Original Article
ISSN (Online): 2582-7472

ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts
June 2024 5(6), 811–814

ECONOMICS OF CLIMATE CHANGE: COST OF INACTION VS. MITIGATION

D. Janaki[1], Dr. J. Moses Gnanakkan[2], Dr. T. Jackuline Brindha

[1]Assistant Professor of Economics,Pope's College, Sawyerpuram - 628 251, Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli-12, Tamil Nadu, India
[2]Assistant Professor of Economics, Nazareth Margoschis College at Pillaiyanmanai, Nazareth - 628 617, Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli-12, Tamil Nadu, India
[3]Associate Professor of Economics, Kamaraj College (Autonomous), Thoothukudi - 628 003, Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli-12, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

Climate change poses significant economic challenges, threatening global ecosystems, human health, and economic stability. This paper examines the economic costs of inaction on climate change, such as rising disaster recovery expenditures, loss of productivity, and health costs, versus the investments required for mitigation strategies like renewable energy, carbon capture, and climate adaptation measures. Using global and regional data, this study evaluates the long-term benefits of mitigation against the growing financial burden of inaction. Findings suggest that while mitigation requires substantial upfront investment, the long-term savings and avoided damages far outweigh the costs.

Keywords: Cost Of Inaction, Cost of Mitigation, Global Warming, Infrastructure Damage, Sustainable Practices

Corresponding Author
D. Janaki,
janulydia@gmail.com

DOI
10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i6.2024.4354

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

1. INTRODUCTION

Climate change is not just an environmental issue but a profound economic challenge. The costs of inaction manifested in rising temperatures, extreme weather events, and resource scarcity are mounting globally. On the other hand, proactive mitigation strategies such as transitioning to renewable energy, enhancing energy efficiency, and carbon sequestration entail significant investments.

The economics of climate change has emerged as a critical area of study, focusing on the financial implications of global warming and the choices societies face in addressing it. At its core lies a fundamental dilemma: the cost of inaction versus the cost of mitigation. Climate inaction failing to address rising greenhouse gas emissions can lead to catastrophic consequences, including extreme weather events, loss of biodiversity, and significant disruptions to agriculture,

infrastructure, and global health. These consequences carry a staggering price tag, both in human suffering and economic losses.

On the other hand, climate mitigation-actions aimed at reducing emissions and transitioning to sustainable practices requires upfront investments in renewable energy, green infrastructure, and technological innovation. While these costs can seem substantial, they are often dwarfed by the long-term savings generated from avoided damages and enhanced resilience.

Balancing these costs has become a pressing global challenge, with policymakers, economists, and environmentalists advocating for immediate action to limit the economic and environmental toll. This paper investigates whether the economic benefits of mitigation outweigh the escalating costs of inaction, providing a framework for policymakers to prioritize sustainable growth.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Climate change imposes multifaceted economic costs: Increased frequency and intensity of natural disasters, causing substantial damage to infrastructure and livelihoods. Declining agricultural productivity due to changing weather patterns. Rising healthcare expenditures linked to climate-related diseases. Economic losses in vulnerable sectors like tourism and fisheries.

Despite these challenges, global efforts toward mitigation face resistance due to perceived high upfront costs. This research seeks to quantify and compare the costs of inaction versus mitigation to highlight the economic rationale for immediate climate action.

3. OBJECTIVES

1. To analyze the economic impacts of climate change under scenarios of inaction and mitigation.
2. To estimate the long-term costs of climate inaction across key sectors.
3. To evaluate the financial and societal benefits of mitigation measures.
4. To provide actionable recommendations for integrating climate strategies into economic planning.

4. HYPOTHESIS

1. The cost of inaction on climate change is less significant than the cost of mitigation.
2. The cost of inaction on climate change exceeds the cost of mitigation in the long term.

5. METHODOLOGY

RESEARCH DESIGN:

The study employs a cost-benefit analysis framework: Estimation of economic losses due to climate inaction and the cost of mitigation measures and Review of policy measures and interviews with climate economists and policymakers.

DATA COLLECTION

1. **PRIMARY DATA:** Surveys and interviews with stakeholders, including government officials, businesses, and environmental NGOs.
2. **SECONDARY DATA:** Reports from IPCC, World Bank, and UNFCCC; economic data from national and international databases.

TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

Scenario analysis for projecting costs under different climate policies. Discounted cash flow (DCF) analysis to compare costs over time. Econometric modeling to quantify sector-specific impacts.

PROFILE OF THE STUDY AREA

This study focuses on India, one of the most climate-vulnerable countries, with Tamil Nadu as a case study. Tamil Nadu experiences rising sea levels, frequent cyclones, and agricultural challenges, making it a critical region for assessing climate impacts. Key economic activities in the region—agriculture, fisheries, and manufacturing—are at significant risk from climate change.

6. SAMPLING DESIGN

Population: Policymakers, climate scientists, industry leaders, and affected communities in Tamil Nadu. Sample Size: 300 respondents, including 100 farmers, 50 policymakers, 100 business representatives, and 50 environmental experts. Sampling Technique: Stratified random sampling to ensure representation from diverse sectors.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1: Economic Costs of Inaction (India, 2023)

Sector	Cost of Inaction	Key Impacts
Agriculture	200	Yield Losses due to erratic Rainfall
Fisheries	50	Decline in Fish stocks, ocean acidification
Infrastructure	150	Damage from floods and Cyclones
Healthcare	80	Increased Vector – borne diseases

Source: IPCC Report (2023), National Climate Vulnerability Assessment (2023).

Agriculture and infrastructure bear the highest costs of climate inaction, highlighting the need for urgent adaptation and mitigation strategies.

Table 2: Costs of Mitigation Measures (Tamil Nadu, 2023)

Mitigation Strategy	Cost (Rs. Billion)	Projected Savings (Rs. Billion)
Renewable Energy transition	150	500 (energy savings by 2040)
Afforestation Programmes	30	100 (Carbon Sequestration benefits)
Climate-Resilient Crops	40	120 (Yield Stability by 2030)
Coastal Protection Measures	50	200 (Damage avoided by 2040)

Source: Tamil Nadu Climate Action Plan (2023), UNEP (2023).

Investments in renewable energy and coastal protection have the highest returns, underscoring their economic feasibility.

Table 3: Cost-Benefit Comparison of Inaction vs. Mitigation (Tamil Nadu, 2023–2040)

Scenario	Total Cost (Rs. Billion)	Remarks
Inaction	1200	Escalating damages across all sectors
Mitigation	400	Upfront investments with long-term gains

Source: Author's calculations based on IPCC and Tamil Nadu State Reports.

Mitigation costs are one-third of the projected inaction costs, emphasizing the economic urgency of proactive measures.

7. FINDINGS

1. The cost of inaction on climate change in Tamil Nadu could exceed ₹1,200 billion by 2040.
2. Mitigation investments, though substantial, yield significant long-term savings, particularly in energy, agriculture, and infrastructure.
3. Renewable energy transition and coastal protection offer the highest economic returns among mitigation strategies.
4. Inaction disproportionately affects vulnerable communities, exacerbating inequalities.

8. SUGGESTIONS

1. Policy Frameworks: Strengthen climate policies with a focus on renewable energy, afforestation, and resilient infrastructure.
2. Public-Private Partnerships: Encourage collaboration between governments and private enterprises for financing mitigation projects.
3. Community Awareness: Launch campaigns to educate communities on the economic and environmental benefits of climate action.
4. Technology Adoption: Promote the use of advanced technologies for clean energy, water conservation, and agriculture.
5. Funding Mechanisms: Establish green bonds and climate funds to mobilize resources for mitigation measures.

9. CONCLUSION

The economic case for climate mitigation is clear: the costs of inaction far outweigh the investments required to prevent and adapt to climate impacts. Tamil Nadu, as a highly vulnerable region, must prioritize renewable energy, coastal protection, and resilient agriculture to safeguard its economy and communities. Proactive measures not only mitigate economic risks but also unlock new opportunities for sustainable growth.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCE

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2023). Sixth Assessment Report.
World Bank. (2023). The Economics of Climate Change.
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). (2023). Emissions Gap Report.
Tamil Nadu State Government. (2023). Climate Action Plan.
National Climate Vulnerability Assessment. (2023). India's Climate Risk Report.
International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA). (2023). Renewable Energy Benefits Report.
Stern, N. (2006). The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review.