

Constructing Climate Justice in Discourse: Australian Logic

Weiye Lu^{1*}

¹ School of Foreign Studies, China University of Mining and Technology, China

*Corresponding author: ts22100019a31@cumt.edu.cn

Abstract

This study aims to find out Australian government's logic on climate justice discourse. With Australia's official speeches at the successive sessions of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the climate change-related policy and legal texts issued by the Australian federal government as the corpus, this study explores the logic of generation, organization and function of the discourse under the guidance of Fairclough's idea. It is found that distributive justice and procedural justice are the main dimensions of climate justice in the discourse. And they're organized through judgement, recognition and action. They function with political, economic and social spheres.

Keywords : Climate Justice; Australia; Discourse Study; Frame Analysis

Suggested citation : Lu, W. (2025). Constructing Climate Justice in Discourse: Australian Logic. *Journal of Current Social Issues Studies*, 2(5), 268–275. <https://doi.org/10.71113/JCSIS.v2i5.202>

Introduction

Climate change is a critical issue related to human survival and development, which not only involves the natural environment but also encompasses geopolitics, energy, economy, and development. It is one of the key factors reshaping global politics and development. In recent years, "climate justice," which focuses on the distribution of climate responsibilities, has gained increased international attention. To protect their image and interests, Governments, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and the media have utilized various discourses on different occasions to convey their positions and demands regarding this issue. However, research on climate justice has predominantly focused on its connotations and implementation from law and ethics. There is still a need for further exploration on the discursive logic, content, and significance of climate justice in different countries.

Australia is the country with the highest per capita carbon emissions (Morton, 2023) and the largest nation in the South Pacific region. In the context of climate change, it not only bears historical responsibility for emissions, but is also directly threatened by rising sea levels. Therefore, it has actively advocated for climate justice in international community, and has introduced domestic climate legislation to construct and maintain climate justice. However, there is still insufficient research on how Australia uses discourse to advocate climate justice and convey its national stance. This study combines critical discourse analysis (CDA) and corpus linguistics (CL) to explore the official discourse on climate issues in Australia. The study aims to interpret the its logic in text, discursive practice and social practice on climate justice, therefore expands the scope of climate justice research, and provide an innovative perspective for Australian studies.

Literature Review

Climate Justice and Its Dimensions

Climate justice extends and expands the concept of "justice" in the context of climate change (Cao Mingde, 2016). It emerged as a response to the significant increase in greenhouse gases emission since the Industrial Revolution, which has led to irreversible climate changes. This concept originated from a report titled *Greenhouse Gangsters vs Climate Justice* by the NGO Corp Watch in 1999 (Bruno et al., 1999). Subsequently, as environmental movement develops, the term "climate justice" has become widely used in international conferences.

Scholars have different definitions and interpretations of climate justice, depending on their focal points. At the macro level, climate justice refers to the fundamental value norms and moral principles in response to the global climate crisis (Wang Canfa & Chen Yijian, 2013). At the meso level, the focus of climate justice is on how climate change affects people in diverse, uneven, and disproportionate ways, and how to correct these injustices in a fair and just manner (Sultana, 2021). At the micro level, climate justice addresses two key issues: how to drastically reduce global greenhouse gas emissions and how to fairly and reasonably allocate emission quotas among countries (Chen Xiao, 2018).

Due to differences in definitions and demands, the dimensions of climate justice are diverse. For human subjects, the dimensions include distributive justice, compensatory justice, and intergenerational justice. Distributive justice refers to the fair

allocation of climate resources and environmental obligations between nations. Intergenerational justice aims to protect future generations from harm and hold those responsible for causing such harm accountable. Compensatory justice refers to the responsibility of those who cause harm to repair and compensate the victims. For non-human subjects, including animals and the natural world, the dimension of climate justice is interspecies justice, which focuses on the fairness between humans and other species (Zheng, 2017). Based on the different forms of climate justice, it can be divided into procedural justice and substantive justice. Procedural justice primarily focuses on decision-making processes, which should be fair and inclusive, including access to information and meaningful participation (Newell et al., 2021). Substantive justice addresses the allocations of burdens related to climate change and share of the benefits, with the main form being distributive justice (Yang Bowen, 2023). In line with the categories above, this study will explore the discursive logic of Australia's construction on climate justice through five dimensions: distributive justice, compensatory justice, intergenerational justice, and procedural justice.

Research of Climate Justice

The research framework of climate justice can be categorized into three levels: theoretical construction, dimensional analysis, and practical impact. At the theoretical construction level, early studies focused on the ethical aspects of climate governance. Jamieson (2001) explored the ethical dimensions of climate change policies, while Brown (2002) and Athanassoulou and Baer (2002) highlighted the responsibility of developed countries and development rights of developing countries in global governance. Li Chunlin (2010) summarized the concept, the connotation and relationship with climate governance of climate justice. With Vanderheriden's (2008) systematic classification of climate justice, an interdisciplinary research paradigm gradually emerged, which further complemented the construction of climate justice.

In studies related to dimensional analysis, there has been a diverse landscape. On distributive justice, researchers focused on responsibility-sharing mechanisms, including Polluter Pays Principle, Ability-to-Pay Principle, Beneficiary Pays Principle, Grandfathering Principle, Emissions Egalitarianism (Yang Tongjin, 2022). Subsequently, researchers have improved such principles, and proposed a mixed responsibility model (Wang Yingying, 2023). For Intergenerational justice, studies focused the allocations of limited resources and rights of future generations from the perspectives of ethics, policy-making, economic analysis, and juridic practice (Ohlsson & Skillington, 2023). Compensatory justice constructs a responsibility loop through historical accountability (Caney, 2005) and economic compensation mechanisms (Adelman, 2016). The procedural justice expands within the international legal framework, containing core elements such as transparency, reciprocity and participation (Brandstedt & Br  ld, 2019), as well as reasonable disagreement and political deadlock, fair process, fair participation, political equality, fair bargaining, and voting (Tomlinson, 2015). In addition, researchers also extend the boundaries of traditional dimensions, advocating interspecies justice based on ecological holism and seeking to coordinate the balance between species (Li Yingchao, 2016).

Research on the practical impact of climate justice presents an interaction between global perspectives and local concerns. Case studies cover industrialized countries such as the U.S., Germany and Australia, as well as climate-vulnerable regions including small island developing states, Southeast Asia, and Brazil. The research topics include climate politics (Xie Laihui, 2017; Tang Xinhua, 2022); energy issues; communication (Qin Zhe & Zheng Quan, 2020) and discourse study. These studies reflect both the common challenges in global climate governance and the divergent demands of developed and developing countries.

The above research shows that diverse theoretical foundation of climate justice, with dimensional paths entailing various forms such as time, space, and population. Its influence extends beyond multiple countries and regions, affecting various social fields. However, current research emphasizes macro-level political, economic, legal, and ethical issues, while the studies of climate justice at the meso and micro levels, as well as the mechanisms of interaction between climate justice and the social environment, remains insufficient. Notably, the role of discourse, an important form of social practice, has been largely overlooked in the field of climate justice. Discourse can facilitate climate negotiations and discussions through its communicative function, thus promoting procedural justice and influencing distributive and compensatory justice. It can also change people's perceptions and attitudes towards climate through its constructive function, advancing climate education and fostering intergenerational and interspecies justice. Through their competition for the meaning and dominance of discourse in climate debates, different actors can also impact distributive and compensatory justice. Therefore, the introduction of discourse study could provide new perspectives to explore the mechanisms between discourse and various dimensions of climate justice, the interactions with different actors, and the connection to social power.

Research on Climate Justice and Discourse

Research on climate justice discourse mainly explores aspects such as discourse actors, discourse competition, and discourse impact. Discourse actors include the media (Dreher, 2015) and governments (MacCallum et al., 2014). Discourse competition primarily focuses on comparing the discourse of developed and developing countries at the United Nations Climate Conferences (Audet, 2013; Lefstad & Paavola, 2023) and comparing government and non-governmental actors' discourse frameworks (Shawoo & McDermott, 2020). They conducted their study through comparative study, critical discourse analysis, and corpus-assisted analysis. As for the impacts, researchers tend to examine countries like Australia, USA and Pakistan on the discourse impacts of policies, social activities, or international affairs. These studies, however, have seldom combined and analyzed of domestic and foreign policy documents to explore how climate justice is expressed, operates, and originates in different contexts.

Australia is one of the countries with the highest cumulative carbon emissions and is also the largest nation in the South Pacific. In the context of climate change, it not only bears historical responsibility for emissions, but is also directly threatened by rising sea levels. For a long time, Australia has viewed climate change as a critical national security issue, and has worked to uphold climate justice through both domestic policy-making and international participation in climate governance. Currently, research on Australia's climate justice discourse includes critical discourse analysis of local government climate change response strategies (MacCallum et al., 2014) and studies of Australian media coverage of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) on climate justice (Dreher, 2015). There're also studies comparing the discourse differences between news agencies and social media on climate justice movements (Chen Kaiping et al., 2023). These studies provide valuable insights into the official statements, as well as social attitudes toward various entities concerning climate justice. Nevertheless, research on the composition, dissemination, and significance of the Australian federal government's climate justice discourse, both domestically and internationally, remains insufficient. Given that critical discourse analysis can explore the content, causes, and mechanisms of discourse through text description, discourse practices, and social practices, and has already been applied in climate justice discourse research, this study aims to examine the generation, operation, and impact logic of the Australian federal government's climate justice discourse. It will do so using Fairclough's three-dimensional framework and corpus-based techniques.

Research Design

Theoretical Framework

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a significant method for analyzing language and discourse. It takes language as part of the society and views discourse as a social practice (Fairclough, 2015). Under such a paradigm, Fairclough set CDA to interpret the connections and dynamics of discursive practice and social-cultural changes (Chen Jin, 2022: 35). For the analysis procedure of CDA, Fairclough (1992) proposed a three-dimensional analytical framework including textual practice (description), discursive practice (interpretation), and social practice (explanation). The description stage helps understand the "formal propoerties of text ,, such as vocabulary, grammar and textual structures (2015). The interpreation stage corresponds to the production and consumption process of the discourse (2022). In the explanation stage, the aim is to figure out the relationship between the discourse practice process and its social context, requiring the incorporation of social structure to show how power and ideology operate (Xin Bin & Gao Xiaoli, 2013).

So far, CDA has been widely applied in studies regarding climate change and government discourse, along with a few studies from the lens of climate justice. However, further attempts in How Australian government constructs climate justice through domestic and international articulation are still in need. In this case, this study introduces frame analysis to interpret the discursive logic. Frame originated from cultural sociology and cognitive psychology, and was elaborated by Erving Goffman. He argued that people's interpretations of events or behavioral sequences are framed by perceptible blueprints surrounding them and the frames that these trigger. This concept was later applied in various research fields, including media studies, cognitive psychology, and linguistics. Based on the functions of framing, Jin Xiaozhe (2022) proposed three dimensions for analyzing the construction of discursive logic: affective focus, cognitive connection, and behavioral transformation, which could be used as the analytical framework of the present study. By integrating CDA and interpretive package, the study could figure out clear how the government's articulaation contributes to the construction of climate justice.

Data Collection

To explore how Australia constructs climate justice in both domestic and foreign affairs, this study selects the speeches made by Australian officials at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP) and Australia's Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) submitted to the United Nations as the corpus for Australia's climate diplomacy (ACD). Additionally, the study also collects texts including *The Roles and Responsibilities for Climate Change Adaptation in Australia*, *Climate Change Act 2022*, and *Annual Climate Change Statement* as the corpus for Australia's climate policy (ACP). The number of data is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The Byte Number of Australia Climate Discourse

Name	Byte number
ACD	35,824
ACP	83,028

To identify dimensions of climate justice witinin Australian government's climate discourse, the study uses a corpus linguistic tool Sketch Engine for textual analysis. This online tool is capable of extracting keywords, collocations and context related to climate justice, thus contributing the comprehensive analysis of the discursive framework surrounding climate justice.

Research Question and Research Steps

Based on Fairclough's three-dimensional framework, the study seeks to explore the following questions:

- (1) What climate justice discourses has Australia produced?
- (2) How are these climate justice discourses structured?
- (3) What are the reasons behind the formation of these discourses?

To figure out the discursive construction and logic of Australian government regarding climate justice, the study combines CDA and corpus linguistics (CL) following the three stages: description, interpretation and explanation. At the description stage, the study uses CL to uncover keywords within the ACP and ADP corpora, thus identifying the key concerns held by the government, laying the foundation of linking the government's emphasis to climate justice. At the interpretation stage, the study furthers the investigation over collocations and concordance lines, then frames the government's climate discourse from framing devices and resonning devices guided by the interpretive package. By doing so, the author could link the semiotic features and underlying intentions of the government's dicourve, thus figure out its logic of countructing climate justice. Follwing the two stages, the explanation stage attempts to explore the reasons behind these constructions, connecting discourse on climate justice to broader sociopolitical factors. The results are presented in the following chapters.

Results

Describing Climate Justice: Distributive and Procedural Justice

In this section, the study identifies the themes Australia outputed on climate issues and their corresponding climate justice dimensions through keywords, lexical choices, and index lines. The study cross-references the ACD corpus with the ACP corpus and extracts the top 10 keywords and terms, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Cross-References of ACP and ACD

ACP		ACD	
Keyword	Term	Keyword	Term
NSW	territory government	umbrella	stretch goal
Queensland	critical mineral	assumption	reference indicator
mineral	annual climate change statement	methodological	Kyoto Protocol
Queensland	greenhouse gas emissions reduction	Durban	methodological approach
mineral	annual climate change	Copenhagen	reference point
study	risk management	multi-year	quantifiable information
October	gas emissions reduction	economy-wide	economic stretch
EV	renewable hydrogen	single-year	economic stretch goal
f	energy sector	coverage	natural disturbance
subsection	disaster risk	absolute	clean hydrogen

The data above shows that the Australian federal government emphasized four themes in its publications: emission reduction, international engagement, risk management and internationally responsibility. Firsly, terms such as "critical mineral," "EV," "greenhouse gas emissions reduction," "renewable hydrogen," and "clean hydrogen" suggest a strong emphasis on energy transition and technological innovation. The presence of words like "absolute" (in "absolute economy-wide emissions reduction") reflects Australia's commitment to binding, measurable emission reduction targets. For the theme of international engagement, there is a particular focus on participation in international conferences by the frequent mention of "umbrella", "Durban", "Copenhagen" and the binding nature of international climate agreements like "*Kyoto Protocol*", "Reference Point", "multi-year", "single-year", and "economic stretch goal". Thirdly, Australian government highlighted "risk management", "disaster risk", "natural disturbance" to show its observation and reponse for domestic climate risks and disasters. Finally, it aso used "fund" and "climate finance" to indicate concerns and reponsibility for international climate actions targeting Pacific Island Countries.

Having figured out the government's focus in emission, engagement and response, the study considers its relation to the dimensions of climate justice, and holds the three themes potentially correspond to distributive justice and procedural justice by examining their concordance the lines. In the first place, the emphasis on emission reduction and risk management are set to lower the climate impacts on Australians and improve climate resilience. In doing so, the government promotes "greatest utility" that maximizes the social benefits, mitigating the hits to people, especially those who are vulnerable. Meanwhile, their demandings also align with Polluter Pays Principle, which usually applied to environmental and climate measures to undertake the outcomes of damages and pollutions (De de Vries et al., 2024).

Moreover, the keywords surrounding international engagement reflects Australia's stress on climate diplomacy, adherence to international law and the spirit of agreements, posintioning itself with the reciprocity and inclusiveness of procedural justice.

However, even though words related to financial aid appeared in the corpora, they're usually linked with "responsibility rather than "history" or "past", suggesting greater inclination on "Capacity to Pay" principle in the distributive justice, but little association on the reflections for historical responsibility in carbon emissions. Meanwhile, the frequency of "compensate" and its derivatives is also low, which indicates the compensatory justice is not consistently underlined compared to the former two dimensions. Finally, to examine if intergenerational justice is concerned by the government, the study searches for words like "future," "children," and "generation" that surrounds future significance, but these words appear infrequently and have weak connections to climate justice in their concordance lines. Such a tendency demonstrates that the Australian federal government has not emphasized intergenerational justice.

These results imply that the government's climate discourse focuses on distributive justice and procedural justice, aligning with its different claims in domestic and international climate adaptation actions and global climate governance participation. Given the frequency and typical cases of these discourses, this study will continue to explore the logic behind the Australian federal government's construction of these two dimensions.

Interpreting Climate Justice: Affective, Cognition and Behavior

This section adopts frame analysis to explore the logic of climate justice discourse. According to this framework, this study combines collocations and intextuality to examine how distributive justice and procedural justice are constructed within Australia's climate discourse. For affection, the study tries to figure out how the government attracts audience attention by searching for evaluative collocations associated with keywords of different climate justice dimensions. For cognition, it identifies the cognitive landscapes generated by related noun phrases associated with keywords. When it comes to behavior, it examines related verbs to determine the practical actions the government calls the audience to take. By extracting the collocations with the highest co-occurrence frequency, the results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Frame on the Construction of Climate Justice Discourse

	Distributive justice	Procedural justice
Affective Focus	active, strategic, national, renewable, global, Pacific, Asian, long-term, bilateral regional	Global, bold, effective, important
Cognitive connection	Australia, emission, energy, technology, decarbonise, billion, Green Climate Fund	commitment, effort, community, agreement
Behavioral transformation	action, impact, benefit, update, deliver	Agree, work, measure, support

Distributive Justice: Reduction and Promotion

The Australian government emphasises emission reduction and clean energy development as primary strategies for meeting its emission reduction and net-zero goals. The government uses the terms "global," "national," "regional," and "rural" within the affection dimension to highlight that emission reduction actions must be implemented through a top-down strategy, reflecting through various spatial locations. In addition to emission reduction, the government adopts an active approach to renewable energy. The cognition dimension underscores that emission reduction involves not only the limitation of greenhouse gas emissions but also the transition to cleaner, and renewable energy. They believe emission reduction shall not adversely affect the economy, employment, or business, nor should it result in increased energy prices due to higher energy taxes, which would impact people's livelihoods. To achieve such goals, while fostering economic development, the main focus should be on technology rather than taxation (Shi Kun & Cai Jianing, 2022). With sufficient resources in renewable energy, and support for technologies and project in the clean energy sector, the government wish to make Australia a "renewable energy superpower" (Tang Jie, 2024), thus holding their commitment on the transformation of energy structure.

In addition, the Australian government stresses financial assistance for developing nations via affective focus and cognitive connection, which manifests the "Capacity to Pay" Principle. The discourse points to the Pacific Island countries and Southeast Asian nations in nearby regions of Australia in the affective focus dimension. The location and regional integration of the South Pacific are significant factors in its analysis, with bilateral aid serving as the primary form of assistance from Australia (Jiang, 2018). Using "billion," "update," and "deliver," the government have demonstrated its continuous aid commitments to developing countries. It strengthened its climate finance commitment, expecting to deliver \$3 billion towards global efforts over 2020-25, which includes includes \$1.3 billion in climate finance for the Pacific Countries (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affair and Trade, 2024). Green Climate Fund was used as a primary mechanism for delivering climate assistance, and the government also indicated supports for the Loss and Damage Fund established at the COP28.

Procedural Justice: Global Participation

On procedural justice. The government values its involvement in international climate matters through the cognitive connection dimension. They supports international climate agreements and make emission reduction promises based on their standing, establishing themselves as a responsible in fulfilling the duties. At the *Kyoto Protocol*, Copenhagen Climate Conference, and Paris Agreement, the Australian government has shown concern and pledged emission reductions. In 2007, the Rudd government approved the *Kyoto Protocol* and established a target to reduce Australia's greenhouse gas emissions by

60% from 2000 levels by 2050 (UNFCCC, 2008). During the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Conference, the Rudd government committed to reduce emissions by 5% below 2000 levels by 2020. The Gillard government subsequently submitted its emission reduction plans and targets at the Durban Climate Conference, and signed the second commitment period of the *Kyoto Protocol* at the Doha Climate Conference in 2012. During the Turnbull administration, Australia signed the *Paris Agreement* in 2015, pledging to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 26%–28% below 2005 levels by 2030 and reach net-zero emissions by 2100. To combat climate change, Turnbull proposed to help poor nations and fund clean energy research at the Paris Conference. After the Morrison administration was criticised for its conservative climate policies, the Albanese government reaffirmed Australia's commitment to the Paris Agreement and climate obligations. In signing the newest *Paris Agreement* climate obligations, Australia has boosted several domestic plans and bills in response to international climate agreements. These include the *Carbon Emissions Trading Scheme Bill*, the *Clean Energy Bill*, the Emissions Reduction Fund, the *National Energy Guarantee*, and the 2022 *Climate Change Bill*. They're all aimed at the targets for emission reductions.

Explaining the Discursive Logic of Climate Justice In Australia

The analysis indicates that the climate justice discourse of the Australian government operates within the frameworks of distributive justice, procedural justice, and compensatory justice. According to the distributive justice dimension, the government sees the development of renewable energy technologies as a means of achieving emission reduction targets. By taking advantage of financial investments and policy support, renewable energy can be applied to promote decarbonization and the energy transition. As for procedural justice, the government underlines its involvement and commitments in international climate affairs, therefore positioning itself as a responsible actor. In the context of compensatory justice, the government focusses on its ongoing climate funding to the South Pacific area. This following section will examine the factors contributing to the emergence of climate justice discourse in Australia from political, economic, and social perspectives.

Political Factors: Global Consensus On Climate Justice

At the political level, the need to adhere to global governance consensus and maintain national image requires the Australian government to comply with climate justice. Climate change is a worldwide problem that affects the world's collective interests and influences the transformation of national and global development models. The collective governance calls for the collaborative efforts of all nations and individuals. The adoption of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992 and the subsequent *Paris Agreement* in 2015 reflect a significant evolution in the international community's commitment and approaches to climate change mitigation. Despite the inherent contradiction between national interests and the public good of global environmental governance, environmental issues are increasingly critical in shaping international relations and security. Engagement in international issues related to the environment is an essential duty for all nations. Consequently, Australia is required to align with international consensus, making commitments and assuming responsibility in accordance with the principle of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR). Furthermore, Australia's position as a significant emitter of fossil fuels and its membership in umbrella countries considerably influences global climate initiatives. Passive actions at international climate conferences or domestic climate measures would weaken Australia's national image and influence in neighboring nations. Australia has received the "Fossil of the Year" award multiple times, reflecting its inadequate performance on climate issues, which has led to a tarnished reputation and criticism from both allies and neighboring nations. Climate issues are a significant focus in Australian elections. The growing public concern regarding these matters, coupled with the emergence of environmental movements, indicates that commitment to climate justice is consistent with public expectations and ethical obligations. Thus, via emission reductions, climate assistance, and other initiatives, Australia attains both primary and secondary compensatory justice, demonstrating its commitment to climate global governance through open and thorough engagement.

Economical Factors: Opportunities for Renewable Energy

At the economic level, new opportunities for economic development motivate the Australian government to emphasize the application of renewable energy within distributive justice. Currently, Australia's coal-fired power plants are relatively outdated and inefficient, with high coal and natural gas prices and excessively high transmission costs. As a result, its electricity supply has not been adequately secured, leading to consistently high electricity prices (Hou, 2020). The development of renewable energy can reduce energy costs and enhance the diversity of electricity supplies. On the other hand, Australia's geographical environment offers substantial clean energy resources, including wind, solar, and hydro power, and it also holds strengths in the research and development of photovoltaic technology. The advancement of renewable energy corresponds with global energy economic trends and presents an opportunity to enhance Australia's fossil fuel-dependent economic framework, thereby promoting the realization of distributive justice. Furthermore, the increasing global demand for renewable energy provides Australia potentials due to its significant mineral reserves, including cobalt, lithium, and nickel, as well as its photovoltaic products. These factors present growth opportunities for the economy, thereby reinforcing the economic assistance components of compensatory justice.

Social Factors: Climate Risks

As climate risks rise, the Australian government is obliged to advance climate justice to ensure environmental and social stability. The natural environment of Australia is susceptible to and significantly impacted by climate change. In recent years, intensified climate change has further impacted Australia's natural ecosystems through extreme heat, severe weather events, bushfire, floods, sea level rise, and other problems. A wide variety of species face significant existential threats. The declining

natural environment presents challenges to Australia's agriculture, tourism, infrastructure, international trade, and other sectors, greatly affecting production and the livelihoods of Australians, ultimately enhancing public awareness of climate protection. Advocating for climate justice demonstrates the Australian government's obligation to the environment and its residents, as well as boosting public awareness of climate change and encouraging the adoption of appropriate emission reduction measures. Additionally, the issue of climate refugees arising from the climate impacts on Pacific Island countries (Wang Shiming, 2019) is also significant. As the major aid provider to Pacific Island nations, Australia provides financial aid and technical support through compensatory justice, which not only enhances these nations' capacity to address climate change but also mitigates the uncertainties caused by the large-scale influx of climate refugees.

Conclusion

This study uses official statements by Australia at past United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of the Parties (COP) meetings and climate-related policy and legal texts issued by the Australian federal government as the corpus. Guided by Fairclough's three-dimensional analysis framework and incorporating quantitative analysis methods, this research explores the generation logic, organizational logic, and operational logic of Australia's climate justice discourse. The study finds that Australia's climate justice discourse primarily manifests in the dimensions of distributive justice, procedural justice, and compensatory justice. Distributive justice is mainly implemented through emission reduction, the development of renewable energy, and financial aid to neighboring countries. Procedural justice is expressed in Australia's recognition and participation in international climate affairs and climate governance. The construction of climate justice by the Australian government is influenced by political, economic, and social factors. Politically, Australia needs to respond to the international consensus on climate governance and maintain its reputation; economically, it can use the development of renewable energy to implement distributive justice and support compensatory justice; socially, promoting climate justice is essential for mitigating the negative effects of climate change and fostering social stability.

China and Australia are two major energy-producing nations encountering specific climate risks. They are crucial for setting emission reduction targets, advancing clean energy initiatives, and engaging in international environmental policy frameworks. With the rising prominence of ethical and moral issues like climate justice, it is imperative for China to enhance its participation in global climate governance. This includes maintaining the progress achieved in international climate initiatives and strengthening its influence in global discussions, as well as protecting national interests in accordance with procedural justice principles. Promoting its emission reduction initiatives from a variety of views would help China establish a reputation as a responsible major power. It may show its attempts to achieve distributive justice, and use its clean energy advantages as a basis for international discussion and collaboration as well. In addition to climate cooperation and assistance based on CBDR and the idea of "a community with a shared future for mankind", China ought to consider the principle of historical accountability when defining the connotation and position of compensatory justice. Finally, the principles and practices of China should be also reflected in the areas of intergenerational and interspecies justice.

Acknowledgment

This research was funded by China University of Mining and Technology, grant number 2023WLJCRCZL165.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Adelman, S. (2016). Climate justice, loss and damage and compensation for small island developing states. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, 7(1), 32-53.
- [2] Athanasiou, T., & Baer, P. (2011). *Dead heat: Global justice and global warming*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- [3] Audet, R. (2013). Climate justice and bargaining coalitions: a discourse analysis. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 13(3), 369-386.
- [4] Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2024, October). *Counting Australia's climate finance* (Report). Retrieved February 14, 2025, from <https://www.dfat.gov.au/publications/international-relations/counting-australias-climate-finance>
- [5] Brandstedt, E., & Brölde, B. (2019). Towards a theory of pure procedural climate justice. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 36(5), 785-799.
- [6] Brown, Donald A. *American heat: Ethical problems with the United States' response to global warming*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.
- [7] Bruno, K., Karliner, J., & Brotsky, C. (1999). *Greenhouse gangsters vs. climate justice*. San Francisco: Transnational Resource & Action Center.
- [8] Caney, S. (2005). Cosmopolitan justice, responsibility, and global climate change. *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 18(4), 747-775.
- [9] Cao, M. D. (2016). The legal standpoint and strategy of China to participate in international climate governance: From the perspective of climate justice [In Chinese]. *China Legal Science*, (1), 29-48.

- [10] Chen, Jin. (2023). *A corpus-based study on China's international counterterrorism discourse (2001–2021)* (Doctoral dissertation). Beijing: Beijing Foreign Studies University.
- [11] Chen, K., Molder, A. L., Duan, Z., Boulianne, S., Eckart, C., Mallari, P., & Yang, D. (2023). How climate movement actors and news media frame climate change and strike: Evidence from analyzing twitter and news media discourse from 2018 to 2021. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 28(2), 384-413.
- [12] Chen, X. (2018). Two turns of climate justice theory and its prospects [In Chinese]. *Journal of SJTU (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 26(2), 34–43.
- [13] De Vries, A., Werner, G., Wijnhuizen, E., Toom, V., Bovens, M., & Hulscher, S. (2024). *Justice in Climate Policy: Distributing Climate Costs Fairly*. Singapore: Springer Nature.
- [14] Dreher, T., & Voyer, M. (2015). Climate refugees or migrants? Contesting media frames on climate justice in the Pacific. *Environmental Communication*, 9(1), 58–76.
- [15] Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- [16] Jamieson, D. (2001). Climate change and global environmental justice. In C. Miller & P. Edwards (Eds.), *Changing the atmosphere: Expert knowledge and global environmental governance* (pp. 287–307). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press
- [17] Jin, X. Z. (2022). U.S. human rights stigmatization of Xinjiang and its logic [In Chinese]. *Human Rights*, (3), 172–194.
- [18] Lefstad, L., & Paavola, J. (2023). The evolution of climate justice claims in global climate change negotiations under the UNFCCC. *Critical Policy Studies*, 17(1), 1-26.
- [19] Li, C. L. (2010). Climate change and climate justice [In Chinese]. *Journal of Fuzhou University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 24(6), 45–50, 108.
- [20] Li, Y. C. (2016). Ethics and response in climate justice [In Chinese]. *Theory Monthly*, (10), 52–57.
- [21] MacCallum, D., Byrne, J., & Steele, W. (2014). Whither justice? An analysis of local climate change responses from South East Queensland, Australia. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 32(1), 70–92.
- [22] Morton, A. (2023, December 7). Australia commits \$150m to climate finance for vulnerable Pacific countries. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/dec/08/australia-commits-150m-to-climate-finance-for-vulnerable-pacific-countries>
- [23] Morton, A. (2023, September 5). Australia has highest per capita CO₂ emissions from coal in G20, analysis finds. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/sep/05/australia-has-highest-per-capita-co2-emissions-from-coal-in-g20-analysis-finds>
- [24] Newell, P., Srivastava, S., Naess, L. O., Adhikari, R., Torres Contreras, G. A., & Price, R. (2021). Toward transformative climate justice: An emerging research agenda. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 12.
- [25] Ohlsson, J., & Skillington, T. (2023). Intergenerational justice. In J. Ohlsson & S. Przybylinski (Eds.), *Theorising justice: A primer for social scientists* (pp. 223–239). Bristol, UK: Bristol University Press.
- [26] Qin, Z., & Zheng, Q. (2020). *An Analysis of Climate Justice in the Content of the United Nations' Official Weibo*. *Youth Journalist*, (30), 52–53.
- [27] Shawoo, Z., & McDermott, C. L. (2020). Justice through polycentricity? A critical examination of climate justice framings in Pakistani climate policymaking. *Climate Policy*, 20(2), 199–216.
- [28] Shi, K., & Cai, J. N. (2021). Primary analysis of Australia emission reduction science and technology deployment and technology pathway [In Chinese]. *Global Science, Technology and Economy Outlook*, 36(12), 19–23.
- [29] Sultana, F. (2021). Climate change, COVID-19, and the co-production of injustices: A feminist reading of overlapping crises. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 22(4), 447–460.
- [30] Tang, J. (2024). *A study of Australia's energy transition since new century* (Master's thesis). Shanghai: East China Normal University.
- [31] Tang, X. H. (2022). US climate strategy and Sino-US climate cooperation [In Chinese]. *Contemporary International Relations*, (1), 8–16, 61.
- [32] Tomlinson, L. (2015). *Procedural justice in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- [33] Vanderheiden, S. (2008). *Atmospheric justice: A political theory of climate change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [34] Wang, C. F., & Chen, Y. J. (2013). On climate justice [In Chinese]. *International Social Science Journal (Chinese Edition)*, 30(2), 5–6, 10, 30–44.
- [35] Wang, S. M. (2019). Open regionalism and China–Australia cooperation in the South Pacific Islands region [In Chinese]. *China International Studies*, (1), 54–74.
- [36] Wang, Y. Y. (2023). Which kind of justice and how to be effective: Rethinking ethical principles in climate change [In Chinese]. *Journal of China University of Geosciences (Social Sciences Edition)*, 23(4), 72–81.
- [37] Xie, L. H. (2017). The success of Paris Agreement and the new order of international climate politics [In Chinese]. *Foreign Theoretical Trends*, (7), 116–127.
- [38] Xin, B., & Gao, X. L. (2013). Critical discourse analysis: Goals, methods and dynamics [In Chinese]. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, (4), 1–5, 16.
- [39] Yang, B. W. (2023). Study on compliance rules of national communication obligations of parties under carbon neutral target of Paris Agreement [In Chinese]. *International Business Research*, 44(5), 87–97.
- [40] Yang, T. J. (2010). Global justice: Ethical principle of distributing greenhouse gas emissions [In Chinese]. *Journal of Renmin University of China*, 24(2), 2–10.