

Current affairs 8th July 2025 by Right IAS

The Bonn Climate Conference: A Prelude to COP30

Mid-year climate meet held in Bonn, Germany to prepare for COP30 in Belém, Brazil (Nov 2025). Considered a "litmus test" for global climate commitment and ambition. Delayed Start & Procedural Disputes LMDCs (incl. India) demanded inclusion of: Article 9.1 (Developed countries' legal obligation to provide finance) Carbon border taxes as an agenda item. EU & developed countries resisted, leading to: 2-day delay in formal negotiations. Informal consultations as a compromise. Divisions: Developing countries: Focus on historical responsibilities. Developed countries: Push for forward-looking frameworks.

Mitigation Work Programme (MWP) Created to help meet 1.5°C goal. Tensions: Some countries want more ambition. Others (incl. LMDCs) Like minded developing countries) want it facilitative, not punitive. Key Debates: Whether MWP discussions create a "safe space". Resistance to new commitments without financial/technical support. New Proposal: Digital platform for sharing mitigation tools. Mixed reactions over duplication concerns

Loss and Damage (L&D) Discussions on: Integrating L&D into NDCs. Role of Santiago Network. The Santiago Network is a United Nations initiative designed to connect vulnerable developing countries with technical assistance to address climate-related loss and damage. It was established at COP25 in Madrid in 2019, with key demands including more finance, faster access, and non-economic L&D inclusion. India and others pushed for streamlined support

mechanisms. Just Transition Core themes: Equity, development rights, labour & Indigenous rights. Impact of carbon border taxes, trade barriers, and role of critical minerals.

[The Hindu](#)

Climate Change and Coastal Displacement in India

Environmental Impact of Climate Change on Coastal India. Rising sea levels, saltwater intrusion, and frequent erosion are reshaping India's coastline. Both eastern and western seabords are witnessing loss of land and livelihoods. Coastal communities dependent on agriculture, fishing, and ecosystems are most affected. Triggering forced migration towards urban areas without legal or financial safeguards.

Regional Examples of Displacement Odisha (Satabhaya): Entire villages lost to the sea; resettlement colonies lack livelihood opportunities. Karnataka (Honnavar Taluk): Traditional fisherfolk displaced due to port development, tourism, and mangrove loss. Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Kerala: Similar cases of displacement due to both climate effects and unregulated development. Role of Development Projects in Accelerating Degradation Coastal development under programs like Sagarmala, aquaculture, and energy projects worsens ecological stress. Mangroves, sand dunes, wetlands – natural barriers – are systematically destroyed. Environmental clearances often ignore cumulative climate risks and community impact. Leads to greater social vulnerability and environmental loss.

Migration and Labour Exploitation
Displaced populations migrate to urban areas such as Bhubaneswar, Chennai, Hyderabad, Mumbai. Enter informal, precarious work sectors: construction, domestic work, brick kilns. Face: Debt bondage: Wage advances tie them into exploitative conditions. Lack of legal protection: Labour laws like BOCW Act (1996) rarely enforced for informal workers. Gender-based exploitation: Displaced women are at higher risk of abuse and trafficking. Legal and Policy Gaps No national law or policy specifically addresses climate-induced displacement. Existing frameworks are inadequate: Disaster Management Act, 2005 – focused on rapid disasters, not slow-onset climate events. Environment Protection Act, 1986 & CRZ Notifications – prioritise conservation, not rehabilitation. CRZ 2019 – Criticised for weakening zoning laws to favour tourism and industry. Labour Codes and urban planning laws ignore climate migrants.

Constitutional and Jurisprudential Background Article 21 of the Constitution guarantees life and dignity. Supreme Court cases: M.C. Mehta vs Union of India (1987), Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action vs Union of India (1996) Affirm link between environment and human rights. Yet, these principles are not translated into effective legal safeguards for displaced communities. Resistance and Community Mobilisation Coastal communities and indigenous groups are resisting ecologically harmful projects. Examples: Ennore Creek protests (Tamil Nadu) – against port expansion. Pattuvam Mangrove Protection Movement (Kerala). Save Satabhaya Campaign (Odisha). Despite peaceful resistance, activists face criminalisation, intimidation, and surveillance.

Emerging Concern: Weaponisation of Climate Adaptation "Managed retreat" strategies (planned relocation) are sometimes used without: Community consultation, Legal safeguards, Sustainable resettlement plans. Undermines participatory rights and democratic principles.

Recommendations: Towards a Rights-Based Framework Recognise climate migrants under migration and urban policies. Ensure: Decent work, housing, education, healthcare. Reform labour codes to extend protections to climate migrants. Revise coastal management to balance ecology and community rights. Align with SDG Target 8.7: Eliminate forced labour, promote decent work for all. **Concluding Thought:** Climate-induced displacement is not just an environmental crisis, but a constitutional and democratic test. India's response must be rooted in: Human rights, Social justice, and Sustainable development.

[The Hindu](#)

One Health Approach

The One Health approach is a collaborative, multi-sectoral, and transdisciplinary strategy that recognizes that human health, animal health, and environmental health are closely linked and interdependent. This approach aims to prevent, detect, and respond to diseases, especially those that spread between animals and humans (called zoonotic diseases, e.g., COVID-19, Nipah, Avian Flu, etc.).

Key Components: Human Health – Public health systems, medical services. Animal Health – Veterinary services, livestock health, wildlife health. Environmental Health – Deforestation, pollution, climate change, biodiversity.

Israel-Iran Tensions and Netanyahu's Political Strategy

Netanyahu's Domestic Political Crisis Facing public dissatisfaction due to: Failure to fully dismantle Hamas. Incomplete recovery of hostages. Mounting pressure due to ongoing Gaza war. Used a diversionary tactic: Launched surprise strikes on Iran (June 13) to shift focus. Barely survived a no-confidence vote in the Knesset. His political survival is linked to prolonging military conflict.

Israel's Strategic Objectives Maintain status as the only nuclear power in the region. Strongly opposed the 2015 Iran nuclear deal (JCPOA). Wants Iran's nuclear program dismantled like Libya's. Concerned over talks about a regional nuclear fuel consortium, possibly hosted near Iran. Believes military pressure can make Iran more pliable in talks. Ongoing U.S.–Iran Negotiations Six rounds of talks held; sixth in Muscat (June 15). Iran insists on its right to enrich uranium under the NPT. Partial progress made on regional enrichment facility, but location remains contentious.

Iran's Miscalculations Felt secure due to U.S. intelligence assessment that Iran was not building a bomb. Assumed ongoing negotiations would deter Israeli or U.S. strikes. However, IAEA report in May criticized Iran's lack of cooperation and noted: 400+ kg of 60% enriched uranium. Mossad's deep infiltration led to key assassinations. Iran underestimated Israel's readiness and U.S. willingness to support. U.S. Entry and Military Support U.S. began evacuating embassy staff in early June — signs of anticipation. On June 22, U.S. supported Israel with: B-2 bombers dropping bunker buster bombs on Fordow and Natanz.

Cruise missiles targeting Isfahan. Iran's retaliation was limited, causing few casualties. Trump declared a “12-day war” victory.

Results of the Strike Israel claimed success: air defences destroyed, uranium sites hit. Iran: Suffered 600+ casualties. Lost half its missile launchers. Failed to shoot down Israeli aircraft. Trump wants to use this military success to push for a deal with Iran. Iran, in turn, cut off IAEA inspector access, complicating diplomacy. Divergence in U.S. and Israeli Positions Both oppose Iranian nukes, but: U.S. is open to a deal that allows limited civilian enrichment. Israel wants zero nuclear capability for Iran. Netanyahu supports regime change; Trump's domestic base opposes foreign entanglements. Iranian nationalism ensures that even a new regime would push for deterrence.

Iran's Nuclear Evolution Started civilian nuclear program in the 1950s; joined NPT in 1970. Shifted to clandestine enrichment in the 1990s post-Iran-Iraq war. After 2002 disclosures, aimed for threshold nuclear status. Enrichment levels used as leverage for sanctions relief. Current weakness of proxies and loss of deterrence pushes Iran closer to seeking actual nuclear weapons.

Conclusion Netanyahu has temporarily regained control but risks opening a larger geopolitical crisis. Iran's future actions may depend on: Regime security. Desire to establish a credible nuclear deterrent. Talks may resume, but mutual trust is low, and diplomacy is on a tightrope.

The Golden Dome and the Weaponisation of Space

What is the Golden Dome? Announced in May 2025 by U.S. President Donald Trump.

A \$175 billion space-based missile defence system. Aims to protect the U.S. from ballistic, hypersonic, and orbital threats. Utilises satellite interceptors, potentially with kinetic or directed energy weapons. Legal and Geopolitical Concerns Raises significant challenges under international space law, especially the: Outer Space Treaty (OST), 1967. Article IV of OST prohibits: Nuclear and WMDs in space. Military activities on celestial bodies. Loophole: Conventional weapons like kinetic interceptors are not banned. Kinetic interceptors are a type of missile defense system that destroys incoming ballistic missiles by directly colliding with them at high speed, rather than relying on explosives. Ambiguity around terms like “peaceful purposes” allows dual-use exploitation.

Strategic Impact Even if not technically illegal, the Golden Dome can: Create a first-strike advantage for the U.S. Undermine mutual deterrence. Disrupt arms control norms and provoke an arms race in outer space. Violates spirit of UN-PAROS resolutions which advocate peaceful use of space. **Dual-Use Dangers** Kinetic interceptors meant for defence can be repurposed to destroy enemy satellites. This ambiguity escalates mistrust between space powers. Increases risk of miscalculation or conflict escalation, especially with China and Russia.

India’s Strategic Dilemma India is a U.S. partner in space situational awareness and tracking. Has supported PAROS and peaceful space governance. Faces a normative contradiction: Cooperating with the U.S. may hurt India’s image as a responsible space power. Staying aloof may affect strategic ties with the U.S.. India’s Space Activities Bill (pending) will play a key role in: Defining dual-use policies. Regulating private sector participation. Aligning with international obligations. **Global Repercussions** Golden Dome may normalize weaponisation of outer space. Could spark a new orbital arms race: China, Russia, and others may respond in kind. Smaller nations may adopt asymmetric tactics like cyberattacks, satellite jamming, or debris generation. Risk of space becoming a militarised conflict zone.

Need for Legal Reform The OST is outdated and lacks enforcement mechanisms. There is a need for: Modern, legally binding treaties on space weapons. Transparency mechanisms for military space activities. Stronger national laws, like India’s Space Bill, to define responsible behaviour and regulate defence collaboration. **Conclusion** The Golden Dome is not just a U.S. defence initiative — it’s a global legal and strategic challenge. It marks a turning point in space governance. Nations like India must help lead the modernisation of space law and advocate for demilitarisation and international cooperation in outer space.