"Youth is not a political position": Exploring justice claims-making in the UN Climate Change Negotiations

Harriet Thew*, Lucie Middlemiss, Jouni Paavola

School of Earth and Environment, Sustainability Research Institute, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

Youth articulations of climate change injustice are experiencing an unprecedented moment in the spotlight as, inspired by Greta Thunberg, young people around the world take to the streets demanding justice for their generation in the face of climate emergency. Formal opportunities for youth voices to be heard in environmental governance are slim, although the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) offers a rare opportunity for youth to share their perspectives as one of nine civil society constituencies: YOUNGO. Recent research in Global Environmental Change has called for empirical exploration of justice claims-making by different stakeholders to develop understanding of how justice is conceptualised and negotiated in climate change governance spaces. To date, climate justice claims from youth have not been explored in the academic literature. This paper draws upon rich, ethnographic, longitudinal data on the evolution of justice claims made by a group of youth participants in the UNFCCC to contribute to this empirical gap. In our research, a UK-based case study organisation and long-established member of YOUNGO was studied between 2015 and 2018, including observation of their participation at the 21st, 22nd and 23rd Conferences of the Parties. We find that youth participants first articulated injustices based on perceived future risks to their generation but, over time, switched to solidarity claims about injustices experienced by other groups in the present. Whilst laudable, this impedes their mandate as representatives of younger generations. We also make three theoretical contributions to environmental justice theory. First we expand participation justice theory to both the visible structures of participation (*procedural justice*) and the informal rules and discourses shaping participation (*representation justice*). Second we demonstrate the importance of both external and self-recognition for the articulation of justice claims. Third we clarify the relationship between power and justice claim-making, proposing that we must look beneath what is articulated to shed light on the exercise of ideological power that shapes the framing and claiming of justice in environmental governance spaces.

1. Introduction

Greta Thunberg, and other teenage climate activists, have inspired millions of young people around the world to engage in school strikes, drawing attention to the climate emergency and demanding rapid political action. School Strikes for Climate in over 150 countries (as of 2019) have garnered widespread public and media attention, with young strikers receiving encouragement from academics, teachers and politicians (Taylor, 2019). This has reinvigorated the discourse of intergenerational justice in climate change activism and catalysed public debate on what society owes to the young.

In the climate change governance literature, attention to youth is long overdue. Studies of non-state actor (NSA) participation have paid scant attention to younger generations although Youth NGOs

"YOUNGO" was formally recognised as one of nine civil society constituencies in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in 2009 (2017) and grew to become the fourth largest constituency at COP 22 (UNFCCC, 2017). As justice is pluralistic, studying the variety of groups making justice claims can help to develop theory (Schlosberg and Collins, 2014). NSAs play a key role in ensuring that climate change governance is just (Derman, 2014): yet scholarship has paid little attention to NSA claimants, their claims and the consequences for inclusive outcomes.

Recent scholarship has called for research to go beyond theoretical justice principles to explore the ways in which justice is articulated in climate change governance spaces (Bulkeley et al., 2013, Klinsky et al., 2017). Whilst a small body of research has explored justice in the UNFCCC from the perspective of some NSA groups (Derman, 2014,

Table 1
Environmental and social justice theory showing sphere of activity, facet of justice and dual aspects of concern for justice claims-making

Sphere	Facets of justice	Concerned with
Social	Recognition justice	Social recognition (structural inclusion)
		Self-recognition (psychological inclusion)
Political	Participation justice	Procedural justice (participatory mechanisms, governing institutions and democratic rights)
		Representation justice (first-order justice claims and engagement in the meta-framing of justice)
Economic	Distributive justice	Temporal distribution of resources (intergenerational justice)
		Spatial distribution of resources (intragenerational justice)

Glaab, 2017), youth justice claims have not yet been examined. We therefore do not know how justice is conceptualised by young people, what types of justice claims they articulate in climate change governance spaces in what circumstances, and what this can tell us about the relationships between justice claims and the power dynamics shaping their articulation.

This paper addresses both the empirical gap on youth justice claims in the UNFCCC and the theoretical gap regarding what this tells us about the relationships between power and justice claims-making. To explore these complex dynamics as they unfold requires a methodology enabling deep enquiry into participatory experiences over time. We draw on a longitudinal ethnographic study of youth participation in the UNFCCC from 2015 and 2018 in a case study of a UK-based youth organisation, the UK Youth Climate Coalition (UKYCC). We seek to use this rich empirical data to enrich theory. Guided by Bulkeley et al. (2013) and Klinsky et al. (2017) we ask three research questions: *What type of justice claims are youth making in UNFCCC conferences? How and why do youth participants articulate (in)justice in particular instances and (how) is this shaped by their interactions with other social groups over time? What does this tell us about the relationship between power and justice claims-making?*

Our ethnographic approach provides insights into how youth articulate (in)justice in private spaces (i.e. youth-only meetings and conferences) and how this contrasts with their public articulations amongst more powerful social groups. Our longitudinal approach captures changes in youth perceptions and articulations of justice over time. We find that after interactions with other groups, youth justice claims shifted from emphasising their own future vulnerability (i.e. first-order justice claims) to amplifying the present vulnerability articulated by other stakeholders (i.e. solidarity claims). We argue that, although solidarity is important and warranted, this shift at the same erodes youth's ability to represent their generation. We argue that, contrary to the statement made by a youth participant in our title, youth *is* a political position, and that despite formal recognition of YOUNGO as a relevant stakeholder group, youth participants and hindered by the exercise of power by other stakeholders which shapes the informal rules of participation and accepted discourses in the UNFCCC. Over time, this erodes their belief (self-recognition) that youth have a unique stance from which to interpret the negotiations, believing themselves to be unworthy claimants of climate injustice. These findings have several implications for environmental justice theory.

In addition to its empirical contribution, our paper makes three theoretical contributions: (1) we recast relevant justice theory by incorporating Fraser's (2010) work on representation justice into David Schlosberg's (2004) tripartite environmental justice framework, thereby expanding participation justice theory to consider both the visible structures of participation (*procedural justice*) and the informal rules and discourses shaping participation (*representation justice*); (2) we also highlight the importance of both internal (psychological) and external (structural) aspects of recognition in shaping justice claims, overcoming Fraser and Honneth's long-standing debate on this issue, and; (3) we explore the hidden relationship between power and justice claims-making, using Lukes' theory of ideological power (2004).

In what follows, Section 2 reviews the key academic literature on distribution, recognition, procedural and representation justice, before

discussing the relevance of Lukes' theory of power for mobilising justice theory beyond theoretical principles to enable a more sociological inquiry of how justice plays out in reality. To situate our study we also outline existing studies of NSA perceptions and articulation of justice in the UNFCCC. Section 3 explains the ethnographic, longitudinal methodology followed in the research. Section 4 presents our results and Section 5 discusses their theoretical and practical implications. Section 6 draws conclusions.

2. Justice claiming and framing, participation and power

When investigating the *type* of justice claims youth are making in the UNFCCC, it is necessary to differentiate between facets of justice. We begin by discussing the most common facets of environmental justice: *distributive, recognition* and *participation* (Schlosberg, 2004) before proposing the addition of *representation* from the social justice literature (Fraser, 2010).

Early justice theory focused on the distribution of resources across time and space, with intergenerational justice focusing on temporal distribution of resources and responsibilities between generations and intragenerational justice focused on spatial distribution of goods and impacts between locations and social groups (Norton, 2002, Rawls, 1971). These two aspects of *distributive justice* must be considered when studying justice claims-making (see Table 1). Whilst youth participation in climate change governance relates to intergenerational justice due to the unequal temporal distribution of costs and benefits across age groups (Hausfather, 2019), intergenerational justice theory focuses primarily on what we owe to hypothetical unborn generations without considering what we owe to existing younger generations (Norton, 2002). Intragenerational distributive justice theory has in turn followed the "Westphalian" approach for which nation states are the only units of analysis, overlooking the diverse experiences of different social groups within those nation states (Fraser, 2010).

Arguing that distributive justice was too narrow a framing, Nancy Fraser argued for attention to *recognition justice*, following calls for recognition of different social groups as a precursor to maldistribution (Honneth, 1996, Taylor, 1994, Young, 1990). Whilst Iris Young proposes that justice theory move *beyond* distribution, Fraser (1995) argues that recognition should be considered *alongside* distribution, exploring who is included and excluded in decision-making processes. She claims that distribution takes place in the economic sphere and recognition in the social sphere and despite interlinkages they require analytical distinction.

Fraser emphasised the *structural* aspects of recognition, arguing that what matters for justice is a group's ability to achieve participatory parity i.e. to be "*full partners in social interaction*" (2000, p.111) Axel Honneth in turn has emphasised *psychological* aspects, arguing that individuals must develop self-recognition as a precursor to agency, perceiving impact on psychological wellbeing as injustice (Fraser and Honneth, 2003). Fraser's emphasis on structural aspects of recognition has sought to avoid overshadowing distribution amidst the rise of identity-politics which she feels focuses on cultural difference without sufficiently acknowledging links to economic injustice (Fraser, 2000).

Fraser and Honneth's arguments are not as far apart as they might

seem. Schlosberg (2009) argues that Fraser oversimplifies Honneth's argument in suggesting he overlooks the role of structure, but Honneth explores how individuals develop self-esteem when they receive recognition from the state and society as well as from individuals, claiming that self-recognition diminishes when an individual is excluded from certain rights and subjected to damaging cultural norms, which subsequently damages their agency. We suggest that self-recognition should be considered a factor in a group's ability to achieve participatory parity and that doing so would complement Fraser's emphasis on structural impediments. Arguing that the two factors are complementary, not mutually exclusive: we depict them as dual aspects of recognition justice in Table 1.

Fraser also identifies invisible rules and discourses as barriers to participatory parity, drawing upon examples of gendered cultural practices to argue that some groups are framed as deficient and treated differently in society even if they appear to have participatory parity in terms of visible structures (Fraser, 2014). Following Kompridis (2007), we suggest it is difficult to identify these invisible structures without engaging with the subjective experiences of individuals facing these barriers. Regarding youth, the importance of informal rules and discourses in shaping participatory parity between different age groups has been emphasised in the youth participation literature. Several studies claim that youth participants in social and environmental policy-making are overlooked on account of *"their legal and social positioning"* (Trajber et al., 2019, p89). Youth are often underestimated (Tanner, 2010), regarded as "human becomings" rather than human beings" (Tisdall, 2015) and welcomed as passive learners rather than active contributors (Tanner, 2010). Their participatory parity is marred by the discursive framing of youth as apathetic, deficient, under-developed and incapable, in need of support or discipline rather than of recognition (Checkoway, 2011, Edwards, 2009, Harris et al., 2010). A method enabling deeper investigation into these invisible barriers is therefore necessary for our study.

A third facet, *participation justice*, was added to environmental justice theory alongside distribution and recognition by David Schlosberg (2004). Schlosberg emphasises the importance of just participatory mechanisms, governing institutions and democratic rights, calling for greater attention to the formal structures shaping "procedural justice" in the political sphere. Based on studies of social movements, he identifies links between recognition in the social sphere and participation in the political sphere, emphasising that self and social recognition of diverse identities, knowledges, rights and cultures is a necessary first step to gaining access to decision-making processes.

Schlosberg (2004) emphasises that it is difficult to distinguish between social movements' calls for participation and recognition as they are so closely interlinked. Citing Borrows (1997) he suggests that increasing diversity in participation will increase recognition of diverse knowledge types. This has happened in the UNFCCC where NSA participation has become increasingly large and diverse (Neeff, 2013). However, Schlosberg also notes calls from indigenous groups for meaningful participation *in addition* to formal recognition of their diverse identities, cultures, knowledges and rights, which suggests another level of justice at play within participatory processes which is linked to recognition but goes beyond having a seat at the table (2004). We turn again to Fraser for guidance. After publication of Schlosberg's framework, which incorporates her work on recognition, Fraser added her own third facet of justice analysis: *representation*, which, as with Schlosberg's third facet: *participation*, pertains to the political sphere. There is substantial overlap between their work, though Schlosberg's (2004) framework prompted a divergence in literatures with his portrayal of participation justice shaping environmental justice literature thereafter whilst Fraser's representation justice has been mostly utilised in social justice studies.

Representation justice goes beyond studying which groups can access a decision-making space to consider which groups can express personal "first-order" justice claims in that space. It is also concerned with the meta-framing of justice i.e. the way in which justice questions are constructed and how this shapes who "counts" as a legitimate subject of justice analysis (Fraser, 2010). It analyses a group's *"inclusion in, or exclusion from, the community of those entitled to make justice claims on one another" (Fraser, 2010 p.286)*. In contrast to Borrows (1997), Fraser suggests that it is not access to the space which counts, but the perception of the community therein that you are a worthy justice claimant, again emphasising the importance of informal customs and discourses as well as formal structures. She warns that there may be *"ideological minorities…rendered voiceless"* even in processes where their social difference is formally recognised (Nash and Bell, 2007 p.76). Fraser calls upon the political theorist to *"describe a new grammar of political-claims making, in which what is at issue are not only first-order questions of justice but also meta-questions about how first-order questions ought to be framed"* (Nash and Bell, 2007 p.74). We argue that what is needed is not only a political theorist but also an ethnographer who can build trust with less powerful groups exploring whether their perceptions match their articulations of justice, gaining a deeper understanding of justice claims making as a power-laden process.

Like Schlosberg (2004) and Fraser (2010) highlights the importance of visible structures of participation in the political sphere which she calls the "ordinary-political" dimension of representation justice. Mirroring her work on recognition justice in the social sphere she also notes a "meta-political" dimension of representation justice, concerning invisible rules and discourses in the political sphere. Schlosberg also acknowledges discourse but in less depth. Our first theoretical contribution is thus to propose analytical separation of *procedural justice* (focusing on visible structures) following Schlosberg and *representation justice* (focusing on invisible rules and discourse) following Fraser as dual aspects of participation justice as depicted in Table 1. This is depicted in Table 1.

Fraser also emphasises the importance of power in shaping justice, as illustrated by the gendered experiences of men and women in society (Fraser, 2014). Regarding participation justice she argues that: *"The capacity to influence public debate and authoritative decision-making depends not only on formal decision rules but also on power relations rooted in the economic structure and the status order"* (Fraser, 2007, p31). In other words, the social and economic spheres of recognition and distributive justice also shape participation in the political sphere as decision-making does not happen in siloes but is shaped by pervasive power dynamics which underpin interactions between social groups with varying degrees of economic power and social status. Investigating how and why youth participants articulate (in) justice in particular instances and whether this is shaped by interactions with other social groups over time therefore requires attention to power.

In response to Bulkeley et al.'s (2013) and Klinsky et al.'s (2017) calls for social inquiry into justice-claims making, we propose that a key theory on power from Steven Lukes can help to mobilise Fraser and Scholsberg's more static, philosophical justice theory for empirical inquiry into how justice claims-making plays out in reality as a dynamic process. Lukes (2004) argues that power has three faces. (1) *Decision-making power* is exercised when a group shapes a decision-making process so that its preferences are realised in the outcomes of decision-making processes. (2) *Non-decision-making power* is exercised in agenda-setting to ensure that certain issues are included or excluded, identifiable in whose preferences shape the parameters of decision-making regardless of final outcomes. (3) *Ideological power* is exercised in shaping how other participants perceive and articulate problems and solutions, identifiable when a group is unable or unwilling to express their "true preferences" as they conflict with the ideology of a more powerful group. This invisible form or power is particularly difficult to detect and can manifest in "latent" conflict as the powerless adopt the preferences of the powerful, even when they go against their own interests. We suggest Lukes' theory offers a more detailed explanation of Fraser's assertion that justice is negotiated in power-laden interactions between different groups (2014).

Ideological power may explain why justice claims are made (or not) in different instances, potentially increasing understanding of the claiming and framing of justice as a power-laden process. Empirical application of Lukes' theory confirms that perceptions and articulations of fairness are shaped by power-laden interactions between social groups (Gaventa, 1982). In an historic case study of white pastoralists in the rural Appalachian region of the United States of America who experienced domination when white, predominantly British, capitalists plundered the region for coal, Gaventa found that the exercise of ideological power manifested as "quiescence" (i.e. latent conflict) when the Appalachians' resistance was stifled by feelings of powerlessness. This created a false illusion of consensus despite what could be described as distributive, recognition and participation injustice (Fraser, 2010, Schlosberg, 2004). The Appalachians did not claim injustice for many years because their preferences were shaped by the capitalists' exercising of ideological power which blamed the Appalachians for not developing "a strong sense of civic responsibility" (Gaventa, 1982, p36) labelling them as "apathetic" and "deficient" (p41). The parallels in the language used to undermine youth as identified in the youth participation literature are striking (Edwards, 2009, Harris et al., 2010). This re-enforces our belief that ideological power is an integral consideration in studying justice claims, and may be of particular relevance to youth.

Even the discursive exclusion of youth as human becomings or tomorrow's leaders/citizens (Tisdall, 2015) mirrors the discursive exclusion of the Appalachians as "yesterday's people" (Gaventa, 1982, p41). It suggests that in addition to Fraser's assertion that the *grammar* of justice matters Fraser (2007), *tense* also matters as framing a group as irrelevant in the present (whether proposing they are the people of yesterday or tomorrow) can result in that group's grievances going "unexpressed" (Gaventa 1982, p41). Less powerful groups may be subjected to "myths" about their deficiencies and come to deny and reject their former grievances as they are "socialised" or "moulded" to accept and replicate the status quo (Gaventa, 1982, p68). Identifying injustice must therefore go deeper than a surface-level exploration of whether and how a group publicly articulates (in)justice, to determine whether their justice claims differ in private and whether their perceptions and articulations of justice are shaped by interactions with more powerful groups over time.

Gaventa emphasises the importance of studying how power relations develop over time as latent discontent may be re-activated following a shift in power dynamics. When the British mining company began to struggle financially, the Appalachians began expressing their grievances which he takes as evidence that their former expressions of support were a result of powerlessness rather than of consensus. Identifying ideological power therefore requires a methodology which facilitates trust and reciprocity as well as requiring sufficient time and resources to conduct longitudinal work investigating how these complex dynamics unfold over time. Our ethnographic, longitudinal approach is well-suited to this task. In order to contextualise our empirical contribution we now turn to justice claims made by other NSAs in the UNFCCC.

2.1. NSA participation and justice claims in the UNFCCC

Justice studies focusing on the UNFCCC have focused on distributive justice claims made by states in relation to other states (Morgan and Waskow, 2014, Okereke, 2010) highlighting unequal participation of state actors (SAs) and the implications for procedural justice and legitimacy. NSAs do not have the same access to formal mechanisms of participation: they can't directly participate in the negotiations, and don't experience participatory parity with state actors. However, they can play a role in shaping invisible rules and discourse by engaging with formal participatory mechanisms facilitated by the UNFCCC for the nine recognised NSA constituencies. Therefore, although the UNFCCC is an intergovernmental process, it has been described as a

"uniquely relevant site" for NSAs to contribute to justice debates in climate change governance (Derman, 2014). Derman attributes this to the increasing levels and diversity of NSA attendance though we have established that attendance does not necessarily equate to representation justice which requires closer attention.

The formal structures facilitated for YOUNGO have been explored by Thew (2018), finding that although youth have the same access to them as all other NSA constituencies (e.g. they can attend and host side events and exhibits, deliver actions and plenary interventions and meet with high-level representatives) they do not experience participatory parity with other NSAs. This is partly due to lack of finances which prevents youth from capitalising upon available opportunities e.g. as volunteers self-funding their participation, youth struggle to apply for and prepare side events and exhibits in advance. This also restricts their ability to develop relationships with more powerful actors over time as self-financing repeat attendance often isn't possible. Youth attribute their participatory challenges to lack of recognition from other stakeholders despite being officially recognised as a constituency (Thew, 2018). This further supports the theory that informal, invisible rules act as a barrier to participatory parity even when formal structures appear fair, whilst confirming that youth are a suitable case study to investigate this further.

The state-centric framing of justice has been challenged by increased awareness of transboundary environmental and economic impacts in a globalising world, with calls for empirical research of how justice is understood by different groups (Bulkeley et al., 2014). Whilst a small body of work has explored the participatory experiences and justice perspectives of a variety of NSA groups such as environmental NGOs (Chatterton et al., 2013, Derman, 2014), faith-based actors (Glaab, 2017) and farmers (Sova et al., 2015), they do not engage deeply with justice theory. Furthermore, although these studies suggest the presence of unequal power dynamics, this is only explored by Sova et al. (2015) who review a wide range of literature on power, selecting Lukes' theory as fruitful for the study of NSAs in the UNFCCC. They suggest that ideological power shapes the preferences of smallholder farmers in the agricultural adaptation regime, though due to a lack of smallholder farmers in the UNFCCC they test this hypothesis by interviewing SAs. Thus, further work is needed to explore justice claims made in the UNFCCC.

Several studies on NSA participation include articulations of justice made by youth in the UNFCCC without acknowledging that youth are of unique interest. Hurlbert (2011) assumes that a claim made by young NSAs from the Seychelles indicates the perspective of the Seychelles government; (Derman, 2014) refers to a public letter from a Canadian youth delegation as an example of general NSA perspectives; and in their study of indigenous participants Belfer et al. (2017) share perceptions of tokenism as articulated by a young indigenous person, highlighting the need to explore the intersection of age and indigeneity though their focus remains firmly on the indigenous constituency. This demonstrates that youth are articulating justice claims in the UNFCCC, though whether they share their true preferences or are adapting their claims as a result of power dynamics within the negotiations remains unknown. Our refinement of the concept of representation justice offers a way to increase understanding of how justice claims-making and meta-framing shapes participation justice, which has implications for procedural legitimacy and for ensuring no one is left behind (Klinsky et al., 2017). This will shine light on the aforementioned research gaps regarding how justice is conceptualised by youth participants, what types of justice claims they articulate in the UNFCCC and what this tells us about how power shapes justice claims-making.

3. Methods

This research employs a longitudinal, ethnographic approach to explore the claims youth are making in the UNFCCC, how they articulate (in)justice and how this is shaped by their interactions with

other social groups over time. This approach facilitates detailed investigation of lived experiences of youth participation over time by establishing trust and openness, enabling deeper exploration of the psychological factors shaping youth experiences of recognition and participation justice in this context. Our ethnography focuses on 20 young participants, a standard number of participants for research of this kind and depth. All are members of a voluntary youth organisation, the UK Youth Climate Coalition (UKYCC) aged between 17 and 29 years old, reflecting the age range of YOUNGO though the constituency lacks formal lower and upper age limits.

UKYCC was selected as a case study as one of the longest established member organisations of the UNFCCC's youth constituency, YOUNGO. Although they are privileged in comparison to delegations from some countries, they are quite representative of YOUNGO which is dominated by similar Global North based, predominantly middle class voluntary groups. Studying a group based in the same country as the researchers was necessary to facilitate ethnographic engagement over a long time period. It also enabled a clearer focus on age as the root of injustice, enabling some analytical separation from other identity-based barriers to their participatory parity. This is not withstanding that 25% of the research participants are activists of colour and 90% are female or gender non-binary and may therefore experience barriers relating to racism and sexism intersecting with ageism.

In order to situate our findings within the broader context of youth participation in the UNFCCC and reflect on relevance for youth experience in other countries, we also analysed public documents produced by youth participants, including reports from two Conferences of Youth (COYs) in which thousands of youth gathered ahead of the COPs, as well as blogs written by and citing YOUNGO representatives and the lead researcher's observations of the constituency. The lead researcher has personal experience of YOUNGO as an active member between 2012 and 2018, participating in six COPs and five intersessionals and staying informed through subscription to YOUNGO's mailing lists. Whilst our research explores the justice claims of *some* youth participants, we do not presume to speak about *all* youth participants. Youth are not homogenous and neither are their experiences. We hope this study paves the way for further engagement with the diverse range of youth organisations from around the world. However, we emphasise the necessity of ethnographic approaches conducted by younger researchers, as the ability to see below the surface of how youth present themselves to outsiders was a key factor in obtaining data we know to be robust.

Though not a member of UKYCC, attending as a representative of an international youth organisation at some of these conferences, our lead researcher gained in-depth insights into UKYCC'S participation by engaging in over 900 hours of participant observation conducted over a three-year period at COPs 21, 22 23 and intersessionals, plus UKYCC team meetings in the UK. She also conducted 32 semi-structured interviews with UKYCC members between June 2015 and March 2018 in person and over Skype. This period of study captured youth experiences of the UNFCCC leading up and immediately following adoption of the Paris Agreement.

Changing perceptions and articulations of justice were explored in interviews if the researcher identified a change from a previous discussion. For several participants, it was possible to conduct repeat interviews over time, asking similar questions. Interviews with the same participants were analysed independently to open code for themes, then compared to identify longitudinal changes. Close relationships established with participants and ongoing reflexivity by the lead researcher enabled delicate questioning and, in some instances, the researcher was able to prompt further reflection from the participant as to why their perceptions/articulations had changed offering deeper insights.

In line with ethnographic practice, coding was inductive, slowly building themes from the data, utilising Nvivo to make sense of a rich, complex data set (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Ethnography uses observations and analysis to inductively build theories from the bottom up, in an ongoing balancing act between inductive and deductive theorising. This allows for a reflexive, realist approach "zigzagging" between data and theory to develop topics of inquiry rather than set hypotheses, bringing realism to an otherwise "flat" ontology, allowing a more thorough consideration of context (Emmel, 2013) which can lead to the discovery of new questions and answers (Madden, 2010). Coding began with a broad "youth perceptions of climate justice" developing into e.g. "youth justice claims", "youth articulate other groups' claims", "youth censor their own claims" before zigzagging to the literature to differentiate between different facets of justice e.g. "procedural" and "recognition".

Participants have selected pseudonyms which do not necessarily correlate with their genders. Data have been anonymised and identifying details removed, though it may be possible for individuals to recognise themselves and their peers in their testimonies.

4. What type of justice claims are youth making in the UNFCCC, how do they articulate justice in particular instances and (how) does this change over time?

Here we explore UKYCC's preparations for and participation in the UNFCCC chronologically, showing how their justice claims changed over time from early 2015 to early 2018. This is further illustrated by the lead researcher's observations of YOUNGO and analysis of public documents produced by the constituency to illustrate the broader trends in youth participation during this period.

4.1. COP 21, 2015

Throughout 2015, the lead researcher attended UKYCC's preparatory meetings for COP21 where the youth participants predominantly articulated justice as first-order distributive claims, expressing concerns that climate change would affect their futures:

Lily: *"We're going to inherit this situation, when it gets really bad we'll be in our 40s."*

Zara: *"I am worried that I won't be able to put food on the table in 30 years."*

One of UKYCC's campaigning slogans at this time was *"How old will you be in 2050?"* referring to the medium-term focus of many climate policies and projections and claiming that delays and inaction will disproportionately impact their generation. This was printed on a banner and used at several events including the UK's 2015 People's Climate March. They acknowledged the vulnerability of other social groups but believed that youth would be more vulnerable to climate change impacts over the course of their lifetimes, and on this basis felt worthy of claiming distributive justice in the UNFCCC:

Euan: *"We will be more affected so that gives us a powerful voice in the negotiations."*

UKYCC members attended the 11th annual Conference of Youth (COY11) in Paris before COP21, with the lead researcher in tow. In addition to the event in Paris, 3,000 youth attended local COYs across Africa, Asia and North and South America. The young organisers livestreamed events and ran an online consultation, creating a manifesto to present to the French presidency of COP21, welcoming contributions from anyone under 30 years old. The manifesto identified eight themes such as energy, conservation and adaptation, acknowledging vulnerability of other social groups such as "poor persons" and "minorities" (with which individuals may have also identified as other aspects of their identities) alongside asserting repeatedly that youth are the future and framing themselves as representatives of future generations. A key theme was "youth inclusion", a demand for recognition emphasising that *"the resounding position of youth from around the globe is that any decisions that affect the current reality and the future of youth must be made in consultation with youth. The youth will inherit the Earth from older generations and we are therefore more motivated to make decisions that are better for our future. Youth must be at the heart of all decision-making and*

have a seat at every table. The youth have unique perspectives and motives and, as they make up 1.2 billion of the world population must be seen for what they are – an essential asset to any country!" (COY11, 2016, p.20).

The COY11 manifesto also calls for intergenerational equity which was one of YOUNGO's key advocacy goals at COP21. Several of the research participants belonged to a YOUNGO working group lobbying for text on intergenerational equity "Inteq" in the Paris Agreement. They aligned with other NSAs in a cross-constituency working group of NSAs which sought to frame justice around human rights, emphasising the rights of vulnerable groups including indigenous peoples and women, to which they added future generations. Despite claiming procedural injustice on account of access restrictions placed on all NSAs during COP21, in working alongside these other stakeholders, youth experienced some success in shaping the meta-framing of justice and intergenerational equity was included into the Preamble of the Paris Agreement (UNFCCC, 2015). However, the relegation of this text to the non-legally binding Preamble is firstly indicative of the non-decision-making power stemming from the lack of procedural justice for NSAs in the UNFCCC and secondly indicative of a shift in the discursive framing of distributive justice in the UNFCCC as compared to the three references to future generations in the original UNFCCC Convention (UNFCCC, 1992). The Paris Agreement contains no direct references to future generations (UNFCCC, 2015). Without youth advocacy, any reference to intergenerational equity may have been entirely lost.

4.2. COP 22, 2016

Over the next year, the Inteq working group disbanded despite having had plans to further pursue its operationalisation in the Paris Agreement and YOUNGO's calls for intergenerational injustice became less frequent. Members of UKYCCC continued to articulate intergenerational injustice in private research interviews and in public blogs:

Khloe: *"I feel like it's our role to say we are youth, we are the ones who are gonna inherit the future that you're building for us, or rather destroying for us, and we're not gonna let you do that… It's about justice. It's about saying you can't keep on destroying the world, that you will not be there to see the consequences of…that's really unfair and unjust".*

"Young people are the most affected by climate change. Yet our voices are ignored in decision-making processes, our presence is excluded in certain negotiation sessions, and our potential to be part of solutions is constantly downplayed" UKYCC member cited in blog (Hope, 2016).

However, they felt less able to articulate this amongst other stakeholders in the UNFCCC, claiming that lack of social recognition was a barrier to their participatory parity:

Maria: *"Being a youth means you're not considered seriously…but we try to bring a strong voice to the negotiations"*

Nadia: *"I think that there's a hierarchy, so the Parties are the important ones and then there's the observers and then there's the youth observers".*

YOUNGO representatives also claimed recognition injustice. One action involved youth from all around the world calling for financial resources to "unlock their potential". In side events and blogs YOUNGO representatives emphasised youth voices and actions but questioned their social recognition:

"The youth are talking but are also doing. Are you listening?" (IISD, 2016).

"We have been reduced to a photo opp…That's not youth representation" (Lockwood, 2017).

"Yes, youth at COP22 are reduced to a photo opportunity. We can only hope that amplifying our voices will help us eventually enact real change" (Lockwood, 2017).

The lead researcher repeatedly observed youth participants struggling to be heard, often due to a perception that youth are there to learn

rather than to contribute. As a relatively young researcher she experienced a marked difference in how people responded to her in the UNFCCC when they realised she was a researcher amidst youth participants rather than a youth participant herself. Perhaps to counteract this recognition injustice, many members of YOUNGO began dressing more professionally to assimilate with non-youth, favouring suits and dark colours over their previous attire of jeans and slogan T-shirts. They also sought collaboration with non-youth NSAs though this often led to them promoting the advocacy messages of other constituencies without opportunity for substantial input. For example, youth regularly contribute hours (or even days) of work preparing the "Fossil of the Day" action in which ENGOs publicly shame governments who are stalling the negotiations. However, youth are not permitted to nominate governments themselves nor to shape what is said during the action, only to prepare props and promote it online.

4.3. COP 23, 2017

Over the next year UKYCC's justice claims shifted, with first-order intergenerational justice claims becoming supplemented with and replaced by articulations of present injustices experienced by other constituencies (i.e. solidarity claims). This shift followed interactions with other NSAs, particularly the "Demand Justice Now!" (DCJ!) coalition who emphasise present and historic injustices to counteract depoliticised discourses from powerful governments who seek to position climate change as a future project rather than a result of historic maldistribution to avoid discussions of responsibility.

UKYCC once again recruited and trained new members, this time highlighting the distributive injustices perpetuated by racism, sexism and capitalism in global climate change governance and emphasising the need to express solidarity with developing states and vulnerable social groups, particularly women and indigenous people but not youth. The lead researcher inquired about this during an interview with a participant leading the training. When asked if they had raised any issues of youth vulnerability, she reflected on this:

Gabriella: *"Not specifically for young people, more about people in the global south or people who have not caused climate change and are being affected. Which obviously young people [are] but we didn't talk about it, we talked about funding for countries that are going to be really badly affected… When we have been talking about climate justice I think we've spent a lot of time thinking about the ways in which we are privileged and haven't really spent any time thinking about the ways we will also be negatively affected… I think it's probably something we should think about more… because age also intersects with the other things [e.g. she previously mentioned intersectionality of age, race and gender]. Not talking just specifically about us but youth in the global south are gonna be more affected than youth here, but also are more affected than adults in the global south, things like that."*

Articulations of youth vulnerability became increasingly rare and this one may have only occurred due to the researcher's prompt. It didn't lead to any changes in the training and the team continued to focus on expressing solidarity with non-youth groups rather than considering youth-specific injustices. Participants began to question whether youth were worthy justice claimants and stopped articulating first-order claims. Another participant (unprompted by the researcher) reflected on the difficulty in raising youth-specific concerns:

Mona: *"Whenever you talk about climate justice I find it really hard to talk about anyone from the global north, and so even youth from the global north is still global north, people…look down on you or something…and, I'm really struggling with this. There's so much tension and this isn't helping going forward…There's this horrible debate around what is most urgent…I mean if climate change is happening now and affecting people now these are the people we need to stand by and so future generations come next…there really is this sense of urgency that takes over everything but…I find it really hard that I still have to argue…for youth to be able to have a voice… even with very close friends …they honestly don't see or believe that youth have*

much to bring. Or [we have to] bring it in a [certain] way which is: we can do actions, we can do unpaid work, we can do the art…it's really a constant battle to fight for the space and to be listened to."

Many of the more experienced members of UKYCC spent increasing amounts of time supporting non-youth constituencies, prioritising this over engagement with YOUNGO. Many did not attend the Conference of Youth (COY13) though some of their newer recruits did, where they ran a workshop on climate justice. Following their training, they emphasised the links between capitalism and maldistribution, highlighting the present vulnerability of marginalised groups *including youth*, suggesting an ability and perhaps a perception of responsibility to articulate first-order claims in this youth-only conference whilst shifting in their framing from intergenerational to intragenerational injustice.

This discursive shift was more widespread. The COY13 outcome document (COY, 2017) produced by young attendees from around the world focuses only on present injustices experienced by youth and other groups (i.e. intragenerational justice as experienced by social groups in the present) in marked difference to the COY11 manifesto which made many intragenerational justice claims. Furthermore, the COY13 outcome document does not refer to intergenerational justice though does demand recognition and participation justice (both procedural and representation) in the form of "intergenerational spaces" where youth should be *"recognized and included as equal and prominent partners"* demanding *"mechanisms for genuine and meaningful engagement"* (COY13, 2017, p10). It also highlights a current lack of consultation with, capacity-building for and access to funding for youth which they attribute to a lack of social recognition of youth's leadership potential, stemming from broader lack of social recognition of youth in societies around the world (COY, 2017).

Articulation of first-order justice claims were perceived as barriers to collaboration with non-youth and came to be seen as a faux-pas. Rather than adding solidarity claims to their own advocacy after learning of other vulnerabilities, the older participants felt ashamed of their former first-order claims and stopped articulating them in public:

Khloe: *"Sometimes it can feel quite uncomfortable or awkward to be someone quite privileged and middle class from the global north, because even if it's something we need to challenge sometimes it makes you feel guilty".*

Lily: *"Claiming my own vulnerability feels pretty wrong or, I've just gotten so out of that mind set and so would steer away from that… (I'm) trying to be a bit more aware, living the decolonisation I talk about but…I do miss that feeling like I can have my own [voice]…I guess in the UK [youth is] an important category which needs to have a voice …but then the minute you come into this space and you're suddenly sat there with all these people from other countries then [UK youth] realise…their country's colonial past and the white privilege they have, or, not everyone has white privilege but they have UK privilege…having, the youth niche being [sic] we have more of an interest in the future cos we're going to be alive longer [awkward laughter] trails off…*

Researcher interjects: *"so would you cringe at that...we're young, we're gonna be alive for longer?"*

Lily: *"yeah it's not really an argument you can say like that"* [embarrassed laughter]

Lily suggests that this perception is more widespread than just her personal position and explains how it creates a challenge for the youth constituency's articulation of justice:

Lily: *"I remember [a Former YOUNGO Focal Point] saying that youth is not a political position. I remember hearing that and being like, this is very true."*

The erosion of self-recognition is apparent. This phrase was repeated by several others showing that this idea had gained traction and that in interacting with non-youth constituencies, over time these youth participants had lost confidence that youth-specific concerns mattered either in the present or the future. Several youth participants stopped attending YOUNGO meetings, using accreditation from youth organisations to amplify the voices of other constituencies. As volunteers,

many youth participants are not required to stay "on message" in the same way that paid employees are, increasing their susceptibility to ideological power. As such, the links between distributive justice and representation become clear along with the need for financial support to ensure consistent representation and parity of participation for youth in the UNFCCC.

5. Discussion of our findings and their implications for justice theory

Our results make an empirical contribution by identifying the perceptions and articulations of justice of youth as understudied UNFCCC participants. The depth and richness of our data offers new insights into the justice claims made and the circumstances in which claims are articulated (Bulkeley et al., 2013, Klinsky et al., 2017). Our longitudinal method enables identification of changes over time following interactions with other social groups. We find that youth make claims of recognition, participation and distributive injustice though the framing of these is shaped by interactions with more powerful non-youth groups over time.

In private interviews; in youth-only spaces such as UKYCC meetings and Conferences of Youth; and when interacting with other stakeholders in the UNFCCC whose meta-framing of justice aligns with their own (as seen in YOUNGO's collaboration with the cross-constituency working group on human rights), the youth participants primarily articulated personally framed, intergenerational justice claims. This highlights a link between recognition and representation justice by demonstrating that social recognition supports the articulation of first-order justice claims. Whilst acknowledging and amplifying claims highlighting the vulnerability of other social groups, they possessed self-recognition that their generation were particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts in the future and, as a result, they should be taken seriously as a key stakeholder in climate change governance.

Over time, following interactions with other stakeholders in the UNFCCC whose meta-framing of justice did not align with theirs (such as DCJ!'s emphasis on past and present rather than future injustices) their public articulation of first-order intergenerational injustice waned and became supplemented and then replaced with claims of intragenerational injustice experienced by other social groups. One may interpret interactions with other constituencies as a form of learning and argue that the shift from first-order to solidarity claims is indicative of youth broadening their understanding of global climate change impacts. This argument would be compelling if youth added the concerns of other stakeholders to their own but the replacement of first-order claims with solidarity claims suggests quiescence (Gaventa, 1982) in response to the exercise of ideological power (Lukes, 2004). Although youth are eager to challenge injustices faced by other social groups and although non-youth may seek to "train" youth in good faith, no other group in the UNFCCC is expected to demonstrate solidarity by *replacing* their personal advocacy messages with that of another constituency.

An exception to this was the articulation of first-order intergenerational injustice in online blogs, suggesting that it is not the public forum but the direct interaction with other social groups that acts as a barrier to the articulation of "true preferences" (Lukes, 2004). As such we suggest that the exercise of ideological power prevented youth from articulating their preferred claims. This is further supported by the finding that in COY13 (i.e. a youth-only space) youth still articulated first-order claims, highlighting present injustices experienced by youth as well as by other vulnerable groups.

In reframing their first-order claims to emphasise their present rather than their future relevance to climate change discussions between COY11 and COY13, we see the importance of self-recognition as a driver to overcome challenges to social misrecognition. Nonetheless, we note that the exclusion of certain discourses in the meta-framing of justice can influence claims-making even in private (i.e. youth-only) spaces. This supports our suggestion that in addition to the *grammar* of

justice (Fraser, 2007) the *tense* of justice preferred by actors able to engage in its meta-framing is an important factor in shaping who is and isn't permitted to the community of stakeholders entitled to make justice claims on one another.

In line with other studies of youth participation (Checkoway, 2011, Tisdall, 2015), youth in our research felt their participation was tokenistic, their attendance resulting in them being seen but not heard. This supports our argument that participation justice analysis must look beyond attendance of diverse groups as Borrows (1997) suggests and beyond the presence of formal structures as Schlosberg (2004) suggests, particularly when different age groups are involved, though this is likely to also apply to other marginalised actors. Whilst some youth vocally challenged invisible barriers to their participatory parity by claiming recognition injustice and articulating the reasons for their self-recognition, others sought to circumvent these barriers by assimilating with non-youth participants. This was visually identifiable in changes to their attire and ideologically identifiable as seen in the decline of intergenerational injustice claims and acceptance of work for other constituencies without reciprocity. This builds upon Gaventa's work (1982) in illustrating how quiescence develops over time as individuals seek assimilation into over conflict with more powerful groups, hoping to overcome barriers to their individual participation but in so doing create latent conflict as their individual assimilation fails to ameliorate the position of the less powerful group.

We suggest that in meta-framing climate justice solely around intragenerational equity to the exclusion of intergenerational equity, non-youth NSAs unintentionally excluded youth from the community of accepted justice claimants due to strong associations between YOUNGO and the temporal framing of intergenerational justice. As a result, several of our research participants lost self-recognition of youth as a relevant stakeholder in the present as well as the future and stopped articulating first-order claims. This illustrates a clear link between representation and recognition justice. Our longitudinal approach enabled us to prompt participants to reflect on these changes. Not only did they perceive first-order claims to be a barrier to collaboration, the participants came to view their previous articulations of youth claims as shameful, associated with naivety at best and racism at worst. This culminated in loss of self-recognition as youth lost confidence that they had a relevant position from which to comment on climate change governance. Again, we see this as evidence of quiescence given the parallels with Gaventa's study of the Appalachians 7(1982).

We also find that social and self-recognition are not mutually exclusive as Fraser and Honneth's debate suggests (2003), rather they are mutually reinforcing. Both are important in achieving participatory parity as they shape the articulation of justice claims and whether or not a group believes it has a right to be included in the community of these entitled to make justice claims on one another: a key aspect of representation justice (Fraser, 2010). Our results therefore provide empirical evidence in support of Scholsberg's (2009) and Kompridis's (2007) argument that both psychological and structural elements of recognition are important considerations for justice. This builds on Thew's (2018) finding that recognition must be secured repeatedly from multiple actors in the UNFCCC rather than being held in perpetuity based on procedural recognition from the process convenors. Furthermore, we demonstrate that Lukes' third face of ideological power is helpful in demonstrating *why* self-recognition matters and how it can be eroded over time.

Lukes (2004) proposes that a less powerful group may not articulate their true preferences if they are subject to ideological power as the way in which a group perceives and articulates (in)justice is shaped by cultural norms which are established by more powerful groups. We see that articulated youth preferences changed following interaction with non-youth over time. When Gaventa (1982) applied Lukes' theory to the Appalachians he found that quiescence developed, i.e. consensus appeared to emerge when the less powerful group came to believe that they were underdeveloped and that the more powerful group's values

were superior to their own. They fell in line and didn't rebel against the status quo even when it caused them to experience distributive injustices. Our results indicate that youth came to believe they were underdeveloped and rather than learning from other constituencies how to best utilise formal structures of participation to raise the first-order justice claims of their generation, they were socialised so that their perception of their right to participate as equals diminished, ultimately leading to their loss of belief that youth is a valid political position.

Rather than developing a shared identity and maximising their agency as YOUNGO, youth are encouraged to transition into adult constituencies as quickly as possible. This transience is specific to YOUNGO and the lack of paid roles for youth advocates institutionalises the lack of participatory parity that youth experience, creating what Fraser would call "status inequality". Like the Appalachians, we saw youth feeling embarrassed, blaming themselves for being at odds with the status quo (Gaventa, 1982). Unlike the Appalachians, youth share similar values to the groups who "socialise" them and it is not our intention to attribute blame. Nor is it possible to determine the extent of distributive injustice caused by the exercise of ideological power in the same way as Gaventa did, as the impacts will be felt in the future rather than the past. Rather, we call for financial investment in YOUNGO to retain institutional memory and facilitate youth-led capacity building to enable youth to adequately represent their generation *alongside* amplifying other voices. Beyond considering the vulnerability of youth in the present and the reduction of risk being transferred to them in the not so distant future, it is necessary to ensure that future framings of justice are permitted to enable visioning of alternative futures and development of just solutions (Kenis and Mathijs, 2014).

Gaventa observed that when power dynamics altered the Appalachians rebelled, demonstrating that the former appearance of consensus wasn't genuine, it was attributable to a sense of powerlessness. Similarly, we see that the quiescence that developed in our study was promptly disrupted by Greta Thunberg and other youth strikers in 2018 and 2019. This has led to a resurgence of first order, future framed justice claims from youth including research participants who had seemingly "grown out of" believing youth to be a relevant voice on climate change. Further research is needed to explore this evolving situation. Guided by our results we present a second theoretical contribution as depicted in Table 2.

We suggest that *recognition justice* is a necessary precursor to *non-decision-making power* as formal and informal societal rules shape who is deemed a valid contributor to a topic and therefore who is included in and excluded from political processes and inclusion enables an individual or group to exercise non-decision-making power by shaping what and who is discussed, but not necessarily the outcomes of that decision (Lukes, 2004). We note that self-recognition is identifiable in either a *choice* or *application* to participate in a decision-making process, acknowledging that some processes require prospective participants to self-nominate before being accepted or rejected by more powerful actors, demonstrating the importance of both self and social recognition.

We propose that *procedural justice* further facilitates the exercise of *non-decision-making power* as formal structures of participation within a political process enable the groups who have access to them and the capacity to use them to shape discussions but, again, not to determine their outcomes (Lukes, 2004). In the UNFCCC this is complicated by the difference in formal structures of participation offered to SAs and NSAs. We argue that this prevents NSAs from directly exercising non-decision-making power in the negotiations though they can influence SAs (see Betsill and Corell, 2008) to indirectly exercise non-decision-making power.

In addition to navigating the visible structures of participation associated with procedural justice, participants must navigate the invisible rules and discourses of participation which we argue are associated with *representation justice* (Fraser, 2010) and the exercise of *ideological power* (Lukes, 2004). We argue that representation justice is

Table 2

Identifying links between facets of justice and faces of power

Facets of justice	Concerned with	Identifiable by	Faces of power
Recognition justice	Social recognition (structural inclusion)	Permission granted from other actors to attend/be included in a decision-making process	Non decision-making power
	Self-recognition (psychological inclusion)	Choice/application to attend a decision-making process	
Participation justice	Procedural justice (participatory mechanisms, governing institutions and democratic rights)	Equal access to and capacity to utilise formal structures of participation	Non decision-making power
	Representation justice (first-order justice claims and engagement in the meta-framing of justice)	Articulation of first order justice claims	Ideological power (freedom from)
		Ability to shape how justice is perceived	Ideological power (exercise of)
Distributive justice	Intergenerational justice	Decision-making outcomes reflect a group's true preferences for spatial distribution	Decision-making power
	Intragenerational justice	Decision-making outcomes reflect a group's true preferences for temporal distribution	

shaped by ideological power as it enables or constrains a group's ability to make first-order justice claims (Fraser) articulating their "true preferences" (Lukes). Here we differentiate between the articulation of first-order claims as indicative of a group's freedom from ideological power as exercised by others, and their ability to engage in the meta-framing of justice (Fraser, 2010) as them exercising ideological power over others by shaping who is included and excluded from the community entitled to make justice claims on one another.

Finally, we suggest that *distributive justice* is closely connected with the exercise of *decision-making power*. The exercise of decision-making power by an individual or group is identifiable when the outcomes of a political process reflect their preferences for the spatial and temporal distribution of resources. We emphasise the importance of considering distribution to different social groups as well as to different countries, countering the Westphalian model's sole focus on nation states (Fraser, 2010).

Consideration of the three faces of power (Lukes, 2004) helps to mobilise justice theory in an empirical inquiry, enabling exploration of justice in action, i.e. how it is played out in social settings and thus helping to bridge the gap between the more philosophical approach taken by Fraser (e.g. 1995, 2000, 2010) and Schlosberg (2004, 2009) and the more sociological approach favoured by Bulkeley et al (2013; 2014), Klinsky et al (2017). Further empirical research is needed, in a variety of contexts, utilising Lukes (2004) to mobilise philosophical concepts of justice for sociological inquiry, developing understanding of what moderates and empowers claimants of (in)justice in reality.

6. Conclusion

This paper draws upon rich, ethnographic, longitudinal data on the evolution of justice claims made by a group of youth participants in the UNFCCC to address an empirical gap regarding youth perceptions and articulations of climate justice. Responding to calls for research into justice claims-making in environmental governance spaces (Bulkeley et al., 2013, Klinsky et al., 2017), we shed light upon the type of justice claims youth make, why they articulate (in)justice in particular instances and how this is shaped by interactions with other social groups. We find that youth make a variety of claims but, following interactions with other groups, shifted from emphasising their own future vulnerability (i.e. first-order justice claims) to amplifying the present vulnerability articulated by other stakeholders (i.e. solidarity claims). Over time this eroded their self-recognition, leading to their perception, as the paper's title indicates, that youth is not a political position. We argue that, although expressing solidarity is important, youth require support to overcome invisible barriers to representing their generation in the UNFCCC.

We also offer three theoretical contributions: (1) we extend environmental justice theory to incorporate Fraser's concept of representation justice (2007; 2010) into Schlosberg's (2004) framework

of recognition, distribution and participation justice. This offers analytical clarity between dual aspects of participation justice: the visible structures of participation, which we label "*procedural justice*" and the invisible rules and discourses through which justice is claimed and framed which we label "*representation justice*". (2) We illustrate the dual roles of self (psychological) and social (structural) recognition in shaping justice claims, countering Fraser and Honneth's long-standing debate on recognition. (3) We emphasis the hidden relationship between ideological power (Lukes, 2004) and the claiming and framing of justice.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Harriet Thew: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Writing - original draft. **Lucie Middlemiss:** Supervision. **Jouni Paavola:** Supervision.

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.

References

Belfer, E., Ford, J.D., Maillet, M., 2017. Representation of Indigenous peoples in climate change reporting. Clim. Change 145, 57–70.

Betsill, M.M., Corell, E., 2008. NGO Diplomacy: The Influence of Nongovernmental Organizations in International Environmental Negotiations. MIT Press.

Borrows, J., 1997. Living between water and rocks: first nations, environmental planning and democracy. U. Toronto LJ 47, 417.

Bulkeley, H., Andonova, L.B., Betsill, M.M., Compagnon, D., Hale, T., Hoffmann, M.J., Newell, P., Paterson, M., Vandeveer, S.D., Roger, C., 2014. Transnational Climate Change Governance. Cambridge University Press.

Bulkeley, H., Carmin, J., Broto, V.C., Edwards, G.A., Fuller, S., 2013. Climate justice and global cities: mapping the emerging discourses. Global Environ. Change 23, 914–925.

Chatterton, P., Featherstone, D., Routledge, P., 2013. Articulating climate justice in Copenhagen: antagonism, the commons, and solidarity. Antipode 45, 602–620.

Checkoway, B., 2011. What is youth participation? Children Youth Serv. Rev. 33, 340–345.

COY11. 2016. Conference of Youth (COY11) Manifesto [Online]. Paris, France. Available: https://conference-of-youth.org/en/coy11/ [Accessed 21st November 2019].

COY13. 2017. Conference of Youth (COY13) Final Output [Online]. Bonn, Germany. Available: https://www.coy13.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Final-Output-COY13.pdf [Accessed 26th November 2019].

Derman, B.B., 2014. Climate governance, justice, and transnational civil society. Clim. Policy 14, 23–41.

Edwards, K., 2009. Disenfranchised not 'deficient ': how the (neoliberal) state disenfranchises young people. Austral. J. Soc. Issues 44, 23–37.

Emmel, N., 2013. Sampling and Choosing Cases in Qualitative Research: A Realist Approach. Sage.

Fraser, N., Honneth, A., 2003. Redistribution or Recognition?: A Political-Philosophical Exchange. Verso.

FRASER, N., 1995. Recognition or redistribution? A critical reading of Iris Young's Justice and the politics of difference. J. Polit. Philos. 3, 166–180.

Fraser, N., 2000. Rethinking recognition. New Left Rev. 3, 107.

Fraser, N., 2007. Re-framing Justice in a Globalizing World. (Mis) Recognition, Social Inequality and Social Justice. Routledge.

Fraser, N., 2010. Who counts? Dilemmas of justice in a postwestphalian world. Antipode 41, 281–297.

Fraser, N., 2014. Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the" Postsocialist" Condition. Routledge.

Gaventa, J., 1982. Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian valley. University of Illinois Press.

Glaab, K., 2017. A climate for justice? Faith-based advocacy on climate change at the United Nations. Globalizations 14, 1110–1124.

Hammersley, M., Atkinson, P., 2007. Ethnography: Principles in Practice. Routledge.

Harris, A., Wyn, J., Younes, S., 2010. Beyond apathetic or activist youth: 'Ordinary'young people and contemporary forms of participation. Young 18, 9–32.

Hausfather, Z. 2019. Why children must emit eight times less CO2 than their grandparents [Online]. Available: https://www.carbonbrief.org/analysis-why-children-must-emit-eight-times-less-co2-than-their-grandparents [Accessed 5th December 2019].

Honneth, A., 1996. The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts. Mit Press.

Hope, M. 2016. Young People Express Disbelif at Older Generation's Trump and Brexit Choices, Say 'Join Us' to Solve Climate Change [Online]. Available: https://www.desmogblog.com/2016/11/10/young-people-express-disbelief-older-generation-s-trump-and-brexit-choices-say-join-us-solve-climate-crisis [Accessed 26th November 2019].

Hurlbert, M.A., 2011. Evaluating climate justice–attitudes and opinions of individual stakeholders in the United Nations Framework Climate Change Convention Conference of the Parties. Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences 8, 267–286.

IISD. 2016. IISD Reporting Services Coverage of UNFCCC COP 22 [Online]. Available: https://enb.iisd.org/climate/cop22/enbots/10nov.html#event-2 [Accessed 26th November 2019].

Kenis, A., Mathijs, E., 2014. Climate change and post-politics: repoliticizing the present by imagining the future. Geoforum 52, 148–156.

Klinsky, S., Roberts, T., Huq, S., Okereke, C., Newell, P., Dauvergne, P., O'Brien, K., Schroeder, H., Tschakert, P., Clapp, J., 2017. Why equity is fundamental in climate change policy research. Global Environ. Change 44, 170–173.

Kompridis, N., 2007. Struggling over the meaning of recognition: a matter of identity, justice, or freedom. Eur. J. Polit. Theory 6, 277–289.

Lockwood, D. 2017. How youth delegates at COP22 are mobilizing ahead of a Trump presidency [Online]. Available: https://psmag.com/news/how-youth-delegates-at-cop22-are-mobilizing-ahead-of-a-trump-presidency [Accessed 26th November 2019].

Lukes, S., 2004. Power: A Radical View. Macmillan International Higher Education.

Madden, R., 2010. Being Ethnographic: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Ethnography. Sage Publications.

Morgan, J., Waskow, D., 2014. A new look at climate equity in the UNFCCC. Clim.Policy 14, 17–22.

Nash, K., Bell, V., 2007. The politics of framing: an interview with Nancy Fraser. Theory Cult. Soc. 24, 73–86.

Neeff, T., 2013. How many will attend Paris? UNFCCC COP participation patterns 1995–2015. Environ. Sci. Policy 31, 157–159.

Norton, B.G., 2002. The ignorance argument: what must we know to be fair to the future. Econom. Ethics Environ. Policy 35–52.

Okereke, C., 2010. Climate justice and the international regime. Wiley Interdiscipl. Rev.: Clim. Change 1, 462–474.

Rawls, J. 1971. A Theory of Justice.

Schlosberg, D., Collins, L.B., 2014. From environmental to climate justice: climate change and the discourse of environmental justice. Wiley Interdiscipl. Rev.: Clim. Change 5, 359–374.

Schlosberg, D., 2004. Reconceiving environmental justice: global movements and political theories. Environ. Polit. 13, 517–540.

Schlosberg, D., 2009. Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature. Oxford University Press.

Sova, C., Vervoort, J., Thornton, T., Helfgott, A., Matthews, D., Chaudhury, A., 2015. Exploring farmer preference shaping in international agricultural climate change adaptation regimes. Environ. Sci. Policy 54, 463–474.

Tanner, T., 2010. Shifting the narrative: child-led responses to climate change and disasters in el salvador and the philippines. Children Soc. 24, 339–351.

Taylor, C., 1994. Multiculturalism: Expanded Paperback Edition. Princeton University Press.

Taylor, M., 2019. Schoolchildren go on Strike Across World over Climate Crisis. The Guardian.

Thew, H., 2018. Youth participation and agency in the United Nations framework convention on climate change. Int. Environ. Agreem.: Politics Law Econ. 1–21.

Tisdall, E., 2015. Children and Young People's Participation. Routledge International Handbook of Children's Rights Studies. pp. 185.

Trajber, R., Walker, C., Marchezini, V., Kraftl, P., Olivato, D., Hadfield-Hill, S., Zara, C., Fernandes Monteiro, S., 2019. Promoting climate change transformation with young people in Brazil: participatory action research through a looping approach. Action Res. 17, 87–107.

UNFCCC. 1992. Essential Background [Online]. Available: http://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf#page=17 [Accessed 18th August 2017].

UNFCCC. 2015. Paris Agreement [Online]. Available: http://unfccc.int/paris_agreement/items/9485.php [Accessed July 30th 2016].

UNFCCC. 2017. Statistics on Participation and in-session engagement [Online]. Online. Available: https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/parties-non-party-stakeholders/non-party-stakeholders/statistics-on-non-party-stakeholders/statistics-on-participation-and-in-session-engagement [Accessed 18th July 2019].

Young, I.M., 1990. Justice and the Politics of Difference. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.

YOUNGO. 2017. Submission to the SBI Chair [Online]. Online. Available: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/931.pdf [Accessed 18th July 2019].