ie.WorkingPaper

Climate Justice Now!
The Viennese Climate Movement - A Framing Analysis on Fridays for Future, Extinction Rebellion and System Change not Climate Change and their Approaches to Climate Justice

Lena Gruber & Kathrin Hofer
Co-Authors: Jana Binder, Anne Hampp, Nora Karim, Annette Stolz

The ie.WorkingPaper series presents research carried out at or in partnership with the Department of Development Studies at the University of Vienna. The Department understands development research as a transdisciplinary field of knowledge that includes a wide range of epistemological, theoretical, and methodological approaches and perspectives. These approaches and perspectives should be compatible with and contribute to decolonial and emancipatory production of knowledge. Although there are a wide range of thematic and regional focuses, our research shares two commonalities: the centrality of researching processes and mechanisms that contribute to the production and reproduction of social inequality on the global, regional, and local level and a relational understanding of social, political, and economic transformations.

Climate Justice Now!

The Viennese Climate Movement - A Framing Analysis on *Fridays for Future*, *Extinction Rebellion* and *System Change not Climate Change* and their Approaches to Climate Justice

Authors: Lena Gruber & Kathrin Hofer

Co-Authors: Jana Binder, Anne Hampp, Nora Karim, Annette Stolz

Abstract: This working paper aims to contribute to capturing the diversity of the current climate movement with a focus on the Viennese context. A look at this scene in 2019 and beyond shows that it is characterised by different actors, interpretations of the cause of the crisis and possible solutions, as well as varying modes of action. By analysing the framing within the self-representation of three selected groups (Fridays for Future, Extinction Rebellion, System Change not Climate Change including the Climate Camp) within the Viennese climate movement, this paper examines the different approaches of the groups, their reciprocities, linkages and differences and if climate justice thereby functions as a master frame. On the basis of a qualitative content analysis of the group's websites as well as semi-structured expert interviews a profound understanding of the various characteristics within the movement was enabled. Whereas all three selected groups are referring to the concept of climate justice, they are ranging on a spectrum between more 'moderate' and more 'radical' attitudes towards their problem diagnosis, strategies and modes of action.

Author Information:

Lena Gruber was a student at the Department of Development Studies at the University of Vienna. Her research interests focus on social inequality as well as gender and climate justice in the nexus of feminist political ecology, the economics of care, (power-)critical education, social-ecological transformation and alternative ways of living. She is now working in an organisation in Berlin that raises awareness on topics of intersectional justice and the importance of diversity within the early educational sector.

Kathrin Hofer was a student at the Department of Development Studies as well. Her research interests focus on activism, ranging from social movements and protests to personal livelihoods and alternative ways of living. Additionally, she is interested in the field of education and pedagogy - especially in (power-)critical education and its relation to social inequality. She is now working for the Viennese

association wienXtra, where she is active in conceptualising and hosting workshops for children on the topics of urban development and participation.

Jana Binder is a student at the Department of Development Studies. Her research interests are focussing on protest movements, civil disobedience and social inequalities. She is also working at the feminist organisation Peregrina where she is teaching German to migrant women.

Anne Hampp is a student at the Department of Development Studies. Her research focuses on feminist and critical social theory and feminist political economy, as well as antisemitism, racism and its intersections. She is interested in critical perspectives on the subject and its entanglements in social power relations.

Nora Karim was a student at the Department of Development Studies. Her research interest has been on topics around the European climate (justice) movement, where she focused on the Extinction Rebellion movement for her master's thesis.

Annette Stolz is a student at the Department of Development Studies. Her research interests are focussing on intersectionality in the context of (environmental) activism and feminism. She works for the Austrian environmental protection organisation GLOBAL 2000.

Contact: Lena Gruber: a01208371@unet.unive.ac.at; Kathrin Hofer: a01368405@unet.univie.ac.at; Jana Binder: jana.binder@univie.ac.at; Anne Hampp: a0120560@unet.unive.ac.at; Nora Karim: a01209139@unet.unive.ac.at; Annette Stolz: a11724696@unet.unive.ac.at

Abstract: Das vorliegende Working Paper soll dazu beitragen, die Vielfalt der aktuellen Klimabewegung mit einem Fokus auf den Wiener Kontext zu erfassen. Ein Blick auf diese Szene im Jahr 2019 und darüber hinaus zeigt, dass sie durch unterschiedliche Akteur*innen, Interpretationen der Krisenursache und möglicher Lösungsansätze sowie unterschiedliche Handlungsweisen geprägt ist. Durch die Analyse des Framings in der Selbstdarstellung dreier ausgewählter Gruppen (Fridays for Future, Extinction Rebellion, System Change not Climate Change inkl. Klimacamp) innerhalb der Wiener Klimabewegung untersucht dieser Beitrag die unterschiedlichen Ansätze der Gruppen, ihre Wechselwirkungen, Verknüpfungen und Unterschiede und ob Klimagerechtigkeit dabei als Masterframe fungiert. Auf Basis einer qualitativen Inhaltsanalyse der unterschiedlichen Webseiten sowie semistrukturierter Expert*inneninterviews wurde ein differenziertes Verständnis der verschiedenen Ausprägungen innerhalb der Bewegung ermöglicht. Während sich alle drei Gruppen auf das Konzept der Klimagerechtigkeit beziehen, bewegen sie sich in Bezug auf ihre Problemdiagnose, Strategien und Handlungsweisen auf einem Spektrum zwischen eher 'moderaten' und eher 'radikalen' Haltungen.

List of Abbreviations:

CJN!	Climate Justice Now!
CDM	Clean Development Mechanisms,
COP 13	UN Climate Conference in Bali, 2007
COP 15	UN Climate Conference in Copenhagen, 2009
COP 21	UN Climate Conference in Paris, 2015
FFF	Fridays for Future
IEN	Indigenous Environmental Network
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSM	New Social Movements
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SCnCC	System Change not Climate Change
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
XR	Extinction Rebellion

1. Introduction

In 2019 - the year before the global COVID-19 pandemic paralysed or rather preoccupied the public discourse - the climate (justice) movement had gained new momentum, making the climate and environmental crisis a very present and widely discussed topic within public discourse in Austria, as well as on a global scale (Wissen/Brand 2019: 31; Narodoslawsky 2020: 104ff.). Through various forms of protest and resistance, both newly emerging and already established groups have contributed to a heightened awareness of the consequences of the climate crisis. However, climate change and related issues have already been discussed scientifically and partially publicly for several decades and protests and movements in this context have become a topic of academic debate as well. Already in the 1970s, when so-called 'New Social Movements'[1] were theorised for the first time, global environmental movements emerged, calling for ecological modernisation. But action groups, organisations and alliances were also formed (Kern 2008: 53). Still, in relation to the extent of the environmental crisis - forest fires, rising sea levels, the increase in extreme weather, storms and droughts, as well as the destruction of livelihoods all around the world as a result - very little has been done to counteract this and minimise the consequences on a systemic level (Tokar 2019: 14f.). This not only applies to global failures and lack of interventions, commitments and radical measures, but also to inadequacies specifically of Austrian policies and the increasing public dissatisfaction with them (Narodoslawsky 2020: 58f.). Therefore, Austrian politicians, but also politicians all over the world are under growing pressure to act. Within the environmental movement it became increasingly clear how important it is to address environmental problems in their global dimension and in the context of prevailing social and economic structures. This has resulted in growing relevance of the climate justice discourse that is focussing on the interlinkage between global power relations, social inequality and the ecological crisis (Jafry 2019: 3). Climate justice can be seen as an approach that highlights the uneven consequences of the climate crisis and deals with issues of equality and human rights. Despite the heterogeneity of existing understandings of climate justice, they all focus on aspects of equity and justice of both the causes and consequences of the climate crisis (Jafry 2019: 3).

Especially since Greta Thunberg started to strike school, which led to the rise of the international 'Fridays for Future' (FFF) movement, concerns regarding climate change became a main focus of public attention (Narodoslawsky 2020: 104). 2019 proved to be an eventful year for climate movements, with a multitude of demonstrations, protests and actions worldwide. Also, in Vienna there was a large mobilisation within the civil society and a huge public attention on the topic. New activist groups formed, and already existing ones often received more recognition (Wissen/Brand

---

[1] From the perspective of protest and movement research, environmental protests and climate movements are mainly addressed in the context of the concept of so-called 'New Social Movements' (NSM) (Kern 2008: 103f.). In contrast to earlier movements, such as the worker's movement at the beginning of the 20th century, it is argued, that these newly emerged protests primarily addressed post-material aims such as women's rights, peace and environmental protection (Buechler 1995: 441f.; Leuthold 1996; Kern 2008: 53). Theoretical approaches conceptualising NSM go back to a European tradition of social theory and political philosophy of the 1960s and experienced its peak of discussions within the late 1970s and 1980s. Although there are a variety of approaches regarding the understanding of NSM, most of them agree that those are based on self-determination, autonomy, political participation as well as decentralised forms of organisations and use non-violent forms of protest and civil disobedience as their modes of action (Offe 1985: 829; Buechler 1995: 442; Kern 2008: 55f.).

2019: 31f.). Various demonstrations and interventions were raising awareness for the need for climate justice and for political action. Yet, although the researched groups are referring to the term 'climate justice', they differ in their approach to and understanding of the concept. For this reason, the goal of this working paper is to analyse the actors' framing[2] within the field of climate movements in Vienna to gain deeper insight into their problem analyses, envisioned solutions and modes of action. Furthermore, this work attempts to contribute to the scientific discourse around climate justice as a shared framework within the climate movement(s). Therefore, the following questions will be answered within this paper:

> *When following a framing approach, what kind of problem-understanding, suggested solutions and motivations for action can be identified within prominent groups of the Viennese climate (justice) movement?*

> *What reciprocities, linkages and differences between these groups' framing in the context of climate justice are discernible?*

To answer these questions, this paper analyses data that was gathered in the *'Forschungswerkstatt Protest'*[3]. Following a framing approach, a qualitative content analysis of the self-presentation of selected actors through their websites was used, and semi-structured expert interviews with representatives of those groups were conducted. In distinction to the other papers published in the context of the '*Forschungswerkstatt Protest*'[4], this paper focuses on the comparison of different groups, their perspectives and understandings of climate justice.

To do so, a profound understanding of the emergence and understanding of the concept of climate justice is necessary. In order to accurately depict climate protest actors and their self-conception, we introduce theoretical reflections on so-called 'framing processes', which offer a basis to interpret actors' perceptions and their function. Then, the three selected actors will be introduced to then gain insight into the methodological approach of this paper. The presented results will be structured along the three dimensions of framing, to highlight their reciprocities, linkages and differences. In conclusion we discuss climate justice as a master frame and pose further questions for future research.

---

[2] In that context, framing means the group's interpretative work on the construction of reality (Snow/Benford 1986: 464f.). Therefore, within this paper a framing approach - in the context of protest and social movement research - is to be applied. This concept will be further described in the second section of this paper (2.3. Framing Processes within Social Movements).

[3] The '*Forschungswerkstatt Protest*' on climate protests in Vienna 2019 is a collective of students and lecturers, which was created within the framework of a seminar of the master's programme in International Development at the University of Vienna. The aim was to take a closer look at the protest scene regarding climate (justice) in Vienna and analyse the activists' motives, attitudes and visions for the future as well as their strategies and cooperation for a climate-friendly future. Therefore, various methods were used such as a quantitative survey at global earth strikes (see Bohl et al. 2021), but also qualitative approaches like qualitative short interviews with participants of the protests were conducted, as well as qualitative expert interviews with representatives of different protest groups on networking and organisational aspects as well as with outside experts regarding the social perception of the protests.

[4] So far, the publications that occured in the context of the '*Forschungswerkstatt Protest*' focused especially research questions in the context of Fridays for Future. For example, Bohl et al. (2021), based on qualitative and quantitative data, focused on the opinions and perspectives of individual protest participants of FFF demonstrations in respect of causes, responsibilities and solutions for solving the climate crisis, this paper compares the opinions and perspectives of prominent activist groups.

2.   Theoretical Background

In order to answer the research question and to better understand the current actors in Vienna in relation to climate activism, as well as their perceptions of the problem, their proposed solutions as well as their motivations to act, it is important to first get an insight of the understanding of the concept climate justice, provide some background information on the groups that are analysed within this paper and describe the theory of framing processes within social movements.

2.1.   Concept of Climate Justice

Climate justice as a concept, its core values and arguments had its origins in the 1990s, where international non-profit organisations and networks, such as the 'Indigenous Environmental Network' (IEN), stressed public attention to the increase of resource extraction in the Global South as an implication of neoliberal economic policies and its impacts on local communities (Tokar 2019: 15f.). The word 'climate justice' first appeared in a report titled "Greenhouse Gangsters vs. Climate Justice" in 1999 (Bruno et al. 1999) that focused on the hegemonic political influence of the petroleum industry and therefore - as part of the justice approach - demanded a just transition away from fossil fuels, as well as the need to challenge the corporate-led globalisation (Jafry 2019: 2). Since 2007, the more socio-critical and action-oriented climate justice approach introduced a shift within the environmental discourse and protest landscape, focussing on the relation between global power distribution, social inequality and the ecological crisis (Sander 2016: 9f.). In the context of the 'United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change' (UNFCCC) 2007 conference of parties (COP 13) in Bali, a new network emerged. 'Climate Justice Now!' (CJN!), consisting of mainly progressive non-governmental actors from the Global South, started to criticise so-called 'false solutions' within global climate policy and wanted to tackle the root causes of the climate crisis by fighting for ecological, social, and gender justice (Gibson 2012: 289; Sander 2016: 8). They demanded that those who benefited the most from economic development take responsibility by reducing emissions and financing systemic transformation, in order to protect the most vulnerable and to involve affected people into decision-making-processes (Tokar 2019: 17).

Therefore, climate justice can be seen as an approach that highlights the uneven consequences of the climate crisis and deals with issues of equality and human rights. According to Tokar (2019: 13):

> Climate justice highlights the disproportionate impacts of climate changes on the most vulnerable and marginalised human populations, as well as the limitations of conventional political responses to rising climate instability and the compelling need for systemic solutions.

Based on the climate justice concerns of the 'Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change'-Report (IPCC-Report) it is clear that the risk of severe ill-health, disrupted livelihoods, increased mortality, morbidity, food insecurity and other climate-related hazards "constitute an additional burden to people living in poverty, acting as a threat multiplier often with negative outcomes for livelihoods" (IPCC 2014: 11). This raises international issues of legitimate jurisdiction, governance, development, population, and birth right. The call for action and climate justice is a crucial way of expressing discontent and an attempt to tackle the existing issues within the economic system (Gibson 2012: 290; Sander 2016: 8).

In the last decade, the discussion about climate justice has intensified rapidly, leading to a very broad and diverse understanding of what can be seen as climate justice. The term is used by social movements and NGOs as well as in the academic debate and is articulated in different ways. Despite the heterogeneity of understandings of climate justice, they all focus on equity and justice aspects of both the causes and consequences of climate change (Jafry 2019: 3). Current approaches focus - among other things - on resolving and alleviating unequal burdens created by climate change, a commitment to redress an unequal distribution of the world's wealth, efforts to address global warming by reducing inequalities in development and in the power structures that drive climate change. Additionally, they stress a human rights-based approach to climate justice that protects the rights of those most affected by climate change, as well as viewing the environmental and human impacts of climate change through the lens of social justice, human rights, and concern for indigenous peoples (ibid.).

Taking all this into account, it can be observed that the substantive focus within the landscape of climate movements underwent a shift from 'climate change' to 'climate justice' in the last decade. This can be attributed - among other things - to the failure of the Copenhagen climate summit in 2009 (COP 15) as well as to the failure of climate movements in international negotiations. This changed the perspective on the problems and their solutions, and thus also on the actions necessary to address them, which again became increasingly radical. Furthermore, climate justice represents a broader frame, allowing for increased collaborations with other movements and the inclusion of other problematic issues (della Porta/Parks 2013: 45). Therefore, the shift from 'climate change' to 'climate justice' by climate movement groups in response to the failure of climate movements in international negotiations, can also be described as a shift in framing. This has led to the identification of two distinct wings in the current academic debate on climate movements: a more 'radical wing' focussing on climate justice and a more 'moderate wing' focussing on climate change. While both wings have a common understanding on the diagnosis of the problem, they differ in their proposed solutions. The more 'radical climate justice wing' sees the problem in capitalism as a system and therefore calls for profound systemic change. The more 'moderate wing' looks for change within the capitalist system and is more focused on technological solutions and Green Economy to achieve this (ibid.: 46).

As per 2019, it can be observed that the term 'climate justice' is very present within the Viennese movement and their rhetoric. Therefore, it is relevant to analyse the problem-understanding, suggested solutions and motivations for action within prominent groups in this context. To understand reciprocities, linkages and differences, a comparison between these groups is indispensable. To do so, an understanding of the framing approach is necessary.

2.2.   Framing Processes within Social Movements

Theories of 'framing' were originally conceptualised by Erwing Goffman (1993) and first used in the context of social movements by Snow and Benford (1986). They can be applied in order to understand the (re-)production of perceptions of reality within societies or social movements (della Porta/Parks 2013: 42). Snow and Benford (1986: 464f.) regard frames as a guideline for individuals concerning actions and experience, whether on an individual or collective basis. Also, the consent of activists

with movement frames is looked at as a precondition for participation in protest movements since they serve as an instrument to correlate individual and collective identity. Goffman defines the fundamental characteristic of frames as allowing "its user to locate, perceive, identify, and label" (Goffman 1993: 21) events and, equally, the world they are part of (Snow/Benford 1992: 137; della Porta/Parks 2013: 42). Further, social movements not only mirror existing systems of meaning or belief but also produce them (Kern 2008: 141; della Porta/Parks 2013: 42). Therefore, they represent constructions of reality, giving an interpretative base to individuals - in this case movement activists. The products of framing processes are 'collective action frames', which function to identify and point out social conditions. In that sense, activists interpret events, people, symbols or circumstances in accordance with their adopted framing, for instance in perceiving a certain social condition as unjust or fair. Moreover, frames operate as modes of attribution and articulation. Thus, they locate problems within given social conditions and suggest possible solutions or alternatives for them (Snow/Benford 1992: 136f.; della Porta/Parks 2013: 41).

Snow and Benford (1992) refer to these core framing tasks, which are at the centre of their interpretative work, as diagnostic framing, prognostic framing and motivational framing (Kern 2008: 142). While the former two aspects of framing primarily aim at elaborating processes of the formation and articulation of an imagination of a community, the latter deals with action-oriented components that aim at mobilising protest actions as well as potential activists (Scholl 2020: 107).

Diagnostic framing refers to the identification of problems and causes, with a focus on assigning blame and determining who is responsible (Kern 2008: 143). It involves highlighting social conditions where the need for change is seen, that is, portraying them as unjust, problematic or immoral. This results in a 'specification' of the protest topic, which means that certain aspects of the problem as well as certain causes and possibly also culprits are brought into focus, whereby the topic is placed in a certain social, factual and temporal context by the protest actor (Scholl 2020: 108). **Prognostic framing** means the process of identifying solutions to problems. Social movements not only need to diagnose the problem, but also have an idea of how the problem should be addressed and what possible solutions might be (Kern 2008: 144). Accordingly, this area of framing articulates the social changes protest should demand by presenting possible ideas for the future. These can be proposals for measures or objectives, but also strategies for dealing with the problem (Scholl 2020: 109). **Motivational framing** refers to the necessary creation of incentives for collective protest action with the aim of initiating collective action to combat the problem. Such incentives include solidarity, moral gratification and prestige (Kern 2008: 145). In other words, it is about convincing potential 'fellow campaigners' to perceive the defined problem as such and as urgent, to emphasise the need for action, and thus to motivate and mobilise people to act in protest (Scholl 2020: 110). So-called **master frames** build another category of frames within the movement theory, which extend their impact over the actions of several movement groups (Snow/Benford 1992: 138; Kern 2008: 149; della Porta/Parks 2013: 42). As soon as a certain interpretive frame reaches beyond a certain group and becomes a point of reference for other movements as well, it can be referred to as a master frame (Kern 2008: 149). According to Snow and Benford (1992), master frames have the same functions as movement-specific collective action frames, namely punctuation, attribution and articulation of the perception of reality, but do so in a broader context and relate to a larger number of movement

organisations (Snow/Benford 1992: 138; Kern 2008: 149). Master frames thus represent a common ideological point of reference for several distinct groups and therefore contribute to cross-movement protest actions (Kern 2008: 150). This paper understands climate justice as one such master frame (della Porta/Parks 2013).

Regarding the two wings within the climate movement that were mentioned before, Della Porta and Parks (2013: 45) apply the framing theory to differentiate their respective problem-analyses, suggested solutions and motivations for action. In their diagnostic framing, the two wings share the understanding that humans are responsible for climate change and its consequences and that without a sufficient response, it will have catastrophic consequences. However, when it comes to connecting diagnostic and prognostic frameworks, differences between the two wings become apparent. While the more 'radical climate justice wing' sees the problem in capitalist society and calls for a profound system change, the more 'moderate wing' looks for change within the system (ibid.: 46). Furthermore, according to Schlichting and Schmidt (2012: 35f.), the climate justice frame focuses primarily on problems of injustice towards those that are, at the same time, last responsible for and most affected by climate change on a global scale. There are also differences in motivational framing between the two wings: although both use direct action as a means of protest, actors of the more 'radical climate justice wing' also demand and make use of more radical and direct actions as well as civil disobedience, rejecting symbolic events (intended to generate attention and pressure as well as to change individual behaviour) which the more 'moderate wing' adheres to (della Porta/Parks 2013: 49). If that is also the case within the Viennese movement, is to be analysed within this paper. Therefore, it is relevant to get an insight on the most prominent actors within this context.

2.3. Austrian Climate Movement Actors

At the latest since mid-2010 the climate justice discourse has found its way into the Austrian protest landscape, which led to a new generation of organisations and a new configuration of alliances. As the largest city in Austria, Vienna marks an important point of crystallisation in the context of social (climate) movements: it is the location of new climate-damaging projects, such as the planned third runway at Schwechat airport, but it is also the place where most protests happen, since it is the seat of government and thus the decision-making processes in environmental policy take place mainly in Vienna.

In that context 2019 represents an important year of climate action in Vienna. Back then, weekly school strikes organised by 'Fridays for Future' (FFF) as well as global Earth Strikes mobilised hundreds or thousands of people onto the streets (see f.e. ORF 15.03.2019; derStandard 27.09.2019; Kurier 29.11.2019). But it was not just FFF that generated attention, as other actors also stepped up with actions against the climate crisis that year. Various interventions took place like the occupation of public places and vigils organised by 'Extinction Rebellion' (XR), as well as various instances of civil disobedience and demonstrations against police violence against climate activists - organised by 'System Change not Climate Change' (SCnCC) (see f.e. Vienna.at 12.01.2019; System Change not Climate Change 2021). For example, on May 31st, a so-called 'Klimaaktionstag' (day of climate action) took place in Vienna, where various groups and alliances were protesting across the city,

showing different modes of action to manifest their resistance against disruptive politics harming the environment. Also, the Climate Camp near Vienna took place for the fourth time and its activists have enabled a space to discuss topics in the context of the environmental crisis and possible solutions by organising workshops, building networks and practising alternative ways of living (System Change not Climate Change 2021).

In the following, three different Viennese actors which our analysis focuses on will be introduced. These formed the centre of climate and climate justice protests and actions in and around Vienna in 2019.

The **'Fridays for Future'** (FFF) protest is a youth movement that originated from school-strikes of Greta Thunberg, a - at the time - fifteen-year-old Swedish girl. Starting in August 2018, it quickly became an international protest movement, spanning several generations and reaching millions of participants, which took place in cities around the world, including Vienna (de Moor et al. 2020: 6f.). The movement addresses policy makers to listen to scientists, leading them to act in accordance with the Paris Agreement to limit global warming to 1,5 degrees. Additionally, FFF demands climate justice and equity for all humans (Fridays for Future 2021). They chose school strikes as a form of protest, which could be interpreted as a way of civil disobedience (von Wehrden et al. 2019: 308). Apart from their protest objectives, it is above all the topic of school strikes that attracts the attention of the media throughout the timeline of FFF protests (Sommer et al. 2019: 35). In Austria, the first group of FFF emerged in Vienna in December 2018, followed by various regional groups and so-called 'alliances' such as 'Parents for Future' or 'Teachers for Future'. FFF Austria is not centrally organised, but all regional groups stand for the same principles and demands, which they worked out together and in accordance with those of the global FFF movement. Amongst others, FFF Austria claims to work in the name of global justice, in a democratic, transparent and non-violent manner, as well as in cooperation with the police (FFF 2021: 1[5]).

Another group that contributed to the public attention for this topic is **'Extinction Rebellion'** (XR). Their first protest took place in London in late October 2018, followed by a large number of national and international actions, which led to the formation of various autonomous XR groups since then. XR represents a non-violent movement which puts into focus mass extinction, shortage of resources and the risk of social collapse. In this sense, the group declares itself as a "politically non-partisan international movement [...] to persuade governments to act justly on the Climate and Ecological Emergency" (Extinction Rebellion 2021). Also, autonomy and decentralisation are central aspects of their self-understanding as a movement. To shed light on these issues and promote political as well as structural change, XR makes use of non-violent civil disobedience as their core mode of action. By promoting these changes, XR aims at creating a world worth living in for future generations (ibid.). The Austrian branch of XR was founded in autumn 2018 and calls itself a civil society mass participation movement. By now, XR local subgroups have evolved in all nine Austrian states. Essentially, XR Austria shares its vision with all international XR groups. In addition, it advocates mandatory non-violent consent to direct action for XR actions taking place worldwide (XR 2021: 6[6]).

---

[5] see Appendix 7.
[6] see Appendix 7.

The Austrian group **'System Change not Climate Change'** (SCnCC) emerged in the context of the COP 21 in 2015 to emphasise the need of a 'social-ecological transformation'[7] to overcome the environmental crisis and to enable a 'good life for all'[8]. Central to their approach is that climate change represents multiple crises and not a singular problem, as it is closely linked to the economy and social lifestyles (Heuwieser 2016: 55f.). SCnCC was one of the first actors of the climate justice movement in Austria and consists of activists and initiatives spread all over Austria to work together for genuine and solidary solutions to the global climate crisis. Furthermore, SCnCC understands themselves as a grassroots movement, divided into regional and national working and content groups. In this sense the associated groups support each other, network with other initiatives and assist existing emancipatory groups with similar visions. One of these associated groups has to be mentioned explicitly within this context, as it represents a particularly relevant platform for discussion and networking. Initially organised and hosted by SCnCC, the **Climate Camp** is now a mostly independent group, albeit still with strong ties to SCnCC, regarding ideological and personnel resources. The core difference to the three aforementioned actors lies within the fact that the Climate Camp only takes place once a year. For this reason, it has a different structure and also differs in the form of protest,their strategies and their focus on the implementation of utopian moments in the present. The Climate Camp has taken place in Wolkersdorf near Vienna for one week once a year since 2016 - until the global COVID-19 pandemic has prohibited its execution in 2020 - and was only feasible on a smaller scale in 2021. Nevertheless, more than just being a group within the climate justice movement, it declares itself to be its centrepiece (KC 2021: 1[9]). In 2019, the core-team of the Climate Camp was a diverse group of people from different organisations, such as SCnCC, *minimal.is.muss, EndeGelände*, Partycipation, *ÖHs*, and others. As they share the same ideological views, these groups are dedicated to reaching ecological sustainability, social justice and a 'good life for all'. Therefore, the Climate Camp is a place for trying alternative ways of living, consuming and learning, with more than 100 different workshops and events. The Climate Camp, as well as SCnCC, express their claims by creative forms of resistance, such as direct action and civil disobedience (KC 2021: 1; SCnCC 2021: 4[10]). Since the two groups share a common history and problem diagnosis, proposed solutions and forms of action, they will be treated as connected groups within the field, whereas SCnCC can be seen as a permanent actor and the Climate Camp as a temporary platform.

3.   Methodological Approach

The impetus for the research pursued in this paper emerged within the so-called *'Forschungswerkstatt Protest'* at the Institute for Development Studies at the University of Vienna. Various sub-research groups analysed the Viennese protests from different perspectives using a mixed-method approach,

---

[7] The concept of 'social-ecological transformation' implies, in contrast to terms such as 'change' and 'sustainability', a more radical and extensive transformation (Brand 2014: 8). In order to deal with the current multiple crises, fundamental social and ecological changes in the way of production and living, outside of capitalist and market-oriented solutions, are necessary (ibid.: 13).

[8] According to SCnCC, "A 'good life for all' includes justice between all people of different sexes, origins, skin colours, religions and sexual orientations - now and for future generations" (SCnCC 2021: 3, translated by the authors).

[9] see Appendix 7.

[10] see Appendix 7.

including both quantitative and qualitative methods. For this working paper, in order to illustrate the framing of different protest actors of the climate (justice) movement in Vienna, we undertake an examination of their self-presentation and self-perceptions. Therefore, a qualitative research approach was pursued, looking to enable a deeper understanding of the groups' interpretative structures, while ensuring an open and flexible perspective. Due to the multidimensional research interest, a triangulated approach was chosen which represents a strategy to substantiate and secure findings by drawing on further insights on the matter and relate these to each other (Dannecker/Englert 2014: 11). This methodological approach tries to create a perspective that is as open and unbiased as possible, thus giving the complexity of the research interest the necessary breathing room. Three expert interviews with representatives of the three selected groups (FFF, XR and SCnCC) serve as initial material for analysis. However, these interviews can only offer a partial and incomplete view on an actor's framing, which is why - in order to consolidate and embed this data - different websites and position papers of these actors, as well as of the Climate Camp, were consulted. These form the central material for the following presentation, while the expert interviews were additionally considered in order to verify, support and - if necessary - complement these findings.

3.1.   Data Collection: Websites & Expert Interviews

As primary data this paper is focussing on the groups' presentation on their websites as well as their official statements and documents presented there. Those sources can portray the positioning of individual climate movement actors, since the actors themselves determine what image they want to convey to the public. The material that can be accessed in this way is considered natural data, in the sense that it is not obtained as part of the research process, but already exists and has been created without the influence of the researcher. For this reason, since they are available in written form as texts, they are analysed as documents (Salheiser 2019: 813). The analysis of documents can help to uncover "patterns of interaction, institutional contexts of action as well as value orientations or opinions" (Best 1977: 162 cited in; Salheiser 2019: 815, translated by the authors) to infer latent social contexts from manifest content. Accordingly, the homepages provide information about the groups' protest goals, demands and strategies and, by analysing their self-presentation on their websites, insights into their public appearance and positioning could be gained. Starting from the home pages of the various groups, the hyperlinks to other websites or documents were systematically consulted and examined to see whether they were relevant to the research. Therefore, various sources of each group could be identified and used as a basis for the analysis[11].

Qualitative interviews are central to analyse the context and social embedding as they focus on what different actors consider as relevant or how the social world is perceived (Froschauer/Lueger 2020: 14). A central data collection method in the context of the present research interest is the qualitative, guideline-based expert interview. The reason for this is that "qualitative interviews provide information on the interpretation of situations, motives for action, self-interpretations [...] of specific actors - individuals, groups or organisations" (Dannecker/Vossemer 2014: 154, translated by the

---

[11] For an overview of the sources used, both concerning the websites and expert interviews, as well as the abbreviations used for the references in the following presentation of the results, see Appendix 7.

authors), which is of essential importance for the analysis of actors in the climate justice movement. In June and July 2019, three guided interviews were conducted with representatives of the climate justice actors, which will be analysed. As the interviewed persons were themselves part of either FFF, XR or SCnCC, it can be said that they have access to certain exclusive knowledge about them, which is why they are perceived as 'experts' or 'specialists'. Therefore, they can help to gain specific and practical knowledge about the actors (ibid.: 161). Within the analysis of this paper, they were consulted for deeper insights as additional sources of information next to the websites and the group's official documents.

3.2.   Data Analysis: Qualitative Content Analysis

The analysis of the text sources as well as the expert interviews is based on the qualitative content analysis according to Mayring (2010), i.e. the data material is examined in a rules-based and methodically controlled manner and processed and evaluated with the help of categories (Mayring 2010: 295ff.; Mayring/Gahleitner 2010: 114ff.). Therefore, in a first step, relevant excerpts of the websites were identified. For the purpose of the research question, the content analysis' coding was carried out as deductive categorisation - along the distinction between diagnostic, prognostic and motivational frame originating from framing theory and further discussed within the research group. This step led to a formation of categories and the identification of specific characteristics, patterns and relations. These observations and insights then were further discussed within the group based on the theoretical background, as well as the insights from the expert interviews. This allowed a look into the diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing of the different actors as well as revealing differences, similarities and reciprocities between them. By analysing these categories, insights into the groups' presentation and understanding towards climate justice - understood as a master frame - was gained.

4.   Framing within the Viennese Climate (Justice) Movement

As described earlier, the main goal of this paper is to understand the framing within the three selected groups of the Viennese movement concerning the environmental crisis. Therefore, the framing approach not only enables an analysis of diagnostic, prognostic and motivational aspects within the groups and the comparison among each other, but also an integration into the idea of climate justice as a master frame. An overview table, showing the various aspects of framing for the different groups, can be found at the end of this chapter.

4.1.   Diagnostic Framing

The diagnostic framing of a group or movement refers to its definition and its identification of the problem and its causes, due to which the group is active. In the context of this paper the central question is who or what is responsible for the climate crisis or more specifically whom or what the different groups criticise in order to make a change. Based on the aforementioned analysis, the

varying problem definitions by the groups, as well as their framing of questions of guilt and (in)justices, could be identified.

4.1.1. Fridays for Future

Besides the criticism of increasing (CO_2) emissions and the usage of fossil fuels, the diagnostic framing of FFF Vienna especially includes social, global and regional injustices regarding the likelihood of being affected by the climate crisis (FFF 2021: 6; FFF 2021: 6a). In addition to global warming, the threat to the ecosystem and diverse livelihoods, as well as the loss of biodiversity are cited as problematic consequences of the climate crisis. These losses will eventually also threaten human livelihoods. The group also recognises that social injustices, like the exploitation of people and nature, racism and sexism, are causes for the current climate crisis and that this crisis will also reinforce existing injustices (FFF 2021: 2). Within the expert interview it became clear that FFF Vienna criticises the economy, especially companies and banks with their drive for profit, as main drivers of the climate crisis (FFF 2019: E1). The group particularly highlights the inaction and irresponsibility of national and international politics as being to blame (FFF 2021: 7). They especially emphasise their ignorance of scientific facts and the unwillingness to comply with the Paris Climate Agreement:

> The fact that politicians still refuse to implement at least a minimum program of actions shows great irresponsibility facing the scientific facts. Warning voices have been consistently ignored for decades, while the consequences of global warming getting out of control are also becoming more and more evident in Austria year after year.   (FFF 2021: 6a, translated by the authors)

Furthermore, FFF states that due to the fact that Austria is politically stable and comparatively wealthy, it should take on greater responsibility and make an adequate contribution to the agreed stabilisation of the global climate rather than profiting from its deterioration. In various instances, they emphasise the far-reaching opportunities Austrian politics could have to achieve significant impact in an economically and socially acceptable way (FFF 2021: 3; FFF 2021: 5; FFF 2021: 7). By referring to the Climate Protection Index the group shows that Austria is poorly rated with a negative trend, and they therefore see Austrian politics as having failed to seize the many opportunities for actual change. Thus, they hold politicians accountable and criticise the fact that Austria has insufficiently fulfilled its treaty obligations (FFF 2021: 7). They understand these obligations not only on a regional level within Austria or the EU, but rather on a global scale, when they emphasise the fact that countries that are profiting from burning fossil fuels - like Austria - are most likely not the ones that have to bear the consequences of climate deterioration (FFF 2021: 6a). In the interview this understanding was further expanded upon in relation to global inequalities between countries. While a few industrialised countries are primarily responsible for emissions, they are less affected by the consequences of climate change due to their geographical location. Storms, heat and extreme weather, for instance, affect particularly countries of the Global South (FFF 2019: E1). In the context of climate justice, this shows that FFF not only sees a strong economic inequality, but also power imbalances between the Global North and the Global South, as well as intergenerational inequalities. Furthermore, they continuously emphasise the urgency of the matter and the need for a timely response (FFF 2021: 3; FFF 2021: 6; FFF 2021: 6a).

4.1.2. Extinction Rebellion

When it comes to the diagnostic framing of XR, the criticism strongly focuses on the political system, which is described as 'toxic' (XR 2021: 4). They blame its innate pressures and the inaction of politicians, without further describing the 'toxic' mechanisms that need to be overcome. While stating that the negative developments are caused by changes in land-use, pollution and climate change, the group more deliberately emphasises the acute threat of the consequences of these aspects. They avoid individual accusations and agitation, as "we live in a toxic system, but it is not the fault of individuals." (XR 2021: 4, translated by the authors). The group further stresses that the livelihood of these individuals is at stake, as there are "only a few years left to stop a self-accelerating process that will end in the destruction of life on Earth, including humans as a species." (XR 2021: 1, translated by the authors). Furthermore, they criticise the ignorance of politics towards scientific facts and give a long list of figures to describe the climatically induced changes, e.g., the elevation of the sea-level and a significant decrease of biomass (XR 2021: 1; XR 2021: 6). The main focus of XR's problem definition highlights the dangers of this 'toxic system' and the urgency of addressing them:

> Our system is destroying our livelihoods within this century. Forests are burning, species and ecosystems are dying. The future of life as we know it is in grave danger. Many millions of lives are threatened: the consequences of heat, drought and species extinction will be hunger and social collapse in large parts of the planet, the effects of which will be felt everywhere. Governments disregard these facts, which have been known for decades, and insist on a system that is destroying the livelihoods of future generations. (XR 2021: 6, translated by the authors).

As the group's name might indicate, they strongly focus their work on the urgency of the existential threat and therefore stress intra- as well as intergenerational injustices and the need for better living conditions now and for future generations (XR 2019: E1; XR 2021: 6).

4.1.3. System Change not Climate Change

SCnCC considers the climate crisis and climate justice in a societal context and its relation to nature. They use phrasing and approaches lifted from social sciences to guide their diagnosis of the problem. Thereby, they place social and global injustice at the centre of their analysis. According to SCnCC, the currently dominant 'imperial way of life'[12] is in contradiction to the necessary system change they aim for. The basis for this is the exploitation and appropriation of people and nature. A few would live at the expense of all. This inequality can be observed both within a country as well as between the Global North and the Global South (SCnCC 2021: 2). Therefore, they explicitly name capitalism - meaning the capitalist logic of accumulation, the exploitation of labour and resources as well as the accompanying social hierarchies - as the cause, or rather the root, of the climate crisis, social, economic and ecological inequalities (SCnCC 2021: 1; SCnCC 2021: 2):

---

[12] With their concept of the 'imperial way of life', Wissen and Brand describe hegemonic-theoretical structures through which international, social structures have manifested themselves in everyday behaviour, i.e., certain patterns of production and consumption that are at the expense of nature, as well as reinforce global social inequality. These follow an externalisation logic, which means that the costs of the way of life are shifted outwards. It can be understood as an exclusive concept because it is not generalisable and presupposes a hierarchisation of the world order and is continuously normalising and reproducing itself through its patterns. The imperial way of life is so embedded in people's everyday practices that the specific patterns of behaviour are no longer even reflected upon (Wissen/Brand 2019: 42).

> While mainstream politics and economics, as well as large parts of the environmental movement, see climate change as the result of insufficiently regulated industries or even market failures, the climate justice movement sees it as a product of social power relations and a capitalist economic system obsessed with growth as an end in itself. Racism, sexism and class discrimination are inextricably linked to the climate crisis. Climate change hits hardest those who have contributed least. Therefore, the struggle for climate justice must also be understood as a struggle against patriarchy, racism, nationalism, militarism, and the exploitation of animals. (SCnCC 2021: 2, translated by the authors).

The diagnostic framing of SCnCC therefore clearly follows an intersectional approach and identifies the capitalist system and its dynamics as the cause of various inequalities, discrimination and the current crisis.

The group around the Climate Camp represents similar perspectives: "We see the climate crisis not as a purely scientific problem, but as a very urgent part of a complex crisis that has environmental, as well as political, economic, and social dimensions." (KC 2021: 1, translated by the authors). Therefore, the goal of the group, as the name already indicates, is a radical change of this system to enable a 'good life for all'.

4.1.4. Reciprocities, Linkages and Differences

The diagnostic framing of the three groups varies very significantly. Whereas all three actors express the urgency of the situation and the need for a swift response, their understandings of the reasons for the problems or their analytical conclusions differ significantly. They all express human intervention as problematic, but their analysis of the reason for that, or rather the conclusions they derive from it are very distinct. When it comes to the problem definition of XR, for instance, they blame the 'toxic system' as a main driver to the climate catastrophe, but do not further express what the underlying causes of this system are, or what they understand as the toxicity of the matter. Additionally, they do not want to put the responsibility on individuals, but rather focus on emphasising the urgency of the problem and the need for the prevention of mass extinction by political action (XR 2021: 4; XR: 2021: 6). FFF also names the urgency of the situation very clearly but describes the reason for the problem within the inaction of political actors as well as the profitability of banks and big companies from exploitation of humans and nature (FFF 2019: E1; FFF 2021: 2; FFF 2021: 7). They further see the related social injustices like racism and sexism as contributing causes to the current climate crisis (FFF 2021: 2). In that context, they fight for a future without oppression and a climate-neutral and socially just world by also critiquing the economic system - but they consciously try to "not build a framing that is anti-capitalist." (FFF 2019: E1, translated by the authors). Contrarily, SCnCC understands capitalism and the 'imperial way of life' as the root of social injustices and the ecological crisis and therefore explicitly follows an anti-capitalist approach in their analysis of the problem and its causes, as well as its consequences (SCnCC 2021: 2). They also emphasise the intersectionality of social injustices, racism, sexism, etc. and the capitalist profit imperative and logic based on the exploitation of humans and nature as well as the related structural violence that prevents a 'good life for all' (SCnCC 2021: 2; SCnCC 2021: 4). Therefore, while FFF Vienna and XR strongly focus on the inaction and missed opportunities of politicians, SCnCC's approach focuses more on critiquing the power imbalances that led to the climate crisis in the first place. Additionally, while all three groups explicitly reference scientific knowledge, SCnCC is the only group that specifically includes

social sciences and analysis into their web-appearance, statements and problem definition. Conclusively, although all three groups see the urgency of the problem and understand climate justice as their core driver, the analysis of the problem definition and related causes are varying and build the basis for their respective proposed solutions.

4.2. Prognostic Framing

This second kind of framing - in relation to the research question - is focussing on the process of finding solutions to the previously identified problems in the context of the environmental crisis (Kern 2008: 142). Therefore, possible changes are named, analysed and also placed within a broader context. By analysing the proposed solutions within the different groups, underlying topics and core issues, strategies and goals can be identified and compared.

4.2.1. Fridays for Future

When it comes to the prognostic framing of FFF Vienna, the proposed solutions mainly focus on politics (FFF 2021: 6). They demand strong environmental policies on an international as well as national level. Internationally, they emphasise the importance of the Paris Agreement and the compliance to the goals set there (FFF 2021: 1). On a national level, they request a socio-ecological tax reform and a climate-suitable social contract. In that context they state that:

> Climate-damaging subsidies must be dismantled, and greenhouse-gas-emissions must be taxed. There are a variety of models to make an ecological tax reform socially just. The tax reform creates incentives for society and the economy to find and implement sustainable solutions. At the same time, it relieves the burden on people with low and medium incomes. We advocate above all for a resource tax on the fossil extraction and processing industry. (FFF 2021: 6, translated by the authors).

Furthermore, they propose that Austria - as one of the richest countries worldwide - has to take responsibility not just nationally, but also globally (FFF 2021: 7). The expert interview with FFF highlighted their strategy with regards to this: by referring to existing scientific knowledge and the existing environmental threats, they emphasise the importance of immediate actions and stress how little time is left to prevent climate disaster (FFF 2019: E1). Therefore, their strategy is to put pressure on politics and try to gain attention and spread awareness throughout the media and the public, but also through their parents. At the same time, the interviewee also stated that they try to stay in dialogue with representatives of politics and the private sector to stress the need for action towards already existing solutions and strategies to the problem (FFF 2019: E1). In that context, their core consensus is to be and remain independent of political parties and organisations in order to be able to exert pressure on politicians across the spectrum (FFF 2019, E1; FFF 2021: 2; FFF 2021: 4). They ask for strong political action but also state that: "If these demands cannot be met within the current system, a system change is needed." (FFF 2021: 6, translated by the authors). Nevertheless, the main goal of FFF within a prognostic frame is to comply with the Paris Agreement and work towards achieving the objectives set there (FFF 2021: 2).

4.2.2. Extinction Rebellion

The claims of XR Vienna also focus on politics, but they emphasise immediate legally binding goals and especially the importance of democratic practice in that context. Therefore, they promote the concept of active citizens' councils and genuine participation of citizens to convey ownership and decision-making power both locally, but also through international cooperation (XR 2021: 2). In that context they state that:

> XR has made the strategic decision not to make any concrete proposals on how to solve the climate and environmental crisis. There have been enough solutions and approaches to the pervasive crises for decades. Our focus, however, is on the creation of decision-making systems such as citizens' councils. There, citizens can learn from experts and from each other, and together make the decisions needed to avert the crises and create a more humane, ecological system. (XR 2021: 2, translated by the authors).

Their core strategies and claims are based on values like decentralisation and autonomy (XR 2021: 4). Therefore, XR's prognostic framing emphasises the importance of the modification of the overall conditions and the need for change in order to prevent environmental catastrophes and disasters. Thus, the group uses a rhetoric of urgency and the pressing need for immediate action in order to prevent a dystopian outcome to the crisis (XR 2021: 2). A primary strategy within this framework is to spread awareness throughout politics and media by challenging the public order with protests as well as non-violent civil disobedience, as a necessary means in order to gain attention to the topic (XR 2021: 4). They want to publicly defy the 'toxic system' we are living in and stress the collective power of the people. Furthermore, they stress the importance of monitoring political action as they have lost their trust in politics and the current distribution of power (XR 2021: 2; XR 2021: 4). XR's main goal is to communicate the urgency of the problem, but also try to establish instances such as citizens' councils which institutionalise just co-determination in order to prevent environmental catastrophes and disasters. Therefore, they demand that politics take responsibility and act upon the environmental crisis as the basis of any political decisions (XR 2021: 2). They emphasise that previous political decisions need to be revised and currently existing power structures need to be challenged (XR 2021: 2). In various places they stress the need for growing awareness - societally, politically and economically - of the urgency of the crisis, its lethal seriousness and fatal outcome (XR 2019: E1; XR 2021: 2; XR 2021: 4; XR 2021: 6).

4.2.3. System Change not Climate Change

At the core of SCnCC's prognostic framing is the idea of eliminating the root causes for climate change and the resulting problems. They understand the capitalist organisation of economy and society as the core issue of societal and environmental problems like gender inequalities, racism, classism, and the general pattern of exploitation - and therefore emphasise the importance of radical change (SCnCC 2021: 2). Furthermore, they state that the current publicly discussed solutions are too short sighted:

> We reject mainstream political and economic solution strategies such as the Green Economy and market-based climate protection mechanisms (such as CDM, REDD+ or emissions trading) as ineffective and harmful apparent solutions, as they remain in the capitalist system of growth

compulsion and competitive logic and even make environmental destruction profitable. (SCnCC 2021: 2, translated by the authors).

Their work focuses on power imbalances and the need to overcome them in order to enable a 'good life for all' (SCnCC 2021: 2; SCnCC 2021: 4). On this basis they aim for a critical analysis of the role of the state, as they recognise that some problems are based on governmental structures and organisation. At the same time, they acknowledge that, due to the urgency of the climate crisis, the government is needed in order to achieve short- and medium-term goals (SCnCC 2021: 2). Therefore, SCnCC has a somewhat ambivalent relation to the state, as structural inequalities are embedded and also executed within its framework. As the group's name already states, their long-term prognostic aim is a radical systemic change (SCnCC 2021: 1). In order to achieve that, they ask for binding targets for political decision makers and emphasise the necessity of renewable energy, democratic organisation, regionally organised economic cycles, food sovereignty, sustainable and affordable public transport, the regaining of the commons as well as a radical redistribution of work, time and property (SCnCC 2021: 3). Each of these items is analysed profoundly and described very concisely on their website (SCnCC 2021: 3; SCnCC 2021: 5; SCnCC 2021: 6). To realise their claims and proposed solutions, international solidarity is crucial to the group, which is why they follow an intersectional approach in their analysis, as well as their strategies (SCnCC 2021: 3). Their main goal is a 'good life for all'. To them, that does not only mean a just redistribution of the burden and consequences of the climate crisis and mitigating destructive dynamics of the capitalist system we are living in, but also includes intersectional justice "between all people of different genders, origins, skin colours, religions and sexual orientations - now and for future generations." (SCnCC 2021: 3, translated by the authors). Therefore, they emphasise the need for a radical transformation and the need for a 'social-ecological society' (SCnCC 2021: 4).

At the Climate Camp such a socio-ecological society is implemented on a smaller scale. Within the microcosmos of the camp a lot of proposed solutions are already realised for a short time. At the same time, they discuss how they can act in order to enable a 'social-ecological transformation' throughout society as a whole (KC 2021: 1). Therefore, the camp is built upon four main pillars: First, it is a place for networking and building alliances for people that are concerned with questions of sustainability and climate justice. Second, it is a place for education, by enabling workshops and providing room for exchange and discussion. Third, the whole Climate Camp is about experiencing alternatives and enabling a 'nowtopia' on a small scale. Last but not least, it is also a place for planning and staging activist actions of protest (KC 2021: 1).

4.2.4. Reciprocities, Linkages and Differences

When it comes to the prognostic framing of the three designated groups, their common goal of changes in a societal and/or political context of counteracting the environmental crisis is evident. All three groups propagate the need for change and urgent political action based on environmental interests. The specific strategy of FFF is to point to try to raise awareness for the underlying core issues by exerting pressure on politicians and their decision-making, while pointing to already existing scientific knowledge and various proposed solutions (FFF 2021: 6). XR, on the other hand, emphasises the importance of participation in decision-making processes and therefore promotes the

need for a living democracy through citizens' councils (XR 2021: 2). SCnCC follows a more radical approach by acknowledging the need for political action and state intervention, but at the same time fighting for a drastic change of the system these political actions stem from. Their anti-capitalist and intersectional approach calls for a 'social-ecological transformation' of society (SCnCC 2021: 2; SCnCC 2021: 4). So, whereas FFF and XR frame their strategies in the context of averting environmental disasters and ask for political action in that context, SCnCC sees these consequences of the crisis as already in effect and try to focus on how to achieve a 'good life for all' by overcoming destructive capitalist structures they see as responsible for these disasters (SCnCC 2019: E1; SCnCC 2021: 3).

While SCnCC strongly promotes anti-capitalist values (SCnCC 2021: 1) and XR demands for a necessary systemic change because they have lost trust into politics (XR 2021: 2), FFF rather communicate their strategies within this system and try to hold politicians accountable for the implementation of possible solutions to the crisis, like the ones proposed in the Paris Agreement. So, FFF understands a systemic change only as a necessity if all the other claims and proposed solutions within this agreement are not reached or cannot be implemented within the current system (FFF 2019: E1; FFF 2021: 6). Contrarily, SCnCC understands these solutions as only a treatment of the symptom and therefore demand a radical system change in order to really address environmental and connected societal problems fundamentally (SCnCC 2021: 2). In contrast to these approaches, XR focuses their strategy and attention to the urgency of ecological problems and the need for the prevention of a catastrophe by trying to raise awareness through challenging the public order and at the same time request more citizens' participation within decision-making processes (XR 2019: E1; XR 2021: 4). Generally, it can be observed that FFF and XR's proposed solutions are described very briefly and point to already existing scientific knowledge or international agreements, whereas SCnCC very distinctly describes their claims by referring to scientific discourses. So, although all three groups try to raise awareness for the current and future ecological (and social) issues and demand change, they approach them with very different resolutions, strategies as well as sources of motivation.

4.3.   Motivational Framing

While diagnostic and prognostic framing serve primarily to emphasise processes of creating community in terms of a shared consensus regarding the problem's interpretation and the possibilities for remedying it, the motivational framing focuses on the action-oriented components. This is implemented by creating incentives for collective action, direct calls for protest as well as stressing the need for action and urgency.

4.3.1. Fridays for Future

In terms of individual mobilisation, FFF creates incentives by emphasising that every individual is required to take action (FFF 2021: 6a) and that the climate crisis as well as climate justice, should be a concern to everyone (FFF 2021: 2). The solutions described in the previous section, such as a sustainable, resource-conserving economic model, are to be achieved together as a society, but always in cooperation with politics and corporations. It is made clear that the situation is constantly getting worse, but that 'we' as a society have a choice on how to deal with it. In general, it is highlighted that

'we', today, are responsible for saving 'our' livelihood - meaning that of humanity - and creating a liveable future to ensure that the planet is inhabitable both for ourselves and for future generations (FFF 2021: 6a): "We have a choice: let's choose the world our grandchildren would like to see!" (FFF 2021: 6a, translated by the authors). There are also repeated references to the relevance of taking action to avoid a future catastrophe, but the focus is on designing a desirable future instead of 'fear-inducing' incentives (FFF 2021: 6). Another part of the group's motivational framing expresses the urgency of the problem as well as temporal pressure for action, emphasising in particular that there is no time left for illusory solutions and that, with each day that passes, the required compliance with the Paris Climate Agreement becomes less likely (FFF 2021: 3).

Besides the group's appeals, its self-image is also relevant for its mobilisation. FFF sees itself as a movement that is open and accessible to everyone who can identify with its demands and where everyone is welcomed (FFF 2021: 2). Furthermore, they want to reach as many people as possible and include a wide range of political positions. It appears that their main goal is to bring as many people as possible onto the streets. To achieve this, it is important for FFF to remain completely independent from political-, civic- or non-governmental organisations. For this purpose, they pursue a so-called 'unilateral strategy', which means that they accept support from other actors, but do not allow themselves to be taken over by the latter (FFF 2021: 2; FFF 2021: 4). In addition, as became clear in the interview with a representative of the Viennese regional group, it is important to FFF to stay away from political framings that are perceived as 'radical':

> I know, for example, that System Change [SCnCC, addition authors] is very strongly anti-capitalist, and we try not to make FFF anti-capitalist. If we go public with System Change now, it could hurt FFF as a movement because a lot of people think it's a good thing but get scared by the word 'anti-capitalism'. (FFF 2019: E1, translated by the authors).

So, when it comes to the motivational framing of FFF, they try to be as independent as possible, both from other actors in the movement and from organisations and political parties. They want to be open to all individuals who are fighting for the same goals and are working to achieve the goals declared in the Paris Agreement. Their versatile protest-actions aim to draw attention to these issues and range from organising school strikes, demonstrations and public events, building alliances with scientists and other relevant groups, to international climate action days, but also discussions with representatives from politics and industry. However, these actions always remain within the legal framework and any resistance against the police is rejected (FFF 2021: 2).

4.3.2. Extinction Rebellion

XR also creates individual incentives for collective acts of protest by emphasising that everyone is needed, and every single person counts. However, since the system itself is described as 'toxic', they specifically do not cooperate with politics and the private sector. Instead, structures which are necessary to challenge existing power relations are to be created collectively within XR (XR 2021: 4). Particularly relevant is the appeal to the individual and a strong reference to the responsibility we have towards future generations to create a liveable future for all, but this does not only refer to ecological factors - such as biodiversity and extinction of species - but also includes other areas, in that XR wants to create a so-called 'regenerative culture' - a culture that is adaptable and resilient (XR 2021: 4). Even more powerful within the motivational framing than the importance of a liveable

future, is the highlighting and visualisation of a future catastrophe, accompanied by dystopian visions of the future: "All of our lives are acutely threatened. We have only a few years left to stop a self-accelerating process, at the end of which is the annihilation of life on earth, including man as a species." (XR 2021: 1, translated by the authors). This points to an existential threat that can be understood as a stimulus to collective action, and again stresses the urgency of the problem.

Of course, the self-image of the movement also plays an important role here. XR is open and accessible to all who agree with its basic principles. There is an increased awareness of solidarity and mindfulness, and the importance of collective action is emphasised (XR 2021: 5). It is also highlighted that everyone's contribution is important, regardless of how much one can and wants to contribute, and that diversity allows the movement to be strong:

> YOUR ideas, inputs, and wealth of experience are needed! [...] No one will dictate to you here, but YOU, with your motivation and energy, are the driving force! [...] We are looking forward to YOU - with you the movement will become even bigger, stronger and more colourful! You count. What you do counts. (XR 2021: 5, translated by the authors).

Their preferred methods of protest are various forms of non-violent civil disobedience, in which they see themselves as part of a long tradition. Referring to past political struggles, they claim to be successful with their efforts, as others have been in the past:

> Extinction Rebellion works with the means of non-violent civil disobedience, because past examples show: Civil disobedience works - when it is non-violent. And it works better than all other forms of resistance. This ranges from Gandhi to the Suffragettes to Hainburg. What they all have in common is a certain willingness to sacrifice. (XR 2021: 3, translated by the authors).

Thus, it becomes clear that they are referring to a long history of struggles for human and civil rights. They understand that some disruption of the collective order is necessary to gain attention, and they see themselves as virtually obligated to do so in the name of a worthy cause. Furthermore, in the interview with the group's representative, it was emphasised that it is assumed that individual behaviour, such as changing consumer behaviour, "will not save the world" (XR 2019: E1, translated by the authors), and civil disobedience is also practised for this reason (XR 2019: E1).

4.3.3. System Change not Climate Change

When it comes to the motivational framing of SCnCC, suggestions for joint protest actions are also phrased in the context of the fact that, in order for change to be possible, a broad base needs to support it: "to change everything, we need everyone" (SCnCC 2021: 7, translated by the authors). But this is not their main focus. The primary concern here is rather to emphasise and create a sense of solidarity. Against the backdrop of their understanding of climate justice, it is stressed how important it is to be in solidarity with people who are (most severely) affected by the impacts of the climate crisis, even though they are the least to blame for 'human-made climate change', as well as with people who suffer most from the prevailing, unjust and unsustainable economic system (SCnCC 2021: 4). However, it also refers to the importance of solidarity with groups and people worldwide who experience repression (such as fines or imprisonment) as a result of their commitment to climate justice (SCnCC 2021: 2).

The relevance of the need for action is made clear, above all, by the fact that the climate crisis is a deep-rooted systemic problem and that the capitalist relation to nature has already led to numerous

transgressions of ecological limits (SCnCC 2021: 2). In addition, there is an active commitment to combating related structures of inequality and injustice, and thus broaden social incentives: "From this, related and no less important issues for an emancipatory left that stand in the way of a climate-just society and a 'good life for all' will be addressed. Racism, sexism, patriarchy, nationalism, state borders, etc." (SCnCC 2021: 2, translated by the authors). SCnCC also emphasises the urgency of the problem, on the grounds of which they justify - despite the actual goal of long-term change - smaller, short-term change within the system, but in doing so they also highlight that they reject "mere symptom treatments, cosmetic interventions and exclusively reformist approaches" (SCnCC 2021: 2, translated by the authors).

SCnCC sees themselves as part of the emancipatory left, strongly prioritising a powerful sense of community. Furthermore, they emphasise the importance of people who are committed to the cause in their sense:

> what has remained, however, is the conviction that it takes people who are critical and organised to stand up for justice and solidarity. And therefore, we are happy about every single person who wants to join us. Neither personal background, nor individual possibilities for the form and extent of their engagement count. As long as you feel you belong to the motto - 'System Change, not Climate Change' - you are welcome to join us (SCnCC 2021: 7, translated by the authors).

SCnCC describes its methods of protest as forms of creative resistance - meaning passive resistance as well as civil disobedience - often with the use of their own bodies, but strictly rejecting violence and endangering others. In their actions, it is also important to them that no discriminatory conditions are reproduced and that they are always oriented towards their goals, i.e., climate justice and system change (SCnCC 2021: 2).

A similar motivational framing could be identified for the Climate Camp: A strong focus on solidarity and on creating a 'good life for all' (KC 2021: 1). It is pointed out that politics and the private sector cannot be relied on, which is why it is necessary to take 'our' future, as well as the future of the planet, into 'our' own hands and become active. Incentives are also created by the fact that the Climate Camp is a place to experience alternatives, or a 'nowtopia', but also a place to learn about climate justice and all related issues (KC 2021: 1).

4.3.4. Reciprocities, Linkages and Differences

In terms of motivational framing, the various actors have a number of similarities and overlaps. But, upon further inquiry, they vary in terms of which incentives they focus on, how they justify the acute need for action, and - above all - in the type of action they take. All actors have in common that they emphasise that the problem affects everyone, and how important every single person is in the fight against the climate crisis and for climate justice (FFF 2021: 6a, XR 2021: 4, SCnCC 2021: 7). Hereby, the urgency of the current situation and the focus on the immediacy of the problem are pointed out. All actors agree that, already, many red lines have been crossed, only little time is left to act and with each passing day the situation gets worse and a sufficient solution becomes less likely (FFF 2021: 3, XR 2021: 1, SCnCC 2021: 2). For FFF and XR, future scenarios are a relevant part of protest mobilisation, although the focus is set differently by the two actors. While FFF primarily highlights the responsibility of all of us to create a liveable and just future, as well as to protect the livelihood

of all living beings (FFF 2021: 6a), XR justifies the acute need for action much stronger with a disastrous and catastrophic potential outcome and in pointing out the subsequent dystopian future (XR 2021: 1). In contrast, for SCnCC and the Climate Camp it is above all the criticism of the current system, the demand for comprehensive systemic changes and the creation of a sense of solidarity (SCnCC 2021: 4, KC 2021: 1). There are both overlaps and differences in the self-perceptions of the various actors. All stress that they are a movement that is open and accessible to all who identify with their values, principles or demands and strive to be as inclusive as possible (FFF 2021: 2, XR 2021: 3, SCnCC 2021: 7). However, while FFF emphasises that they are independent of other organisations and parties and seek to distinguish themselves from other groups - for example, by deliberately excluding anti-capitalism (FFF 2021: 2), SCnCC and the Climate Camp highlight the importance of networking and exchange in the climate justice movement scene (SCnCC 2021: 2). In terms of protest methods and actions, however, there are again major differences between the various actors: FFF uses only moderate forms of direct action and always within a legal framework (FFF 2021: 2), XR and SCnCC, on the other hand, rely on more radical forms of action, passive resistance and means of civil disobedience - although both emphasise the importance remaining non-violent (XR 2021: 3, SCnCC 2021: 2).

Table 1: Diagnostic, prognostic & motivational framing of the three actors FFF, XR and SCnCC & Climate Camp

	diagnostic Framing	*prognostic Framing*	*motivational Framing*
Fridays for Future	problem definition: ● increasing (CO2) emissions & fossil fuels ● social, global & regional injustices ● injustices as cause for crises ● crises as reinforcer of those injustices	proposed solution: ● strong environmental policies ● importance of Paris Agreement ● in Austria: socio-ecological tax reform & climate-suitable social contract ● conditional system change	self-perception: ● open & accessible for all ● unilateral strategy ● avoid political framings
	question of guilt: ● inaction & irresponsibility of national & international politics ● responsibility of Austria (as profiting country) ● ignorance of scientific facts ● economic system (drive for profit)	strategy: ● pressure on politics ● raising attention & awareness ● dialogue with representatives of politics & economy	appeal: ● everyone is responsible ● saving livelihoods ● liveable future ● intergenerational justice ● disaster prevention
	consequences: ● global warming ● threat to ecosystem and livelihoods ● loss of species and biodiversity	goal: ● compliance with Paris Agreement ● societal transformation	mobilisation: ● versatile protest actions ● within legal framework
	diagnostic Framing	*prognostic Framing*	*motivational Framing*
Extinction Rebellion	problem definition: ● threat for existence ● inter- & intragenerational injustices	proposed solution: ● legally binding goals ● international cooperation ● living democracy & lively citizens' council ● societal awareness	self-perception: ● open & accessible to everyone ● diverse movement ● protect the environment
	question of guilt: ● toxic system (not individuals) ● human intervention (land-use, pollution) ● ignorance & inactivity of politics	strategy: ● decentralisation & autonomy ● change in framework conditions ● rhetoric of urgency ● spreading awareness ● non-violent civil disobedience ● monitoring of political actions	appeal: ● everyone is needed ● individual willingness ● responsibility towards future generations ● liveable future ● disaster prevention
	consequences: ● loss of species, extinction & destruction of ecosystem ● scenario of annihilation & social collapse ● threat to human life & livelihood	goal: ● defy toxic system ● communicate urgency ● establish instances ● responsible politics	mobilisation: ● civil disobedience ● non-violent ● raising awareness ● identification with role-models
	diagnostic Framing	*prognostic Framing*	*motivational Framing*
System Change not Climate Change & Climate Camp	problem definition: ● social & global injustices ● imperial way of life ● exploitation & appropriation of people and nature ● part of multiple crises	proposed solution: ● radical transformation & systemic change ● overcome power imbalances ● reject mainstream-solutions ● treat origin of the problem ● binding targets ● international solidarity	self-perception: ● open, socio-political group ● emancipatory left ● prioritising a sense of community
	question of guilt: ● capitalist system & its dynamics ● social power relations ● mainstream politics & economics	strategy: ● intersectional approach ● degrowth ● ambivalent attitude toward state ● make the problem visible ● enabling 'nowtopia'	appeal: ● importance of solidarity ● urgency of problem ● combat related structures of inequality and injustice ● individual contribution to problem solution
	consequences: ● loss of livelihood ● social, economic & ecological injustices ● preventing 'good life for all'	goal: ● 'good life for all' ● intersectional justice ● climate-just/social-ecological society	mobilisation: ● challenging power relations through common structures ● different modes of action ● creative resistance ● non-violent

Source: Authors

4.4. Climate Justice as a Master Frame

After analysing various dimensions of the framing of different climate movement actors in Vienna, this section is going to take a closer look at the master frame of those groups based on the theoretical input of della Porta and Parks (2013: 45) that differentiates between two wings regarding the master frame within climate movements: on the one hand, there is what they call a more 'moderate wing' that works towards a mitigation of climate change, whereas on the other side there is a more 'radical wing' that fights for transformation and climate justice. Therefore, the question is: in what sense can climate justice be understood as a master frame within the Viennese climate movement and the (self-)representation of the three assigned groups. While all three groups refer to climate justice, or rather mention the term or aspects of the concept, they understand it very differently. FFF's second principle - in addition to meeting the Paris Climate Agreement's 1,5-degree target - calls for global climate justice and elaborates on this by acknowledging that "societal injustices are causes of the current climate crisis" (FFF 2021: 2, translated by the authors) and that the climate crisis, in turn, reinforces such injustices. Contrary to this, XR does not explicitly mention the term climate justice at all on their website, but refers to different aspects of the concept, especially emphasising intergenerational justice and the fact that the 'toxic system' "is destroying the livelihoods of future generations" (XR 2021: 6, translated by the authors). However, the most elaborate exploration of the concept of climate justice can be found with SCnCC. Unlike the other groups, SCnCC incorporates an academic perspective into its climate justice arguments and uses and refers to scientific sources. For them, climate justice is not just part of their demands, but it is the fundamental framework of the group. They describe themselves as part of the global climate justice movement (SCnCC 2021: 2) and situate all their actions in this context:

> The goal is to highlight and address the roots of the climate crisis, denounce bogus solutions (such as emissions trading or technological miracle beliefs) and advance real alternatives. We want to pave the way for a just transition to a social-ecological society. This includes a transformation towards an economy that is not based on profit and limitless growth, but respects ecological limits and enables a 'good life for all'. We are committed to climate justice, that is, solidarity with those people who are most affected by the consequences of climate change and the downsides of unjust economic policies - and yet who bear the least blame for human-made climate change. (SCnCC 2021: 4, translated by the authors)

Based on the remarks of della Porta and Parks (2013: 46) on framing processes within the climate movement, it also became clear within the Viennese context that all of the three designated groups frame the environmental crisis as human-made and therefore see humanity as responsible for it. Also, they emphasise the urgency of the topic and the need for a sufficient response in order to prevent catastrophic consequences (see ibid.). But still, they have very different approaches as in how to address this human interference. While all three groups name aspects of the fact that the ones that have caused the problem and are profiting from it, are not the ones that are affected the most by its consequences and thereby refer to intra- and also intergenerational justice and social aspects of the crisis, their conclusions, proposed solutions and motivations to act are very much distinctive as on how they frame the cause of the problem.

When connecting the diagnostic and prognostic framing of the groups those different approaches become visible. As FFF acknowledges that the human-made environmental crisis and the related

social injustices like racism, classism and sexism are apparent on a global scale, they make politicians responsible to take action in line with the Paris Agreement and consciously avoid or reject an anti-capitalist-framing (FFF 2019: E1). Contrarily, XR understands the 'toxic system' as responsible for disasters and focuses on more legally binding goals and the implementation of direct democracy and greater integration of citizens into decision-making processes in order to prevent more disastrous consequences of the environmental crisis. While they express the need for systemic change, they do not specifically use anti-capitalist-terms (XR 2021: 4). SCnCC, on the other hand, as well as the Climate Camp, clearly identify capitalism as the root cause of environmental, global and social inequality and therefore understand systemic change as the only possible solution in order to prevent mere symptom treatment within the current political order and state organisation (SCnCC 2021: 2). Thereby, the differentiation within the climate justice movement highlighted by della Porta and Parks (2013: 47) becomes visible: while SCnCC, as well as the Climate Camp, can be clearly located within the 'radical wing' - they demand a profound 'social-ecological transformation' and position themselves as clearly anti-capitalist (SCnCC 2021: 1; KC 2021: 1) - this is not so clear in the case of XR and FFF. XR calls for systemic change, at least to some extent, but focuses more on legally binding goals and a change within the political system and decision-making processes without explicitly naming anti-capitalist or transformational aspects (XR 2021: 4). FFF seems to belong more to the 'moderate wing', as they see their proposed solutions in cooperation with politics and business. Nevertheless, a 'radical spark' can also be identified for FFF, as they see system change as the last resort if political actions were to fail (FFF 2021: 6).

To advocate for their respective solutions, all groups use direct action (see della Porta/Parks 2013: 48). But while FFF strictly refuses illegal actions as well as civil disobedience, and one of their core principles is to always cooperate with the police, they use school strikes/demonstrations to raise awareness and put pressure on political decision-makers (FFF 2021: 2). To raise public awareness and challenge the public order, XR almost exclusively uses radical, illegal but non-violent actions of civil disobedience as a form of protest. Thereby they also focus on raising public awareness for the problem and strictly emphasise that individuals per se are not responsible, but rather the political system has to change and enable a more direct democracy (XR 2021: 4). Similarly, SCnCC also uses radical forms of non-violent civil disobedience in order to call attention to systemic issues and challenges. In that context they state that they use creative resistance in order to challenge existing power structures (SCnCC 2021: 4). Regarding this aspect, the Climate Camp can be understood as a unique form of action, as its focus lies more on enabling alternative ways of living on a small scale ('nowtopia'), but also educating and sensitising participants to the topic and planning future actions and forms of protest, such as civil disobedience (KC 2021: 1). This shows, with regard to motivational framing (see della Porta/Parks 2013: 48), that again SCnCC and the Climate Camp as well as XR can be assigned to the 'radical wing'. SCnCC - in particular - emphasises that they reject purely symbolic events and value being strategically effective and efficient with their actions (SCnCC 2021: 2) and also XR emphasises the importance of radical actions as the most effective way to protest (XR 2021: 3). On the other hand, it could also be noted that XR is definitely also concerned with creating attention and pressure (XR 2019: E1; XR 2021: 2), which according to della Porta and Parks (2013: 49) would be more attributable to the 'moderate wing' of climate justice movements. However, this

can be seen more clearly with FFF: they explicitly see themselves as pressure movement (FFF 2021: 2) and also focus on generating (media) attention (FFF 2019: E1). In contrast, for none of the groups a framing focusing a change in individual consumption could be observed, which - according to della Porta and Parks (2013: 49) - is more consistent with a 'moderate' attitude. This shows that XR and FFF show both 'moderate' and 'radical' aspects within their motivations, leading to the conclusion that the lines between the two 'wings' are blurred.

Regarding the classification of the master frames within climate movements and the two wings della Porta and Parks (2013: 46) differentiate, it becomes clear that for the Viennese movement this division is not clear-cut. Based on the findings presented in this paper, the master frame can rather be understood as a spectrum than a binary distinction. More 'radical' and more 'moderate' attitudes regarding the idea of climate justice as a master frame could be identified within the analysed groups, but there are no clear dividing lines. It rather can be seen as a continuum with SCnCC and the Climate Camp on the most 'radical' side, while XR touches aspects of 'radical' and 'moderate' characteristics and FFF as the most 'moderate' actor with a 'radical spark'. All three actors frame themselves within a climate justice spectrum/vocabulary and stress the importance of different aspects of climate justice and its implications.

Furthermore, it has to be acknowledged that we could only analyse their public self-presentation through their websites and the statements of the representatives within the expert interviews, leading to the assumption that, within the three groups, more 'moderate' or 'radical' attitudes might be represented. Nevertheless, the various reciprocities, linkages and differences along the diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing led to the conclusion that climate justice can be understood as a shared master frame of the Viennese climate movement.

5.   Conclusion

In 2019 - the year before the global COVID-19 pandemic preoccupied the public discourse - the climate justice movement gained huge public attention in Austria (and all around the world) and was able to raise awareness to the topic and emphasise the need for change (Wissen/Brand 2019: 31; Narodoslawsky 2020: 104). However, the movement consists of various groups with different claims and foci. They vary in the way they interpret the causes of the problem, in their proposed solutions and strategies, as well as in their modes of action. Therefore, by referring to the framing theory, della Porta and Parks (2013: 46) distinguish between a more 'radical wing' of the climate movement that focuses on direct action and climate justice, and a more 'moderate climate change wing' that engages the environmental crisis and its solutions more within the legally binding structures of the system. Despite different manifestations, aspects of this pattern could also be observed within the Viennese context. Although the three selected main actors of the Viennese climate movement - 'Fridays for Future', 'Extinction Rebellion' and 'System Change not Climate Change' - differ in their way of protest, they all use - albeit in different ways - the concept of climate justice for their framing.

The aim of this paper was to understand the reciprocities, linkages and differences between the framing of climate justice within the Viennese climate movement. Thereby, it became clear that FFF frames its activism within the global capitalist system by emphasising the need for political action

within the targets of the Paris Agreement, while simultaneously mentioning global and social injustices and aspects of exploitation of humans and natural resources. So, while their mode of action as well as their analysis can be understood as a more 'moderate' attitude within the climate justice framing, they still acknowledge the importance of (social) justice, both on a global scale and in the context of future generations. On the other hand, XR's framing focuses on the 'toxicity' of the system and the need to prevent disastrous consequences without explicitly blaming capitalism and mentioning climate justice as a concept. Nevertheless, they advocate for inter- and intragenerational justice and have a more disobedient mode of action. This led to the conclusion that XR represents some 'moderate' aspects as well as 'radical' characteristics within their framing. Contrarily, SCnCC as well as the Climate Camp explicitly promote an anti-capitalist understanding of the problem, understand themselves as part of the global climate justice movement and emphasise that a 'good life for all' is only achievable, if there is a radical system change, leading to the conclusion that they can be categorised within the 'radical wing' of the climate justice master frame, which is also reflected in their mode of action.

Despite these various approaches, most of the claims within the three selected groups of the Viennese climate movement can be situated within the climate justice context, which shows that it functions more as a universal guideline and central concept that allows for different interpretations, albeit commonly emphasising global and social aspects of the climate crisis. Therefore, climate justice can be considered as a shared master frame as the three selected groups share common ideological reference points and cross-movement protest actions could be observed - for example on the *'Klimaaktionstag'*, May 31st, 2019. Although showing different modes of action and expressing diverse foci, the groups still collaborate and support each other. Nevertheless, it became clear that the framing of climate justice within the Viennese movement has different expressions of radicality and therefore presents itself on a spectrum. While all selected groups promote the need for justice on a global, social and intergenerational level, the question as to whether justice can be achieved within the system - or rather without a systemic change - is answered very differently.

This question is also one that is discussed within the academic discourse on climate justice by analysing different aspects of the concept as well as the effects of its mainstreaming (Dietz/Garrelts 2013; Jafry 2019). Therefore, this paper tried to establish a base of knowledge in this regard within the Viennese climate movement, on which further analysis can be built upon. Especially the question as to what effect the framing of climate justice as a master frame has within public discourses and political decisions, in Vienna and beyond, remains to be analysed. For example, it would be interesting to further look into the influence of the rather 'moderate' position of FFF on the integration of the topic into the mainstream public discourse. Thus, it would be interesting to think about how this integration influences the concept of climate justice and its 'radical' or rather system-critical character. Furthermore, this leads to the question of the impact of more 'radical' approaches on the public perception and political actions in the Viennese or Austrian context.

Lastly, it remains to be seen whether the topic of climate justice can regain public attention, as the global COVID-19 pandemic as well as the war in Ukraine and its consequences currently dominate the public discourse. For the climate movement the question will be on how to integrate these concerns into their framing of global (climate) justice.

6.   Bibliography

Best, Heinrich (1977): Die quantitative Analyse inhaltlicher und kontextueller Merkmale historischer Dokumente. In: Best, H./Mann, R. (eds.): Quantitative Methoden in der historisch-sozialwissenschaftlichen Forschung. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 162-205.

Bohl, Clemens/Braunhuber, Barbara/Daniel, Antje/Glässer, Denise/Ilchmann, Otto/Lange, Lemonia/Wingender, Andreas (2021): The Climate Crisis and the Fridays for Future Movement: Causes, Responsibilities and Solutions through the Lense of Framing Theory. In: ie.WorkingPaper, 10.

Brand, Ulrich (2014): Sozial-ökologische Transformation als gesellschafts-politisches Projekt. In: Kurswechsel, 2, 7-18.

Bruno, Kenny/Karliner, Joshua/Brotsky, China (1999): Greenhouse Gangsters Vs. Climate Justice. TRAC/Tides Centre.

Buechler, Steven M. (1995): New Social Movement Theories. In: Sociological quarterly, 36, 464.

Dannecker, Petra/Englert, Birgit (2014): Einleitung. In: Dannecker, P./Englert, B. (eds.): Qualitative Methoden in der Entwicklungsforschung. Wien: Mandelbaum, 7-19.

Dannecker, Petra/Vossemer, Christiane (2014): Qualitative Interviews in der Entwicklungsforschung Typen und Herausforderungen. In: Dannecker, P./Englert, B. (eds.): Qualitative Methoden in der Entwicklungsforschung. Wien: Mandelbaum, 153-157.

de Moor, Joost/Uba, Katrin/Wahlström, Mattias/Wennerhag, Magnus/De Vydt, Michiel (2020): Protest for a future II: Composition, mobilization and motives of the participants in Fridays For Future climate protests on 20-27 September, 2019, in 19 cities around the world.

della Porta, D./Parks, L. (2013): Framing-Prozesse in der Klimabewegung: Vom Klimawandel zur Klimagerechtigkeit. In: Dietz, M./Garrelts, H. (eds.) Die internationale Klimabewegung. Bürgergesellschaft und Demokratie. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 56.

derStandard (2019): Rekord-Klimaprotest: Veranstalter sprechen von 150.000 Teilnehmern in ganz Österreich. https://www.derstandard.at/jetzt/livebericht/2000109165686/earth-strike-oesterreich-steht-vor-groesstem-klimaprotest-seiner-geschichte?responsive=false (09/04/2021).

Dietz, Matthias/Garrelts, Heiko (2013): Die Internationale Klimabewegung: Ein Handbuch. Wiesbaden.

Extinction Rebellion (2021): About Us. https://rebellion.earth/the-truth/about-us/ (09/04/2021).

Fridays for Future (2021): What We Do. https://fridaysforfuture.org/what-we-do/ (09/04/2021).

Froschauer, Ulrike/Lueger, Manfred (2020): Das qualitative Interview: zur Praxis interpretativer Analyse sozialer Systeme. Wien: facultas.

Gibson, Shannon (2012): Climate Justice Now! In: Philander, G. S. (ed.) Encyclopedia of Global Warming and Climate Change. 2 ed. California: SAGE Publications, 289-291.

Goffman, Erving (1993): Frame analysis: an essay on the organization of experience. Boston, Mass., Northeastern Univ. Pr.

Heuwieser, Magdalena (2016): System Change, not Climate Change! In: Kurswechsel, 3, 55-64.

IPCC - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2014): Climate Change 2014. Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Technical Summary.

Jafry, Tahseen (2019): Routledge Handbook of Climate Justice. London/New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Kern, Thomas (2008): Soziale Bewegungen: Ursachen, Wirkungen, Mechanismen. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften | GWV Fachverlage GmbH.

Kurier (2019): Klimastreik-Veranstalter melden 20.000 Teilnehmer in Wien. https://kurier.at/chronik/oesterreich/klimademo-und-black-friday-sorgen-fuer-staus-in-wien/400689179 (09/04/2021).

Leuthold, Margit (1996): 10 Jahre Umweltberatung in Österreich. In: FJSNB, 9, 57-65.

Mayring, Philipp (2010): Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse : Grundlagen und Techniken. Weinheim: Beltz.

Mayring, Philipp/Gahleitner, Silke (2010): Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. In: Bock, K./Miethe, I. (eds.): Handbuch qualitative Methoden in der Sozialen Arbeit. Budrich: Opladen &Farmington Hills, 295-304.

Narodoslawsky, Benedikt (2020): Inside Fridays for Future: die faszinierende Geschichte der Klimabewegung in Österreich. Wien, Falter Verlag.

Offe, Claus (1985): New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics. In: Social research, 52, 868.

ORF (2019): Zehntausende bei Klimademos in Österreich. https://orf.at/stories/3115229/ (09/04/2021).

Salheiser, Axel (2019): Natürliche Daten: Dokumente. In: Baur, N./Blasius, J. (eds): Handbuch Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 1134.

Sander, Hendrik (2016): Die Klimagerechtigkeitsbewegung in Deutschland. In: Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung.

Schlichting, Inga/Schmidt, Andreas (2012): Strategische Bedeutungen des Klimawandels. Frames und ihre Sponsoren. In: Forschungsjournal Soziale Bewegungen, 25, 29-41.

Scholl, Sebastian (2020): Geographien des Protests: Eine räumliche Analyse der »Movimiento por la Paz con Justicia y Dignidad« in Mexiko. Bielefeld.

Snow, David A./Benford, Robert (1986): Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation. In: American sociological review, 51, 481.

Snow, David/Benford, Robert (1992): Master Frames and Cycles of Protest. In: Morris, A./Mueller, C. (eds.): Frontiers in social movement theory. New Heaven/London: Yale University Press, 133-155.

Sommer, Moritz/Rucht, Dieter/Haunss, Sebastian/Zajak, Sabrina (2019): Fridays for Future. Profil, Entstehung und Perspektiven der Protestbewegung in Deutschland. In: ipb working paper 2/2019.

System Change not Climate Change (2021): Vergangene Aktionen 2019. https://systemchange-not-climatechange.at/de/2019-2/ (09/04/2021).

Tokar, Brian (2019): On the evolution and continuing development of the climate justice movement. In: Jafry, T. (ed.): Routledge Handbook of Climate Justice. London/New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 13-25

Vienna.at (2019): Klima-Aktivisten veranstalteten "Die-in"-Protest bei Vienna Autoshow. https://www.vienna.at/klima-aktivisten-veranstalteten-die-in-protest-bei-vienna-autoshow/6059025 (09/04/2021).

von Wehrden, Henrik/Kater-Wettstädt, Lydia/Schneidewind, Uwe (2019): Fridays for Future aus nachhaltigkeitswissenschaftlicher Perspektive. In: Gaia, 28, 309.

Wissen, Markus/Brand, Ulrich (2019): Working-class environmentalism und sozial-ökologische Transformation. Widersprüche der imperialen Lebensweise. In: WSI Mitteilungen, 72, 47.

7. Appendix

List of sources

FFF: 1	https://fridaysforfuture.at
FFF: 2	https://fridaysforfuture.at/ueber-uns
FFF: 3	https://fridaysforfuture.at/media/pages/wien-wahl/a0673b9acf-1601826606/forderungen-wien.pdf
FFF: 4	https://fridaysforfuture.at/gruppen/wien
FFF: 5	https://www.fridaysforfuture.at/exitcoal
FFF: 6	https://fridaysforfuture.at/forderungen
FFF: 6a	https://fridaysforfuture.at/media/pages/forderungen/384cbdaf33-1598813625/factsheet_forderungen_v1.pdf
FFF: 7	https://fridaysforfuture.at/fightfor1point5-statement
XR: 1	https://xrebellion.at/klimakrise-oekologischer-kollaps/
XR: 2	https://xrebellion.at/ueber-uns/unsere-forderungen/
XR: 3	https://xrebellion.at/ueber-uns/gewaltfreier-ziviler-ungehorsam/
XR: 4	https://xrebellion.at/ueber-uns/prinzipien-werte/
XR: 5	https://xrebellion.at/werde-aktiv/
XR: 6	https://xrebellion.at/ueber-uns/
SCnCC: 1	https://systemchange-not-climatechange.at/de/wofuer-wir-stehen/
SCnCC: 2	https://systemchange-not-climatechange.at/de/unser-selbstverstaendnis/
SCnCC: 3	https://systemchange-not-climatechange.at/de/positionspapier/
SCnCC: 4	https://systemchange-not-climatechange.at/de/ueber-uns/
SCnCC: 5	https://systemchange-not-climatechange.at/de/positionspapier-energiedemokratie/
SCnCC: 6	https://systemchange-not-climatechange.at/de/just-transition-positionspapier/
ScnCC: 7	https://systemchange-not-climatechange.at/de/regionalgruppen/
KC: 1	https://klimacamp.at/unsere-vision/

List of Interviews

FFF: E1	Semi-structured Expert Interview with representative of FFF Vienna
XR: E1	Semi-structured Expert Interview with representative of XR Vienna
SCnCC: E1	Semi-structured Expert Interview with representative of SCnCC Vienna