

Climate Justice: Whose Justice?

Chris O. Ikporukpo

La Villa Academia, 1 Villa Academia Way
Seigha Bina II, Odimodi, Forcados Terminal, Delta State, Nigeria
Department of Geography, University of Ibadan
Ibadan, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The increasing literature on climate justice is indicative of the increasing severity and public awareness of the challenge of climate change and the need for action. Generally speaking, the extant literature emphasises climate justice activism during COPs, climate justice movements and their activities, and climate justice activism in specific geographical regions. A case study approach is typical and neglects the actions of non-climate justice movement actors. This approach does not make for generalization on climate justice action. This article analyses the emergence and propagation of climate justice from a global perspective taking into consideration state actors and non-state actors, including non-movement groups and individuals. Varied sources of data are used and the analysis is descriptive and perspective. Rawls' theory of justice and the resource mobilisation theory provide the theoretical underpinning. State actors, which are commonly analysed as antithetically related to the climate justice movements, play sensitisation and awareness-creation roles through IPCC. Furthermore, State-actors through COP play critical roles negotiating for polluters pay and emission mitigation (net-zero) systems. Non-State actors, including non-formal groups and individuals, have been particularly critical in the fight for climate justice. Their actions have been through songs and poems, pressured mobilisation through protests, strikes and sloganeering, and litigation. Several challenges hinder the entronement of climate justice. A successful entronement of climate justice necessitates cooperation between State and non-State actors; which is the basis of the Marrakech Initiative of 2016.

Key Words: Climate Justice, Climate Justice Strategies, State Actors, Non-State Actors, Non-Climate Justice Movement Actors, Climate Justice Challenges.

INTRODUCTION

Anthropogenic Climate Change has now been firmly established as a phenomenon of grave implications. Scientific evidence continues to build on the ashes of the denials. The arguments denying the existence and gravity of the phenomenon (Whitmarsh, 2011; Berlie, 2018; Porter et. al., 2018) are getting increasingly weaker, with a decreasing following. As the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) declared in its Fourth Assessment Report (Parry, et. al., 2007: 9).

Much more evidence has accumulated over the past five years to indicate that changes in many physical and biological systems are linked to anthropogenic warming. There are four sets of evidence which taken together, support this conclusion.

The manifestations and consequences of climate change, such as extreme weather/climate conditions, sea level rise and ecosystem modification, and the implications, are not uniform in their temporal, spatial and interpersonal incidence (Parry, et. al., 2007; Bhattarai, 2017; Palomo, 2017; Ornes, 2018; Arora, 2019; Burrell, et. al., 2020; Masson-Delmotte, et. al., 2020; IPCC, 2021). It is this disparity in incidence and disproportionate impact that are the very bases of climate injustice (Pottier, et. al., 2017; Porter, et. al., 2020). Climate justice has since the 2000 Conference of Parties (COP) in Copenhagen (Chatterton, 2013) emerged as a critical framework in the anti-climate change struggle.

One basic issue that has emerged in the climate justice movement is that, although the developed world has been the beneficiary of the processes leading to climate change, the developing world bears a disproportionate burden. In other words, the issues of responsibility and burden have been major uniting frames in the climate justice movement. It is realised that the injustice goes beyond this broad perspective, for, several other complexions of injustice, such as intergenerational, inter-gender, inter wealthy - non-wealthy and between indigenous and non-indigenous people, have emerged.

The literature on climate justice is diverse and increasing; reflective of the growing significance of the climate challenge (Randall, 2016; Pottier, et. al. 2017; Alves Mariano, 2018; Maguire & Shaw, 2021). The emergence of the climate justice movement has thrown up a number of fundamental issues which are reflected in the literature. These include: (i) what is an equitable criterion for enthroneing and dispensing climate justice? (Burkett, 2008; Farber, 2008; Cameron, et. al. 2013; Rhodes, 2015); (ii) who should be responsible for dispensing climate justice? (Cuomo, 2011; Broto, 2013; Rochaet, et. al. 2015; Knaggard, et. al. 2020); and (iii) what strategies could be adopted to ensure that those responsible for enthroneing and dispensing climate justice, even if they were reluctant, do not renege. Aspects of this last emergent theme have received considerable research attention (e.g. Chatterton, et. al. 2013; Bugden, 2020; Derman, 2020).

The extant works are typically compartmentalised into three themes. These are: (i) climate justice activism during COP summits and other United Nations meetings (e.g. Death, 2010; Chatterton, et. al. 2013; Wahlstrom, et. al. 2013; Quinn-Thibodeau & Wu, 2016; Tokar, 2016; Backstrand, et. al. 2017); (ii) climate justice movements and their activities (e.g. Pettit, 2009; Wahlstrom, et. al. 2019; Badianne, et. al. 2020; Benkenstein, et. al. 2020; de Moor, et. al. 2020; Fisher, 2019 & 2020. Han & Ahn, 2020); and (iii) climate justice activism in specific geographical regions of the globe (e.g. Reid, et. al. 2012; Hirschberger, et. al. 2020; Strab-Senol, 2021). The existing literature is largely on case studies on these three identified themes. As Derman (2020: xxii) put it,

Rarely ... have studies (on climate justice) examined the varied landscapes of climate justice mobilization and thought. Nor have studies typically examined this panoply of advocacy and activism in cojoined empirical and conceptual terms.

The dominant case study approach, while meaningful and useful, tends to ignore the usefulness of generalisation. The very few works that articulate a broader perspective of the climate justice struggle (e.g. Derman, 2020) tend to assume that the struggle for climate change justice is engaged in by only climate justice movements and organisations. Whereas there is no doubt that these are the key climate justice “fighting forces”, the role of other groups and individuals reflected in such media as songs and poems cannot be ignored.

Furthermore, the dominant trend in climate justice research gives an impression of an antithetic relationship between state and non-state actors. Such an antithetic relationship is not necessarily the case; for, IPCC and COP in different ways pursue elements of climate justice. The perception of antithesis may have arisen because of the perspective of non-State actors, especially civil society organisations, that the Parties are either too reluctant or too slow in taking the necessary action. As the Executive Director of the Indigenous Environmental Network declared in an address to protesters during the 2009 COP in Copenhagen.

A lot of our world leaders are not negotiating for you, but they are negotiating for the corporations ... We are talking about systematic changes ... We want real solutions, not false solutions ... We want to cut the value of a fossil fuel economy! (quoted in Derman, 2020: xix).

This perception may have partly necessitated the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action launched in 2016 (UN, 2016) which, in addition to other provisions, called for cooperation between State and Non-State actors in the fight to control climate change and indirectly enthroning climate justice.

This article analyses the emergence and propagation of climate justice at the global stage from the perspective of strategies and challenges. The following specific issues are examined: (i) what are the formal and informal strategies that have been adopted in the struggle for climate justice?; and (ii) what are the emergent challenges in the attempt to enthrone and dispense climate justice? A theoretical context is provided employing aspects of Rawls’ theory of justice (Rawls, 1971) and the resource mobilisation theory of collective action.

SOURCES OF DATA/INFORMATION

One basic source of data is published research works on various aspects of climate change. Given the significance of climate change, these works are numerous and cover various aspects of the climate crisis. Data on the nature of the crisis and the attempts at addressing it, which served as background information for this article, were obtained from this source. Of particular relevance are the climate justice activities of various organisations. This source also provided information on those organisations that are active in the climate justice scene. This information was useful in determining the focus for more detailed data/information gathering.

Based on this general information, various reports of relevant organisations were accessed from which useful data were obtained. Reports and publications of the United Nations, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), World Meteorological Organization (WMO), Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and those of several NGOs, such as Greenpeace, Oxfam, and Friends of the Earth, were particularly useful. These Reports provided information on the environment and climate justice activities of these organisations.

Bulletins, newsletters, magazines, and Press Releases of various organisations interested in promoting climate justice were also useful sources of information. Such organisations included mainly Climate Justice Alliance, Climate Alliance International, Climate Action Network International, Fridays for Future (FFF), Extinction Rebellion (XR), Climate Justice Now, Greenpeace, Oxfam and Friends of the Earth. The Earth Negotiation Bulletin, published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development, and the Eco, published by Climate Action Network International were particularly useful. For instance, Earth Negotiations Bulletin publishes timely proceedings of each day during COP negotiations. The various publications making up this source provided information on the climate justice activities of relevant organisations.

The websites of several organisations and groups, and their social media releases, such as blogs and tweets, also provided information. This source was particularly useful for obtaining information on relatively obscure organisations and groups that in their own right participate in climate change and climate justice related activities. For instance, songs and poems and other actions of individuals relevant to climate justice were obtained through this source. Though a tedious process, some minute and rather obscure aspects of the struggle for climate justice emerged and proved to be useful information.

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING

The widely accepted theory of justice by Rawls (1971) and the resource mobilisation theory of group action (McCarthy & Zaid, 1977; Tilly, 1978; Jenkins, 1981) provide the theoretical context. Rawls asserted that “justice is the first virtue of social institutions” (p.3) and that justice is fundamental in the effective functioning of society. Justice is so fundamental that the Second Priority Rule of the theory centres around “the priority of justice over efficiency and welfare” (p.302). The theory posited that other things being equal, justice is the usual outcome in social actions because “parties are situated behind a veil of ignorance” (p.136). Three types of justice and strategies for the dispensing of justice are enunciated. These are equality, equity and redress or compensation. In the context of climate justice, only the last two are relevant. Equity is based on the idea of the proportionality of burdens and benefits while compensatory justice as Rawls (1971: 100) put it, “undeserved inequalities (burdens) call for redress”. The burdens of climate change are not proportionately distributed and because the disproportionate burdens of climate change on such regions as the small islands of the Pacific and, indeed, the developing world are undeserved, there is need for redress.

The need for redress and controlling the burdens of climate change have remained controversial and subjected to foot-dragging by many States. The result has been the emergence of several social movements. It is this that gives relevance to the resource mobilisation theory. The resource mobilisation theory, in spite of the criticism (e.g. Jenkins, 1983; Pichardo, 1988; Piven & Cloward, 1991), remains relevant in the analysis of group action. It emerged in the 1970s as a consequence of weaknesses and the resultant dissatisfaction with earlier theories of social movements, particularly relative deprivation, mass society and collective behaviour theories.

The basis formulation of the resource mobilisation theory is that resources are fundamental in the emergence and growth of social movements. As McCarthy & Zaid (1977: 1213) put it, resource mobilisation theory

examines the variety of resources that must be mobilized, the linkages of social movements to other groups, the dependence of movements upon external support for success, and the tactics used by authorities to control or incorporate movements.

The resources that must be mobilised for the emergence and success of social movements have been categorised in various ways. One major categorisation is in terms of tangible and intangible resources (McCentury & Zaid, 1977; Jenkins, 1983; Dennis, 2016). Tangible resources are facilities including means of communication and funds, while the intangible ones include human resources, technical expertise, organisational skills and legitimacy.

Edwards & McCarthy (2004) provided a much more explicit categorisation involving five resources. The category of human resources includes people, skills, expertise and experience while that of material resources involves funds, physical facilities and equipment. Organisational ability, social networks/infrastructure made up the social-organisational category. The cultural resources group includes collective action, knowhow, experience and appreciation of issues involved. The fifth category, moral resources, is made up of legitimacy, solidarity and sympathetic support.

The next two sections examine the actions of State-actors and Non-State Actors respectively.

STRATEGIES OF STATE-ACTORS

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Conference of Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP), each has been significant in issues of climate change and, consequently, climate justice. Three strategies of State actors may be identified. These are sensitisation, negotiating for “polluters pay” and negotiating for “net-zero pollution”.

Sensitisation and Awareness-Creation

The IPCC has been central in sensitisation and awareness-building on climate change which are the fulcrum of the struggle for, climate justice. The Organisation itself (IPCC, 2010: 1) put it clearly thus:

The Organisation's goal is to provide policy - relevant but not policy-prescriptive information on key aspects of climate change, including the physical science basis, impacts of and vulnerability to climate change in human and natural systems, options for adapting to the climate changes that cannot be avoided, and options for mitigation to avoid climate change.

It was the first Assessment Report of the IPCC and the Supplementary Report (Table 1) that sensitised and created awareness among world government leaders, some of whom had doubts that climate change was real and posed a great challenge to humankind. The Assessment Report established the fact that human activities were significantly increasing greenhouse gas concentration in the atmosphere and that the global mean surface air temperature had risen by 0.3 to 0.6°C over the last 100 years. It also indicated an average sea-level rise of about 6cm per decade over the next century due to thermal expansion of the oceans and melting ice (Houghton, et. al. 1990). The availability of the Assessment Report to the UN General Assembly resulted in the setting up of an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) which was charged with the responsibility of negotiating a climate convention to be signed at the United

Nations Conference on Environment and Development expected to hold at Rio-de-Janeiro in June 1992. The preparation of the Supplementary Report was meant to provide further and more reliable scientific information to facilitate the work of the INC. The Report addressed climate change impacts, mitigation and adaptation. It was divided into four broad sections on prediction of climate change, energy and industry-related issues, agriculture and forestry-related issues, and vulnerability to sea-level rise (IPCC, 1992).

In the same way that the First Assessment and the Supplementary Report guided deliberations in Rio and the subsequent emergence of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, other IPCC Reports (Table 1) have been fundamental in guiding subsequent climate change decisions and Agreements, such as the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement (Bolin, 2007; United Nations, 2015; Rhodes, 2019; Poortvliet, et. al. 2020) and hence providing information on climate (in)justice. This is particularly evident in those Reports that have regional dimensions. For instance, the contents of the Second Assessment Report (1995), particularly the assertion that there was evidence suggesting clearly human influence on global climate (Houghton, et. al. 1996), engendered many world leaders into the negotiations that resulted in the Kyoto Protocol. Similarly, the Fifth Assessment Report (2014) was useful guide and stimulant in the Paris Agreement of 2015. The Reports of IPCC are so significant that they are useful not only internationally but also locally (Howarth & Painter, 2016). The Secretary-General of the WMO and the Executive Director, UNEP, put this significance of the IPCC in their Foreword to the Fourth Assessment Report thus:

The IPCC multivolume assessments have since ... played a major role in motivating governments to adopt and implement policies in responding to climate change, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol (Parry, et. al. 2007: vii).

Side-events during COPs have also been significant in the sensitisation and the awareness creation processes (Hjerpe, et. al. 2008; Schroeder & Lovell, 2012). These activities, which are usually organised by UNFCCC secretariat, the Parties and NGOs, usually discuss a variety of issues related to climate change, including climate justice, benefit both State and non-State actors. Expectedly, the particular issue of interest in a given side event depended on the interest and bent of the organiser. For instance, while climate justice issues interested NGOs and climate justice organisations, and developing country Parties, most industrialised country Parties shy away.

Negotiating “Polluters Pay” Strategy

Sensitisation, as indicated in the previous section, is a significant dimension of the effort in addressing climate change and subsequently attaining climate justice. However, the actual action is much more important; particularly, as the Paris Agreement (United Nations, 2015) put it in its preamble; “the importance for some of the concept of climate justice”. The strategies for the actualisation of climate justice are defined in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (the Convention) and the Reports of the various COP meetings (Table 2). An immediate (present) and a future strategy may be identified. The present strategy is one of adaptation and mitigation while a future one is a complete control of anthropogenic emission or what is now defined as “net-zero emission”.

The fulcrum of adaptation and mitigation is mainly financial flows from the developed countries, the overwhelming emitters of greenhouse gasses (GHGs), to the less developed ones. This is what I defined as “the polluters pay” strategy. The negotiations in the COPs that ultimately resulted in this strategy have been tedious and long-drawn (Chatterton, et. al. 2013; Allan, et. al. 2017; Backstrand, et. al. 2017; Garrison, 2017; Neier, et. al. 2018).

The foundation for this strategy was laid by the Convention which in its preamble indicated that “the largest share of historical and current global emissions of greenhouse gases has originated in developed countries” and proceeded in Article 3 to enunciate the principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities”. Consequent on this principle, the developed countries, were expected to “take the lead in combating climate change and the adverse effects thereof” (United Nations, 1992: 9). This involved, among others, providing “new and additional financial resources to meet the agreed full costs incurred by developing country Parties in complying with their obligations” (United Nations, 1992: 13 & 14). This included cost of adaptation to the adverse effects of climate change and “transfer of technology”. A Financial Mechanism, whose operation as Article 11 put it, was to “be entrusted to one or more existing international entities” was established to manage the financial resources. The Global Environmental Facility subsequently emerged as the entity, although the Green Climate Fund (GCF) was later established as a replacement (Chaudhury, 2020; Timilsiha, 2021).

The most fundamental decisions on financing as Table 2 indicates, were made during COP 3 (Kyoto), COP 7 (Marrakech), COP 15 (Copenhagen), COP 16 (Cancun), COP 21 (Paris) and COP 26 (Glasgow), where the existing financial mechanisms were either proposed, established or reinvigorated. The major mechanisms are the GCF, the Adaptation Fund, the One Billion Dollar Mechanism, and the Special Climate Change Fund (Ackerman, 2009; Egenhofer & Georgieva, 2009; Chaudhury, 2020; Bhandary, et. al. 2021; Ginbo, et. al. 2021; Mitchell, et. al. 2021; Timilsina, 2021). The GCF, established during COP 16 in Cancun, Mexico, in 2010, is meant to assist developing countries, particularly the most vulnerable, to control GHG emissions and adaptation while the Adaptation Fund, the result of the Kyoto Protocol, as the name suggests, is more focused. It was as part of the Copenhagen Accord that the developed countries agreed to mobilise one billion dollars annually by 2020 to assist developing countries address climate change while the Special Climate Change Fund was established during COP 7 in 2001 at Marrakech, Morocco, for climate resilience. Article 9 of the Paris Agreement explicitly provided for the flow of funds from developed to developing countries. The significance of financial flows was underscored in Article 55 of the Glasgow Climate Pact of 2021 which “calls upon developed country Parties, multilateral development banks and other financial institutions to accelerate the alignment of their financial activities with the goals of the Paris Agreement”.

The perspective that climate change-based financial flows from developed to developing countries is appropriately conceptualized as payments by the polluters has been particularly popular among climate justice organisations, NGOs and the developing world (Roberts & Parks, 2009; Pickering & Barry, 2012; Khan, et. al. 2020); although the term “polluters pay” is not employed. The climate debt, carbon debt, or emission debt, school of thought asserts that anthropogenic climate change and its consequences have resulted from disproportionate emissions over the decades by developed countries in their development process while the

developing countries are now disproportionately bearing the burdens. It is therefore expected from a moral angle that the developed world should pay for adaptation and mitigation.

Negotiating Net-Zero Emission Strategy

The polluters pay perspective is controversial and is perceived by some as an unnecessary distraction of the negotiations to increase financial flows to address climate change. The strategy of net-zero emission is not as controversial. Indeed, this is the very basis of UNFCCC. This is clearly stated in Article 2 of the Convention, thus:

The ultimate objective of this Convention ... is to achieve in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.

In order to achieve this basic objective, the Parties to the Convention were expected to, as Article 3 urged, “take precautionary measures to anticipate, prevent or minimize the causes of climate change” with the developed countries taking the lead.

The attempt to mitigate climate change has since the Convention been the focus of world leaders, through the various COPs (Table 2). As significant as each of the COPs has been, there is no doubt that COP 3 of 1997, which resulted in the Kyoto Protocol (United Nations, 1998) and that of 2015, the source of the Paris Agreement (United Nations, 2015), are the most fundamental. The Kyoto Protocol of 1997 established legally binding limits of greenhouse gas emissions by the developed countries. Article 3 of the Protocol put it succinctly that the industrialized nations should:

Individually or jointly ensure that their aggregate anthropogenic ... emissions of greenhouse gases ... do not exceed their assigned amounts.

They were expected to reduce their emissions “by at least 5 percent below 1990 levels in the commitments period, 2008-2012”. Article 2 specified that this will be effected through measures such as energy efficiency including renewables, protections and enhancement of sinks and reservoirs of greenhouse gases, and the promotion of sustainable forms of agriculture.

The Kyoto Protocol was extended to 2020 at COP 18 held in Doha, Qatar in 2012 with the understanding of the need to negotiate and create a new and much more comprehensive binding treaty by 2015. The need for a comprehensive treaty to address climate change came to fruition during COP 21 held in Paris from 30 November to 12 December 2015 with the emergence of the Paris Agreement. The Agreement (United Nations, 2015), as Article 2 indicates “aims to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change ...” In the context of mitigation and achieving net-zero emissions, it is expected that the aim of the Agreement will be achieved through:

- (i) ensuring that the global average temperature is kept well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and making determined efforts to limit the increase to not more than 1.5°C pre-industrial levels (Article 2a);
- (ii) enhancing adaptation ability and climate resilience (Article 2b);
- (iii) countries ensuring that they achieve their “nationally determined contributions (of emission reduction) to the global response to climate change” (Article 3);

- (iv) Parties aiming “to reach global peaking of greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible ...” (Article 4[i]);
- (v) developed country Parties taking the lead and encouraging developing country Parties to enhance their efforts at mitigation (Article 4[4]); and
- (vi) supporting the developing country Parties in their climate mitigation actions (Article 4[5]).

Since the Paris Agreement, the issue of 1.5°C limit has attracted considerable attention in the attempt at addressing climate change. An IPCC special report (IPCC 2018) underlined the significance of this target. The report analysed the pattern of greenhouse gas emissions and associated global warming, impacts and risks and potential mitigation measures. Several researches (e.g. Schleussner, et. al. 2016; Karmalkar & Bradley, 2017; Dietz, et. al. 2018; Rhodes, 2019; Xu, et. al. 2020; Rogel, et. al. 2021; Batres, et. al. 2021) have, following the Paris Agreement, examined different pathways of global warming, impact and mitigation.

An inescapable mitigation measure, as the Paris Agreement, several COP resolutions and IPCC Reports have indicated, is controlling emissions. The development of greenhouse gas sinks and greenhouse gas removal technologies are associated measures. The main instrument employed in checking emissions is the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC), while the Parties are also expected to have their individual climate action (Committee on Climate Change, 2016; Berge & Montford, 2020; Government of Canada, 2021). In order to ensure transparency and effectiveness, Article 4(9) of the Paris Agreement stipulated that “each Party shall communicate a nationally determined contribution every five years” to the Secretariat of the Agreement. The first of such communication, reflecting the setting as at 31 December 2020 (United Nations, 2021) indicated the situation in 75 countries (Parties). The report reflected a high degree of determination by the Parties. For instance, all the Parties had quantified mitigation targets. Furthermore, “many Parties have strengthened their commitment to reducing or limiting GHG emissions by 2025 and/or 2030, demonstrating increased ambition to address climate change” and “Parties have increased the coverage of sectors and GHGs ...” (United Nations 2021: 4). The Glasgow Climate Pact (2021) succeeded in speeding up the timeline for climate action, urging Parties to improve on their nationally determined contributions in order to, as Articles 29 put it, “align with the Paris Agreement temperature goal by the end of 2022”

STRATEGIES OF NON-STATE ACTORS

Generally speaking, non-State actors, more than the State ones, have been very active in the pursuit of climate justice. Climate Justice Organisations (CJOs), such as Fridays for Future (Wahistrom, et. al. 2019; Bowman, 2020; de Moor, et. al. 2020; Marquardt, 2020). Generation Climate Europe (Hirschberger, et. al. 2020), Extinction Rebellion (Wilson & Walton, 2019), Environmental Justice Organisations (EJOs) such as Green Peace and Friends of the Earth, social engineering NGOs such as Oxfam (Cugelman & Otero, 2010) and even some individual artistes have been particularly active. Three types of strategies in the struggle for climate justice by non-State actors may be identified. These are mobilisation through print, songs and poems, protest and litigation.

Mobilisation Through Media, Songs and Poems

In spite of the fact that the existence of anthropogenic climate change is becoming less and less controversial, the concept of, and the need for, climate justice continue to be. The proponents

and the foot soldiers of climate justice have therefore aggressively pursued the ideal through press releases, newsletters, posters, posts, advertisement, inspirational talks, emails, conferences, magazines, pamphlets/books research publications, poems, songs, chants and lobbying, in an attempt to mobilise and influence the public and State stakeholders. Press releases and newsletters have been effectively employed in mobilisation and awareness generation by the CJOs and the EJOs during COPs and off-season. Many of these organisations have established newsletters and associated media in their mobilisation effort. For instance, Climate Action Network International publishes Eco Newsletter and Greenpeace, the Eco watch. Several climate newsletters privately published have also emerged. Some of the best known are Climate Beat, Climate Crisis, Climate Outreach, Hot House, Heated and Hot Take.

The publications of the Eco Newsletter during COP 25 in Madrid, Spain, are good examples of mobilisation by a CJO during negotiation of Parties while the regular publications of the private newsletters, many of them on a weekly basis, exemplify off-season of COPs. In its 4 December 2019 edition, Eco Newsletter urged the Parties, thus:

Today, at the stocktake on Pre-2020 implementation and ambition, you will have one of the best opportunities to reflect on how well (or how badly?) you are doing in meeting your 2020 targets ... With the deadline looming large, three things need to be foremost in your minds - and your interventions during the session.

Eco gave the three critical things as bridging the adaption finance gap, the need for transparency and fairness, and the need to control emissions. Similarly, it urged the Parties in its edition of 13 December 2019 (the last day of COP 25) that

When the final plenary closes this evening, Eco expects Parties to send clear political signs that you will address ambition in all three long-term goals of the Paris Agreement.

A publication by Climate Justice Alliance on 17 April 2021 is a good example of a press release. The release declared in part,

Climate Justice Alliance (CJA) strongly opposes market-based approaches to the climate crisis such as Cap and trade. These false "solutions" are essentially revenue schemes for big businesses and will only serve to continue the cycle of historical harm our communities have faced for centuries at the hands of extractive industry. We cannot rely on those who created the climate crisis to solve it.

As in the case of State-actors, research publications have been significant aspects of the mobilisation process. The publications of Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth are good examples. Examples of the publications by Greenpeace include Climate Time Bomb (1994), the Carbon Bomb (1994), Polar Meltdown (1997) and Crashing the Climate (2019). In the case of Friends of the Earth, Just Solution for Climate Induced Migration (2017), Coal Financing in Asia Pacific Must Stop (2017) and The Big Con (2021) are good examples.

There is no doubt that social media has tremendously facilitated the mobilisation process. The rise with an increasing following of Fridays for Future (Wahlstrom, et. al. 2019; Bowman, 2020; de Moor, et. al. 2020; Marquardt, 2020) is a remarkable case in point. The organisation emerged from the action of the then 15-year-old Swedish girl (Greta Thunberg) who skipped school for three weeks and sat in front of the parliament building, beginning from 20 August 2018, to protest the lack of action to address the climate crisis. The posting of her action on Instagram

and Twitter from the first day was such that within a few days, she was not only joined by students and even parents from Sweden but also several students from all over the globe in their various countries. Indeed, by November 2018, barely three months from the initiation, more than 17,000 students in 24 countries took part in the Friday School Strikes (Taylor & Elks, 2021). The social media continues to be used effectively by Fridays for Future (FFF) such that millions of students and the young now participate in the Friday School Strikes which occur several times in any given year. All other CJOs and EJOs have also used social media in mobilisation. For instance, their websites and tweets not only educate on the challenges of climate change but also from time to time urge individuals to join their climate justice actions. Even with the effectiveness of social media, these organisations sometimes employ traditional mobilisation approaches such handbills and posters. For instance, in the summer of 2019, Extinction Rebellion (XR) organised a mobilisation campaign in New York City involving the distribution of information on the climate crisis in subway vehicles. Other traditional systems of mass communication, such as radio, have also proved useful. The “Climate Airwaves” Scheme of Ghana (Harvey, 2011) is a good example. This has served as an avenue for mobilising and educating rural dwellers on climate justice initiatives and challenges.

Songs, and poems have also been effective organs of mobilisation and awareness creation (Huntington, 2017; Richwood, 2017; Carrington, 2018; Schlutz, 2018; Sun, 2020). Songs and poems appeal to the inner emotions of individuals and are therefore capable of influencing human actions. Although songs and poems are common in scenes of climate activism, they are much more a manifestation of what the ingenuity of individual artistes could contribute to mobilisation and awareness creation in the struggle for climate justice. Table 3 displays a sample of songs on different dimensions of the climate crisis. The songs reflect the drivers, the manifestation and control of the crisis. For instance, Jimmy Cliff’s “Save our Planet Earth”, Captain Sea Level Rise’s “when the North Pole Melts” and Bo Diddley’s “Pollution” largely reflect the drivers. Childish Gambino’s “Feel Like Summer”, Adrian Belew’s “Hot Zoo”, Bob Dylan’s “The Time They Are A-Changing” and Miyorah’s “Global Warming” are manifestations. The control is reflected in Bad Religion’s “Kyoto Now” and Macy Gray’s “All I Want for Christmas”. The sample of poems (Table 4) also reflect different dimensions of the climate crisis. The theme of sea level rise reflected in five of the poems is particularly significant.

Pressured Mobilisation: Protests, Strikes and Sloganeering

Protests and strikes have become common characteristics of the struggle for climate justice. Generally speaking, they are a result of the perception that other mobilisation approaches are not succeeding or taking too long to succeed. These protests and strikes may be conveniently divided into two types. These are those during COPs and those outside the season of COPs. The protests during the season of COPs are much more popular among climate justice activists.

Table 5 shows the most significant protests and strikes during the two decades, 2000 to 2020. The significance of COP season protests relative to non-season is apparent. There is clearly diversify in the participation; although young people are more prominent. Fridays for Future has been particularly prominent since its emergence in 2018.

Sloganeering in an attempt to mobilise and create awareness among the public characterises these protests and strikes. Table 6 indicates the commonly used slogans. The slogans reflect the nature of the climate crisis, its drivers, the manifestation, the need for urgent action and the

dissatisfaction with current action. The most commonly used slogan, “Climate Justice Now!” reflects the need for urgent action. This is so significant among climate justice activists that it has become the name of a network of climate justice organisations. Other slogans, such as “Climate Emergency Now!”, “Dead Planet Soon, Act Now!” and “My House in On Fire, Act Now!” also indicate the need for immediate action. The slogan, “The Empty Promises Are the Same” indicates the dissatisfaction with current climate change action. The theme of sea level rise, reflected in such slogans as “Don’t Let Us Drown” is a common one. The slogan, “You Had a Future, So Should We!” used by young activists, such as those of FFF, depicts intergenerational inequity in climate change, while “Polluters Must Pay” reflects the disproportionality in the incidence of the crisis.

As indicated earlier, and as reflected in Table 5, off-season COP protests are less popular. FFF and XR are very significant in the scene of off-season COP protests and strikes. Table 7 indicates that FFF has regularly planned and organized its “Friday School Strikes” since its emergence. For instance, it had 6 strikes in 2019; though only 2 in 2020 because of the challenge of COVID 19. The figure for 2021 including planned ones is nine. The popularity of these strikes is reflected in the number of participants, the number of cities and the number of countries involved. For instance, in the strike of 27 September 2019, more than 3.7 million participants in 2,269 cities across 150 countries were involved.

Extinction Rebellion (XR), though an international organisation, is particularly active in the UK and the USA. An example of a very impactful protest it has organised is that of October 2019, which it christened “International Rebellion”. The two-week long action held in several cities of the world; although the UK and the USA were the main centres of protest. For instance, in London, there was a demonstration on October 7 involving several thousand individuals which largely disrupted activities particularly in the central districts. Then on 10 October, there was a sit-in action in one of the exits of London City Airport. Some activists climbed on top of the terminal building while one on top of a British Airways aircraft. Flights were consequently delayed. Over the two-week period, activities in several parts of London were disrupted. This two-week protest by XR was a much more milder one compared to one earlier planned. In a press release of 30 May 2019, it indicated that there would be a non-violent action on 18 June to ensure that Heathrow Airport, being a major polluter, was closed for that day. It also insisted that if the government did not shelve the plan of expanding the airport, it would take necessary action to close the airport for ten days from 1 July 2019. Given the fact that a lot of alarm and criticism followed, fuelled by rumours of violence, the planned action was “postponed” (Wilson & Walton, 2019).

Experience has shown that where the different forms of mobilisation and advocacy, including lobbying, fail, litigation has been the last resort. This approach is examined in the next section. Be this as these failures may be, it is necessary to add that, as the activities of Oxfam have shown (Cugelman & Otero, 2010), lobbying could be successful in some circumstances.

The Litigation Strategy

Litigation has since the 1990s emerged as a common strategy employed by CJOs, EJOs, social engineering NGOs, communities and even governments in the attempt at climate and environmental justice (Boom, et. al. 2016; Spier, 2020; UNEP, 2020; Beauregard, et. al. 2021).

Litigation cases are important, because, as the Global Climate Litigation Report of 2020 (UNEP, 2020: 9 & 10), asserted, they

... Compel governments to accelerate their efforts to implement emissions reduction targets, demonstrate that national GHG emissions goals are insufficiently ambitious or not being pursued at all, connect harms suffered by vulnerable communities to emitters responsible for a share of global temperature increases, bring global climate change concerns to bear on local action, and either force adaptation action or recover damages that result from others' failures to adapt.

The litigations are typically brought against governments and corporations, particularly multinationals. In 2017, there were 884 cases in 24 countries with the USA accounting for 654 of these. By 1 July 2020, there were at least 1,550 cases with the USA accounting for about 1,200. Other countries with significant number of cases were Australia (97), UK (58) and the EU recording 55 (UNEP, 2020). Another source (Setzer & Byrnes, 2020) indicated that there were 1,587 cases between 1986 and the end of May 2020 in 37 countries, with the USA accounting for 1,213. Other significant countries were Australia (98), UK (62) and EU (57). The Global South had 37 cases; 16 in Asia, 14 in Latin America and 7 in Africa. Of the cases outside the USA between April 1994 and May 2020, 58% were favourably successful, 33% were not and 9% were neutral. It is significant that individuals, communities and governments, particularly local ones, in the developing countries, encouraged by CJOs and EJOs, are now employing the litigation approach. Oil producing countries and the small island countries are typical examples.

Some of the most celebrated cases have demonstrated the potentials of the litigation strategy as an instrument of climate justice. These cases include *Urgenda v. the Netherlands*, *Juliana v. USA*, *Demanda v. Minambiete*, and *Oxfam and three others v. France*. The case between *Urgenda Foundation and the Netherlands* pertained to keeping to the emissions limitations imposed by the Paris Agreement (Backes & van der Veen, 2020; Wewerinke-Singh & McCoach, 2020). The Supreme Court of the Netherlands on 20 December 2019 upheld the judgements of the lower courts, and ruled in favour of *Urgenda*, that the Netherlands is legally obliged to limit its greenhouse gas emissions by at least 25% of the 1990 level by the end of 2020. The case of *Juliana v. United States* (Couch 2020; Reed, 2020) is one example of unsuccessful litigation. Twenty-one teenagers brought a case against the government of the USA that its inaction on climate change was endangering their future. A District Court in Oregon upheld the claim; however, the appeal court in a two-to-one judgement reversed the ruling of the lower court in January 2020, declaring that the plaintiffs had no standing; although the judgement has been appealed. The case of *Demanda Generaciones Futures (Future Generations) v. Minambiennte (Ministry of the Environment) and others in Columbia*, very similar to that of *Juliana v. United States*, was successful. Twenty-five youth plaintiffs, in the age group of 7-26 years, sued the government of Colombia and others, such as Corporations, claiming that climate change consequent on the deforestation of the Colombia Amazon Forest and the government's inaction on climate change threatened their welfare and their fundamental human rights. A lower court dismissed the case. However, on 5 April 2018, the Supreme Court reversed the judgement of the lower court and upheld the claim of the youthful plaintiffs. In other words, the Supreme Court ordered the government to take the necessary action on climate change (Slobodian, 2020; Viglione, 2020). In the case of *Oxfam and Others v. the Government of France*, the Court declared the government liable in a judgement of 3 February 2021 for failing to meet its

emissions reduction commitments fast enough. Although, the judgement could be appealed, the Executive Director of Oxfam France in a press release of 3 February 2021 declared the judgement as “a historic victory for climate justice”.

In spite of the fact that not all litigations have been successful, the success stories clearly indicate the potential of litigation as a strategy for enthrone climate justice. There are legal obstacles, as some cases have shown. Obviously, the obstacles to achieving climate justice are not limited to the legal sphere; there are other challenges. It is these challenges that are analysed in the next section.

Challenges of Enthroning Climate Justice

As desirable as climate justice might be, its entronement is hampered by several settings. These include:

- (i) doubts about the existence of the climate change phenomenon;
- (ii) foot-dragging on the control of the phenomenon;
- (iii) doubts about the effectiveness of control mechanisms;
- (iv) the powerlessness of the critically-burdened regions and people; and
- (v) the belief that climate justice is an unnecessary distraction.

In spite of the apparently overwhelming evidence that has been provided by IPCC and other sources, there are still denials about the reality of climate change. Such denials imply that there is still no total united front on the need for climate justice. Obviously, there is no basis, as some argue, to address a non-existent challenge. The counter-climate change movement, as the denial school of thought is now christened (Bhatia, et. al. 2020; McKie, 2021), has advanced a number of arguments (Berlie, 2018; Cook, 2019; Bhatia, et. al. 2020; Busch & Judick, 2021). The grand position is that there is no anthropogenic climate change. It is asserted that all the changes taking place are natural. After all, there has been different climatic epochs, such as the ice age, it is asserted. It is argued that the process involved in the derivation of evidence employed by IPCC is flawed and that climate change scientists are ideologically and/or economically motivated.

Those in the less extreme counter climate change movement assume the position that the incidence of anthropogenic climate change is very mild. This very mild and insignificant climate change is not harmful but is rather beneficial in some respects. In other words, the proponents posit that there are positive externalities in the mild insignificant climate change and therefore no attempts should be made to control the phenomenon. Commonly cited positive externalities include more availability of CO₂ for plants, milder winters, longer growing seasons, and better quality of life. The flipside of the position is that the negative externalities such as sea-level rise, droughts and bio-diversity loss are not as serious as the scientists assert. A related argument is that a cost-benefit analysis is in support of their position. They therefore posit that the funds being used for climate action are better employed to improve human welfare, such as providing health facilities. The school also believes that, given the circumstances, the emphasis should be adaptation and not mitigation. A human rights argument of ensuring that people's right to choose, such as consumption pattern, should not be restricted, as climate action requires, because it is not democratic.

The counter climate change movement has employed a number of strategies to promote its perspective (Dunlap & McCright, 2015; Farrell, 2016; Cook, 2019). Newspapers supportive of the counter movement, particularly in the USA, have been used to propagate anti-climate change and climate justice ideas. This is usually done through editorials, opinion articles and coverage of anti-climate change news. The social media has also been effectively used. The publication of books and reports to counter climate change scientists and IPCC has also been a popular approach. For instance, between 1993 and 2013; 40,785 written and verbal texts were produced by counter-movement organisations and individuals (Farrell, 2016). The lobbying of congressmen has also resulted in the blocking of climate legislation in USA. The financial backing for the counter-movement is usually provided by the heavy-polluting industries, particularly fossil energy and automobile manufacturing companies.

The foot-dragging of many countries on climate action also hampers the climate justice drive. Several authoritative studies and reports (e.g. Olhoff, et. al. 2014; IPCC, 2021; United Nations, 2021) have indicated very clearly the lagging behind of countries in achieving not only the standards provided by the UNFCCC and associated bodies such as COP, but also their own intended nationally determined contributions. Even if it could be argued that this may be due to genuine inability, it cannot be said of some countries that deliberately renege. The USA, Russia and Brazil are typical examples in this regard (Cole, 2020). The refusal of the USA to sign the Kyoto Protocol and its withdrawal from the Paris Agreement are clear indicators.

The emergent doubts about the genuineness and the effectiveness of current climate action complicates the challenge to climate justice. Doubts about net-zero emissions is a good example. A 2021 Oxfam report (Sen & Dabi, 2021) and another of the same year by Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung (Lauron, et. al. 2021) provide the case. The position of Oxfam is that zero-net is clearly different from zero emission and that the idea of zero-net is an attempt by world leaders to allow the great polluters, particularly the fossil fuel companies, to continue to pollute under the protection of net-zero. It put it dramatically thus:

Net zero emissions and zero emissions do not mean the same thing. Instead, in many cases, net zero targets are a greenwashing exercise that enable business as usual ... What is needed is an immediate dramatic and irreversible reduction in the billions of carbons, these countries and corporations are pumping into the atmosphere on a daily basis (Sen & Dabi, 2021: 6).

The perspective of Lauron, et. al. (2021) is similar to this. "They put it succinctly thus

What net zero really means is that the production of harmful emissions will continue but by restoring forests or using technologies that capture, carbon will be balanced out, removing GHGs from the atmosphere ... Nevertheless, the untold reality of net-zero thinking is that it essentially allows rich countries and their corporations to buy and dazzle their way out of dirty, extractive, and extremely profitable activities (Lauron, et. al. 2021: 1).

They concluded that effective climate action and climate justice requires a system change and the reinventing of capitalism.

Young climate justice activists and their organisations have been particularly vocal on doubts about the genuineness of current climate change mitigation actions. The speech by Greta-

Thunberg, a foremost young climate justice activist, during the Youth4Climate Summit in Milan, Italy, from 28 to 30 September, 2021 typifies the perspective of the youth. She asserted that the action of world leaders has been “thirty years of blah, blah, blah” and deceit. She added that their (young individuals’) “hopes and dreams drowned in (the) empty words and promises” of world leaders. She therefore urged thus:

We can no longer let the people in power decide what hope is. Hope is not passive. Hope is not blah, blah, blah. Hope is telling the truth. Hope is taking action. Hope always comes from the people. We want real climate action and we want climate justice.

The divergent views expressed by non-State actors may destroy the unity between State actors and non-State actors needed for enthrone climate justice.

There is no doubt that the very slow progress being made in the enthrone of climate justice; one that is unacceptable to CJOs and CJOs, is related to the nature of the power relationship between the major polluters and the major burdened. The main polluters are the powerful while the main burdened are the powerless. If the burdened countries were world powers, foot-dragging and reluctant countries would have been sanctioned and therefore forced to be climate justice compliant. Imagine if the USA, UK, Russia and China were the burdened and the developing countries, the major polluters reluctant to take necessary climate action. When the USA withdrew from the Paris Agreement, world leaders were simply disappointed, dumbfounded and embarrassed in varying degrees (Rhodes, 2017); but the international community was helpless. There were debates about possible sanctions against the USA, such as carbon tariffs (Bohringer & Rutherford, 2017); but given the economic and political power of the USA, the sanctions ended at the stage of debate.

One of the most critical challenge, from a climate justice perspective, is the fact that many world leaders do not believe in the ideals of climate justice. As far as they are concerned, even if climate action is necessary, it cannot be couched in the language of climate justice; for climate justice is the language of the radicalised. This is apparently why the use of the phrase in paragraph 13 of the preamble to the Paris Agreement: “noting the importance for some of the concept of climate justice”. Whatever the acceptable nomenclature, what is important is that the climate crisis demands effective action.

CONCLUSION

In August 2021, IPCC released its 6th Assessment Report. The Report was unequivocal about the worsening climate crisis. “Observed increases in well-mixed greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations since around 1750 are unequivocally caused by human activities”, it declared. It also indicated that “since 2011 ... concentrations have continued to increase in the atmosphere ...” and that “each of the last four decades has been successively warmer than any decade that preceded it since 1850” (IPCC, 2021: SPM 5). The Report reinforced earlier ones and is clearly a clarion call to necessary action.

Given the developments and the continually disproportionate incidence of the burdens and risks of climate change, the need for climate justice is becoming more and more apparent. Both State-actors and non-State actors are relevant in the pursuit of climate justice; although, the latter is largely dissatisfied with the actions of the former. The State-actors, through the IPCC,

have engaged in the creation of awareness about the climate crisis and attempted adaptation and mitigation measures through COP engagements. Within the perspective of climate justice, it is the actions of the very diverse non-State actors that have been more prominent. The principal focus of the non-State actors has been putting pressure on State-actors to take urgent, meaningful, acceptable and effective action for mitigation and control of the climate crisis particularly from the perspective of burdened vulnerable and relatively disadvantaged regions and groups. The strategies adapted have varied from sensitisation, using various instruments, through strikes and protests, to litigation. The struggle for climate justice has dramatically shown how meaningfully and effectively the youthful population is capable of playing to create a safe, equitable and peaceful developed world.

References

- Ackerman, F. (2009) Financing the Climate Mitigation and Adaptation Measures in Developing Countries. G-24 Discussion Paper, No.57. United Nations, New York.
- Ahmed, B. (2018) Who Takes Responsibility for the Climate Change Refugees? *International Journal of Climate Change, Strategies and Management* 10: 5-26.
- Allan, J. et. al. (2017) From Bali To Marrakech: A Decade of International Climate Negotiations IISD, New York.
- Alves, M.W.F. & Mariano, E.B. (2018) Climate Justice and Human Development: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 202: 360-375.
- Arora, N.K. (2019) Impact of Climate Change on Agriculture Production and Its Sustainable Solutions. *Environmental Sustainability* 2: 95-96.
- Backes, C.W. & van der Veen, G.A. (2020) Urgenda: The Final Judgement of the Dutch Supreme Court. *Journal for European Environmental & Planning Law* 17: 307-321.
- Backstrand, K. et. al. (2017) Non-State Actors in Global Climate Governance: From Copenhagen to Paris and Beyond. *Environmental Politics* 26: 561-579.
- Badianne, S.; Lalanette, M. & Ilkiw, D. (2020) "School Strike 4 Climate": Social Media and the International Youth Protest on Climate Change. *Media and Communication* 8: 208-218.
- Batres, M. et. al. (2021) Environmental and Climate Justice and Technological Carbon Removal, *The Electricity Journal* 34: 107002.
- Beauregard, C. et. al. (2021) Climate Justice and Right-Based Litigation in a Post-Paris World. *Climate Policy* 21: 652-665.
- Benkenstein, A. et. al. (2020) Youth Climate Advocacy, South African Institute of International Affairs, Johannesburg.
- Bergen, M. & Mountford, H. (2020) 6 Signs of Progress Since the Adaption of the Paris Agreement. World Resources Institute.
- Berlie, A.B. (2018) Global Warming: A Review of the Debates on the Causes, Consequences and Politics of Global Response. *Ghana Journal of Geography* 10: 144-164.
- Bhandary, R.R.; Gallagher, K.S. & Zhang, F. (2021) Climate Finance Policy in Practice: A Review of the Evidence. *Climate Policy* 21: 529-545.
- Bhatia, S.; Lau, J.H. & Baldwin, T. (2020) You are Right, I am Alarmed - But by Climate Change Counter Movement, arXiv: 2004.14907v1 [CS.CL].
- Bhattarai, U. (2017) Impact of Climate Change on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services: Direction for Future Research. *Journal of Water, Energy and Environment* 20: 41-48.
- Bohringer, C. & Rutherford, T.F. US Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement: Economic Implications of Carbon-Tariff Conflicts. Discussion Paper 17-89, Harvard Project on Climate Agreements, Harvard Kennedy School.

- Bolin, B. (2007) *History of the Science and Politics of Climate Change: The Role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Boom, K.; Richards, J. & Leonard, S. (2016) *Climate Justice: The International Momentum Towards Climate Litigation*. Heinrich Boll, Stiftung.
- Bowman, B. (2020) They Don't Quite Understand the Importance of What We're Doing Today: The Young People's Climate Strikes as Subaltern Activism. *Bowman Sustainable Earth* 3: 16.
- Broto, V.C. (2013) Who has Moral Responsibility for Climate Change? *E-International Relations*. <https://www.e.ir.info/2013/03>
- Bugden, D. (2020) Does Climate Protest Work? Partisanship, Protest, and Sentiment Pools. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 6: 1-13.
- Burkett, M. (2008) Just Solutions to Climate Change: A Climate Justice Proposal for a Domestic Clean Development Mechanism. *Buffalo Law Review* 56: 169-243.
- Burrell, A.L. et. al. (2020) Anthropogenic Climate Change Has Driven Over 5 Million Km² of Drylands Towards Desertification. *Nature Communications* 11: 3853.
- Busch, T. & Judick, L. (2021) Climate Change - That is Not Real! A Comparative Analysis of Climate - Sceptic Think Tanks in the USA and Germany. *Springer Nature* <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10584-021-02962z>
- Cameron, E.; Shine, T. & Bevins, W. (2013) *Climate Justice: Equity and Justice Informing A New Climate Agreement*. Working Paper, World Resources Institute and Mary Robinson Foundation.
- Carrington, K. (2018) *Activist Poetics: Intersecting Ecopsychology and Poetry to Inspire Environmental Action*. CEP, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Chatterton, P.; Featherstones, D. & Routledge, P. (2013) Articulating Climate Justice in Copenhagen: Antagonism, the Commons, and Solidarity. *Antipode* 45: 602-620.
- Chaudhury, A. (2020) Role of Intermediaries in Shaping Climate Finance in Developing Countries - Lessons from the Green Climate Fund. *Sustainability* 12: 5507.
- Cole, M. (2020) Capitalism and Planetary Destruction: Activism for Climate Change Emergency. *Cultural Logic: Marxist Theory and Practice* 24: 1-29.
- Committee on Climate Change (2016) *UK Climate Action Following the Paris Agreement*. Committee on Climate Change, London.
- Cook, J. (2019) Understanding and Countering Misinformation About Climate Change in Chilwa, I. & Samoilenko, S. (eds.) *Handbook of Research on Deception, Fake News, and Misinformation Online*. Hershey, PA: IGI-Global, 281-306.
- Couch, K. (2020) After Juliana: A Proposal for the Next Atmospheric Trust Litigation Strategy. *William & Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review* 45: 219-246.
- Cugelman, B. & Otero, E. (2010) *Evaluation of Oxfam GB's Climate Change Campaign*. Oxfam International Oxford.
- Cuomo, C.J. (2011) Climate Change, Vulnerability, and Responsibility. *Hypatia*, Vol.X, No.X, (XX XX) Hypatia.
- de Moor, J. et. al. (2020) New Kids on the Block: Taking Stock of the Recent Cycle of Climate Activism. *Social Movement Studies* DOI: 10.1080/1474.2837.2020.1836617.
- Death, C. (2010) Troubles at the Top: South African Protests and the 2002 Johannesburg Summit. *African Affairs* 109: 555-574.
- Dennis, A.L. (2016) Black Contemporary Social Movements, Resource Mobilization, and Black Musical Activism. *Law and Contemporary Problems* 79: 29-51.
- Derman, B.B. (2020) *Struggles for Climate Justice: Uneven Geographies and the Politics of Connection*. Springer Nature, Cham, Switzerland.

- Dietz, S. et. al. (2018) The Economics of 1.5°C Climate Change. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 43: 455-480.
- Dunlap, R.E. & McCright, A.M. (2015) Challenging Climate Change: The Denial Countermovement, in R.E. Dunlap & R.J. Brulle (eds.) *Climate Change and Society: Sociological Perspectives*. Oxford University Press, New York, 300-332.
- Edwards, B. & McCarthy, J.D. (2004) Strategy Matters: The Contingent Value of Social Capital in the Survival of Local Social Movement Organizations. *Social Forces* 83: 621-651.
- Egenhofer, C. & Georgieva, A. (2009) The Copenhagen Accord: A First Stab at Deciphering the Implications for the EU. *Commentary of the Centre for European Policy Studies*, Brussels.
- Farber, D.A. (2008) The Case for Climate Compensation: Justice for Climate Change Victims in a Complex World. *Utah Law Review* 2008: 377-414.
- Farrell, J. (2016) Corporate Funding and Ideological Polarization About Climate Change. *PNAS* 113: 92-97.
- Fisher, D.R. & Nasrin, S. (2020) Climate Activism and Its Effects. *WIREs Climate Change* e683.
- Fisher, D.R. (2019) The Broader Importance of Fridays For Future. *Nature: Climate Change* 9: 430-431.
- Frumhoff, P.C.; Heede, R. & Oreskes, N. (2015) The Climate Responsibilities of Industrial Carbon Producers. *Climate Change*. DOI 10.1007/10584015.
- Garrison, J.A. (2017) Overcoming Obstacles in Global Climate Action from Copenhagen to Paris: Issue Framing as a Tool to Understand Opportunities for Policy Change. *KFG Working Paper*, Berlin.
- Ginbo, T.; Dicorato, L. & Hoffmann, R. (2021) Investing in Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation: A Methodological Review of Real-Options Studies. *Ambio*. 50: 229-241.
- Government of Canada (2021) Canada's Climate Actions for a Healthy Environment and a Healthy Economy. Ottawa, Government of Canada.
- Han, H. & Ahn, S.W. (2020) Youth Mobilization to Stop Global Climate Change. *Sustainability*, 12, 4127.
- Harvey, B. (2011) Climate Airwaves: Community Radio, Action Research, and Advocacy for Climate Justice in Ghana. *International Journal of Communication* 5: 2035-2058.
- Hirschberger, B. et. al. (2020) Young Voices on Climate Justice: The European Youth & Climate Justice Report 2020. *Generation: Climate Europe*.
- Hjerpe, M. et. al. (2008) The Functions of Side Events at the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *CSPR Report 08: 02 Norrköping, Sweden*.
- Houghton, J.T. et. al. (1996) *Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Houghton, J.T.; Jenkins, G.J. & Ephraums (1990) *Climate Change: The IPCC Scientific Assessment Report Prepared for IPCC By Working Group 1*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Howarth, C. & Painter, J. (2016) Exploring the Science-Policy Interface on Climate Change: The Role of the IPCC in Informing Local Decision-Making in the UK. *Palgrave Communications* 2: 16058.
- Huntington, C. (2017) *Can Poetry Save the Earth?: A Study in Romantic Ecology*, University of Puget Sound, Summer Research, 295.
- IEA (2021) *Net Zero By 2050: A Road Map for the Global Energy Sector*. IEA, Paris.
- IPCC (1992) *Climate Change 1992: The Supplementary Report to the IPCC Impacts Assessment*. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.
- IPCC (2010) *Statement on IPCC Principles and Procedures*, IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.
- IPCC (2018) *Global Warming of 1.5°C: An IPCC Special Report on the Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5°C*. WMO. Geneva, Switzerland.

- IPCC (2021) *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis (Summary for Policy Makers)*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Jenkins, J.C. (1981) *Sociopolitical Movements*. *Handbook of Political Behaviour*, IV: 81-153.
- Jenkins, J.C. (1983) *Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements*. *American Review of Sociology* 9: 527-553.
- Karmalkar, A.V. & Bradley, R.S. (2017) *Consequences of Global Warming of 1.5°C and 2°C for Regional Temperature and Precipitation Changes in the Contiguous United States*. *PLOS ONE* 12(1): e016869.
- Khan, M. et. al. (2020) *Twenty-five Years of Adaptation Finance Through a Climate Justice Lens*. *Climate Change* 161: 251-269.
- Knaggard, A.; Persson, E. & Eriksson, K. (2020) *Sustainable Distribution of Responsibility for Climate Change Adaptation*. *Challenges* 11: 11 doi:10.3390/challe11010011
- Lauron, T. et. al. (2021) *Dangerous Distractions*. A Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung Report.
- Marquardt, J. (2020) *Fridays for Future's Disruptive Potential: An Inconvenient Youth Between Moderate and Radical Ideas*. *Frontiers in Communication* 5: 48.
- Masson-Delmotte, V. et. al. (eds.) (2020) *Climate Change and Land: An IPCC Special Report (Revised)*. IPCC.
- McCarthy, J.D. & Zaid, M.N. (1977) *Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory*. *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 1212-1241.
- McKie, R.E. (2021) *Obstruction, Delay, and Transnationalism: Examining the Online Climate Change Counter-Movement*. *Energy Research & Social Science* 80: 102217.
- Mitchell, I.; Ritchie, E. & Tahmasebi, A. (2021) *Is Climate Finance Towards \$100 Billion "New and Additional"?* Center for Global Development Policy Paper 205, Washington DC.
- Muguire, D. & Shaw, C. (2021) *Fair Energy Transition for All-Literature Review*. Climate Outreach Report. Oxford, England.
- Neier, H.; Neyer, J. & Radunsky, K. (2018) *International Climate Negotiations - Issues at Stake in View of the COP 24 UN Climate Change Conference in Katowice and Beyond*. European Parliament, Luxembourg.
- Olhoff, A. et. al. (2014) *The Adaption Gap Report - A Preliminary Assessment*. UNEP, Nairobi.
- Ornes, S. (2018) *How Does Climate Change Influence Extreme Weather?: Impact Attribution Research Seeks Answers*. *PNAS* 115: 8232-8235.
- Page, E.A. (2008) *Distributing the Burdens of Climate Change*. *Environmental Politics* 17: 556-575.
- Palomo, I. (2017) *Climate Change Impact on Ecosystem Services in High Mountain Areas: A Literature Review*. *Mountain Research and Development* 37: 172-187.
- Parry, M. et. al. (2007) *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pettit, J. (2009) *Climate Justice: A New Social Movement for Atmospheric Rights*. *IDS Bulletin*. 35: 102-106.
- Pichardo, N.A. (1988) *Resource Mobilization: An Analysis of Conflicting Theoretical Variations*. *The Sociological Quarterly* 29: 97-110.
- Pickering, J. & Barry, C. (2012) *On the Concept of Climate Debt: Its Moral and Political Value*. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 15: 667-685.
- Piven, F.F. & Cloward, R.A. (1991) *Collective Protest: A Critique of Resource Mobilization Theory*. *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society* 4: 435-458.
- Poortvliet, P.M. et. al. (2020) *Communicating Climate Change Risk: A Content Analysis of IPCC's Summary for Policymakers*. *Sustainability* 12, 4861.
- Porter, A.J. et. al (2018) *Organizing Authority in the Climate Change Debate: IPCC Controversies and the Management of Dialectical Tension*. *Organization Studies* 39: 873-898.

- Pottier, A. et. al. (2017) A Survey of Global Climate Justice: From Negotiation Stances to Moral Stakes and Back. *International Review of Environment and Resource Economics* 11: 1-53.
- Quinn-Thibodeau, T. & Wu, B. (2016) NGOs and the Climate Justice Movement in the Age of Trumpism. *Development* 59: 251-256.
- Randall, T.E. (2016) Climate Justice: A Literary Review. *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics* 9: 246-262.
- Rawls, J. (1971) *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Reed, A. (2020) *Juliana v. United States*. *Public Land & Resources Law Review* 0: 11.
- Reid, H. et. al. (2012) *Southern Voices on Climate Policy Choices: Analysis of and Lessons Learned from Civil Society Advocacy on Climate Change*. International Institute for Environment and Development, London.
- Rhodes, C.J. (2017) US Withdrawal from the COP 21 Paris Climate Change Agreement, and Its Possible Implications. *Science Progress* 100: 411-419.
- Rhodes, C.J. (2019) Only 12 Years Left to Readjust for the 1.5 Degrees Climate Change Option-Says International Panel on Climate Change Report: Current Commentary. *Science Progress* 102: 73-87.
- Rhodes, E. (2015) A Review of "Climate Justice: Vulnerability and Protection", By Henry Shue *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 22: Article 13.
- Rickwood, J. (2017) Lament, Poetic Prayer, Petition, and Protest: Community Choirs and Environmental Activism in Australia. *Musicultures* 44: 109-132.
- Roberts, J.T. & Parks, B. (2009) Ecological Unequal Exchange, Ecological Debt, and Climate Justice: The History and Implications of Three Related Ideas for a New Social Movement. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 50: 385-409.
- Rocha, M. et. al. (2015) Historical Responsibility for Climate Change - From Countries Emissions to Contribution to Temperature Increase. *Climate Analytics Report*.
- Rogelj, J. et. al. (2021) Three Ways to Improve Net-Zero Emissions Targets. *Nature* 591: 365-368.
- Schleussner, C. et. al. (2016) Differential Climate Impacts for Policy-relevant Limits to Global Warming: The Case of 1.5°C and 2°C. *Earth Systems Dynamics* 7: 327-351.
- Schlutz, A. (2018) Calls in the Desert: Peter Reading's Climate Change Poetry. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 25: 786-808.
- Schroeder, H. & Lovell, H. (2012) The Role of Non-nation-State Actors and Side Events in the International Climate Negotiations. *Climate Policy* 12: 23-37.
- Sen, A. & Dabi, N. (2021) *Tightening the Net: Net Zero Climate Targets - Implications for Land and Food Equity*, Oxfam International, Oxford, UK.
- Setzer, J. & Byrnes, R. (2020) *Global Trends in Climate Change Litigation: 2020 Snapshot*. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment and Centre for Climate Change Economics and Policy, London School of Economics and Political Science, London.
- Slobodian, L. (2020) *Defending the Future: Intergenerational Equity in Climate Litigation*. *Georgetown Environmental Law Review* 32: 569-589.
- Spier, J. (2020) The Strongest Climate Ruling Yet: The Dutch Supreme Court's Urgenda Judgment. *Netherlands International Law Review*. 67: 319-391.
- Strab-Senol, H. (2021) *Resisting Climate Change Apocalypticism: Environmental Justice Activism from the Southern Pacific*, Rachel Carson Center.
- Sun, Q. (2020) Analysis of the Characteristics and Impacts of Red Songs on Social Mobilization During the CCP Yan'an Period. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research* 517: 948-952.
- Taylor, L. & Elks, S. (2021) *Three Years of Greta Thunberg's Activism: Still Time to Change Our Climate Future*. Thomson Reuters Foundation News 20: August, 2021.

- Tilly, C. (1978) *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Timilsina, G.R. (2021) Financing Climate Change Adaptation: International Initiatives. *Sustainability* 13; 6515.
- Tokar, B. (2016) Movements for Climate Justice, in Dietz, M. & Heiko, G. (eds.) *Handbook of the Climate Change Movement*, Routledge.
- UNEP (2020) *Global Climate Litigation Report: 2020 Status Review*, UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya.
- UNFCCC (2006) *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Handbook*. Climate Change Secretariat. Bonn, Germany.
- United Nations (1992) *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. UN, New York.
- United Nations (1998) *Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. UN, New York.
- United Nations (2015) *Paris Agreement*. UN, New York.
- United Nations (2016) *Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action*. New York.
- United Nations (2021) *Nationally Determined Contributions Under the Paris Agreement Synthesis Report* By the Secretariat. New York, UN.
- Vanderheiden, S. (2011) *Climate Change and Collective Responsibility* in N.A. Vincent et. al. (eds.) *Moral Responsibility* DOI 10.1007/978-94-007.
- Viglione, G. (2020) Climate Law Suits Are Breaking New Legal Ground to Protect the Planet. *Nature* 579: 184-185.
- Wahlstrom, M. et. al. (2019) Protest for Future: Composition, Mobilization and Motives of the Participants in Fridays for Future Climate Protests on 15 March, 2019 in 13 European Cities. Retrieved from URL.
- Wahlstrom, M.; Wennerhag, M. & Rootes, C. (2013) Framing “The Climate Issue”: Patterns of Participation and Prognostic Frames Among Climate Summit Protesters. *Global Environmental Politics* 13: 101-122.
- Wewerinke-Singh, M. & McCoach, A. (2021) *The State of the Netherlands v. Urgenda Foundation: Distilling Best Practice and Lessons Learnt for Future Rights-based Climate Litigation*. *Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law* 30: 275-283.
- Whitmarsh, L. (2011) Skepticism and Uncertainty About Climate Change: Dimensions, Determinants and Change Over Time. *Global Environmental Change* 21: 690-700.
- Wilson, T. & Walton, R. (2019) *Extremism Rebellion: A Review of Ideology and Tactics*, Policy Exchange, London.
- Xu, C. et. al. (2020) Future of the Human Climate Niche. *PNAS*. 117: 11350-11355.

Table 1: IPCC Reports from Inception to 2021

Assessment Reports	Special Reports
• First Assessment, 1990 • Supplementary Report (To First Assessment), 1992. • Second Assessment, 1995. • Third Assessment, 2001. • Fourth Assessment, 2007. • Fifth Assessment, 2014. • Sixth Assessment, 2021.	• Emissions Scenarios, 2000. • Renewable Energy Sources, 2012. • Extreme Events & Disasters, 2012. • Global Warming of 1.5°C, 2018. • Climate Change & Land, 2019. • Ocean & Cryosphere, 2019.

Source: Compiled (from Various Sources) By Author

Table 2: Major Outcomes of COP Negotiations/Meetings from Inception in 1995 to 2021

COP No.	Year	Location	Outcome
1	1995	Berlin, Germany	• Agreed to accelerate negotiations on emission control.
2	1996	Geneva, Switzerland	• Agreed on Climate technology transfer from developed to less developed countries. • Agreed on effective implementation of UNFCCC. • Provided guidance to Global Environmental Facility.
3	1997	Kyoro, Japan	• First negotiated legal instrument of UNFCCC (Kyoto Protocol). Kyoto Protocol established principle of common but differentiated responsibility and obligation of reducing emissions by developed countries. • Agreed on “flexible” market-based mechanisms by developed countries to meet emission-reduction targets. • Established Clean Development Mechanism.
4	1998	Buenos Aires, Argentina	• Adopted Plan of Action on Implementation of Article 4 (8 & 9) of UNFCCC and 3.14 of Kyoto Protocol. • Reviewed implementation of commitments by Parties.
5	1999	Bonn, Germany	• Established Consultative Group of Experts on National Communication to improve communication. • Agreed on financial and technical support to developing countries to build capacity for implementation of UNFCCC.
6	2000	The Hague, Netherlands	• Negotiations collapsed. A number of controversial issues were discussed; e.g. USA introduced a controversial proposal to allow credit for Carbon sinks in forest and agricultural land.
7	2001	Marrakech, Morocco	• Marrakech Accord encompassing decisions resulted. • Agreed on need to bring Kyoto Protocol into force. • Finalised most of the details of Buenos Aires Plan of Action.

- | | | | |
|---|------|------------------|--|
| 8 | 2002 | New Delhi, India | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopted New Delhi Ministerial Declaration urging developed countries to transfer technology and minimize impact of climate change on developing countries. |
| 9 | 2003 | Milan, Italy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed use of Adaption Fund in developing countries for better results. • Agreed on use of Adaption Fund for capacity building in developing countries through technology transfer. |

COP

No.	Year	Location	Outcome
10	2004	Buenos Aires, Argentina	• Established Buenos Aires Plan of Action on effective climate adaptation by developing countries. • Discussed allocation of responsibility for emissions reduction.
11	2005	Montreal, Canada	• Agreed to extend the life of Kyoto Protocol beyond the 2012 expiration date. • Negotiated significant emissions reduction.
12	2006	Nairobi, Kenya	• Designed a five-year plan for more adaption support to developing countries. • Agreed on modalities for the Adaption Fund established in 2001.
13	2007	Bali, Indonesia	• Designed Bali Road Map and Bali Action Plan for “fully effective and sustained implementation of UNFCCC.
14	2008	Pozna, Poland	• Established Pozna Strategic Programme involving technology transfer, refinement of Clean Development Mechanism and amendment of Kyoto Protocol Compliance Committee procedures.
15	2009	Copenhagen, Denmark	• Established goal of mobilizing 100 billion dollars yearly by 2020 for developing country climate funding. • Set goal of limiting global average temperature to not more than 2°C above pre-industrial era. • Put forward need for Green Climate Fund. • Deadlock on many issues.
16	2010	Cancun, Mexico	• Establishment of Green Climate Fund. • Emphasized the need for a legally binding successor of the Kyoto Protocol.
17	2011	Durban, South Africa	• Adapted Durban Platform for Enhanced Action which established a process to negotiate “a treaty, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force”.
18	2012	Doha, Qatar	• Introduced amendment to Kyoto Protocol and extended its life.

			• Agreed to address “loss and damage” issues of developing countries.
19	2013	Warsaw, Poland	• Established Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage. • Agreed to intensify preparation of Intended Nationally Determine Contribution.
COP No.	Year	Location	Outcome
20	2014	Lima, Peru	• Agreed on further guidelines on Intended Nationally Determined Contribution.
21	2015	Paris, France	• Emergence of Paris Agreement establishing legally binding commitments for all countries. • Agreed to limit increase in temperature to less than 2°C of pre-industrial era and pursuing a goal of not more than 1.5°C. • Established a number of principles to guide the accounting of emissions and emission reduction. • Built in principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibility.
22	2016	Marrakech, Morocco	• Launched Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement through collaboration between State and non-State actors. • Provided guidelines for successful implementation of Paris Agreement.
23	2017	Bonn, Germany	• Launched Clearing House for Risk Transfer to assist vulnerable countries have affordable insurance. • Emergence of Coal Phase-Out Alliance.
24	2018	Katowice, Poland	• Agreed on Paris Rule Book, an operating manual for the Paris Agreement, dealing with issues such as how Parties should report their emissions and contribution to climate finance.
25	2019	Madrid, Spain	• Agreed to bring improved emissions reduction plans of Parties to next COP, i.e. COP 26.
26	2021	Glasgow, Scotland	• Recognised the urgent need to mobilize more climate finance. • Agreed to implement strategies to minimized and address loss and damage from climate change in developing countries. • Reaffirmed the 1.5°C temperature goal of Paris Agreement and called for urgent action. • Urged accelerated efforts to “phase-down” coal power and inefficient fossil fuel subsidies.

Source: Compiled (from various sources) by Author.

Table 3: Sample of Songs on Climate Change and Climate Justice

S/No.	Title	Artist	Focus/Critical Lines
1	Save Our Planet Earth	Jimmy Cliff	You better stop bursting the ozone layer. Stop disturbing atmosphere. Stop polluting the air.
2	When the North Pole Melts	Captain Sea Level Rise	Want to tell you about the greenhouse effect and a little ozone hole. The Sahara Desert now has grown to the entire continent.
3	Feels Like Summer	Childish Gambino	Every day gets hotter than the one before.
4	Kyoto Now	Bad Religion	Kyoto Now! The arid torpor of inaction will be our demise.
5	Global Warming Day	Breaking Laces	It's Global Warming Day. You're gonna wanna change when everyone is baked.
6	Hot Zoo	Adrian Belew	Walk through heat wave afternoon. Fast food, hot zoo ... Waste here souvenir land.
7	The Time They Are A-Changin	Bob Dylan	Come gather 'round people, wherever the roam. And admit that the waters around you have grown.
8	Pollution	Tom Lehner	Pollution, Pollution. Just go out for a breath of air. And you'll be ready for Medicare.
9	Global Warming	Steel Pulse	Mother Nature Calls. A weeping cloud above with acid rain. The smell of the pollution poison in the water.
10	4 Degrees	Anohni	I wanna see this world. I wanna see it boil.
11	Global Warming	Pitbull	Take this as a, take this a warming. Well come to, welcome to global warming.
12	All I want for Christmas	Macy Gray	So please take care of the environment ... Do what you can to stop global warming.
13	Star	Smash Mouth	Judging by the hole in the Satellite photograph, the ice we skate is getting pretty thin. The water is getting warm ... My world's on fire.
14	Pollution	Bo Diddley	Pollution, Pollution. Now jet planes line-up in the sky. Pretty soon we all going to die.
15	Global Warming	Niyorah	

Global Warming, the cry is out. The Earth is getting hotter without a doubt. The glaciers are melting in the north and south.

Source: Conceptualized and Compiled (from Several Sources) by Author.

Table 4: Sample of Poems on Climate Change and Climate Justice

S/No.	Title	Author	Focus/Critical Lines
1	Climate Justice and Food Sovereignty Now.	Elizabeth Mpofu.	Seasons have changed. Now ... Hotter, drier and shorter. Winds and storms harsher and destructive.
2	Climate of Change.	George The Poet.	And in the case of Climate Change a good place to start is Science.
3	Sea-Rise.	John Englander.	In Greenland, Antarctica and beyond, the ice is melting. Great glaciers gradually soften, gravity guides them surely to sea.
4	Climate Change, the Measure of Our Times.	John Pepper Clark.	Today in our race on wings of fire, ... we of the earth ... seem dead set to torch the world ...
5	Global Warming.	Kira.	Burning hot temperatures. More gases in our air ... The Earth will need a fan or two.
6	Thirteen ways of Looking at a Glacier	Cray Santos Perez.	The Sea is rising. The glacier must be retreating.
7	Warned.	Sylvia Stults.	Now damned, Obscured, Pollution's haze. One can't blame pollution alone.
8	Dear Matafele Peinam.	Kathy Jetnil-Kijiner.	I want to tell you about that Lagoon ... Men say that one day it will gnaw at the Shoreline Chew at the roots of your breadfruit trees gulp down rows of your seawalls.
9	How's My Coal?	Simon Barraclough.	How is my Oil faring? It keeps best underground, in the dark.
10	Can't Live Without Hummus.	Francisco Ferreyra.	I didn't really care at first about things like global warming. It's bad enough the sea will rise.
11	Evening		
12	How to Let go of the World	Dorianne Laux	
13	A sense of Denial	Franny Choi	

14		Dorothea Smartt	We know the land is disappearing beneath the sea, iselands swallowed like pre-historic fish.
15	Together United	Stefan Nicholson	There is a documentary about climate change ... I cried when I saw the photos of bleached reefs.
16	Letter to Noah's Wife	Maya O. Popa	Denial is the burning smell of toast. Or the blacked burnt-out wreck of once upon Ogoni Land ... Morning traffic fumes smog clogging a child's breath.
	4 Degrees Celsius Up	Peter Reading	For you know the seas will surely rise ... but there will never be an answer. I'm not a vegetarian, shop plastic, use an air conditioner. Is this what happens before it all goes fluvial? 4 degrees Celsius up, 40 years on: Antarctic glacier meltdown, ergo, sea level risen (albeit: most marine life extinct).

Source: Conceptualized and Compiled (from Several Sources) by Author.

Table 5: Notable Pro-Climate Justice Protests, 2000-2020

S/No.	Date	Organizers	Character of Participants	Estimated No. of Participants	Nature of Protest
1	November 20, 2000.	Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace & other groups.	Mixed.	Tens of Thousands.	Mainly protest involving drumming, catcalls, whilstling and addresses outside The Hague Congress hall where COP 6 was meeting.
2	October 25, 2002.	Several Climate Justice Groups.	Mixed; Children and Youth prominent.	Hundreds.	Rallies around COP 8 meeting venue in New Delhi. Children and youth dressed in colourful costumes chanting slogans. Carried placards, condemning U.S.A's refusal to be part of Kyoto Accord. Prominent placards read: "Earth has fever. Dr. Bush is ill".
3	February 12, 2005.	Several Climate Justice Groups.	Mixed.	Hundreds of Thousands.	Rallies, Talks. Particularly in London, Brussels & Kyoto to mark coming into force of Kyoto Accord next few days on February.
4	December 3, 2005.	Several Climate Justice Groups.	Mixed.	Hundreds of Thousands.	Demonstrations and Rallies all over Cities of the World coinciding with COP 11 in Montreal.
5	November 4, 2006.	Several Climate Justice Groups.	Mixed.	Hundreds of Thousands.	Largely Street Demonstrations and Rallies, coinciding with COP 12 in Nairobi. Activities all over the world. Noteworthy was "Walks Against Warming in Several Australian Cities". "I Count Rally" in London by Stop Climate Chaos.
6	December 8, 2007.	Several Climate Justice Groups.	Mixed.	Hundreds of Thousands.	Street demonstrations, talks and rallies during COP 13 in Bali. Climate activities also produced Bali Declaration calling for action on Climate Change.
7	December 6, 2008.	Several, Friends of the Earth, Indigenous Peoples	Mixed.	Hundreds of Thousands in more than 60 Countries.	Demonstrations, parades, talks & meetings in various cities during COP 14 in Poznan, Poland. In addition, representative of indigenous

		Environmental Coalition & Accra Caucus on Forests & Climate Change prominent.				people, local Communities and NGOs submitted a partition condemning the non-cooperation of USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
S/No.	Date	Organizers	Character of Participants	Estimated No. of Participants	Nature of Protest	
8	December 12, 2009.	Coalition of NGOs: The Global Campaign for Climate Action.	Mixed.	Hundreds of Thousands. In Copenhagen itself more than 100,000.	Street demonstrations, rallies, talks, candle light vigils, during COP 15. Activists organized “alternative Climate Summit”.	
9	December 4, 2010.		Mixed.			
10	December 3, 2011.	Coalition of Climate groups.	Mixed.	Tens of Thousands globally.	Demonstrations, rallies and talks not only in Cancun, Mexico, venue of COP 16 but all over the world. For instance, “March for Zero Carbon Britain”. In London “Sing for the Climate” event in Brussels.	
11	November 24, 2012.	Several climate groups, such as Greenpeace, 350.org and Several African groups.	Mixed.	Hundreds of Thousands all over the world.	Demonstrations, activists singing traditional South African freedom songs. Speeches, signing and presentation of petitions. Chanting slogans in the COP 17 venue in Durban. Common Slogans were “Listen to the People Not the Polluters”, “Don’t Kill Africa”, “Stand Strong Africa”. The demonstrations were largely in solidarity with Africa and Small Islands.	
12	November 13, 2013.	Several groups. Asian	Mixed.	Tens of Thousands all over the global.		
13	September 21, 2014.	groups, such as Arab Youth Climate Movement very active.	Mixed.			
		Several Groups. Greenpeace particularly active.		Tens of Thousands all over the world.	Demonstrations mainly in COP 18 revue in Doha. Chanting of slogans, such as “Time for Climate Action”.	
				Hundreds of Thousands globally. About	Street demonstrations particularly around venue of COP 19 in Warsaw. As part of	

People's
Climate
Movement.

311,000 in New
York.

action Greenpeace activists
protested on September 18
against Arctic oil drilling at an
oil platform off coast of
northern Russia.

A response to a Climate
meeting of world leaders
expected to hold in New York
on September 23. Street
protests, symposia and
chanting.

S/No.	Date	Organizers	Character of Participation	Estimated No. of Participants	Nature of Protests
14	December 11, 2014.	Several Groups, Greenpeace and South America groups particularly active.	Mixed.	Tens of Thousands globally.	Street demonstrations calling for clean energy in Lima venue of COP 20. Peruvian indigenous people demonstrated against destruction of their forests. Petition by children.
15	November 29, 2015.		Mixed.	Hundreds of Thousands globally.	Demonstrations marking COP 21 in Paris. Rallies, talks and petitions. Chanting of slogans "Keep Fossil Fuels in the Ground", "Just Transition to Renewable Energy".
16	December 10, 2016.	Several Groups.	Mixed.		Street demonstrations in several British Cities Singing of Carols; sending of Christmas carols to MPs and the Prime Minister. The slogan of protest was "All we want for Christmas is Climate Action!".
17	April 29, 2017.	Campaign Against Climate Change.	Mixed.	Thousands in several British cities.	The street protests, against Trump's environmental/climate change policies, were on Trump's 100 days in office. In Washington, the focus was around the White House. The typical chant was "Trump's Residence" is here to stay, welcome into your 100 day.
18	June 1, 2017.	People's Climate Movement.	Mixed.	Tens of Thousands in Washington and U.S.A. Cities.	Street demonstrations, talks, petitions against President Trump's plan to withdraw U.S.A. from Paris Agreement. The dominant slogans were "Trump: Climate Disaster"; "Trump: Climate Genocide".
19	December 3, 2018.	Campaign Against Climate Change.	Mixed.	Thousands. Mainly in British and American Cities.	Demonstrations in several cities to coincide with COP 24 in Katowice, Poland.
		Several Groups. Extinction Rebellion was prominent.		Tens of Thousands globally.	

Protests in Brussels, London, Berlin and Cologne. The organizers christened protest “Claim the Climate” march. There was a lot of emphasis on checking emission.

S/No.	Date	Organizers	Character of Participation	Estimated No. of Participants	Nature of Protests
20	September 20, 2019.	Fridays For Future (School Strike).	School Children and Youth.	More than 4 million globally.	School children not going to school in some days, particularly Fridays to urge action on Climate Change. Placard-carrying march, set-in protests, speeches notably by the Swedish teenager. Greta Thunberg, using slogan such as “Our House is on Fire”, “This is an Emergency”.
21	January 3, 2020.	Fridays for Future.	Students all over the world.	Several millions.	Not attending classes one day each week for several weeks to urge action on climate change.
22	September 25, 2020	Several Groups.	Mixed.	Tens of Thousands all over the world.	Street demonstrations, rallies to mark. Global Day

					of Action for Climate Justice.
23	November 19, 2020	Youth Climate Justice Groups.	Youth.	Hundreds globally.	As a protest against the postponement of COP 26, more than 330 young individuals from several countries organized a virtual mock COP. Eighteen action policies, which are expected to be presented to world leaders, emerged. The "COP" ended December 1, 2020.

Source: Conceptualized and Compiled (from several sources) by Author.

Table 6: Notable Pro-Climate Justice Slogans/Chants

S/No.	Slogans/Chants	Instance of Use
1	Climate Justice Now!	During protests in COP 13 in Bali, December 2007 and COP 15, December 2009 in Copenhagen. One of the most popular, is now the name of a network of Climate justice organisations.
2	Warning! Global Warming.	Demonstrations during COP 13 in Bali, December 2007.
3	Climate Change leads To Hell.	Demonstrations during COP 13 in Bali, December 2007.
4	The Climate is Changing, Why Aren't We?	Demonstrations during COP 13 in Bali, December 2007.
5	There is No Planet B.	Demonstrations during COP 13 in Bali, December 2007.
6	You Had a Future, So Should We!	Demonstration by Fridays For Future (School Strike). Activists in New York, September 2019.
7	Climate Emergency Now	Fridays For Future Demonstration in Nairobi, Kenya, September 2019.
8	Stop The Global Pyromania	Fridays For Future Demonstration in Berlin, Germany, September 2019.
9	Dead Planet Soon, Act Now!	Fridays For Future Demonstration in Quezon City, Philippines, September 2019.
10	Don't Let Us Drown.	Greenpeace Activists Protest During COP 6 in The Hague, Netherlands, November 2000.
11	Nature Does Not Compromise.	Demonstration of Activists During COP 15 in Copenhagen, December 2009.
12	Don't Nuke The Climate	

13	Keep It (Fossil Fuel) In The Ground	Demonstration of Activists in Washington, November 2015, a few days to COP 21 in Paris, France.
14	Keep The Oil In The Soil	Demonstration of Activists in Washington, November 2015, a Few days to COP 21 in Paris, France.
15	• System Change, Not Climate Change. • Change the System, Not the Climate. • Change the Politics Not the Climate	Climate Activists Demonstration in Ottawa, Canada. June, 2018.
16	We Are Not Sinking, We are fighting.	Demonstration of Activists During COP 15 in Copenhagen, December 2000.
17	Be A Part of The Solution, Not Part of The Pollution.	Demonstration by Youth, September 2019, in Pacific Island of Kirabati.
18	My House Is On Fire, Act Now!	Youth Activists Demonstration in New Delhi, India, September 2019.
		Demonstration by Activists during COP 17 in Durban, South Africa, December 2011.
S/No. Slogans/Chants Instance of Use		
19	Polluter Must Pay.	Demonstration by Activists during COP 17 in Durban, South Africa, December 2011.
20	Raise Your Voice, Not The Sea Level.	Fridays For Future Demonstration in Athens, Greece, September 2019.
21	Make The Planet Green Again.	Fridays For Future Demonstration in Athens, Greece, September 2019.
22	The Empty Promises Are the Same, The Lies Are the Same, And the Inaction is The Same.	Fridays For Future Demonstration in New York, U.S.A., September 2019.
23	Carbon Murder.	Demonstration by Activists during COP 6 in The Hague, November 2000.

Source: Conceptualized and Compiled (from Several Sources) By Author.

Table 7: Friday School Strikes by Fridays for Future, 2018-2021

Dates	No. of Countries	No. of Cities	No. of People Involved
	Involved	Involved	
30 Nov. 2018	9	147	26,777
15 March 2019	133	2,362	2,284,115
24 May 2019	127	1,989	752,086
20 Sept. 2019	155	3,849	3,466,308
27 Sept. 2019	150	2,269	3,762,670
29 Nov. 2019	133	2,159	1,192,031
6 Dec. 2019	116	1,228	523,424
24 April 2020	71	370	286,540
25 Sept. 2020	93	794	286,169
26 March 2021	51	365	115,902
7 May 2021	53	400	115,366
20 August 2021	65	303	2,738
27 August, 2021	66	311	1,242
3 Sept. 2021	67	321	1,491
24 Sept. 2021*	78	629	NA
22 Oct. 2021*	61	230	NA
29 Oct. 2021*	60	220	NA
5 Nov. 2021*	60	217	NA

Note: * = planned; NA = Not available.

Source: Website of Fridays for Future (Down-loaded, 8 September, 2021).