the distrust (Wong & Feygina, 2020) only can be the commensurate actions that people can regard as most cherishing charm and doable input. Challenges are more than achievement as Arora and Mishra (2021) duly note in this issue. However, every single country admits of climate change positioning as prime concern as well as crisis at the present. Most of countries commit to have unleashed substantive support to mitigate the hazard and jettison cost of accruing climate complexity along with burgeoning and ballooning burden. As well as they go fairly vocal to unfold verbal solidarity on each of proposed initiatives. Thus, they often claim of being worried to the situation and functioning in responsive manner to ensure some resorts over the problem.

Despite deepening concerns, the set of efforts those countries have purported of serving the issue is mere formality and fake show, a count or call for cosmetic purpose. A state of willful malfunction and egregious carelessness is rampant and rife from those nations which are to be rightmost responsible for this devastating deal. Indeed, no any strong and impactful effort targeting the biosphere reserve through sustainable use is initiated yet; Aggarwal et al. (2020) too argue in similar spirit. Norm setters themselves are violators; those who have to build the outcome have breached the base and exacerbated the bond despite the fact that there is an utter request from stakes along with other nations in order to improve conservation outcomes as Cooney et al. (2021) analyze and argue. Behest to only developing and under developing nations, which is- in words of Caro et al. (2022)- only an inconvenient misconception for no reasons, makes no sense and hails no result at all. Developing world, especially country like Nepal, has been double fold victimized in this vice.

Climate change warning has been a soft power political tool of supposed world-power nations to extend hegemony and exercise the colonial attitude. Ergo, it is utterly urgent and incontrovertibly imperative to rebuke blend of their malign diktat over others along with intentional reluctance in self. Following analyses deeply and duly unfold their intentional recklessness and designed colonial attitude over other nations in regard to climate change or climate crisis discourse.

### **Discussion and Analysis**

Following eight submissions will reinforce then justify the chief argument that this write-up has claimed.

1) Concept of development that the power-nations have enforced is itself grossly anti-climactic. Prizzon et al. (2024) remark that it has failed to frame fairness and justice as the hotter world has impeded growth. Development is falsified in construction of skyrocketing RCC buildings and expansions of roads unwisely to every nook and corner of the village. Taking reference of world development index proposed by the World Bank as well as inferences from various other scholars/ researches, Mendola et al. (2013) conclude that unplanned and haphazard aggression on competing to have road networks, multiplex commercial buildings and physical infrastructures is understood and misjudged as key indicators of development. Those are even imparted to others too as ‘key axes of development’ as Krebs (2024) observes. Such reckless and inattentive acts not only have contributed various sorts of pollutions but also have loosen the soil compactness thus leading to widespread destruction and negative impacts too as Lee et al. (2024) have studied. The existing trend of capitalism- which has internalized the manifestation of development in an attempt to recklessly modernize, chaotically urbanize, additionally mileage to haphazard infrastructure and industrialization- serves as root causes of climate change (Gonzalez, 2024).

Prior to recent emergence of this faulty notion of development, as Stringer et al. (2022) have deduced from a deep study, development efforts and endeavors were on pathways of climate resilience and bio-friendly living. All the materials used in construction of houses and buildings were decomposable and soil adjustable. Deconstruction or demolishing debris could neither harm ecosystem nor would pose any challenge to manage wastes or garbage. Eco-centric perspective was systematized, as Dunlap & Brulle (2015) have found in their research which had applied multiple regressions model. The current

parameters of development, which western nations purported, presented and utterly prescribed to the rest of the world, is responsible for climate catastrophe and an infinite ecocide. Furtherance, it has amounted much in creating a double risk society indicated with probable collapse of both the earth and human race in near future (Islam & Kieu, 2021). Concept of sustainable development or harmonic development along with green economy (Huseynova, 2024, Page 49), which emphasizes the consideration of economic development along with ecological and social advancements cum social and economic justice, is a recent emergence but sadly has not yet been appropriately assimilated by many nations. Western countries' consistent immersion on theorizing development as roads, factories, buildings, cities, vehicles and infrastructure- mostly in utterly unmethodical and disorganized manner- on cost of greenery is arch responsible input for current day's climate crisis. Thus, those nations ought to be accountable to the gross and grave loss. Powerful western nations should humbly apologize for propounding a wrong notion and percolating it across the globe in regard to development, which has not only severely jeopardized the climate equilibrium but also has sabotaged the here-so-forth prevailing climate resilient and biodegradable cum scientific model of development pattern. The faulty orientation from their side and its forceful transposition to other spaces is root cause of climate crisis.

2) Nepal is not a carbon-emitting nation. Much of emission originates from the same countries which boastfully brag over other nations to control it. Shrestha et al. (2012) regard having relatively slightly high-level carbon emission in few of the cities owing to excessive vehicles plying daily (Page 90), however, the national ratio is still quite negligible compared to global average. But countries not emitting it, often addressed as non-emitters, are also being equally suffered and grappling with the grim and grave danger immensely and imminently posed from this incident as like net-emitters have incurred as a study from Grkovic (2024, Page 33) confirms. Country like Nepal is double fold victimized. Out of total 37.55 gigatonnes of emission in year 2023, 32 and 13 percent as first and second positions is ill-served by China and America respectively (Becky 2024). Nepal has only 0.04 percent share standing somewhere in below than 120<sup>th</sup> position. Proportionate and uniformed damage in all sectors (Chaudhary & Maharjan, 2023) from added vulnerability in national security (Kapri, 2024) to burst of glaciers to glacier lakes due to 1 to 5 square km shrinkage in area (Khadka et al., 2023) to resulting into excessive floods to water induced diseases and many more have cuffed Nepal much. In some sectors i.e. temperature rise, the signal of outrageous outcome is even in higher scale than global average. Every single sector- based on research

findings from Rijal (2024) - from production, food, human health, farming, precipitation, mental status, reproduction, tourism to economy is severely affected and heavily impacted due to climate change despite being non-emitter nation. Similar effects were even assessed by Karki et al. (2010) in a separate study sometimes back.

Diverse impacts and devastating damage are common on sight of all in these domains. Why should Nepal be condemned and convicted for the crime never committed and contributed either? Emitters should assimilate their guilt than alarming the rest; and due compensation should be ensured to other non-emitting nations of the world like Nepal. It is never the matter to command or coerce over others rather to compensate the victims and ensure justice for contributor's offence or felony they have franchised here so forth. But mere alarming the rest and not admitting own guilt as well as not assuming responsibility of assisting or compensating victims is an added or multiplied offence again over the maiden offence created with excessive emitting. Thus, double fold offence is being practiced by those emitters and double fold perpetration or persecution is caused to non-emitters.

3) Those power nations (the high carbon emitting nations) have almost and already achieved the expected level of development. Both the industrialization and urbanization have been graphed above many other nations. The emergence of recent trade tussle as brought into discussion by Gök & Ekici (2024) is reflection of the same status. The competition is even termed as Thucydides Trap or 'T Trap' (Sanger, 2011); and Allison (2017) alarms that it may destine them to the outbreak of violent war ahead. After establishing enough factories, heaping then hoarding the productions of goods and controlling the global market with those goods, now, they are willing to diplomatically bar other countries to simulate the same trend on note of climate change. High emitting countries have big factories, largest road networks, many industries, rapid and robust expansion of infrastructures, and the biggest most corporations resulting in collectively compounding emission and contributing wastages then remitting the equal or higher loss to rest of non-responsible nations as well. Those western and Euro-American nations are die-heart willing other nations not to gain the power and grow to the sizeable success whatever they have earned harnessing the ecology and environment. It is a well-orchestrated conspiracy (Räikkä, 2023 & Uscinski et al., 2017) and conspiracy-filled narratives (Tam & Chan, 2023) presented with cosmetic courtesy towards others so that none can evolve to the level of their existence. Most of major

responsible countries are being mere rhetoric; and, Bolsen et al. (2022) feel on them as restricting others from achieving the success than willing to contribute on alleviating climate crisis. They just warn and alarm others, preempt or preclude others in acting for development dimensions but don't set any visible precedent themselves to motivate the rest. Their die-heart infatuation and gross obsession to existing anti-climactic and anti-ecological exercise is never minimized rather has been fueled to added height, of late or every recent year.

4) Neither are they devotedly nor are committedly doing anything strong in order to lower the climate risk and to advance the expected greenery security. The carbon emission graph by them is not significantly declined. Compared to 2022, the carbon emission graph in 2023 is higher in countries like USA, India, Japan, Saudi Arabia, Indonesia and some others. Not any policy is formulated for self-regulation. No option is availed for countries which have yet to earn the level of development as par them; but they are being apparently alarmed and precluded for prosperity in proposition or pretext of climate justice. Most of great-power are in direct or indirect competition of nuclear power (Herzog, Page 4) and damaging the world equation of ecology through this offence inter alia notion of faculty development. China has commenced and commanded an aggressive achievement in electrifying 'electronic move'. The same is assumed as prime footprint and directives to global bio-diversity conservation since this endeavor- as Wei (2021) argues- makes China and other countries on the path of non-fossil fuel consumption. Meng et al. (2022) prescribe that genesis as the most standard system to adopt globally, however, other countries are willingly paying denial to those initiative-based productions. They are rather vilifying Chian to the best of their bone and brain. Nature based approach is yet not prioritized (Hobbie & Grimm, 2020) though seem worried bogusly and baselessly on carbon emission and climate crisis.

5) As this shall be a severe problem, whole set of each international law should focus on it. Most of the international convents and conventions, especially western power countries generate or promulgate, focus around disarmament, global war, confrontations and so on. Critiquing on UNO's attention to the issue, Parry & Khurshid (2024) note that many vetoes have been tried for several times when issue of geopolitics or genocide takes place; however, a rare focus and prioritization is paid when it comes to climate justice or carbon crime. In fact, not any veto out of 279 practices in its history- from the maiden use on 16<sup>th</sup> February 1946 till the recent one on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2024, is yet used or positioned by any country on the issue of climate justice as Reuer et al. (2024) have explored in detail. All vetoes are on or against warfare, annexation of

other countries, support to military expenses and other sorts of geopolitical debris and bickering. All international communities and organizations have been mute bystander and numb stamp in attention of enshrining strong global commitment and due implementation of it in these pressing issues vis a vis carbon emission. Thus, it unfolds their cartel on compounding climate crises to the new volume.

6) Global concept of generation theories on human rights i.e. limiting it mere from first generation to third generation has now been obsolete and unpragmatic thought. Thus, given this grave scenario and gory picture, a next dimension or fourth generation should be attributed to climate change- based on assessment by Kopytsia & Hudzenko (2022)- as it has shed severely profound impact on a wide range of human and animal rights. Besides political, economic and cultural rights mused and assimilated as first, second and third generation of human rights respectively, now the healthy breathing should be theorized as the fourth generation and brought into global discourse leaving an unbeatable obligation and duty to world power and its other stakes. Climate change is a course that is brewing humanitarian crisis; this outbreak can never be handled sans high level of collective effort. It has already impeded much in food security, sanitation, drinking water to several other dimensions of human life. World power countries are being reluctant to acknowledge and act on the much compounded and consolidated damage and to a new frontier of human right crisis (Etuk, 2024) caused by climate change.

7) The series of ongoing awareness regarding climate change crisis is mere an anthropomorphic in nature; human race tends being a bit serious once the danger is now likely to be posed over humans. But people are much late to assimilate and internalize the fact that this globe is common to all human and non-human creatures. Animals, wild-lives, flora and funna are undoubtedly Bonafide coparcenary of this grand nature. The recently evolving consciousness and awareness in human is only centered to humans and saving their lives. Still, non-human creatures of the world are sidelined and bursh-sided in this customary consciousness. Had there been the danger sensed only to others, evidently excluding humans, such a robust reaction and responses would not definitely have been presented. This is itself colonial attitude by humans towards non-human entirety of the ecology.

8) Furtherance, the forest ratio of high carbon emitting countries is comparatively quite less compared to other countries in the globe. USA has



33.2%, China has 21.9%, Russia 49.4%, Germany 32% of forested landmass whereas non-emitting countries like Suriname has 93%, Micronesia has 91%, Bhutan, Sweden & Finland have over 65% forest ratio, which is prime actor in mitigating climate change crisis and best ever assumed preventive method. Hence, the rife and rampant recklessness by power countries is not invisible to rest of the world. Their haphazard and inconsiderate responses with high emission but less forestation, beside intentional lapses, is net responsible to the global climate crisis.

## **Conclusion**

Thus, the concern globally paid on banner of climate justice is a tricky and deceptive luxury show; powerful countries are just showcasing a formality and cosmetic solidarity. Neither they are indeed intended to curb the emission nor are they devoted to ensure compensation of disproportionate loss and raze that the non-emitting nations have undergone or suffered so far till the date. By the time, they have bountifully harnessed and over-dose exploited the nature for added comfort and multi-fold expansion of facilitates, now, they are shouldering climate concern towards other countries to prevent and preclude them from commanding comfort and ease as they have earned. It is both a blend of conspiracy over emerging cum developing nations in practice and colonial exercise in attempt as it possesses so-called world powers' hegemonic concept over others.

## **References**

- Aggarwal, K., Puri, K., Joshi, R., & Garkoti, S. C. (2020). Biosphere reserves: A solution reconciling biodiversity conservation with its sustainable use. *ESSENCE: International Journal for Environmental Rehabilitation and Conservation*.
- Alfonso, S., Gesto, M., & Sadoul, B. (2021). Temperature increase and its effects on fish stress physiology in the context of global warming. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 98(6), 1496–1508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.14599>
- Allison, G. T. (2017). *Destined for war: Can America and China escape Thucydides's Trap?* USA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Arora, N. K., & Mishra, I. (2021). COP26: More challenges than achievements. *Environmental Sustainability* 4(4), 585–588. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42398-021-00212-7>
- Becky M., (2024). Countries with the highest carbon footprints, 2024. *Green-Match*. <https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/countries-with-the-highest-carbon-footprint>

- Bolsen, T., Palm, R., & Kingsland, J. T. (2022). Effects of conspiracy rhetoric on views about the consequences of climate change and support for direct carbon capture. *Environmental Communication*, 16(2), 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2021.1991967>
- Burdon, J. J., & Zhan, J. (2020). Climate change and disease in plant communities. *PLOS Biology*, 18(11). [10.1371/journal.pbio.3000949](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000949)
- Caro, T., Rowe, Z., Berger, J., Wholey, P., & Dobson, A. (2022). An inconvenient misconception: Climate change is not the principal driver of biodiversity loss. *Conservation Letters*, 15 (3), e12868. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12868>
- Chaudhary, D., & Maharjan, K. (2023). Climate change variability and its impacts in Nepal. *Journey for Sustainable Development and Peace Journal*, 1(2), 47-57. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jsdpj.v1i02.58219>
- Cooney, R., Challender, D. W., Broad, S., Roe, D., & Natusch, D. J. (2021). Think before you act: Improving the conservation outcomes of CITES listing decisions. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 9, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2021.631556>
- Dunlap, R. E., & Brulle, R. J. (2015). *Climate change and society: Sociological perspectives*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199356102.001.0001>
- Etuk, E. (2024). Impacts of climate change on human rights: a new frontier. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. DOI: [10.2139/ssrn.4774930](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4774930)
- Frick, W. F., Kingston, T., & Flanders, J. (2020). A review of the major threats and challenges to global bat conservation. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1469(1), 5–25. DOI: [10.1111/nyas.14045](https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14045)
- Gök, N., & Ekici, S. (2024). The US-China rivalry in Latin America after 2000. *İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(1), 192-215. <https://doi.org/10.17336/igusbd.1173368>
- Gonzalez, C. (2024). Racial capitalism, climate change, and ecocide. *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, 41(4), 479. <https://doi.org/10.59015/wilj.VCPQ4704>
- Grkovic, V. (2024). Contribution to comparison different countries regarding Carbon Dioxide emissions. *Journal of Energy Research and Reviews*, 16(7), 30-36. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jenrr/2024/v16i7360>
- Guerra, C. A., Rosa, I. M. D., Valentini, E., Wolf, F., Filippini, F., Karger, D. N., et al. (2020). Global vulnerability of soil ecosystems to erosion. *Landscape Ecology*, 35, 823–842. DOI: [10.1007/s10980-020-00984-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-020-00984-z)

- Herzog, S. (2024). The trilateral dilemma: Great power competition, global nuclear order, and Russia's war on Ukraine. *Peace Review*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402659.2024.2401058>
- Hobbie, S. E., & Grimm, N. B. (2020). Nature-based approaches to managing climate change impacts in cities. *Philosophical Transaction of Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 375(1794), 20190124. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0124>
- Huseynova, N. (2024). Transition to sustainable development and green economy. *International Conference*, 47(209), 47-54. <https://doi.org/10.51582/interconf.19-20.07.2024.004>
- Islam, M. S., & Kieu, E. (2021). Sociological Perspectives on Climate Change and Society: A Review. *Climate*, 2021, 9(7), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cli9010007>
- Kapri, C. (2024). Climate change-induced disaster and its impact on the national security of Nepal. *Unity Journal*, 5(1), 223-238. <https://doi.org/10.3126/unityj.v5i1.63181>
- Karki, M., Mool, P., & Shrestha, A. (2010). Climate change and its increasing impacts in Nepal. *The Initiation*, 3, 30-37. <https://doi.org/10.3126/init.v3i0.2425>
- Khadka, N., Chen, X., Sharma, S., & Shrestha, B. (2023). Climate change and its impacts on glaciers and glacial lakes in Nepal Himalayas. *Regional Environmental Change*, 23, 143. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-023-02142-y>
- Kopytsia, I. & Hudzenko, Y. (2022). Human rights in the context of climate change. *Economics and Finances Law*, 5(2), 27-32.
- Krebs, S. (2024). *Axes of Development. Soviet composers and the development of Soviet Music.* Routledge, 26-32. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003535485>
- Lavelle, K. C. (2020). *The challenges of multilateralism.* USA: Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300252323>
- Lee, J., Kang, H. & Hwang, Y. (2024). Development of an auxiliary indicator for improving the rationality and reliability of the national-level carbon productivity indicator. *Energies*, 17(15), 3831. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en17153831>
- Malhi, G. S., Kaur, M., & Kaushik, P. (2021). Impact of climate change on agriculture and its mitigation strategies: A review. *Sustainability*, 13(3), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031318>
- Mendola, D., Scuderi, R., & Lacagnina, V. (2013). Defining and measuring the development of a country over time: A proposal of a new index. *Quality*

- and Quantity, 47(5), 2473-2494. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-012-9665-8>
- Meng, S. L. Y.-P. Z., & Li, C. J. (2022). Current situation, challenges and recommendation of biodiversity conservation standard system in China. *Biodiversity Science*, 30 (11), 22117. DOI: [10.17520/biods.2022117](https://doi.org/10.17520/biods.2022117)
- Mosoh, D., Prakash, O., Khandel A., & Vendrame, W. (2024). Preserving earth's flora in the 21st century: Climate, biodiversity, and global change factors since the mid-1940s. *Frontiers in Conservation Science*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcosc.2024.1383370>
- Parry, S. & Khurshid, I. (2024). Geopolitics and genocide: How major powers limit recognition and response. *Inclusive*, II (25), 650-663. DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.13337199](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13337199)
- Prizzon, A., Wiggins, S., Abdenur, A., Daggash, H., Dubash, N., Kimani, J., & Lopes, C. (2024). Climate and development: What opportunities, what threats? *Development Policy Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12810>
- Räikkä, J. (2023). Climate change conspiracy theories. *Handbook of philosophy of climate change*. Springer, Cham, 1-18. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16960-2\\_141-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16960-2_141-1)
- Reuer, J., Klijn, E., Devarakonda, S., & Olie, R. (2024). Veto rights in international joint ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 55(7), 880-895. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-024-00710-w>
- Rijal, N. (2024). Climate change and its impact on the people of Nepal. *Journal of Health and Social Welfare*, 8, 19. <https://doi.org/10.58196/jhsw/v8/i2/2024.12.28>
- Sanger, E. D. (2011). Superpower and upstart: Sometimes it ends well. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/23/weekinreview/23sanger.html>
- Shrestha, P., Shrestha, K., & Shrestha, K. J. (2012). Carbon Dioxide emissions by the transportation sector in Kathmandu valley, Nepal. *International conference on sustainable design, engineering, and construction (ICSDEC)*, 90-97. <https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784412688.011>
- Stringer, L., Simpson, N., Schipper, L., & Eriksen, S. (2022). Climate resilient development pathways in global drylands. *Anthropocene Science*, 1(3), 311-319. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44177-022-00027-z>
- Tam, K. P. & Chan, H. W. (2023). Conspiracy theories and climate change: A systematic review. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 91, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2023.102129>
- Tebaldi, C., Ranasinghe, R., Voudoukas, M., Rasmussen, D. J., Vega-Westhoff, B., Kirezci, E., Kopp, R., Sriv, R., & Mentaschi, L. (2021).

- Extreme sea levels at different global warming levels. *Nature Climate Change*, 11, 746–751. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01127-1>
- Uscinski, J., Douglas, K., & Lewandowsky, S. (2017). Climate change conspiracy theories. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Climate Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228620.013.328>
- Wei, F. (2021). Toward post-2020 global biodiversity conservation: Footprint and direction in China. *Innovation*, 2 (4), 100175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xinn.2021.100175>
- Wong-Parodi, G., & Feygina, I. (2020). Understanding and countering the motivated roots of climate change denial. *Current Opinion Environmental Sustainability*, 42, 60–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.11.008>
- Zandalinas, S. I., Fritschi, F. B., & Mittler, R. (2021). Global warming, climate change, and environmental pollution: Recipe for a multifactorial stress combination disaster. *Trends in Plant Science*, 26, 588–599. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2021.02.011>
- Zhou, Z., Wang, C., & Luo, Y. (2020). Meta-analysis of the impacts of global change factors on soil microbial diversity and functionality. *Nature Communication*, 11(1), 3072. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16881-7>
- Zhu, L., Hughes, A. C., Zhao, X. Q., Zhou, L. J., Ma, K. P., Shen, X. L., et al. (2021). Regional scalable priorities for national biodiversity and carbon conservation planning in Asia. *Science Advances*, 7 (35), eabe4261. [10.1126/sciadv.abe4261](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abe4261)