



New directions in climate justice? A dialogue between critical climate justice and policy studies scholars

Andrea Schapper^{*}, Paul Cairney^{id}, Neil J. W. Crawford^{id}, Clemens Hoffmann, Hyeyoon Park, Hannes Stephan

All: Division of History, Heritage, And Politics, Pathfoot Building, University of Stirling, FK94LA, UK

ABSTRACT

New directions in just climate policymaking can emerge from the dialogue between critical climate justice and policy studies scholars. Current climate justice research presents a strong and coherent message about the scale and urgency of climatic challenges, historical responsibilities, colonialism, systemic inequalities, intersectionality and the role of recognition, procedural, and distributional justice-driven solutions. However, it struggles to explain how to overcome profound gaps between aspiration and reality. In this Perspective, we bring insights from critical climate justice scholars and policy scholars into conversation. Policy theories help us explain gaps between high ambitions but low progress towards policymaking integration and policy coherence for climate justice. However, they focus largely on evidence from Western countries and struggle to harness wider international insights on policy innovation, with the potential to largely contribute to a doom spiral. We use the example of non-anthropocentric policymaking and planetary justice approaches to explore this dialogue on drivers and barriers to change.

1. Introduction

Despite the wealth of climate justice research in various disciplines, we still lack knowledge on how to overcome the gap between normative climate justice demands and creating just climate policies. This literature demonstrates that justice claims need to be considered when designing climate policies, such as distributional, recognition, restorative, procedural, corrective and social justice. However, we can find few government policies translating justice into practice. There is considerable evidence of innovation in grassroots policies, for example those practiced by Indigenous communities (Aránguiz Mesías and Till-eczek, 2025), or policies emerging from transformative, non-anthropocentric legal innovations, such as rights of nature (Kauffman and Martin, 2021). However, there is minimal evidence that governments are learning and scaling up from success.

In this *Perspective* piece, we establish a continuous dialogue between research on essential policy change and on the barriers and facilitators to change for establishing (more) just climate policies. Insights from public policy theories help us understand why we do not see the radical change that is demanded in climate justice scholarship. Concepts like bounded rationality, policy complexity, policy integration and coherence help to explain why climate justice demands often do not translate into policy changes or outcomes. Insights from climate justice inform debates on how to respond, such as to generate new ideas and seek new ways to influence outcomes.

We use this iterative dialogue between critical climate justice and policy studies scholars to develop three scenarios of just climate policymaking: an incremental approach, a reformist approach, and a radical approach. This dialogue helps to explain the lack of substantive just climate policies to date but also identifies sources of innovation and new forms of collaboration between the human and the more-than-human world.

2. Insights from climate justice research

Climate justice scholarship is based on critical interdisciplinary insights from Green Political Theory and Philosophy, Political Ecology and Political Economy, Law and Social Movement Studies, among others. The literature emphasises that those states (but also social groups within countries) who are historically the least responsible for greenhouse gas emissions and have the fewest resources to adapt, are often most affected by and most vulnerable to climate change consequences (Schlosberg, 2007). Scholarly reflections on climate justice discuss how just relations between states, societies and generations in the context of climatic challenges can be established (Page and Edward, 2006; Shue, 2014). At the same time, critical demands voiced by the environmental justice movement have informed interdisciplinary scholarship (Bullard, 2001) and called attention to the fact that climate change and climate policies, for example large-scale renewable energy projects, often exacerbate socio-economic inequalities within societies (Schapper and

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: andrea.schapper@stir.ac.uk (A. Schapper), p.a.cairney@stir.ac.uk (P. Cairney).

Urban, 2021).

The character of justice relations discussed in the literature varies with respect to scale, temporal dimension, actors involved, and normative political claims. More recently, justice relations between the human and the more-than-human world have been discussed (planetary injustice) (Biermann and Kalfagianni, 2020; Pedersen et al., 2024).

Critical climate justice scholarship reflects on historical responsibilities (Coolsaet et al., 2024), including climate coloniality (Sultana, 2025), ecocidal capitalism (Surprise, 2024), structural injustice (Eckersley, 2016), racial discrimination (Gonzalez, 2021), as well as climate action and knowledge in/from the Global South (Crawford et al., 2023) and gender inequality and intersectionality (Mikulewicz et al., 2023).

Normative considerations have, for a long time, dominated climate justice scholarship. These often draw on the four-part characterisation of environmental justice proposed by Kuehn (2000). This characterisation comprises (a) distributive justice; (b) procedural justice; (c) corrective justice; and (d) social justice (Kuehn, 2000). Distributive justice requires equal treatment and equal access to resources, while procedural justice requires the participation of all stakeholders in decisions that affect them. Corrective justice requires punishing wrongdoers and remedying harm inflicted on individuals and communities. Social justice comprises an analysis of how groups within society are affected by climate change and climate policies in different ways (Kuehn, 2000). In addition, (e) recognitional justice requires that contexts and needs, including historical, regional and cultural factors, of those affected by climate change and climate policies are adequately acknowledged (Preston and Carr, 2018). Furthermore, (f) transitional justice considers how to design decarbonisation processes to limit adverse justice impacts on vulnerable groups (Abram, 2022) and (g) restorative justice focuses on repairing and restoring climate change related damages, including historical emissions and resource extraction (Robinson and Carlson, 2021). Whereas various climate justice scholars have emphasised different dimensions of justice, many have been considered to complement each other. Overall, there are different ways of defining just climate policies and scholars emphasise varying aspects when evaluating whether climate policies are just.

Only in recent years, more empirical climate justice research has been conducted focusing on specific country case studies and the justice impacts of climate policies (Hoang et al., 2018) or using certain elements or dimensions of climate justice, such as intergenerational (Knappe and Renn, 2022) or procedural justice (Klöck et al., 2025), as a benchmark for analysis.

3. Insights from public policy

The contribution from policy theories is to identify evergreen barriers to the pursuit of rapid, radical, and well-integrated or coherent changes to policy and policymaking (Cairney et al., 2023). Policy theories promote a conceptual shift from a tendency in climate justice research to identify: (1) the radical change that they want to see in the world (e.g. to shift from neoliberal to social justice driven policy), and (2) what they require of policymaking to that end (e.g. to produce a new policy mix, including higher state intervention to redistribute resources and regulate business and social behaviour), but (3) a lack of political will to overcome resistance from vested interests. Given that approach to policy and policymaking, climate justice research focuses on the need for new forms of political activity, including organisation and collaboration, to foster a new dominant social justice discourse, and to mainstream climate justice across policymaking to produce a whole-of-government approach to policy integration (Cairney, 2025). Yet, it also identifies a major gap between these aspirations and reality.

An essential response to this problem is to treat the policy process as a well-researched object of study, not a 'black box' translating what climate justice advocates seek into a new and coherent policy mix. To that end, policy theory research focuses on two general concepts:

1. *Bounded rationality*, or the cognitive and organisational limits to gathering and using information to make policy (Simon, 1976). Policy theories examine the multiple ways in which policymakers respond, such as to devote disproportionate attention to problems and information on their size and severity (Baumgartner et al., 2023); and, interpret problems through the lens of deeply held beliefs, such as when deciding which social groups deserve rewards or punishments (Schneider et al., 2014) or forming part of one advocacy coalition competing with actors with competing beliefs (Norstedt et al., 2023).
2. *Policy complexity*. A focus on 'policymaking environments' highlights multiple concepts to describe the actors making or influencing policy across multiple venues; rules and norms of each venue; relationships between policymakers and groups in networks or subsystems; dominant ways to frame problems in each venue; and, the socio-economic conditions or events that constrain or facilitate change. A focus on 'complex policymaking systems' highlights their often-unpredictable dynamics, including bouts of positive and negative feedback, sensitivity to initial conditions, and a tendency for policy outcomes to 'emerge' from systems (Cairney, 2020).

Their common focus is on the absence of one single powerful centre of policymaking, able to process all information and translate it into a coherent and well-integrated and coordinated response to policy problems. Rather, policymaking is characterised by many policymakers responding to problems beyond their understanding, operating in policymaking environments beyond their control, largely in subsystems processing one part of a problem, and contributing one of many policy instruments that contribute to an overall mix. The result is an unclear connection between policy intentions and outcomes, even when policymakers express a sincere commitment to fostering climate justice.

In that context, it is imperative to ask: *how would radical policy change happen?* Common ideas include: paradigm change following profound policy failure and the loss of confidence in a dominant idea or coalition; policy punctuations akin to a pressure dam effect in which the effort required to overcome institutional resistance produces profound change; a 'window of opportunity' to select a new policy strategy or instrument; 'emergence', such as changes to systemic behaviour or outcomes; gradual changes with long-term transformative effects; or, change via collaboration and innovation to address collective action problems (Hall, 1993; Baumgartner et al., 2023; Herweg et al., 2023; Nohrstedt et al., 2023; Streeck and Thelen, 2005; Ostrom, 1990).

4. Dialogue between insights from climate justice and public policy

Policy theories explain why the shift from normative climate justice to designing and implementing just climate policies is particularly challenging. Despite the bulk of existing information, policymakers do not pay enough attention to climate justice concerns and make short-term cost-benefit calculations and prioritise economic interests. These decisions occur in a policymaking environment consisting of many venues, each with a multitude of governmental and non-governmental actors, pursuing different beliefs, rules, norms regarding how to define and address climate justice. These insights help to explore the effect of an absence of one single powerful centre dedicated to climate justice policymaking. In the UNFCCC Conferences of the Parties (COPs), a large range of actors from the Global South and North, including governments, Indigenous Peoples, civil society and business representatives come together to address climate justice issues. Although proposed as a mean for unanimous decisions, a consensus does not do justice to all stakeholders affected. Further, the agreement is not substantively binding on countries responsible for policy outcomes. Policymaking integration and policy coherence is the aim (Pickering, 2023) but fragmentation and incoherence is the norm (Zelli and van Asselt, 2013; Cairney, 2025).

In that context, can climate justice and policy research combine to inform more positive accounts of current and future progress? This project begins by noting that policy theories are currently mainly focused on empirical evidence from the Global North, with three implications. First, it neglects the structural economic and social inequalities, intersectional and colonial legacies that need to be more strongly considered for sustainable and just climate policymaking. Second, it does not fully account for promising sources of policy innovation and progress beyond the Northern norm. For example, important examples of just climate policies can be found among Indigenous communities, fostering local or grassroots policy change (Mesías et al., 2025). Here, the dialogue may focus on concerns in policy theory that such initiatives are not replicable or transferable across scales or contexts, but also wider insights that question why scaling up the same initiatives to national levels is essential.

Third, policy theories often seem conservative (or pragmatic) and their role in ambitious future thinking is unclear. Climate justice requires a greater focus on how to envisage major policy change in the near and distant future. A key example is work on planetary justice (Pedersen et al., 2024; Celermajer et al., 2021; Biermann and Kalfagianni, 2020), in which the environment or elements of nature are considered as actors in their own right (Schapper et al., 2022). Important examples of non-anthropocentric approaches to climate justice are rights of nature or the granting of legal personhood to ecosystems, as can be observed in New Zealand, India, Bolivia, Columbia, Ecuador and Spain (Kauffman and Martin, 2021; Follette et al., 2020). Such examples of new forms of collaboration – including between the human and non-human world – should prompt new dialogue and encourage policy scholars to consider wider perspectives.

5. Three scenarios for just climate policymaking

We outline three scenarios to focus this scholarly dialogue on action to inform future policy change. It moves us from explanations of limited change from the ‘top’ towards comparisons of feasible future scenarios and greater consideration of non-traditional sources of policy innovation and change.

The **first approach is pragmatic and incremental**, emphasising the ‘art of the possible’ within existing political systems and establishing the means to produce policy change. Learn from what has worked or not so far, such as to compare change processes driven by governments, voluntary international agreements backed by obligations, courts, social movements, innovations in participatory and deliberative democracy, and other actors or collaborations at multiple levels of policymaking.

This approach prioritises policy measures to reach a political consensus in the short term while strategically limiting opposition and backlash. The current mainstream of global climate finance policies follows this tendency. One of the most prominent directions is upscaling climate finance through broadening the contributor base, particularly via mobilising private finance (or ‘blended’ finance consisting of both public and private finance). Following this line, during COP29 in Baku, member states agreed to scale up to USD 1.3 trillion per year by diversifying climate finance sources to meet developing countries’ demands (UNFCCC, 2024).

Many global policymakers (e.g., the World Bank or IMF) promote this strategy as the most realistic solution for an effective climate policy outcome (Gordon, 2023), also in terms of distributive climate justice. However, critical scholars argue that increasing private investors’ engagement could lead to other injustice situations, including: more debt for Global South countries, and the imbalance between financing mitigation and adaptation (or loss and damage) projects because these actors pursue loan-based, profitable, and bankable projects to maximise their economic profits (Pauw et al., 2022). There is another concern that the focus on private finance could weaken the legal obligation of developed countries’ publicly funded commitments (IISD, 2024).

The **second approach is reformist of the current situation**,

emphasising the need to reject the usual way of doing things in favour of enforcing policy change on sovereign governments in the absence of voluntary agreement, drive policy through grassroots social movements, or otherwise replace, reform and improve the policymaking systems that are contributing to the very problems they are responsible for solving. One example is climate litigation, which is often initiated and driven by civil society and is forcing governments to substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions (Savaresi et al., 2014). The *Urgenda Climate Case* (2015–2019) in the Netherlands and *Neubauer v. Germany* (2021) are, among others, successful cases that have led to governmental climate policy change (Bartmann et al., 2023). Both cases include references to intergenerational justice in the court rulings and can also be considered as an operationalisation of other normative justice principles, including social justice and recognitional justice. Further, non-anthropocentric approaches to rights of nature and ecosystems have, in the past, led to more just and sustainable decisions, pointing to a shift towards planetary justice approaches (Celermajer et al., 2021; Biermann and Kalfagianni, 2020). All of these are examples of initially successful policy changes, in which legal (human rights and rights of nature) monitoring and enforcement mechanisms are used to achieve more climate justice. Here, the aim for policy theories is to harness insights from research on integration and coherence to anticipate and help actors respond to major barriers to the maintenance and delivery of such initiatives and consider how each new initiative contributes to a climate justice policy mix.

The **third approach is more radical in relation to the global political economy**. It involves scenario generation to identify feasible future economic and political systems, anticipate their dynamics, and design responses in that context. Here, the assumption is that the norms, expectations, and practices that we currently take for granted will need to be transformed. Radical solutions involve a change in the global political economic structures underlying both emissions, as well as socio-economic and environmental injustices. They critique conventional notions of economic growth, measured in individual states’ GDP, as the key benchmark for human well-being and social progress (Fressoz and Bonneuil, 2017). Such aims exacerbate the increasing extraction and burning of fossil fuel and other environmentally damaging practices such as ‘land grabs’ (Exner, 2013). Decarbonisation policies, too, are frequently seen as part of a damaging global capital accumulation regime, which still requires the extraction of resources in the form of minerals and rare earths (Wanner, 2015). Some demand the transformation of capitalism altogether (Tetreault, 2017). More concrete and increasingly recognised policy solutions are based on ‘post-growth’ and ‘degrowth’ economics (Kallis et al., 2012). These suggest that environmental and climate justice can only be achieved through different conceptualisations of socio-economic reproduction that give up on competitive growth (Sandberg et al., 2019). Although a transformation of capitalism and growth is a more radical scenario, which is less likely to materialise, the potential for achieving more distributive, social and intergenerational climate justice via such fundamental change would be substantial.

6. Perspective and conclusion

A dialogue between insights from public policy and climate justice research helps us understand not only why we expect most policy change to be minimal and find few opportunities for reformist change, but also to envisage more diverse and effective sources of innovation in the future. Concepts like bounded rationality and policymaking complexity initially help to explain the absence of one single powerful centre of policymaking and a lack of policymaking integration and policy coherence, but could be repurposed to boost such aims.

Research on concepts such as ‘windows of opportunity’ can be applied to new developments like the recognition of the new International Human Right to a Healthy Environment, which could potentially lead to the creation of climate rights and, therefore, could lead the way to just climate policies. Further, studies of gradual but transformative

change could help to analyse the shift to planetary justice approaches (Pedersen et al., 2024; Biermann and Kalfagianni, 2020), which could have transformative effects in the long run. This shift to non-anthropocentric policymaking as well as some of the more radical political economy approaches, like post-growth, have yet to be captured by policy theories but are certainly required for just and sustainable climate policymaking in the future.

More attention needs to be paid to bottom-up approaches in just climate policymaking. Despite the lack of just climate policies at the international level, which would require unanimous approval in the COPs, there are interesting community-based experiences of implementing policies that foster climate justice. Promising projects relate to local food sovereignty (Routledge, 2011), intergenerational repairing practices among Indigenous groups (Aránguiz Mesías and Tilleczeck 2025) and low-carbon energy transitions (Mundaca et al., 2018). Such grassroots level activities can lead to translocal climate justice solidarities (Routledge, 2011) or transcalar advocacy, potentially transferring local justice experiences to the international climate negotiations (Schapper and Dee, 2024). More attention should be paid to learning from these bottom-up experiences for just climate policymaking at the domestic and international levels.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Andrea Schapper: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Conceptualization. **Paul Cairney:** Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization. **Neil J. W. Crawford:** Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization. **Clemens Hoffmann:** Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization. **Hyeyoon Park:** Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization. **Hannes Stephan:** Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

References

- Abram, Simone, 2022. Just transition: a whole-systems approach to decarbonisation. In: Atkins, Alex Dietzel, Jenkins, Kirsten, Kiamba, Lorna, Kirshner, Joshua, Kreienkamp, Julia, Parkhill, Karen, Pegram, Tom, Santos Ayllón, Lara M. (Eds.), *Clim. Policy* 22 (8), 1033–1049.
- Bartmann, Marius, Halsband, Aurélie, Schapper, Andrea, 2023. Climate justice: ethical aspects and policy aspects. *Ethik in den Biowissenschaften*. Baden-Baden: Verlag Karl Alber 26.
- Baumgartner, Frank, Jones, Bryan, Mortensen, Peter, 2023. Punctuated equilibrium theory: explaining stability and change in public policymaking. In: Weible, Christopher (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process*. Routledge, London, pp. 65–99.
- Biermann, Frank, Kalfagianni, Agni, 2020. Planetary justice: a research framework. *Earth Sys. Governance* 6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100049>, 100049.
- Bullard, Robert, 2001. Environmental Justice in the 21st Century: Race Still Matters. Cairney, Paul, 2020. *Understanding Public Policy*. Red Globe, London.
- Cairney, Paul, 2025. Why perfect policy coherence is unattainable (and may be ill-advised). *Policy Sci.* 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-025-09582-9>.
- Cairney, Paul, Timonina, Irina, Stephan, Hannes, 2023. How can policy and policymaking foster climate justice? A qualitative systematic review. *Open Res. Europe* 3 (51), 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.15719.2> [version 2; peer review: 2 approved].
- Celermajer, Danielle, Schlosberg, David, Rickards, Lauren, Stewart-Harawira, Makere, Thaler, Mathias, Tschakert, Petra, Verlie, Blanche, Christine Winter, 2021. Multispecies justice: theories, challenges, and a research agenda for environmental politics. *Environ. Polit.* 30 (1–2), 119–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2020.1827608>.
- Coolsaet, Brendan, Agyeman, Julian, Kashwan, Prakash, Rivera, Danielle Zoe, Ryder, Stacia, Schlosberg, David, Sultana, Farhana, 2024. Acknowledging the historic presence of justice in climate research. *Nat. Clim. Change*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-024-02218-5>.
- Crawford, Neil J.W., Michael, Kavya, Mikulewicz, Michael, 2023. *Climate Justice in the Majority World: Vulnerability, Resistance, and Diverse Knowledges*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Eckersley, Robyn, 2016. Responsibility for climate change as a structural injustice. In: Gabrielson, Teena, Hall, Cheryl, Meyer, John M., Schlosberg, David (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Environmental Political Theory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 346–361.
- Exner, Andreas, 2013. The new land grab at the frontiers of the fossil energy regime. In: Exner, Andreas, Fleissner, Peter, Kranzl, Lukas, Zittel, Werner (Eds.), *Land and Resource Scarcity*. Routledge, London, pp. 119–162.
- Follette, La, Cameron, Maser, Chris, 2020. *Sustainability and the Rights of Nature in Practice*. Routledge, London.
- Fresso, Jean-Baptiste, Bonneuil, Christophe, 2017. Growth unlimited: the idea of infinite growth from fossil capitalism to green capitalism. In: Borowy, Iris, Schmelzer, Matthias (Eds.), *History of the Future of Economic Growth*. Routledge, London, pp. 52–68.
- Gonzalez, Carmen G., 2021. Racial capitalism, climate justice, and climate displacement. *Onati Socio-Legal Series* 11 (1), 108–147.
- Gordon, Noah J., 2023. Climate finance: an overview. *Environment* 65 (4), 18–26.
- Hall, Peter, 1993. Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: the case of economic policymaking in Britain. *Comp. Polit.* 25 (3), 275–296.
- Herweg, Nicole, Zahariadis, Nikolaos, Zohlnhöfer, Reimut, 2023. The multiple streams framework: foundations, refinements, and empirical applications. In: Weible, Christopher (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process*. Routledge, London, pp. 17–54.
- Hoang, Cam, Satyal, Poshendra, Corbera, Esteve, 2018. “This is my garden”: justice claims and struggles over forests in Vietnam’s REDD+.”. *Clim. Policy* 19 (Suppl. 1), S23–S35.
- IISD, 2024. BASIC ministers call for new climate finance goal to reach trillions. IISD Newsletter. 31 July, 2024. <https://sdg.iisd.org/news/basic-ministers-call-for-new-climate-finance-goal-to-reach-trillions/>. (Accessed 18 February 2025).
- Kallis, Giorgos, Kerschner, Christian, Martinez-Alier, Joan, 2012. The economics of degrowth. *Ecol. Econ.* 84, 172–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.08.017>.
- Kauffman, Craig M., Martin, Pamela L., 2021. *The Politics of Rights of Nature: Strategies for Building a More Sustainable Future*. MIT Press, Boston.
- Klöck, Carola, Baatz, Christian, Wendler, Nils, 2025. Procedural justice and (in)equitable participation in climate negotiations. *UCL Open Environ. Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.14324/uclopreprints.277.v2>.
- Knappe, Henrike, Renn, Ortwin, 2022. Politicization of intergenerational justice: how youth actors translate sustainable futures. *Eur. J. For. Res.* 10 (6), 1–11.
- Kuehn, Robert, 2000. A taxonomy of environmental justice. *Environ. Law Rep.* (30), 10681–10703.
- Mesías, Aránguiz, Pablo, Tilleczeck, Kate, 2025. Williche scyborgs and planetary health: ecologies of repair for intergenerational environmental justice in southern Chile’s channels. *Environ. Values* Forthcom.
- Mikulewicz, Michael, Caretta, Martina Angela, Sultana, Farhana, Crawford, Neil J.W., 2023. Intersectionality & climate justice: a call for synergy in climate change scholarship. *Environ. Polit.* 32 (7), 1275–1286.
- Mundaca, Luis, Busch, Henner, Schwer, Sophie, 2018. Successful low-carbon energy transitions at the community level? An energy justice perspective. *Appl. Energy* 218, 292–303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.02.146>.
- Nohrstedt, Daniel, Ingold, Karin, Weible, Christopher, Koebele, Elizabeth, Olofsson, Kristin, Satoh, Keiichi, Jenkins-Smith, Hank, 2023. The advocacy coalition framework: progress and emerging areas. In: Weible, Christopher (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process*. Routledge, London, pp. 130–150.
- Ostrom, Elinor, 1990. *Governing the Commons: the Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Page, Edward A., 2006. *Climate Change, Justice and Future Generations*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Pauw, W.P., Moslener, U., Zamarioli, L.H., Amerasinghe, N., Atela, J., Affana, J.P.B., Buchner, B., et al., 2022. Post-2025 climate finance target: how much more and how much better? *Clim. Policy* 22 (9–10), 1241–1251.
- Pedersen, Stefan, Stevis, Dimitris, Kalfagianni, Agni, 2024. What is planetary justice? *Environ. Polit.* 33 (7), 1137–1145.
- Pickering, Jonathan, 2023. Can democracy accelerate sustainability transformations? Policy coherence for participatory co-existence. *Int. Environ. Agreements Polit. Law Econ.* 23, 141–148.
- Preston, Christopher, Carr, Wylie, 2018. Recognition justice, climate engineering, and the care approach. *Ethics Pol. Environ.* 21 (3), 308–323.
- Robinson, Stacy-ann, Carlson, D’Arcy, 2021. A just alternative to litigation: applying restorative justice to climate-related loss and damage. *Third World Q.* 42 (6), 1384–1395.
- Routledge, Paul, 2011. 384 translocal climate justice solidarities. In: Dryzek, John S., Norgaard, Richard B., Schlosberg, David (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society*. Oxford University Press, 0.
- Sandberg, Maria, Klockars, Kristian, Wilén, Kristoffer, 2019. Green growth or degrowth? Assessing the normative justifications for environmental sustainability and economic growth through critical social theory. *J. Clean. Prod.* 206, 133–141.
- Savaresi, Annalisa, Setzer, Joana, Bookman, Sam, Bouwer, Kim, Chan, Tiffanie, Keuschnigg, Isabela, Armeni, Chiara, Harrington, Alexandra, Heri, Corina, Higham, Ian, Hilson, Chris, Luporini, Riccardo, Macchi, Chiara, Nordlander, LinnÅa, Obani, Pedit, Peterson, Lauri, Schapper, Andrea, Singh

- Ghaleigh, Navraj, Tigre, Maria Antonia, Wewerinke-Singh, Margaretha, 2014. Conceptualizing just transition litigation. *Nat. Sustain.* (7), 1379–1384.
- Schapper, Andrea, Dee, Megan, 2024. Super-networks shaping international agreements: comparing the climate change and nuclear weapons arenas. *Int. Stud. Q.* 68 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqad105>, 10.1093/isq/sqad105.
- Schapper, Andrea, Urban, Frauke, 2021. Large dams, norms and indigenous Peoples. *Dev. Policy Rev.* 39 (S1), O61–O80.
- Schapper, Andrea, Hoffmann, Clemens, Lee, Phyllis, 2022. Procedural rights for nature – a pathway to sustainable decarbonisation? *Third World Q.* 43 (5), 1197–1216.
- Schlosberg, David, 2007. *Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements and Nature*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Shue, Henry, 2014. *Climate Justice: Vulnerability and Protection*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Simon, Herbert, 1976. *Administrative Behavior*. Macmillan, London.
- Streeck, Wolfgang, Thelen, Kathleen, 2005. Introduction: institutional change in advanced political economies. In: Streeck, Wolfgang, Thelen, Kathleen (Eds.), *Beyond Continuity: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 1–39.
- Sultana, Farhana, 2025. *Confronting Climate Coloniality: Decolonizing Pathways for Climate Justice*. Routledge, London.
- Surprise, Kevin, 2024. Beyond ecodical capitalism: climate crisis and climate justice. In: Carroll, William K. (Ed.), *The Elgar Companion to Antonio Gramsci*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 448–468.
- Tetreault, Darcy, 2017. Capitalism versus the environment. In: Veltmeyer, Henry, Bowles, Paul (Eds.), *The Essential Guide to Critical Development Studies*. Routledge, London, pp. 341–350.
- UNFCCC, 2024. COP29 UN climate conference agrees to triple finance to developing countries, protecting lives and livelihoods. UNFCCC News. 24 November, 2024. <https://unfccc.int/news/cop29-un-climate-conference-agrees-to-triple-finance-to-developing-countries-protecting-lives-and>. (Accessed 18 February 2025).
- Wanner, Thomas, 2015. The new ‘passive revolution’ of the green economy and growth discourse: maintaining the ‘sustainable development’ of neoliberal capitalism. *New Polit. Econ.* 20 (1), 21–42.
- Zelli, Fariborz, van Asselt, Harro, 2013. The institutional fragmentation of global environmental governance: causes, consequences and responses. *Glob. Environ. Polit.* 13 (3), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1162/GLEP_a_00180.