MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

„Framing, Strategies and (Counter-)Hegemonic Elements of the ‚Extinction Rebellion' Movement in the UK and Austria"

verfasst von / submitted by

Nora Karim, BA

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2021/ Vienna, 2021

Acknowledgements:

Abstract

The emergence of the Extinction Rebellion (XR) movement in the UK in late 2018 has given rise to a multitude of local subgroups around the world, calling for action to prevent future environmental and social collapse. As the movement represents a key player in the global climate (justice) movement and continues to grow, further research is needed. This thesis analyses the framing processes and strategies of XR, and shows where (counter-)hegemonic elements can be identified. Given the lack of research on the movement, especially regarding the Austrian context, the qualitative research in this thesis contributed to shed light on different facets of the relatively new movement, with a focus on Austria and the UK. To this end, an empirical analysis was conducted based on expert interviews and documents, which were subsequently categorised using Philipp Mayring's (2015) qualitative content analysis. This enabled the presentation of the diagnostic framing of XR, including problem identification, perceived 'victims' and culpable actors. The thesis also portrays XR's key strategies in the context of their prognostic framing, the underlying motivation as well as possible solutions. Seven new motivational frames, most of which were expressed by both the Austrian and British groups, and two frame bridging processes were identified. In addition, the results point to climate justice as the master frame, as both the diagnostic and prognostic framing of the analysed XR cases are dominated by climate justice framing. In some aspects of XR's positioning, strong correspondences with (counter-)hegemonic elements could be found, whereas in others little or none at all. Given the steady growth of XR groups worldwide and the accompanying regional adjustments of positioning and strategies, the movement represents an interesting field for future research.

Kurzfassung

Die Entstehung der Extinction Rebellion (XR) Bewegung in Großbritannien Ende 2018 hat zur Entstehung einer Vielzahl von lokalen Untergruppen auf der ganzen Welt geführt, die zum Handeln aufrufen, um einen zukünftigen ökologischen und sozialen Kollaps zu verhindern. Da die Bewegung ein wichtiger Akteur der globalen Klima(gerechtigkeits)bewegung ist und weiter wächst, ist weitere Forschung notwendig. Diese Arbeit analysiert die Framingprozesse und Strategien von XR, sowie an welchen Stellen (gegen-)hegemoniale Elemente identifiziert werden können. Angesichts des Mangels an Forschung über die Bewegung, insbesondere in Bezug auf den österreichischen Kontext, trug die vorgestellte qualitative Forschung dazu bei, verschiedene Facetten der relativ neuen Bewegung mit einem Fokus auf Österreich und Großbritannien zu beleuchten. Zu diesem Zweck wurde eine empirische Analyse auf Basis von Experten*inneninterviews und Dokumenten durchgeführt, die anschließend mittels qualitativer Inhaltsanalyse nach Philipp Mayring (2015) kategorisiert wurden. Dies ermöglichte die Darstellung des diagnostischen Framings von XR, einschließlich der Problemidentifikation, der wahrgenommenen 'Opfer' und der schuldigen Akteure. Außerdem stellt die Masterarbeit zentrale Strategien von XR im Kontext des prognostischen Framings dar, warum sie eingesetzt werden sowie einhergehende mögliche Lösungen. Es wurden sieben neue motivationale Frames, von denen die meisten sowohl von der österreichischen als auch von der britischen Gruppe geäußert wurden, und zwei Frame Bridging-Prozesse identifiziert. Darüber hinaus weisen die Ergebnisse auf Klimagerechtigkeit als Master Frame hin, da sowohl das diagnostische als auch das prognostische Framing der analysierten XR-Fälle von Klimagerechtigkeits-Frames dominiert werden. In einigen Aspekten der Positionierung von XR konnten starke Übereinstimmungen mit (gegen-)hegemonialen Elementen gefunden werden, an anderen Stellen jedoch wenige oder gar keine. Angesichts des stetigen Wachstums von XR-Gruppen weltweit und der damit einhergehenden regionalen Anpassungen von Positionierungen und Strategien stellt die Bewegung ein interessantes Feld für zukünftige Forschung dar.

Table of Content

List of Abbreviations

CCC	Climate Change Committee
CJN	Climate Justice Now!
COP 6	UN Climate Conference in Bonn, 2001
COP 15	UN Climate Conference in Copenhagen, 2009
COP 21	UN Climate Conference in Paris, 2015
EJCC	Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative
FfF	Fridays for Future
GN	Global North
GS	Global South
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
NSM	New Social Movements
SCnCC	System Change, not Climate Change!
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
XR	Extinction Rebellion
XR MCR	Extinction Rebellion Manchester
XR UK	Extinction Rebellion United Kingdom

1   Introduction

Two and a half years after Extinction Rebellion (XR) emerged and despite the outbreak of the COVID-19 Pandemic in early 2020, the international movement continues to appear on the scene. A number of protests are still taking place in the United Kingdom (UK), the movement's place of origin, and plans for more protest are in progress. For instance, XR United Kingdom (XR UK) intends to expand their campaign against the banking system and the dominant role of the financial system (Taylor, The Guardian 05/04/2021; XR UK 2021c). The same tendency can be observed in Austria, where a national subgroup named 'XR Austria' was founded, which sees itself as part of the international XR movement (XR Austria 2021a). XR Austria is currently occupied with planning a large number of smaller decentralised actions for the upcoming months in preparation for the rebellion week in the fall of 2021 (XR Austria 2021i).

In October 2018, the XR movement emerged, an international movement which aims to raise awareness of the current and future ecological state and its (social) consequences in a nonviolent way. A wave of protests followed and the XR approach quickly spread internationally (XR global 2021a), giving rise to a variety of national and local groups worldwide (XR UK 2021a; XR Austria 2021a). The movement attempts as its main goal "to halt mass extinction and minimise the risk of social collapse" (XR UK 2021a) and has received a lot of media attention due to its civil disobedience actions and symbolic performances. Through the regular protests and global reach of the XR and Fridays for Future (FfF) movements, which took on an international character during the same period as XR, particularly through the participation of young students in school strikes, following the example of Greta Thunberg, the environmental discourse gained an immediate presence in public discourse in 2019 (Der Standard 25/05/2019; Schweinschwaller 2020: 386).

However, 2020 was a great contrast compared to 2019 due to the global COVID-19 pandemic and the strict measures on freedom of movement and protest that came with it. These restrictions made it almost impossible to organise mass protests and led to a stagnation of climate protests. Nevertheless, the protest climax of 2019 strengthened the XR discourse with its large amount of XR activists, media attention and interest from the scientific field.

As XR represents a relatively new movement, scientific resonance on the movement has been comparatively low so far, particularly with regard to the Austrian XR context. Currently, an increasing number of contributions can be observed, which mainly investigate the movement with respect to its strategies, personal experiences, emotionalisation and values

(Schweinschweller 2020: 390). The lack of research, the high number of XR groups (see XR global 2021b) and the diversity of climate (justice) movements in their demands, organisation, and strategies emphasise the importance of further analysis of the movement. Since XR activists are socially embedded and thus also their demands, framing processes and strategies of XR in particular should be shed light on in order to better understand this newly emerged international movement. Protests express the issues perceived by individuals or groups (Teune 2008) and are directed towards specific actors and conditions. Antonio Gramsci's (1971) concept of hegemony analyses social power structures and therefore serves as a possible perspective to approach XR's concerns and counterparties, possibly enabling the identification of hegemonic or (counter-)hegemonic elements within the movement. Taken all these aspects into consideration, it leads to the relevance of this thesis and results in the following research question:

> **Which framing, strategies and (counter-)hegemonic elements can be observed with the 'Extinction Rebellion' movement in the UK and Austria?**

For this research, the focus is laid on the European context. On the one hand, the British XR movement is investigated as the movement's place of origin, and on the other hand, the Austrian XR branch due to the academic context and background knowledge of the researcher. The emphasis on 'XR UK' and 'XR Austria' intends to analyse the two countries individually but at the same time to enable a comparison of the two movement branches and their key elements to further identify common and distinctive features in regard to their framing, which corresponds to their positioning, key strategies as well as (counter-)hegemonic elements.

Frames represent perceptions of the world of certain groups, often applied in the context and research field of social movement studies, and facilitate the identification and interpretation of certain phenomena (Goffman 1974). Based on this, the frames of XR can be determined by focusing on their demands, who they are addressed at and what they are intended to achieve. In accordance with this approach, Gramsci's hegemony offers an interesting basis to examine the counterparties of XR, as it grasps social power relations, how they are produced and maintained. This broadens the perspective on XR's framing by contributing discussions on (counter-)hegemonic elements and whether such can be identified within the movement or not. A qualitative research approach lends itself to this analysis as it tries to capture people's realities (Gukelberger/Gerharz 2019: 19). Additionally, frame analysis mostly makes use of qualitative research, which underlines the advantages of this approach for this thesis. Qualitative frame

analysis usually applies (transcribed) interviews and/or documents as a data basis to understand movement specific frames, such as strategic or mobilising frames (Johnston 2002: 72, 75). Interviews as method attempt to grasp people's perceptions of reality (Blee/Taylor 2002) and, as complementary to this, documents that have emerged without the researchers' interest add a new perspective on phenomena (Bowen 2009). The combination of these methods is applied to specific cases of both the Austrian and British XR movements, which are selected subsequent to the conducted expert interviews. The collected data on these cases then are processed by means of Philipp Mayring's (2015) content analysis which enables the analysis of different types of texts, such as transcriptions and documents, and therefore serves as the central evaluation method for the thesis.

The research interest is on the one hand relevant for the movement research field as it examines a relatively new movement, in which there is only limited scientific echo. On the other hand, it is of significance to the research field of Development studies which focuses on global, regional and local processes as well as inequality. Therefore, phenomena on a global scale, including grassroots or (counter-)movements, must be considered in order to understand these dynamics and processes within society as a whole. Thomas Kern (2008: 9) even declares social movements as "driving force of social change" which underlines the importance of analysing actors aiming at social change. The XR movement calls for environmental protection, system transformation and sustainability. This diversity in claims connects various topics which requires further research, especially from the perspective of transdisciplinary studies. Accordingly, this thesis aims to strengthen the research field of XR with regard to the discipline of Development Studies.

The introduction is followed by the theoretical framework of this research interest (Chapter 2). Three thematic blocks will be highlighted, providing an introduction to the study field of social and environmental movements, to the widely used framing concept according to Benford/Snow (1988) and Benford/Snow (2000), and finally to Antonio Gramsci's (1971) concept of hegemony. Chapter 3 describes the methodology of the thesis, which first includes the chosen qualitative research methods, the semi-structured expert interviews and document analysis, that allow us a triangulated insight to the research interest. Second, Mayring's (2015) qualitative content analysis is presented, including the categories that serve as its basis. This chapter concludes with the outlining of the limitations of the research work. Chapter 4 serves as an introduction to the XR movement, presenting its background, visions, demands, central values and criticism. Various sources are cited and used to support this, such as the conducted expert

interviews, different documents (XR websites and handbooks) and to date. In Chapter 5 and 6, the empirical findings based on the described qualitative approach are highlighted, followed by the presentation of the key findings with regard to the research question in Chapter 7. Lastly, Chapter 8 provides final conclusions as well as an outlook on further research fields.

2   Theoretical Framework

Since the study field of social and environmental movements is of great extent, the first section provides an insight into different approaches that deal with and attempt to grasp this comprehensive field. Besides introducing definitions and basic elements of social and environmental movements, the New Social Movements paradigm is presented. Since XR is primarily concerned with ecological issues, an overview on environmental activism is given, showing in particular an overview of developments to date in the UK and Austria and the discourse on the climate justice movement. The chapter concludes with theoretical approaches to protest strategies, especially nonviolent civil disobedience. The second section, the framing concept of protest and social movement research is introduced, including its central processes. Essential to this chapter is the insight provided into previous framing approaches in environmental and climate movement research. The third and final section discusses Antonio Gramsci's (1971) theory of hegemony. Here, the focus is laid on key elements of hegemony, conceptual views of the neo-Gramscian discourse and, finally, on counter-hegemonic approaches related to social movements.

2.1   An Introduction to Social and Environmental Movements Studies

Extinction Rebellion, despite its diversion in various subgroups around the world, adheres to the consensus of being an international movement (XR UK 2021a; XR Austria 2021), which is why it can be assigned to the theoretical field of social movements. In its core, the study field of social and protest movements is engaged in researching the "causes, forms of appearances and consequences of social movements" (translated, Kern 2008: 9). Therefore, this research interest lays emphasis on the positioning, claims and forms of strategies of XR. Social movements are a phenomenon which exists everywhere in the world. Most often, they aim to challenge and transform certain circumstances (Cox 2018: 3) and express their goal through one-time or recurring protest actions in public, which represents thus their most essential means

of expression (Teune 2008: 528ff.). Thomas Kern (2008: 8) even declares them as "driving force of social change". As such, they have a central role to play within societies. They are even said to have a central role in having established modern world (Cox 2018: 22) and to exert influence on public opinion within democratic societies (Teune 2008: 530). This makes movements an attractive research field to seize various elements and processes of social changes, especially as frequently new ones emerge.

A variety of definitions of social movements (Snow/Soule/Kriesi 2004; della Porta/Diani 2006; Tarrow 2011) can be found within related literature. This thesis will draw upon the definition of Alain Touraine[1] (1991) who defines social movements as

> a collective action aiming at the implementation of central values against the interest and influence of an enemy which is defined in terms of power relations. A social movement is a combination of social conflict and cultural participation. (Touraine 1991: 389)

In this sense, social movements function as a collective that attempts to impose its own values within given social power structures, which implements unequal power relations and unequal cultural participation. For this reason, this definition appears suitable for the research interest as framing tries to capture the positioning and interests of movements, which includes attributing blame and naming culpable agents. Furthermore, Antonio Gramsci's (1971) concept used for the thesis describes power relations within a community which includes notions of enemies and social conflicts. This in turn allows to regard movements in a setting paved by power structures as they express demands in regard to certain social structures perceived as unsatisfying. Thus, (counter-)hegemonic elements of the XR movement can better be set into focus with Touraine's movement definition.

2.1.1 New Social Movements Studies

In the second half of the 20th century, a new paradigm within the study field of protest and social movements emerged, called "New Social Movement" (NSM) (Kern 2008: 13). It originated from European traditions of social theory and political philosophy (Buechler 1995: 441), which experienced its peak in the 80s and 90s of the last century. It became clear that new approaches were necessary for analysing new rising movements at the time, such as the ecological, women's and peace movements. It therefore draws on a collection of different

---

[1] Alain Touraine is a sociologist who is specialised, among other things, on the study of social movements (see Touraine 1991: 385).

perspectives on how the protests could be classified and to what extent they could actually be considered a new form. The paradigm was accompanied by an innovative way of looking at social protests and movements which, from that on, considered them as an essential part of society, modernity as well as modernisation processes. Reason for it is that they addressed problems associated with modernisation or side effects of it, among other things (Kern 2008: 13, 48f., 53ff.; Beyer/Schnabel 2017: 138). Here, Kern (2008: 51f.) refers to the example of the ecology movement, without which information about the far-reaching ecological consequences of industrialisation would in all probability not have reached the wider society. In this sense, protest movements take on the role of drawing attention to negative perceptions of current social conditions, which otherwise would not necessarily happen.

Before, social movements mainly addressed issues concerning labour or nations (della Porta/Diani 2006: 6). A number of new characteristics compared to earlier movements were observed with this 'new' form of movements, such as rationality, creative powers and heterogeneity in participants. Furthermore, the subject of protests of the NSM differentiated from protests before: instead of focusing on political decision-making processes or economic injustices, new sources of identity and self-realisation gained in importance; especially the element of identity and its new dimensions determined the motivation of activists in this context. NSM reassembled their collective identity in cultural elements or topics such as equal and human rights, life quality or political participation compared to former movements that were defined by groups such as proletarian or ethical minorities, aiming at changes in political power structures. Other new incentives for movements were issues regarding areas of everyday life, including consumption or sexuality. Participation in these protests was mainly guided by the desire to create alternative means of influencing and changing social conditions and to limit the power of dominant actors from the respective context. Most of the NSM protests were carried out with new tactics, using civil disobedience, non-violence and dramatic symbols. Their way of organisation took also a new form, showing a tendency towards autonomous, local and decentralised organisational processes, thus counteracting hierarchical structures that had previously dominated the protest landscape (Buechler 1995: 442; Kern 2008: 55ff.; Beyer/Schnabel 2017: 138). Despite these differences, Kern (2008) nevertheless claims that there are parallels between the NSM and their predecessors.

Alain Touraine's (1985) neo-Marxist interpretation of the NSM is considered one of the most prominent contributions to the NSM paradigm (Kern 2008: 56; Beyer/Schnabel 2017: 139). As could be observed in Touraine's (1991) definition of social movements, the focus is laid on the implementation of values of a certain group into society. Therefore, Touraine identifies social

movements within a cultural sphere. The aspect of culture comes to the fore in his writings as social movements are described as a conflict over ruling "cultural patterns", which include "a model of knowledge, a type of investment, and ethical principles" (Touraine 1985: 754f.). Touraine (1985: 760f.) determines three core characteristics of social movements: firstly, the establishment of a collective actor's identity; second, the definition of an opponent; and finally, the focus on a central conflict issue or field of conflict that dominates a certain society of which the two opposing actors are part of. Within the framework of the NSM, the conflicts deal with identity-related issues and questions concerning lifestyles instead of social distribution issues. With this, Touraine emphasises the guidance of NSM by the desire to reach individual and collective freedoms (Kern 2008: 56f.).

2.1.2 Environmental Activism

As with social movements, there are different approaches to and definitions of environmental movements. However, Rootes (2004: 610f.) identifies two main traditions to approach them: the American tradition, which tends to be associated with a catholic, empiricist, and nominalist approach, and the European tradition, which understands movements as essential actor or phenomenon contributing to profound social change. Furthermore, the distinction between different environmental actors is central, as for instance, the distinction of environmental movements from environmental organisations or protests. According to Rootes, environmental movements can only be considered as such when different actors and organisations network and engage together in collective action. In comparison, Rucht (1996: 15) defines environmental movements as cooperation between NGOs and non-state groups which build a common front in the name of environmental protection and the protection of the natural life basis against political and social conditions preventing this. A further distinction is made within environmental movements themselves, of which the climate movement represents a branch that is itself a heterogeneous actor; subgroups include, for example, the climate justice or the ecological modernisation movement (Dietz/Garrelts 2014: 2).

The history of environmental movements goes back a long way but reached a new peak of mobilisation with the second half of the 20th century. It was during this period that the relationship between humans and nature came to the fore, resulting in new demands regarding politics, economics and society (Kern 2008: 103ff.). It represented a new perspective at the time to enlarge the focus from regional issues and environmental risks to a global scale (Rucht 1996: 15). Since the rise of environmental movements in the NSM period, different processes have

taken place: on the one hand, environmental organisations emerged from the broad-based movement and on the other hand, an institutionalisation of environmental activism took place in the following decades. Not only have Green Parties emerged in many countries of the 'Global North'[2] (GN), but meanwhile environmental agendas were also introduced to other party programmes. Through these different processes and phases, the environmental movement was able to assert itself and could ensure its existence until today (Rootes 2004: 608f.). However, a certain paradox can be recognised: the environmental movement managed to grow substantially and maintain. It also succeeded to introduce its interests into the international discourse and thereby bring them onto the political agendas, which was accompanied with its institutionalisation. At the same time, however, the ecological and climate conditions of the world have massively deteriorated in these decades despite the success progression of the movement (Rucht 1996: 15f.; Brand/Wissen 2017: 21f.).

Rootes (2004) allocates first environmental campaigns in regions of the 'GN', such as Europe and the United States, in the 19th and early 20th century, in which demands were made for clean water and air. By this, a link between humans and the ecosystem was established. With the help of increasing scientific research, the impact on environmental conditions became more visible in the first half of the 20th century in Europe. Hereby, the British Clean Air Act of 1956 represented an example for first measures on consequences of environmental issues, which was initiated due to thousands of deaths caused by a serious smog incident in London some years before (Rootes 2004: 612f.).

Following on this brief historical introduction and since this thesis follows a clear regional focus, a closer look will now be provided on first the British environmental activism, followed by the Austrian.

Environmental activism in the UK

"Britain […] has the oldest and one of the strongest and most influential environmental movements in the world.", according to Rootes (2012: 24). Its beginnings can be attributed to the late 1960s and 1970s, in which the Green Party and other environmental organisations were founded in the UK (Elaine Graham-Leigh 2014). By comparison, other theorists date them back

---

[2] The 'Global North' has traditionally been associated with the 'Western', 'historically industrialised' countries within studies on local and regional developments. However, the distinction between the 'Global North' and the 'Global South' has already been criticised for its binary approach, which is said to influence people's thinking patterns and leads to falsely based stereotypes, and for its lack of consideration of interactions between or changes of these regions (Pike/Rodríguez-Pose/Tomaney 2014).

to an earlier period and hereby, identify three periods of major activity within the British environmental activism history: the mid-19th century to the beginning of the 20th century, the end of the 1960s to the end of the 1980s, and finally the 1990s to the present day. The first period is associated with the so-called Victorian environmentalists, who held only small numbers. Besides opposing the damage caused by industrialisation, they dealt mainly with issues such as pollution, urban development or the conservation-preservation (Prendiville 2020: 17f.) The above mentioned British Clean Air Act of 1956 took place in between the two periods and represented a milestone, as it was one of the first environmental measures introduced by the government in response to deaths caused by a severe smog some years before (Rootes 2004: 613). The modern environmentalism indicates the second active period which thematised the limits to economic growth as well as conceptualised sustainability. It was also during this time, in 1973, that the UK Green Party was founded (Prendiville 2020: 41, 44). In the mid-1990s, a period of intense 'development' and economic agendas, a peak of environmental protests could be observed in the UK. The interest of civil society in environmental agendas was also reflected in the success of the Green Party during these years. A number of new environmental campaigns were also launched, covering issues such as road traffic, the export of living animals and oil storage processes. The most addressed issues were transport, animal welfare, nature conservation, pollution and industry (Rootes 2003: 25f., 29). The foundation of Earth First! (UK) in the beginning of the 1990s, a British branch of the US organisation of the same name, gave more radical supporters the opportunity to confront the actors responsible for environmental degradation by means of direct action. Also, it gave rise to further protest groups around the country, mainly organising large road mobilisations to point out the consequences of road traffic (Prendiville 2020: 39f.). The last period, political ecologism, is assigned to the last two decades, with which the idea of an alternative and ecocentric model for living of society as a whole has come into focus (Prendiville 2020: 44).

Starting with the 2000s, several environmental groups emerged in the UK and the focus was increasingly laid on concerns towards climate change in the course of the Kyoto Protocol and its controversial political discourse. During this period, an upturn in the ecological movement could be observed, also reflected in various strands within the movement: groups pressuring international and national governments to act on climate change; more direct action groups such as the Camp for Climate Action, a practical example of combining direct action training, (alternative) education and sustainable living, representing a form of prefigurative utopia; and environmental groups focusing on reaching people or companies directly to encourage the mitigation of emissions. Besides the Camps, there were also initiatives carrying out direct

actions at airports such as Rising Tide, Plane Stupid or the more radical Reclaiming the Power. These different branches show the complexity of the environmental activism scene in the UK.

Furthermore, the UN Climate Conference in Copenhagen (COP 15) in December 2009 had a strong impact on the British climate movement by raising the largest climate protest action of the UK up until then with about 50 000 participants. Additionally, the protests around the Climate Conference initiated talks about possible alliances between environmental protest groups across Europe (Rootes 2012: 25; Graham-Leigh 2014: 107f.; Wahlström et al. 2019: 32). The goal of these groups was to engage together against climate change as a more wide-ranging and united movement. From then on, climate summits and similar meetings on climate change related issues represented an opportunity for regular protests to demand government action in Britain; this mainly affected activists who saw possible solutions for the climate in the actions of governments or other institutions, thus within the current system. This approach is however in contradiction with the failure of the COP 15, in which the governmental system failed to find a solution. However, the numerous participations in climate change protests can be nevertheless understood as a symbol for climate action promotion in general (Graham-Leigh 2014: 113ff.). In the past years, the number of climate protests increased immensely. This can be partly traced back to the emergence and uprising of the British XR movement and upcoming Global Climate Strikes initiated by FfF in 2018. The first protest of XR was followed by further traffic blockages in London as well as media interest, also triggered by XR's publication of a special report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)[3] of that year indicating the continuing high emissions worldwide, which were far from the targets set during the UN Climate Conference in Paris in 2015 (COP 21) (Wahlström et al. 2019: 32; Prendiville 2020: 2f.).

Environmental activism in Austria

Two political camps, the Socialists and the Christian Conservatives, dominated Austrian society from 1918 onwards. This division limited the possibilities for social movements that placed themselves outside these political frameworks (Pelinka 1991: 231; Pelinka 1998: 109f.). The NSM supported a new type of emancipation by allowing the establishment of new smaller parties outside the two traditional political ones in Austria in the 1980s, which included green lists at the municipal, state, and federal level (Pelinka 1991: 233; Gottweis 1992: 321; Pelinka

---

[3] More information can be found on the homepage of UN IPPCC: https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/ (30/04/2021).

1998: 113). This process resulted in the rise of new parties, such as the Green Party which entered the Austrian parliament in 1986 (Pelinka 1998: 114). For this reason, NSM in Austria can be associated with political change and social innovation (Pelinka 1991: 241). Against this background, more political participation with reference to democracy was demanded by Austrians at that time (Pelinka 1998: 117). The interest in environmental issues had also increased in Austria during this period, especially with the emergence of the NSM in Austria in the 1970s (Wösendorfer 1988: 136; Gottweis 1992: 313). Due to the lack of integration of nature issues into political decision-making, topics such as the destruction of nature came to the fore, especially with regard to the Alpine region, road construction, the energy industry, especially hydroelectric power stations, agriculture, forestry and Austrians cultural landscape (Wösendorfer 1988: 136; Gottweis 1992: 314, 320). Thus, voices were raised calling for nature conservation and the expansion of national parks alongside sustainable energy management, while at the same time plans were being made for the expansion of power plants (Wösendorfer 1988: 113ff.). Also, actors who had already played an important role in environmental conflicts before, such as in Zwentendorf (1977/78) or "Rettet die Lobau" (1969-1972), were also strongly involved in the resistance to the construction of the power plant in Hainburg (Wösendorfer 1988: 136). In particular Zwentendorf and Hainburg took on a special role in Austrian environmental activism of the 20th century. In case of Zwentendorf, the commissioning of the power plant was to be prevented. Initially, opposition to this project came from the ranks of nature and environmental groups as well as conservative circles before they were joined by a number of other Austrian-wide groups. Finally, the commissioning was prevented due to the massive protests with around 500 000 activists. For this reason, Zwentendorf can be regarded as a key moment within the Austrian protest landscape of the 1970s, especially for the environmental scene, since it represented a central political conflict in Austria at the time. The Austrian ecology movement until then gained considerable momentum through this event (Gottweis 1992: 315f.; Gottweis 2000: 61f.).

This was followed in the 1980s by a growing alternative movement, which expressed itself through organic food shops, cooperatives and other projects. Supporters of this rising movement showed equally interest in the environment (Gottweis 1992: 316). At the same time, increasing attention to environmental related issues emerged such as urban and spatial planning, energy supply through power plants, transport as well as air pollutants and their negative effects (ibid: 320). The protests in Hainburg also took place in this decade. The planned Hainburg project, a Danube power plant, was strongly criticised by the alternative wing, various initiatives and nature conservation organisations with regard to its environmental impact,

whereupon a community emerged from these as a 'counter-power' to the Au project. Public discussions became heated in the course of this. The approval ultimately led to the occupation of the Hainburger Au in 1984 with simultaneous solidarity protests with about 40 000 participants in Vienna, which represented another climax of the conflicts on environmental protection (Wösendorfer 1988: 113ff.; Gottweis 1992: 320). As mentioned above, the origin of the institutionalisation of Green parties in Austria goes back to this period which represented fundamental changes within the traditional political structures. This led to a sustainable inclusion of environmental issues in politics and citizen participation in decision-making on environmental protection, its planning and power plant permits (Gottweis 1992: 321f.).

In the 1990s, the ecological movement in Austria experienced a professionalisation through which essential actors established, such as WWF, Global 2000 or GreenPeace (Gottweis 2000: 62). Nevertheless, according to Dolezal and Hutter (2007), on average not many environmentally motivated protests took place in Austria between the mid-1990s and 2005; although their analysis shows that the number of protest events in Austria was generally relatively low during this period, especially in European comparison (Dolezal/Hutter 2007: 343ff.). Compared to other countries, the discourse on the climate crisis and possible solutions to it remained predominantly in the field of environmental protection in Austria. It was only in 2015, in the context of the COP 21 that the debate on the climate crisis in connection with the economic system began. During this period, a new movement emerged. Before the UN summit, the Austrian movement 'System Change, not Climate Change!' (SCnCC) was founded. Within the framework of SCnCC, an alliance between various Austrian environmental actors emerged, which increasingly addressed the concept of climate justice. Thus, the connection between the climate crisis, mobility, the capitalist way of life and the capitalist economic, trade and production system came into focus. This led to the central demand to change the current global system with the help of *socio-ecological transformation*[4] (Heuwieser 2016: 55f.).

In recent years, new groups such as XR (see Chapter 4), FfF and Ende Gelände(wagen) emerged in the Austrian climate movement landscape (Schweinschwaller 2020: 386). By now, XR and FfF have evolved into global movements with a number of regional groups in Austria. FfF concentrates on the compliance with the Paris Climate Agreement[5], adopted at the COP 21, and follows an approach strongly based on climate justice (FfF Austria 2021). With its concerns

---

[4] Brand and Wissen (2017) refer to the term *social-ecological transformation* as fundamental changes or transformation of social structures and their various dimensions toward sustainability, and thus, contextualising the ecological crisis in a broader context (Brand/Wissen 2017: 28f.).

[5] More information on the Paris Agreement: https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement (30/04/2021).

and weekly protest in the name of climate justice, FfF was able to mobilise thousands of people in Vienna on several occasions (Der Standard 25/05/2019; Bohl/Antje 2020: 62f.).

FfF is an example of a movement strongly committed to climate justice. Since there is limited academic resonance on XR and only little direct references of the movement to climate justice, it is not clear whether the movement can also be assigned to the climate justice discourse. However, while these movements are still relatively new, the emergence of the climate justice movement dates back to the last two decades, about which background information will be provided in a next step.

The Climate Justice Movement

In the beginning of this subchapter, it was noted that the climate justice movement can be considered as a branch of the global climate movement. Current environmental groups or movements committed to questions of climate justice and related issues can be assigned to this discourse. It dates back to the last two decades and during this period, the concept has grown to a considerable extent and is now treated in different contexts. At the centre of the discourse are the consequences of climate change, which affect people worldwide in different ways, the lack of commitment by international governments to counteract climate change, and structured approaches to solving the problem. It points out that it is mainly the marginalised and vulnerable part of the world's population that is affected by climate-related impacts, which is not sufficiently highlighted in the overall international climate change discourse, according to its activists (Tokar 2019: 13).

The term 'climate justice' was first used in the late 1990s in a report by the US Corporate Watch group, some of whose members belonged to the environmental justice movement in the US, which had only recently emerged. The report included a first climate justice approach as it pointed out issues regarding the core causes of global warming as well as the impact of the oil industry and called for support for the communities most affected. The first Climate Justice Summit took place in 2000 in the context of the UN's Climate Conference in Bonn (COP 6). As a result, the Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative (EJCC) was launched in the following year. The initiative consisted of a variety of groups, such as religious, climate justice, policy or environmental justice groups, which in 2002 called out ten key principles of climate justice. The content of these principles was strongly oriented towards the to date

experiences of US American environmental justice communities and therefore focused on the protection of vulnerable communities, renewable energy, participatory and just decision-making and the reduction of emissions and fossil fuel usage. In the same year, the coalition Climate Justice Network was launched, which established the Bali Principles of Climate Justice, which is regarded as the first official international action of the climate justice movement. The Bali principles were strongly connected to the US environmental movement in terms of content, for instance, by emphasising the rights of indigenous communities and compensation concerning environmental damages. Only when the UN Climate Conference took place in 2007, the first network in the name of climate justice emerged, called Climate Justice Now! (CJN). During this conference, demands were made by representatives of indigenous people, affected communities, women and other groups regarding renewable energy resources, changing ways of consumption and lifestyles worldwide sustainable food production. In the following year, CJN took a clear stance by defining a vision for necessary action on an international level from a climate justice perspective, including aspects as 'just' distribution of responsibility concerning transformation of the system, defending rights and protecting the most vulnerable part of the world society as well as participatory decision-making. The network already counted about 750 supporting organisations worldwide by 2010, which signalled an immense growth of the approach. The failure of the COP 15 in 2009 also contributed significantly to the emergence of the climate justice movement. Various perspectives on it have developed since then, building a wide spectrum of networks fighting for issues related to climate justice (Schlosberg/Collins 2014: 362, 366f.; Brand/Wissen 2017: 24; Tokar 2019: 15ff.). With the Paris Agreement in 2015, first steps had been taken towards an institutional climate justice agenda, among other things, calling for action in respect of equity in various dimensions, the protection of biodiversity, limiting the extent of global warming to 2 degrees. The climate justice movement has contributed thematically to the global climate movement in terms of highlighting disproportionate effects of climate related consequences on the global society, especially on marginalised and vulnerable communities; those responsible for climate change, economic agendas and institutions, are equally responsible for poverty and inequality; and by enabling an intersectional approach to related issues (Tokar 2019: 19ff.).

It can be observed that climate justice activists regard the climate crisis equally as a global justice crisis. Factors contributing to this view are the different allocations of impact of the climate crisis and its consequences between the 'GN' and 'Global South'[6] (GS). In this respect,

---

[6] The 'Global South' has originally been associated with the 'Less Developed Countries' or 'Low Income Countries' within Development Studies[2] (Pike/Rodríguez-Pose/Tomaney 2014).

the greatest impact will be on the 'GS', with some environmental impacts already observed, while the industries in the 'GN' will mainly cause them (Brand/Krams 2018).

Through its concerns and demands, the climate justice movement includes implicitly in its agendas the "Degrowth" (Brand/Krams 2018) approach. The concept itself became first topic within scientific discourses in the 1970s. After the failure of the COP 15 in 2009, the perspective was picked up again. It was therefore re-established in the last decade and is related to post-growth approaches. However, the concept is not a movement in its own right, but merely a perspective, which is linked to aspects of climate justice. Moreover, there is no clear definition, but reference points that describe the concept in more detail. On the one hand, the capitalist economic system is seen as the main problem area, which causes current crises and social inequality through its focus on economic growth and capital accumulation. In this sense, a complete social transformation would be necessary to overcome these issues. On the other hand, the Degrowth approach should bring alternatives to light and embrace them in a bigger context (Brand/Krams 2018: 18f.).

2.1.3   Protest Strategies

For several reasons, strategies should be taken into account when investigating movements: certain tactics can be used to mobilise potential activists and communicate intentions to the public. With this characteristic, protests can put certain actors or decision-makers under pressure (della Porta/Diani 2006: 165). Strategies also perform an internal function in that they can contribute to the collective identity of the movement, which could be strengthened along the way (ibid.: 179). Additionally, forms of protest can fundamentally vary in their symbolic value, radical nature and purpose. Actions of movements make use of cultural and political strategies, differing in their focus, which makes it a very subjective element (ibid.: 170). Taking all these aspects into account, it results that the decision of which strategies or forms of action to use is essential for the movement in question, especially since they are often the element with which the movement is most associated (ibid.: 168).

Starting from the 1960s, an increasing number of new forms of political participation was observed, such as occupations, signing petitions, demonstrating, blocking traffic or sit-ins. Through this, protesting represents a form of political participation (della Porta/Diani 2006: 166). New types of media, including television and mobile phones, but in particular, the age of the internet has expanded the repertoire of protest forms for social movements. This change in

communication tools has profoundly changed the scope of mobilisation and enabled protests to be more decentralised and to assert themselves at a global level (ibid.: 170).

It has been observed that forms of protest follow different categories, also depending on their degree of extremism (della Porta/Diani 2006: 178). One possible way of distinguishing them is the extent to which they take place within a legal framework. Legal forms of protest include petitions, for instance. Then there are nonviolent but illegal actions such as unofficial strikes or peaceful occupations and lastly, both violent and illegal protests. As far as the degree of legality is concerned, it should be noted that the choice of protest form may be related to the political system in which it is carried out (ibid.: 170, 173).

In the introduction of this thesis it was already mentioned that civil disobedience actions of the XR movement received a lot of media attention during 2019 (see Der Standard 25/05/2019; XR global 2021a). For this reason, this form of protest will now be discussed in more detail by presenting previous research approaches.

A theoretical approach to nonviolent civil disobedience

Different concepts of civil disobedience exist which Hayes and Ollitrault (2019) distinguish in normative and performative approaches. The former deals with a universal, static idea of disobedience, whereas the latter thematises its justification and legitimation, the claims that go with it and the framework in which the protest is embedded. The authors form their argument based on theoretical approaches of Hannah Arendt (1972) and John Rawls (1971/1999) (Hayes/Ollitrault 2019: 131). Rawls' approach is based on his central text *Theory of Justice,* which defines civil disobedience as "a public, nonviolent, conscientious yet political act contrary to law usually done with the aim of bringing about a change in the law or policies of the government" (Rawls 1971/1999: 320). However, the act of disobedience does not necessarily have to break the law being protested against (ibid.). The relation of Rawls' definition to the idea of a nearly 'just society'[7] must be taken into account, assumed to follow a democratic system or state, in which the protests take place (Rawls 1971/1999: 319). At this point, Hayes and Ollitrault note that Rawls' concept of civil disobedience aims to defend a

---

[7] Rawls' definition of civil disobedience has to be treated carefully when referring to current movements such as Extinction Rebellion. Although both regional foci of this research interest, UK and Austria, exercise democratic systems, the notion of a 'just' system is subjective. Nevertheless, his approach offers a first approximation to the concept of civil disobedience.

person's rights as citizen. In this case, participation in such actions is carried out with the notion of defending one's rights within an existing system. Consequently, civil disobedience actions are possibly not directed against the government itself, but support stronger rights within a democratic system. Similar to this, Hannah Arendt argues that illegal actions such as civil disobedience take place in a certain context which is legally and politically defined. By breaking the law in public, the concerned activists indirectly confirm the commonly ruling framework by representing an exception to it. Following these understandings, the strategy aims at correcting perceived systemic problems within an ongoing democratic system (Hayes/Ollitrault 2019: 133).

Characteristics of nonviolent civil disobedience

Various characteristics can be assigned to nonviolent civil disobedience actions. Della Porta and Diani (2006) observe that activists participating in such actions aim at conveying a moral message and their convictions with help of direct action, which expresses their "strong commitment to an objective deemed vital for humanity's future" (della Porta/Diani 2006: 176) by making the public a witness of their protest. They are also associated with the idea of participatory democracy. Typical actions of this tactic have so far included blockages of nuclear power plants, destructions of genetically modified fields, passive resistance against the police or symbolic provocation. Through this, participants take personal risks or incurring costs in order to demonstrate their concerns (della Porta/Diani 2006: 176f.).

Furthermore, della Porta and Diani (2006) identify the characteristic of a tendency towards alternative culture as well as values with participants in civil disobedience actions. This applies in particular with the idea of political transformation or bringing about system change from below instead of from above. Movements striving for such goals often want changes in thinking patterns of the broad masses. Thus, changes on an individual basis must be made for this purpose (della Porta/Diani 2006: 177).

Another characteristic is giving civil disobedience actions a symbolic note when carried out in public. Concerned activists seek to mirror their main protest objectives with the choice of strong symbolic direct actions. By means of this tool, the message remains clear with a higher probability in case of media or other actors reporting the protest content differently. Examples for symbolic actions are visual images or acting out possible consequences in the event of failure to achieve the movement's goals (della Porta/Diani 2006: 178).

Justification for civil disobedience as strategy

In their analysis, Hayes and Ollitrault (2019) identify a line of argumentation of movements for when using civil disobedience as protest strategy. Hereby, civil disobedience, indicating to break the law, is justified in situations of urgency in which new means are said to be necessary. In this regard, the authors refer to John Rawls' (1971/1999) theoretical approach which is a possible approach to justify the disobedience of individuals or movements. It tries to capture the rights and obligations of citizens within a democratic (constitutional) system. According to this, breaking the law is legitimised if the individual suffered severe injustice, which can be compared to experiencing violations of the social contract[8] and therefore of one's rights as a citizen. In this sense, carrying out civil disobedience is legitimate as all other possible means within the democratic system or the system itself have failed. However, it is a balancing act, since injustice, necessity and the perception of problems is subjective (Rawls 1971/1999: 320f.; Hayes/Ollitrault 2019: 164).

Through civil disobedience, direct action is immediately taken to influence decisions on certain policies or laws and as a consequence to cause a change in those. This approach can also be found with Henry D. Thoreau (1996) who had great impact on the tactic of civil disobedience with his essay and combined the obligation to act when a person cannot tolerate a situation anymore perceived as unjust (Hayes/Ollitrault 2019: 166f.). In this respect, protests from the past show that time and the resulting urgency to act are central motivations for civil disobedience. The notion of time and urgency is also indirectly highlighted in Hayes and Ollitrault' observation that "the fundamental objective is to prevent the instigation or completion of an action considered socially harmful (even life-threatening)" (ibid.: 169). Accordingly, a central motivation for civil disobedience protests is to prevent primarily negative consequences for the future, particularly related to social conditions perceived as dangerous or harmful. Despite this, direct action can still remain of symbolic value in order to draw attention to the perceived problems (ibid.: 169f.).

The notion of urgency appears as a justification for civil disobedience actions in the literature related to environmental protests, especially concerning the issues climate change and nature in crisis. Because of this, over the last decade, civil disobedience has occurred as an essential

---

[8] John Rawls understands the term social contract as a form of justice, based on the approaches of Locke, Rousseau and Kant, which forms the structural basis for society and all its participants (Rawls 1971/1999: 10). It is further associated with moral duties within democracies and sovereignty between citizens and the constitution (Hayes/Ollitrault 2019: 127).

protest strategy for the global climate justice movement. Especially for more radical groups and NGOs, it seemed to be a justified strategy given the urgency and failure of institutions to counteract a crisis. Environmental activists argue with the intention of protecting and preserving nature and its biodiversity, which mirrors Hayes and Ollitrault justification approach. In this context, the aspect of irreversibility plays an essential role, as protest actions are thus urgent, since future political agendas and governmental decisions based on ecological values cannot be relied upon, which is why the crisis would worsen. In this sense, direct action in the form of civil disobedience aims to help to enforce these values and function as an instrument in order to convince the public and various global actors to introduce changes or to compensate for consequences or damage at least. Environmental protests so far have taken various forms of civil disobedience, such as individual or collective actions, climate camps for exchange of tactics or ideas, and occupations of fossil power stations (Humphrey 2006: 314, 320; Hayes/Ollitrault 2019: 171).

2.2 Framing Theory

One of the core approaches for this thesis represents framing, a concept originally launched by the sociologist Erving Goffman (1974). It was adapted by different authors, such as David A. Snow (1986), Robert D. Benford (1986) and William A. Gamson et al. (1982) for the study field of Social Movements since the 1980s. The framing approach can be assigned to the cultural turn[9] in movement research, which represented a new paradigm shift with focus on lifeworld practices, symbols and the social construction of meaning mainly associated with the concepts of framing and collective identity[10] (Snow 2004: 384; Beyer/Schnabel 2017: 137).

2.2.1 Concept of Framing

According to Kern (2008), the core idea of 'framing' in the context of social movements is that movements not only carry certain values but equally produce them. Therefore, framing analysis serves as an instrument to capture these values and their meaning. In other words, it focuses on "the production and reproduction of cultural structures of interpretation through which social

---

[9] The *cultural turn* marked a shift in the social sciences toward a culture-based view of various activities and meanings that had not previously been associated with culture. This also affected political and movement research. In movement research, the shift was most evident with regard to *frame alignment processes* (Jasper 2010: 59, 71).
[10] The concept of *collective identity* denotes a common social frame of reference for movement participants which forms a common identity and thus is indispensable for collective action (Kern 2008: 120).

movements mobilise their adherence" (translated, Kern 2008: 142). Through this, it links individual perceptions and collective action, which enables better interpretation of protests, movements and their intended meaning (Kern 2008: 141f.; della Porta/Parks 2013: 42; Beyer/Schnabel 2017: 153). In his writings, Goffman (1974: 10f.) defines frames as situational perceptions characterised by basic elements of social organisation and subjective involvement, which is why his frame analysis refers to identifying those elements. Individuals interpret events by means of various frameworks, so-called 'primary[11] frameworks', which stresses their importance for individual perception (Goffman 1974: 21, 38). These primary frameworks "allow[s] its user to locate, perceive, identify, and label […] occurrences" (Goffman 1974: 21) which determine their perception of their world. They are also considered as resilient and mostly unconscious (Beyer and Schnabel (2017: 154). At the same time, the culture and belief system of social groups, and thereby, the individuals acknowledging the group, are shaped by frameworks (Goffman 1974: 27). They build structures or categories for experiences which are socially and culturally constructed and therefore, not purely epistemological. As a consequence, individual perceptions are linked with collective action through frames (Beyer/Schnabel 2017: 138f.). These characteristics show the potential of examining frames in order to better analyse as well as possibly understand interpretative structures of social groups and individuals. Two types of primary frameworks can be identified: on the one hand, 'natural frameworks' which constitute events as unguided, 'pure' and/or fully determined and on the other hand, 'social frameworks' dependent on background knowledge and guided by standards (Goffman 1974: 22).

Significant to the framing approach is the idea that movements themselves play an essential role for meaning systems and their production. Instead of only mirroring meanings, the framing perspective constitutes social movements as main actors in the "production and maintenance of meaning for protagonists, antagonists, and bystanders" (Snow 2004: 384). Hence, frames have a stronger operative characteristic in this context compared to Goffman's original concept. In addition, they hold the function of transforming or focusing on certain issues, for instance, by calling for action against existing social frames or authorities. By this, frames carry a central function for the positioning of movements within society, their way of communication and belief system, which is why they are strongly connected to and embedded in the cultural and political environment of a movement (Snow 2004: 384f.).

---

[11] The term 'primary' originates from its function, since its users consider these interpretations as 'original' and independent from others (Goffman 1974: 21).

The product of framing processes is referred to as 'collective action frames' (Snow/Benford 1992: 136). Benford and Snow (2000: 614) define them as "action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimise the activities and campaigns of a social movement". Different functions were identified with collective action frames: the characteristic of focusing and punctuating meanings. By this, they either redefine or emphasise social conditions and their seriousness, which is why they hold an attributional function. Furthermore, collective action frames offer the possibility to create connections of meaning amongst each other. This is an additional characteristic which enables activists to interconnect different frames and, therefore, create an overall and unified approach (Snow/Benford 1992: 137f.).

2.2.2   Framing Elements

Framing processes are characterised by various elements such as 'core framing tasks', 'frame alignment processes', 'master frames' and 'frame diffusion', which are presented in the following section.

Core framing tasks

Snow and Benford (1988) suggest to take into consideration conditions which possibly have an impact or even constrain the framing of social movements. Due to this, they assign a fundamental role to the tasks of frames and whether they are fulfilled or not. Snow and Benford suggest three core framing tasks: 'diagnostic framing', 'prognostic framing' and 'motivational framing'. According to the authors, the success of mobilising activists depends on how far these three tasks are met; the more solid, complex and interconnected they are, the more mobilisation success can be achieved. Furthermore, they describe diagnostic and prognostic framing as tasks which aim at mobilising potential participants through consent. The motivational framing task on the other hand is directed towards motivating action or participation (Snow/Benford 1988: 198f.). In a next step, the core framing tasks are further distinguished:

Snow and Benford claim that "[d]iagnostic framing involves identification of a problem and the attribution of blame or causality" (Snow and Benford 1988: 200). Thus, the focus is put on attributing blame and responsibility to external actors. This core framing task is associated with injustice frames as it defines 'victims' of an 'unjust' situation, its source and responsible actors. As just mentioned, this framing process aims at establishing consent between a movement's frames and potential activists. Hereby, it is more likely to achieve consent

concerning problem identification compared to the original source of the problem, whether it is certain conditions or actors. However, agreement on the problem source does not condition consent on its nature. Frequently, movements identify several sources of cause, however, there is a tendency of choosing one primary cause, even if other aspects contribute as well. Snow and Benford illustrate this issue with help of their research findings on the peace movement, which point out nuclear threat as main problem while different causes were identified, such as technological, political, economic and moral causes, of which one represents the primary blame source (Snow/Benford 1988: 200; Benford/Snow 2000: 615f.).

In Snow and Benford's analysis, prognostic framing serves as a tool for the definition of possible solutions for the perceived problem(s), goals and strategies to achieve them. Diagnostic and prognostic framing can be in accordance with some movements; for instance, in the case of the peace movement, as political factors can be blamed as the main cause for nuclear threat, problem resolution in the political field might be suggested (Snow/Benford 1988: 201). Prognostic framing represents a multi-organisational field as is shaped by other actors, such as opponents, media or bystanders. This is why Benford and Snow (2000) consider this framing process as the central aspect of difference between movements (Benford/Snow 2000: 616f.).

The third core framing task is motivational framing, which demonstrates the interconnection but also difference amongst the different core tasks. In contrast to the other two tasks aiming at consent, motivational framing functions as motivation creator or rationale for participation in collective action. For this purpose, certain motivational vocabulary is created. Snow and Benford determine that the preceding core tasks cannot assure action mobilisation, since consent with the source of and solution for a certain issue alone are not sufficient. Therefore, possible participation is dependent on creating motivational frames leading up to action mobilisation of potential activists (Snow/Benford 1988: 201ff.; Benford/Snow 2000: 617).

Master frames

These different framing processes focus on the analysis of individual social movements, thus their microlevel. Similar to collective action frames, master frames (Snow/Benford 1992: 134) are seen as providing a base for punctuating, attributing and articulating meaning within social movements. The essential difference reveals in their frame of reference, as master frames operate on a universal level which equivalents the macrolevel. Therefore, any number of

movements, movement organisations or groups can be assigned to one master frame (Snow/Benford 1992: 134, 138). Through the master frame, a common ideological base is built for the concerned actors, potentially leading up to collective action. For this reason, they are an essential aspect for a movement's potential to mobilise activists. This potential is shown in the resonance which represents the possible acquisition of interpretation patterns of the particular movement. However, they can equally contribute to a diminishing rate of the mobilisation of movements. If so, it might be due to sudden political or cultural changes within the concerned society, so that the patterns of interpretation are no longer tangible. As a result, the success of master frames is dependent on the framing strategies of movement activists in the first place (Kern 2008: 150ff.).

Frame Diffusion

Another aspect of the framing concept represents diffusion processes. The idea of frame diffusion describes how a certain frame is spread among different movement groups and beyond national borders (della Porta/Parks 2013: 44). According to Snow and Benford (1999), such processes take place when both involved parties draw a benefit from it, share certain similarities in culture or structure, and are linked by social networks and/or media (Snow/Benford 1999: 23f.). Based on this, the authors propose four different types of social movement diffusion processes structured by the involvement of both sides, transmitter and adopter, and whether they are engaged passively or actively. 'Reciprocation' characterises the process in which the transmitter and adopter are actively involved in diffusion, since both sides show interest in the frame. Then, 'adaptation' describes the process of an active interested adopter and a passive transmitter. As soon as the transmitter is involved actively by promoting frame diffusion, the process type 'accommodation' is applicable. The last type is 'contagion' in which both parties are passively involved or not interested in frame diffusion. However, this fourth type shows little empirical support. Also, it must be taken into account that the presented typology is representing ideal types (Snow/Benford 1999: 25f.; della Porta/Parks 2013: 44).

2.2.3   Frame Alignment Processes

By focusing on processes of participation in and support for social movements, David A. Snow et al. (1986) elaborated 'frame alignment processes', which treat the conceptual linkage between an individual and a movement. The idea of frame alignment processes refers to an

overlap, or even complement, of the interests, values and beliefs of individual participants and those of their preferred social movement, such as activities or goals (Snow et al. 1986: 464). The authors stated that "frame alignment is a necessary condition for movement participation, whatever its nature and intensity." (Snow et al. 1986: 464) On that basis, it is demonstrated that frames, their varieties and processes involved are of fundamental relevance for further analysing movements, their participants and their relation to each other. Four frame alignment processes are identified, which are interrelated but still diverse. Snow et al. suggest the following four processes: 'frame bridging', 'frame amplification', 'frame extension' and 'frame transformation' (ibid.: 464, 467).

Frame bridging is defined as "the linkage of two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem" (Snow et al. 1986: 467). This process either arises at the organisational or the individual level. The former occurs within the same movement, for instance, between two social movement groups. At the individual level, a connection between a movement and an individual is built. In this second case, social grievances or other belief structures of an individual find expression in the frame or ideology of a certain movement. According to Snow et al., frame bridging represents the most common way of alignment or micromobilisation. It is mainly caused by the outreach of movements or information diffusion, evoked by mass media[12], networks on a personal or group dimension (Snow et al. 1986: 467f.).

The second frame alignment process is frame amplification, by which Snow et al. (1986: 469) "refer to the clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue, problem or set of events". Hereby, a connection between the participation of individuals in a certain movement and the strengthening or clarification of certain frames is established. Based on this idea, two types of frame amplification are elaborated: 'value amplification' and 'belief amplification'. In case of the former particular values are identified, idealised and evaluated in course of participation in movement activities. This process supports alignment by strengthening or changing already existing value structures of activists. Thus, these values have not yet been in the foreground of the individual's interest or functioned as a motive for social groups, which for this reason is assumed to represent a motive for mobilisation (Snow et al. 1986: 469). The second type, refers to the strengthening or transformation of participants' beliefs, which are thought to be a necessary element for taking part in movement activities. Five

---

[12] At this point, social media is not mentioned which can be attributed to the publication date of Snow et al. (1986), but since new technologies and computerisation are explicitly named as a facilitation for frame bridging (ibid.: 468) it can be assumed that social media would fall into this category nowadays.

different kinds of beliefs are relevant in this context: firstly, the belief concerning significance or severity of an issue; secondly, the belief in the origin of the issue or blame; thirdly, the conceptions of specific counterparts and targets to be influenced; then, beliefs about the prospects of success of protests; and last but not least, the belief about the necessity to take action (ibid.: 469f.).

The third frame alignment process is frame extension. It stresses the necessity of amplifying specific interpretive elements, in order to extend the number of movement activists. This mainly refers to elements which might not be clearly linked to or congruent with values or beliefs of potential movement participants. In this case, primary frameworks of the concerned movement, such as values and goals, have to be extended in their meaning or put into focus in order to further meet beliefs or values of possible activists. Thereby, activists' interests, life situations or other already existing sentiments have to be identified and further fulfilled, which eventually can serve as a connecting point (Snow et al. 1986: 472).

Frame extension is regarded to lead up to frame transformation, the last alignment process. If values or frames of movements and their potential participants are not met or even contradictory, they have to be adapted. Therefore, old understandings need to be renewed and further replaced by new ones in order to mobilise new movement participants (Snow et al. 1986: 473). This process represents the strongest change in frame. Snow et al. (1986) identified two forms of frame transformation processes: transformations of domain specific and global interpretive frames. In both cases, the conditions of a situation are reframed, whether they are of social or temporal context. As a result, not the context itself is changed but the way of interpretation of a situation is redefined, as for instance, the emergence or adoption of certain injustice frames. As the name suggests, the domain specific frame transformation is concerned with a certain domain or aspect of life, such as consumption patterns, social relationships or social standing, which is reframed as problematic or injustice. The transformation of global interpretative frames however represents a process in which a new primary framework has prevailed over other frames, resulting in a sort of master frame function for the interpretation of events and experiences (ibid.: 474f.).

2.2.4 Framing in the context of Environmental Activism

The previous chapter has provided a detailed introduction to frame theory, highlighting the importance of interpreting the frames of social movements. In order to better analyse the framing processes within XR in a later section, an introduction to key master frames and

conceptual shifts of the environmental and climate movement to date will now be provided, including the traditional 'environmental justice frame', the 'climate justice frame' and 'climate change frame' (Schlosberg/Collins 2014: 360f.).

Environmental justice frame

The bottom up Environmental Justice Movement is said to have evolved in the US due to a shift in framing which was mainly caused by toxic contamination issues during the 1980s and following years. At the time, new conceptions originated from the Environmental Racism Frame, which was more radical in its positioning. Similarities with the concern of civil rights groups can also be drawn. Therefore, the activists who were behind the Environmental Justice movement were predominantly 'people with colour' (Benford 2005: 44). In the context of this movement, the term 'environment' was conceptualised in a broader sense compared to its traditional meaning of wilderness or untouched nature and was primarily associated with people's everyday lives and possible environmental risks in them. Aspects of 'indigenous' conceptions were adopted that established a linkage between nature and humans, emphasising their relationship. Further, with the term 'justice' reference is made to the conception of 'injustice'. This frame enabled a broad spectrum for problem and goal identification for activists. By this, different dimensions were included such as social justice, exclusion, gender, race, class and power inequalities. As a result, the environmental justice frame functioned more as a master frame and indicated the topics justice as well as rights, which put into focus humans as 'victims' instead of the environment (Čapek 1993: 5f., 8; Benford 2005: 41ff.; Schlosberg/Collins 2014: 360f.).

Since these values were used within different cultural and regional contexts, it was easier for the environmental movement to mobilise a broad mass of people and potential activists. Its claims concerned, among other things, the right to accurate information on contamination situations and unbiased hearings in those cases, compensation from responsible persons to victims and lastly, democratic decision-making over contaminated communities. These changes in content were also observable in the diagnostic and prognostic frames of the Environmental Justice Movement. Here, capitalism and the political interest represented causes for the problem as they perpetuate modes of production and consumption resulting in environmental injustice. The resolution is therefore to change the system (Čapek 1993: 5f., 8; Benford 2005: 41ff.; Schlosberg/Collins 2014: 360f.).

Due to frame diffusion processes, the new movement could take different forms depending on society and region on a global scale (Benford 2005: 44). Thus, the environmental justice frame was able to grow and develop a range of approaches throughout different regions, problems and foci, expanding from the US to a global dimension. Due to this broad conceptual spectrum, issues such as climate change were taken up and analysed in more detail. Shortly after the 2002 publication of a document referring to the ten principles of climate justice[13], a report was produced pointing out the disproportionate impact on 'African-Americans' of climate change. Also, the damages made by hurricane Katrina in the US drew attention to the relationship between marginalised or vulnerable communities and environmental damage. Through various events, the climate change issue had been given more space within the environmental justice movement. Slowly, a discourse around climate and justice components emerged. By addressing solutions to climate change and its impact on socially vulnerable groups of society, discussions about climate justice were slowly started, which led to the launch of climate justice initiatives (Schlosberg/Collins 2014: 362ff.).

Climate Justice Frame

Similar to environmental justice, there exist various approaches to the definition of climate justice, which vary between academic, grassroots movements and 'elite' NGO perspectives (Schlosberg/Collins 2014: 364). Influences of the environmental justice approach can be identified in the general positioning of the grassroots climate justice movement. In comparison to the environmental justice framework, which mainly addressed autonomy, inclusion, compensation, sustainability and transparency, the climate justice approach however focused on rights and protection of vulnerable groups, historical responsibility, unjust pollution burden and participatory and transparent decision-making processes (ibid.: 366).

In their study on prognostic frames within the European climate movement, Wahlström, Wennerhag and Rootes (2013) identified climate justice as a central approach to possible solutions on the climate issues. In case of the climate justice frame, action is suggested on a system dimension combined with global justice. Since this frame bridges the issues of climate protection and global justice, the authors consider climate justice as a master frame (Wahlström/Wennerhag/Rootes 2013: 102ff.). These two perceived issues are conceptualised

---

[13] The 10 Principles for Just Climate Change Policies from 2002 are available at: https://www.ejnet.org/ej/climatejustice.pdf (30/04/2021).

with aspects of the relationship between 'poorer' and 'richer' countries and radical changes in the current capitalist system such as a transition towards a de-growth economy (ibid.: 108).

Schlichting and Schmidt (2012) associate also the climate justice frame with the climate justice movement which regards the issues of climate change from a justice perspective. This is why its supporters argue on a moral basis against economic based frames. The focus is laid on climate policy and climate change related distribution issues. Hereby, a dichotomy is identified in that those responsible for climate change do not coincide with those affected by its consequences. This concerns, on the one hand, the relationship between the 'GN' and 'GS' countries and, on the other hand, the relationship between generations. Furthermore, actors in favour of the climate justice frame criticise climate policy and see the problem in the capitalist system. Hence, technological solutions are condemned as they support neoliberalism and 'greenwashing'. Accordingly, solutions are seen in fundamental changes in people's lifestyles, the current world system and social hierarchies or injustices. Justice is also asked in terms of emissions costs and ecological limits (Schlichting/Schmidt 2012: 35f.).

Climate change versus climate justice frame

In their analysis, Donatella della Porta and Louisa Parks (2013) remark significant changes within the climate movement, which they tried to capture by means of a framing analysis. It was primarily due to the failure of the COP 15 in 2009 that major internal debates within the climate movement emerged concerning adequate forms of action, whether direct or symbolic, perceived tendencies to be isolated from other social movements despite being quite similar in claims and lastly, the refusal of green economy as solution (della Porta/Parks 2013: 39f.). However, according to the authors, changes have been particularly visible in the radicalisation of the climate movement. A shift in perspective was observed, moving from climate change to climate justice, which was especially highlighted in the positioning and general problem identification of its activists. In contrast to the climate change frame, by which the climate movement mainly exerted pressure on large bodies such as international organisations or governments, the climate justice frame allows for concrete actions at the local level, which can therefore be of more radical nature. It is also broader in content, allowing different movements with the same goals to cooperate. In this context also processes of frame bridging were identified, establishing a connection between the climate frame and main objectives of other movements. In case of both climate movement streams, even if in different manner, topics of the anti-war, human rights or anti-globalisation movements were adopted; especially in the

radical movement group, active frame diffusion towards a climate justice discourse is observed (della Porta/Parks 2013: 45, 49f.).

Two general branches are proposed within the climate movement: the climate justice stream and the climate change stream. Former represents the more radical wing by performing rather direct-action such as the Climate Camps. The latter is regarded as the moderate stream associated with Stop Climate Chaos! or established environmental organisations such as Greenpeace (della Porta/Parks 2013: 45f.).

By making use of the aforementioned core framing tasks, della Porta and Parks attempted to illustrate the positioning of different subgroups of the climate movement. Regarding the diagnostic framing, they draw the conclusion that both climate streams identify the problem in the same field by blaming humans for climate change and by seeing the urgency of acting immediately to prevent dramatic consequences. When it comes to possible problem resolution by contrast, thus prognostic framing, the approaches of the two streams can be traced back to different basis. Within the climate justice branch, the end of the current global capitalistic economic system as well as fundamental changes to people's lifestyle are regarded as the determined solution. For the moderate climate change branch climate change mitigation is identified as main solution, which can be achieved within existing institutions and thus within the current system; this articulates their acceptance of capitalism to a certain degree since no responsibility or guilt is explicitly expressed and solutions are proposed in the related current system. However, changes can be achieved by means of technical innovation, supporting a green economy as well as limiting emissions and temperature decrease. Differences can also be identified with the motivational framing and perspectives on necessary forms of action to achieve changes. Both streams use direct action as strategy but della Porta and Parks state that supporters of the climate justice stream prefer raising awareness by more radical, partly even illegal actions, which shows their tendency to civil disobedience, over symbolic actions and putting pressure on institutional actors. The climate change stream also carries out direct action but in a moderate way and with focus on symbolic actions (della Porta/Parks 2013: 46ff.).

2.3   Concept of Hegemony

Benjamin Opratko (2014) tries to capture the concept of hegemony as follows: "Political power in the modern capitalist state is based not only, and not primarily, on the potential or actual exercise of coercion and violence, but on the constantly produced and reproduced consent of

the ruled'" (translated, Opratko 2014: 13). Here, Opratko attempts to define hegemony, a concept attempting to describe social power structures within a state. The concept was shaped above all by Antonio Gramsci[14] (1971) and originated in his Prison Notebooks. However, there exists no clear definition of hegemony in Gramsci's writings, which gives room for interpretation and as a result different approaches have emerged (Opratko 2014: 22).

Besides playing a major role for post-Marxist discussions as well as for later movement research, Gramsci's hegemony concept spotlights 'civil society' and its role within democracy, especially set in the context of power relations (Beyer/Schnabel 2017: 23). In contrast to other approaches, power is based on the notion of agreement between different social groups of the concerned power network in this context. This is why, 'consent' instead of processes of 'force' contributes to the maintenance of power structures and therefore represents the main instrument of the leading social group (Opratko 2014: 13). Power structures are characterised by two opposing sides, one being the dominant social class, often represented by the 'bourgeois society', and the other being the dominated or so-called 'subalterns'[15]. Apart from contributing to the reproduction of existing power relations, subalterns hold a disorganised character, according to Gramsci; this nevertheless does not exclude possibilities of organisation amongst the subalterns (ibid.: 30). However, hegemony is not static or secured system but a territory contested constantly by different social groups which is also defined by the role and consent of subalterns (ibid.: 44).

2.3.1 Key Elements of Hegemony

In a next step, central aspects contributing or necessary to hegemonic structures in a society according to Antonio Gramsci will be further elaborated. Since it goes beyond the scope of this thesis to elaborate all hegemonic aspects, the focus is laid on chosen terminological approaches. Certain hegemonic elements function as instruments to enable and maintain given power structures which include the elements of 'consent', 'common sense', 'universalisation' and 'intellectuals', which gives reason to discuss them in more detail (Opratko 2014). However,

---

[14] Antonio Gramsci represents a central figure of Italian communism of the beginning of the 20th century and was co-founder of the Italian Communist Party (PCI). After his arrest in 1926, he produced a large number of political writings in prison, consisting of 32 volumes, later known as *Prison Notebooks* (Beyer/Schnabel 2017: 39f.).

[15] Gramsci refers also to 'subalterns' as 'subaltern classes' or 'subaltern groups' (Opratko 2014).

certain terminology within Gramsci's Prison Notebooks shows contradictory or unclear definitions (Opratko 2014; Beyer/Schnabel 2017).

Consent versus force

The elements of consent and force were already briefly mentioned, since their distinction is significant to the concept of hegemony. At this point, Benjamin Opratko (2014: 36) names the content-related or symbolic pairs of opposites: consent versus force and domination versus leadership. Consent as well as leadership can be assigned to Gramsci's theory of power, since mutual agreement between dominant and dominated groups within a society is the basis for his concept. In comparison to force or domination, leadership equals consent on a moral and cultural level (ibid.). In this sense, the political power of hegemony "functions by consent and on the level of morality, culture and ethics" (translated, ibid.), which illustrates the diverse processes and aspects included in exercising power in the context of this approach. Despite this distinction, certain parts within Gramsci's Prison Notebooks indicate the joint usage of consent and force regarding hegemony. Concerning this, Gramsci explains that hegemony is defined by a balanced level of these two aspects (Opratko 2014: 40).

Integral state, civil and political society

As just shown with the terms consent and force, certain terminology within Gramsci's Prison Notebooks is unprecise and contradictory, which implies shifting meanings. The same applies to the term 'state', where two different uses of the term are identified: on the one hand, state is presented as the political force controlling civil society or also referred to as 'political society'; and, on the other hand, it is used for the idea of the 'integral state', consisting of 'political society' and 'civil society' together. However, the situational meaning of the state is clarified by the context in most cases (Gramsci 1971: 263; Opratko 2014: 39). At the same time, it can be experienced that the political or civil society equally show fluent transitions in their meaning. In Gramsci's writings, a central characteristic of civil society is the production of consent and, thus, hegemony. Part of them are 'private organisations', such as school, libraries and certain social groups (Opratko 2014: 40). In comparison, political institutions, such as the parliament or judiciary, might be interpreted as part of political society but Gramsci describes them as element of hegemonic power structures. Accordingly, they can be also assigned to civil society, which represents the main body of consent and hegemony production. Therefore, no clear

boundaries between these groups can be drawn, but political or civil society should be regarded as entities or dimensions of power structures within society (ibid.: 41).

Universalisation and compromise

Universalisation and compromise represent fundamental elements in order to carry out power in the hegemonic context. In a broader sense, consent can be compared to the idea of compromise. With help of ideological compromises, determined by the dominant social class, hegemonic power can be carried out. As a result, universalisation of the ideas of a certain class is taking place, which correspond to those of the leading class. Hence, the ideology of the leading class is accepted on the basis of consent and accordingly, can be passed on and reproduced in everyday life (Opratko 2014: 43). This process is called universalisation, which Benjamin Opratko describes as follows:

> The particular interests of a class become generalised reference points, but not in the sense of manipulation […] but through a dynamic of universalisation which takes into account and embraces certain elements of subaltern consciousness, everyday experience, historically developed ideologies and material needs. (translated, Opratko 2014: 43)

Hence, compromise preconditions the inclusion of social or ideological ideas of the subalterns, since consent can only be established by mutual interest (Opratko 2014: 43). Consequently, the dominant social group is forced to make sacrifices in terms of production, economy and ideology to achieve consent with the subalterns, which can be found in Gramsci's Prison Notebooks in the following words:

> Undoubtedly the fact of hegemony presupposes that account be taken of the interests and the tendencies of the groups over which hegemony is to be exercised, and that a certain compromise equilibrium should be formed-in other words, that the leading group should make sacrifices of an economic-corporate kind. (Gramsci 1971: 161)

This illustrates the urge of dominant parties to comply with the interests of the subalterns to a certain degree to enable the establishment and maintenance of hegemonic structures. By this, the roles of consent and universalisation of interests in Gramsci's concept become evident in regard to hegemonic power structures.

Common sense

Antonio Gramsci ascribed in his Prison Notebooks an indispensable role to common sense and 'ideology' for maintaining power structures within society. At the same time, these two aspects provide civil society a basis to reflect on them critically and grow consciousness (Beyer/Schnabel 2017: 40). In his understanding, common sense is characterised by consciousness, every day practices as well as unconscious thought patterns of the broad civil society. These elements lead up to certain general views towards oneself and the world (Opratko 2014: 44). Opratko (2014: 44) formulates the concept of hegemony as a social relationship. Thus, the view of oneself and the world emerge from the perspective of the universalised everyday mind or common sense, which indicates similarities or fluent transitions amongst them. Therefore, stability of consisting hegemonic structures is only guaranteed with help of common sense, since it is not questioned and carried out in everyday life practices. This is why this element represents a significant aspect for 'bourgeois society' and its power over the rest of society, and at the same time, builds the starting point for fundamental questioning and possible counter-positioning of subalterns. According to Gramsci, in order to establish a revolutionary movement, its participants have to question and even struggle against common sense of society. This process has to take place within broad civil society and not only in certain ('intellectual') groups. Only through this, critical elements can evolve within common sense of the ruled society which could eventually form a civil block of intellectuals being able to confront existing power structures (ibid.: 45ff.).

Organic and traditional intellectuals

Intellectuals also have an essential role to play within the Prison Notebooks. Above all, Gramsci claims in his writings that 'non-intellectuals' do not exist within society. He argues that there exists no human activity which entirely excludes intellectual contribution. In Gramsci's (1971: 9) words: "All men are intellectuals, one could therefore say: but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals." Thus, each individual contributes in some way to provoking new patterns of thinking by supporting or modifying existing ones (Gramsci 1971: 9; Opratko 2014: 50). The quote indicates also a specific function of intellectuals, which represents their fundamental characteristic. Hence, their function is not based on the conventional idea of producing intellectual discourses or representing 'great thinkers' but referred to social power structures and strategies instead. As such, they can be understood as individuals within civil society assisting the production of hegemony. Moreover, intellectuals are divided in two types,

'organic intellectuals' and 'traditional intellectuals', which are occupying different positions within society (Opratko 2014: 48).

Organic intellectuals can be assigned to organising social reproduction by maintaining organisational positions and existing common sense. Accordingly, organic intellectuals are represented by all social entities carrying this position, consciously or unconsciously, whatever their social class origin. This means that organic intellectuals can also be established by subalterns by taking over organisational positions in society. Nevertheless, these functions are mainly exercised by the bourgeois class of society (Opratko 2014: 48f.). Their role partly consists of organising work in terms of administration, production or culture:

> Intellectuals must be understood not only as the social strata commonly referred to by this term, but in general as the whole social stratum which exercises organising functions in the broad sense, both in the field of production and in that of culture and in the political-administrative field. (translated, Gramsci 1975, quoted in Opratko 2014: 48)

Therefore, common sense and, consequently, hegemony itself are mainly influenced by organic intellectuals, since the self and world perspective as well as values are ultimately (re)produced and passed on by them within society (Opratko 2014: 49).

Traditional intellectuals, however, also hold an organisational position within society. A main difference is their emergence, since traditional intellectuals evolved out of the historical bourgeois class, associated with the former ecclesiastical entities. Due to this and their historic continuing existence, a certain privilege as well as autonomy is assigned to them. For this reason, people having such a position, understand themselves as being independent and autonomous in terms of not obeying the dominant social group or leading political class; examples for traditional intellectuals are scientists, philosophers or scholars (Gramsci 1971: 7; Opratko 2014: 50f.).

Therefore, a fundamental source of hegemonic power is drawn from intellectuals, particularly traditional intellectuals. Because of this, competition over taking over their social positions is caused within civil society and its subalterns. Groups aiming at social dominance are forced to establish their own intellectuals. In addition, common sense of civil society or subalterns is mainly influenced by intellectuals passing on certain views of political, cultural or ideological relevance, whether consciously or unconsciously, which leads to their social universalisation (Gramsci 1971: 10; Opratko 2014: 51f.).

2.3.2 Neo-Gramscian Perspectives[16]

Antonio Gramsci's writings on hegemony have their focus on a national context. After their publication and first debates in Italy from the 1950s up to the 1960s, his main concepts found access into the international academic discourse in the late 1970s after new revolts in these two decades. The foundation for a 'neo-Gramscian' approach was laid by the theorist Robert W. Cox (1983) who adapted Gramsci's core idea for the study field of International Relations in the beginning of 1980s. Through this, the concept was transferred to an international or global context. With Cox' theoretical merge, world order, its structures and current dynamics of International Political Economy have been put into focus; this applies especially to aspects such as stability and changes. From that point forward, research on this field has grown strongly which makes it diverse and difficult to capture a certain definition of neo-Gramscian hegemony. A variety of trends can be found in the field of neo-Gramscian perspectives but it goes beyond the scope of this thesis to elaborate them in detail. Three of those trends have been widely adopted within the hegemony discourse, being historical-structural, constitutionalist and transnational[17] (Opratko 2014: 65ff.). The former trend will be shortly elaborated as it laid the foundation for further neo-Gramscian approaches.

The global historical-structural trend is associated with Robert W. Cox' theoretical approach and is based on the idea of analysing world orders, reciprocal processes and historical changes. In this context, hegemony is characterised by particular interests being conveyed as general interests. Here, consent contributes also to maintaining the dominance of particular interests and is purchased by three aspects: material capabilities, ideas and institutions[18]. By this process, interests of certain groups are projected from a national level on an international level. Additionally, Cox introduces another three-dimensional interfering complex, which is supposed to represent spheres of activities on the international level. This is why hegemony on a global dimension must be analysed in the context of world orders, forms of state and social relations of production[19]. These three elements are of dialectical nature and are again composed by the three above mentioned dimensions, ideas, material resources and institutions, since hegemony is produced by all three actors (Morton 2007: 113ff.; Opratko 2014: 78ff.).

---

[16] Benjamin Opratko (2014: 69) suggests the usage of the term 'neo-Gramscian perspectives' instead of 'neo-Gramscianism' due to the lack of a theoretical school, which possibly leads to assumptions concerning a high level of homogeneity within neo-Gramscian trends.
[17] Detailed elaborations on these trends can be found in Opratko (2014).
[18] See more details in Opratko (2014).
[19] See more details in Opratko (2014).

2.3.3   (Counter-)Hegemony and Social Movements

Subsequent to the neo-Gramscian approach, the focus is laid on the linkage between hegemony and social movements. Already in the initial approach to social movements (see Chapter 2.1) it was made clear that movements are mostly part of a (social) field of tension, which Touraine (1991) and della Porta/Diani (2006) associate mostly with social conflict and opponent actors. These approaches are supported by Anderl and Wallmeier (2019), who argue that "[s]ocial movements challenge relations of domination and are simultaneously shaped and inhibited in by them." (translated, Anderl/Wallmeier 2019: 193) Since domination and power are the central topics of Gramsci's concept of hegemony, it is suitable to view social movements from this perspective.

The concept of counter-hegemony was not theorised by Gramsci himself but only later on. Counter-hegemony implies the attempt to establish a counter force within given social power structures (Brand 2011: 158). It can be interpreted as a process aiming at the "dissolution of current power relations and structures and the creation of alternative forms of socialisation" (translated, Brand 2011: 160) which are implemented, amongst others, by different ways of life, division of labour, material reproduction and natural conditions (ibid.). Further, the term treats the idea of a resistant power within hegemonic structures. Since power is related to possibilities for action within a certain setting, counter-hegemonic forces aim at enlarging the individual and collective action framework for emancipatory or 'vulnerable' social groups. A social power approach combined with the concept of hegemony integrates Gramsci's concept of consent, whether active or passive, and therefore allows a broadened view on possible changes, since consent constitutes a process and not a static state. Thus, it encourages a multidimensional approach towards consisting power structures as well as counter-hegemonic elements within society. Furthermore, Ulrich Brand (2011) suggests to contextualise the term counter-hegemony in a structural and strategic dimension as resistant dynamics emerge from dysfunctional social circumstances or regulation. In addition, it is accompanied by access to material and nonmaterial resources which are essential in order to counter dominant social groups by limiting their ability to determine social interests, identity or norms. Consequently, counter movements and their protests are essential to show weaknesses within existing social power structures (Brand 2011: 158ff.). At this point, it has to be noted that the state itself cannot represent a counter force within a society. Reason for it is its lack of neutrality and embeddedness in the global capitalist system which prevents it from the ability to provoke

transition. It represents a contested territory in which social interests and compromises are pursued by subalterns and dominant parties (ibid.: 161).

For this endeavour, certain key elements of the concept of hegemony shall be discussed and viewed from a broader perspective. Building on this, Sekler and Brand argue for a more diverse completion of the elements, such as civil society, common sense as well as dynamics of those on an international level in order to further conceptualise counter-hegemonic ideas. Also, different facets of the emergence and reproduction of (counter-)hegemony should be taken into account, which include observable and not direct observable actions as well as strategies of various actors. This is to show that hegemonic structures are shaped by processes on various dimensions, for instance, spatial, social, political, cultural and economic levels (Sekler/Brand 2011: 229f.). Due to this multifaceted nature, it is emphasised that hegemony is a field of constant competition, which is why hegemonic structures must be reproduced continuously to maintain them, showing their lack in permanent stability. This, in turn, highlights the importance of paying equal attention to the role and strategies of forms of resistance or counter-hegemonic forces (ibid.: 231).

It was criticised within the neo-Gramscian discourse that the focus was predominantly set on global power structures, which left too little attention to rising or different forms of resistance, such as the Zapatistas[20] counter-movement. Building on this, Sekler and Brand (2011) claim that the concept of hegemonic power structures and approaches in regard to resistance needed to be expanded. In particular the concept of civil society is affected by this, in order to facilitate further elaborations on counter-hegemonic actors, their actions, strategies and general approach to issues. In this context, hegemony is understood as social power structures mainly characterised by processes of reproduction carried out by social actors, which can possibly lead to structural changes. The authors suggest to assess these dynamics by taking into account a multidimensional analysis scope, including different spatial and social conditions as it would enable a more diverse approach to hegemonic structures (Sekler/Brand 2011: 224f.). In addition, the heterogeneous character of civil society and its interaction with existing power structures needs to be emphasised, which does not emerge from Gramsci's writings or neo-Gramscian perspectives. In most cases of neo-Gramscian discourse, civil society actors are represented by think tanks, the economic elite or corporate associations, thereby disregarding

---

[20] The Zapatistas represent a social movement that was the first to provide resistance against the neoliberal globalisation starting from the 1990s. With its origins in Mexico, they addressed above all the different structures of power and exploitation in which the indigenous peoples were embedded. They also showed influence on other emancipatory movements (Brand 2005: 119f., 122).

progressive actors or processes. To counter this, Sekler and Brand recommend to integrate global movements as well as counter-movements as counter actors in order to highlight progressive and resistant powers within society (ibid.: 226f.), since civil society constitutes the place where hegemony is (re)produced, and can be questioned or even confronted within Gramsci's writings. Also, it is mainly characterised by the elements of consent and common sense. However, civil society or its actors are not progressive themselves but only components of existing social power structures which include progressive activities or actors. This approach attributes a contradictory character to civic or progressive actors, since they are embedded in a hegemonic system which they try to challenge. Everyday practices and common sense are mainly influenced by existing power structures which is why not all aspects of it can be fully perceived by its participants, whether consciously or unconsciously (Sekler/Brand 2011: 232).

In regard to counter-hegemonic forces, also the element common sense must be seen in a new light. Above all, it functions as main instrument to maintain hegemonic structures by passing on its basic ideas through implicit activities which is how they are passed on throughout society and its social divisions, such as gender, ethnic or class. This is mainly achieved with help of intellectuals who, consciously or unconsciously, establish coherence. According to Gramsci, common sense always shows to some degree incoherence and cannot be in its entirety hegemonic. This gives room for different forms of interpretation and access for various groups. This aspect is closely connected to times of changes on a political, cultural or socio-economic level which Gramsci describes as moments in which common sense can be reinterpreted, supplemented or transformed. It becomes clear that these periods and loops of coherence present possibilities of counter-hegemonic groups to interfere. Following this, given thinking patterns within common sense can be destabilised by introducing new ones (Sekler/Brand 2011: 233f.).

Through this conceptual broadening, a theoretical approach is given to analyse structural opportunities for forms of resistance. However, success or failures by those are not guaranteed. Its core idea is to enable the identification of possible alternative or progressive practices within given hegemonic structures which may get lost in the bigger picture (Sekler/Brand 2011: 237).

3 Methodology

The thesis is based on a qualitative research approach which is suitable for the study of protests and social movements as it tries to reconstruct people's realities (Gukelberger/Gerharz 2019: 19). The goal is not only to describe the phenomena of the XR movement but to understand its ways of communication. Through a qualitative approach, compared to the quantitative research field, different aspects are considered and interlinked, instead of being analysed as separate elements (Reichertz 2014: 68; Mayring 2015: 19f.). The study field of social and protest movements tries to define or capture "causes, forms of appearance and consequences" (Kern 2008: 9) of movements. Hence, it approaches perceived realities of participants and groups of a movement. This reality is constructed in a certain context and interconnected with various factors, which supports a qualitative research approach in order to understand such processes (Reichertz 2014: 68ff.). It allows certain aspects to be analysed, connect them and derive a theory from individual cases as a result (Mayring 2015: 22). In addition, frame analysis, which represents a central part of this research, commonly uses a qualitative data approach (Johnston 2002: 69). This undermines the necessity of analysing this research interest – the Austrian and British XR movement – from a qualitative perspective.

3.1 Semi-structured Expert Interviews

Besides research on the XR groups of Austria and UK, 'semi-structured expert interviews' were conducted to gain insights on both regional contexts before defining reasonable and suitable cases for the main analysis of this qualitative research. Especially in regard to the British XR movement this was essential, due to the lack of knowledge about the British movement landscape and its XR discourse.

The conducted interviews can be defined as 'explorative' expert interviews which serve as a source of information within the study field. They therefore aim at simplifying orientation at the beginning of the research process and are interpreted as facts (Bogner/Littig/Menz 2014: 23). A different perspective on the XR movement and different knowledge can be acquired by means of expert interviews compared to website research. Semi-structured expert interviews were chosen as a suitable method as they are considered to have access to certain knowledge relevant to the research topic due to their position, being either of social or organisational origin (Bogner/Littig/Menz 2014: 17). They are a useful and common tool in order to understand people's perception of reality, which in this case could be social movement mobilisation from

the movement's perspective or from an external one. Accordingly, such interviews also prove helpful in grasping how activists frame and justify their protests as well as actions (Blee/Taylor 2002: 92f., 95).

Suitable persons for the semi-structured expert interviews were discussed by means of research and contacts that had already been established in the context of Forschungswerkstatt Protest[21]. Additionally, the selection was influenced by positive responses on the requests as well as time availability. The potential interviewees were contacted by mail with detailed information on this thesis, its research interest and the purpose of the interview including the questionnaire. As there were several uncertainties concerning the British XR context, it was favourable to choose an interview partner who was geographically close to the UK and already familiar with XR. By having consulted a social movement researcher with experience on XR, relevant questions on the British XR discourse could be obtained. For the Austrian XR context, there were gaps in knowledge regarding the XR local subgroups in Austria and its emergence. Since the XR scene in Austria has hardly been scientifically researched so far, the expert interview was conducted with an Austrian XR activist. Further, the interviewee was chosen to deepen the knowledge about the movement through the perspective of an XR activist (see Annex 1).

The interviews took place online using the Zoom communication platform due to the geographic distance to the interviewees and the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions. After consultation with the interviewees, they were recorded. In total, two persons were interviewed between the end of December 2020 and the beginning of January 2021 and lasted between 25 minutes and 40 minutes (see Annex 1).

Expert interviews are always supported by a questionnaire, supporting preparation, implementation and comparability (Bogner/Littig/Menz 2014: 27). Through this, the XR topic area could be structured for the research interest. Depending on the researcher's background knowledge, different information needed to be acquired, which is why the questionnaires were slightly adapted for the two conducted expert interviews. Also, identical questionnaires are not required for comparability in qualitative research (Bogner/Littig/Menz 2014: 28ff.). The questions for the British XR context were designed with certain ambiguities and knowledge enhancement regarding XR UK in mind. For this reason, particularly information on the background of XR UK and its regional groups, their differences and presence in the British discourse, were asked besides more general questions on the XR movement (see Annex 2).

---

[21]   See more information on Forschungswerkstatt Protest here: https://ie.univie.ac.at/forschung/forschungswerkstatt-protest/ (accessed 30/04/2021).

These topics can be considered as questions for interpretating relevance and explanations of XR UK's courses of actions, events and interaction to the expert (Bogner/Littig/Menz 2014: 18f.). For the Austrian context, the questionnaire focused on questions regarding the emergence of the movement in Austria and its local subgroups, its positioning and the relationship to XR UK as the country of origin, since more background knowledge concerning the Austrian XR research field was given dure to the researcher's participation in Forschungswerkstatt Protest (see Annex 2).

As the broad spectrum of local groups of both countries exceeds the capacities of this analysis, the field of investigation was narrowed down to specific XR groups of both regions. For this purpose, a case study was used due to its common usage as research strategy within the study field of social movements. A case study is limited to certain instances of the chosen phenomenon to get a detailed and rich idea of it (Snow/Trom 2002: 148f.). In this context, the research topic is narrowed down to analysing XR's strategies, framing and positioning in regard to Gramsci's concept of hegemony. Based on the research and information obtained through the interviews, a specific case selection emerged that seemed suitable to approach the research interest, which are represented by different local XR groups. The case selection enables a detailed presentation of the regional specification and a comparison of the UK and Austria (Snow/Trom 2002: 162). Two local groups per country were selected based on the information from the expert interviews: In the Austrian context, the focus is set on the XR groups of Vienna and Tyrol; these two groups were selected as they were the first locations of Austria in which XR evolved (Interview 05/01/2021). Also, many actions take place in Vienna, as it is the capital city, which makes it a large as well as active group. The XR group in Tyrol shows solidarity with the local group XR Innsbruck (XR Austria 2021c), which is why the latter will serve as a reference in the course of the main analysis. However, there is limited data on the two Austrian groups, e.g., no dedicated website or documents, which is why data on the general XR Austria group will serve as the main basis for presenting this regional context. For the British XR context, the English groups XR London and XR Manchester (XR MCR) are analysed. Again, the capital of England, London, is used because it is an active, large group and of central presence in the XR UK discourse. XR MCR serves as an interesting source and complement to XR London, since the city has a diverse and strong protest background compared to XR London (Interview 22/12/2020).

3.2   Document Analysis

The use of a triangulation, consisting of several qualitative methods, represents a typical characteristic for case studies. Possible qualitative methods range from ethnographic or participant observations to different types of interviews or documents (Snow/Trom 2002: 146f., 150f.). By means of different methods, such as qualitative interviews and documents, different data and perspectives can be merged to avoid possible bias, which is why a 'document analysis' was conducted for this thesis in addition to the expert interviews. This research covers both Austrian and British XR groups, which makes texts or documents a suitable option due to physical distance, as both electronic and printed, can be evaluated and interpreted to capture the XR phenomena. Furthermore, this method can be used to collect and interpret data from documents and texts that originated apart from researchers (Bowen 2009: 27f.), which assumingly applies to the XR data used. Documents aim to convey a specific purpose, impression or message, usually in favour of their authors or representatives, in this case XR. They are also embedded in a certain context and often linked to others, which must be taken into account when using them as a data basis (Bryman 2012: 555).

The document data obtained was then divided in categories, topics or case studies using Philipp Mayring's (2015) content analysis (Bowen 2009: 28). For the main analysis, besides the conducted expert interviews, the websites of XR and its local groups, as well as the documents available on these websites (XR Handbooks, XR position papers) served as interpretation material. XR websites and position papers are "natural documents" (Salheiser 2014: 815) as it can be assumed that they were not created with a research purpose or influenced by researchers but for the public and potential activists. Depending on the form of documents, social science document analysis enables researchers to capture certain values or opinions of individuals or groups (Salheiser 2014: 813ff.). Especially digital media or documents are of high value for social movement analysis nowadays as they function globally as the main communication and coordination platform and thus, as a mobilising source (Beyer/Schnabel 2017: 198). Availability to those is granted, since the discussed documents are publicly accessible. When using documents as a basis for research, it is impossible to ensure their validity as well as to reconstruct their original context and use during the analysis process (Salheiser 2014: 816).

3.3 Mayring's qualitative Content Analysis

For evaluating the data, this thesis consults Philipp Mayring's "qualitative content analysis" (Mayring/Fenzl 2014: 543). By means of it, different kinds of protocolled texts can be dealt with, such as transcripts or documents (Mayring/Fenzl 2014: 543; Mayring 2015: 12), which lends itself to this research. They give the opportunity to gather different forms of communication and, hence, to narrow down the focus of analysis or content by topic, certain groups or geographical domain. The flexibility of this method concerning types of documents or texts undermines its utility for this thesis. According to Mayring (2015: 13), content analysis serves as a tool to analyse 'fixed' communication systematically, theory-guided and to draw conclusions on certain aspects of communication, which corresponds to the aim of this work.

In order to proceed with Mayring's content analysis, the contents of the selected data collection were first prepared by means of the programme MAXQDA, an instrument for qualitative research. For this purpose, the two expert interviews were anonymised and transcribed (see Pryzborski/Wohlrab-Sahr 2014: 164f.). The content of the XR websites and selected documents was extracted and processed into documents using the programme in order to enable the subsequent content analysis. In case of this research, deductive categories derived from the presented literature were used (see Chapter 2.2 and 2.3). The elaborated core framing tasks according to Snow/Benford (1988) and Benford/Snow (2000), Gramsci's central hegemonic elements according to Opratko (2014) as well as counter-hegemonic notions according to Sekler/Brand (2011) served as a basis to build these categories. Within this system, categories and subcategories were established to filter relevant information from the chosen text types. Subsequently, all data could be analysed with the help of this theory-based category system (see Mayring/Fenzl 2014: 544, 546). As the theory section on framings has illustrated, the core framing task prognostic framing includes the analysis strategies and tactics of movements, which is why strategies were included in this category. In a next step, concerning all frame categorisations, data within the existing (sub)categories was inductively re-categorised on the basis of highly representative subject matters to filter out essential aspects of the selected XR cases in regard to their frames. In some cases, content was assigned to two categories if necessary. This operationalisation enabled to capture central XR frames and finally compare those of the different Austrian and British XR groups.

3.4 Limitations

Drawing on the paper's methodology, several sources for limitations can be identified. To begin with, frame analysis itself reflects a certain contradictory character as its focus is laid on situational and individual perceptions. Therefore, it can be claimed that frames are not accessible to external persons. Nevertheless, researchers try to gain access to the frames of social movements using empirical research, through which an approximation is attempted (Johnston 2002: 63).

Given the lack of capacity, only a small case study unit could be analysed. The case study was narrowed down to two local XR groups per country, which severely limits the informative value. For the Austrian context, from the outset, less data is available due to the extent of XR Austria websites and research so far. In the case of the UK, the selected XR groups purely derive from England instead of all four countries, resulting in very specific findings, particularly with respect to the scope of XR UK groups. Against this background, the results only give a highly specific insight (Snow/Trom 2002: 163).

Further limitations can be determined with regard to the selection of data for the analysis according to Mayring (2015): Expert interviews are used and reduced to two as it would otherwise have gone beyond the capacities of this paper. The final choice of interviewees depends on the researcher as well as on the interviewees' accessibility and availability. This limits the extent of data base and perspectives gathered. Additionally, the choice of experts is in itself influenced, as they were selected according to a socially constructed idea of an expert. It also must be taken into account that the selected experts have different approaches to knowledge about the XR movement, as one is involved in the movement and the other is not. An additional limitation is the 'omniscient' position attributed to experts, which affects the results of the qualitative content-analysis. Moreover, when using interviews as a data collection method, it is important to keep in mind that these are "are highly situational conversations" (Blee/Taylor 2002: 111).

The selection of documents and websites also represents a data limitation from the outset (Johnston 2002: 69). Here, the researcher, the accessibility of the documents and their scope influence the final data set, which formed the starting point for the qualitative content analysis. Especially in the case of "visual documents" (Bryman 2012: 554), such as websites, authenticity, credibility, representativity and context must be considered (ibid.).

Finally, data coding during the content analysis is dependent on the perspective of the concerned researcher (Johnston 2002: 69). The categories for qualitative data analysis are determined in a first step on a theoretical basis, followed by a second inductive categorisation process as described in the previous subchapter. Although inductive re-categorisation was driven by highly present topics, this process remains primarily driven by the researcher's perceptions and possible biases. Therefore, other researchers might have conducted different categories and, as a result, identified different hegemonic elements or key XR frames, especially regarding motivational frames.

4 An Introduction to Extinction Rebellion

In a next step, background information on the Extinction Rebellion is given. For this purpose, its emergence, positioning, visions, main demands, current state of research and points of criticism are briefly outlined. To do so, different sources are used, including websites of the global XR movement and some local groups, the conducted expert interviews as well as research contributions to date. However, since the emergence of the XR movement only dates back to the end of 2018, the amount of research is limited. Also, the COVID-19 pandemic limited the possibilities for protests (Schweinschwaller 2020: 394). Through the pandemic the scientific focus was shifted to COVID-19 related issues, which may have contributed to the lack of academic research on XR during 2020 (Interview 22/12/2020).

4.1 Emergence

Extinction Rebellion is a project that emerged from the initiative Rising Up![22], which was founded in 2016. Rising Up! itself was initiated by Roger Hallam, organic farmer and social movement researcher, Gail Bradbrook, a British activist, and other activists or researchers. It is said that XR had its beginnings in Stroud, England (Hallam 2019; Interview 22/12/2020; Kinniburgh 2020: 127f.; XR UK 2021b). According to XR UK, the basic idea to start a rebellion appeared due to the IPCC report at the time, which theorised an ongoing 6th mass extinction and according to which only twelve years remained to stop climate change on a catastrophic scale. Following this realisation, the co-founders Roger Hallam and Gail Bradbrook decided to

---

[22] *Rising Up!* is an organisation founded by activists involved in several initiatives with the aim to change the current political and economic system and to become a social movement (https://risingup.org.uk/about).

spread their ideas and thoughts to other people in order to start resistance. In a short amount of time, others followed (XR UK 2021b).

According to XR, the birth of the movement dates back to 31 October 2018, when the first protest was held on Parliament Square in London, UK. That day, around 1 500 activists gathered peacefully and announced a Declaration of Rebellion against the UK Government. Only in the following weeks, more XR groups appeared first in Europe, the US and then around the world, including Australia, South Africa and India. Another protest followed in November 2018, with around 6 000 activists peacefully blocking five major bridges across the Thames river in London (XR global 2021a; XR UK 2021a). Especially in 2019, the movement received a lot of media attention in the English-speaking world (Schweinschwaller 2020: 386). That year, two XR actions took place with occupations up to two weeks and therefore represented one of the biggest actions to date in the UK. The first one took place in April, in the context of which XR activists occupied five key locations in London by setting up camps turning the protest into a carnival. This protest was followed by the declaration of a climate emergency by the UK parliament which was regarded as a big success from XR's perspective. A similar protest happened in October that year. Both protests resulted in more than 1 000 arrests of participants (Schweinschwaller 2020: 389; Stuart 2020: 488). These actions attracted much public attention both nationally and internationally, allowing XR's vision to spread and be shared with others around the world. In late 2019, a wide range of XR civil disobedience took place in big cities all over the world, such as New York, Paris, Berlin and Melbourne. Their actions included blocking streets, pitching tents or building slacklines (Kinniburgh 2020: 128).

XR in the UK

Currently, the Extinction Rebellion movement has spread to 77 countries worldwide and comprises in total 1172 local groups. The UK contains four national XR groups which are XR Northern Ireland, XR Scotland, XR Cymru Wales and XR United Kingdom with a total of 416 local groups. By far the most of these local groups are located in England, followed by Scotland and Wales (XR global 2021b). The studied data does not provide information on the chronological order in which the other local XR UK groups emerged. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that groups joined shortly after the first major protests. England holds the most local XR groups of all four British regions, which indicates its presence in the British XR activism, which was confirmed by the expert interviewee who claimed that England is the most active and visible XR region within the UK. Research equally revealed that unlike many others, the

groups from Wales and Northern Ireland do not have their own websites, which suggests their minor presence in the overall British XR discourse, which was again confirmed by the interviewee (Interview 22/12/2020; XR global 2021b). Besides XR Glasgow, representing Scotland, mostly English local groups are active, such as XR Manchester, XR Bristol or XR in London. XR in London takes on a special role, as activists tend to travel there for events from the city's immediate surroundings as well as from further afield in the south-west of England. This prevents other major protests besides London in southern England because London dominates the XR discourse. XR London however officially does not hold a major role within XR UK but nevertheless it is perceived that way. Not only the media visibility supports London's role, but also the financial flow and its strong promoters. This results in active internal power structures, especially in London, as people with financial access hold decision-maker positions. Consequently, it is not the official internal structures that ultimately play a significant role, but dynamics and structures evolved by other aspects; this applies to both the national and international level (Interview 22/12/2020). In addition, it is not clear from the XR group mapping which region XR UK represents, since the group is placed in London on the map of their website. Concerning this, the social movement interviewee said that his research suggested similar outcomes, indicating no consent on this issue within the British movement:

> My experience was that neither of them had any clear sense of a distinction between London and England, or between the South of England and the rest of England, or England and the rest of the UK, or England and the rest of the world. (Interview 22/12/2020)

In this regard, Berglund and Schmidt (2020: 44) note that XR UK has a representative function for the whole UK movement. That is exercised insofar that XR activists from various UK regions are included in this group despite having offices in London. Further, they are divided in working groups on a UK-wide basis, coordinate local groups and act as XR's treasury. This suggests possibly an overarching role of the XR UK group within the British XR movement.

Concerning protests, British XR groups protest on a more or less regular basis since their emergence. Although the COVID-19 pandemic and its accompanying measures complicated protests of large scale, protests nevertheless took place throughout the year 2020 (Taylor, The Guardian 04/08/2020; XR UK 2021c).

XR in Austria

Currently, Austria comprises one national XR group, XR Austria. The homepage of the global XR group lists five local groups in Austria, which are Innsbruck, Klagenfurt, Graz, Linz and

Lower Austria. Additionally, XR Austria is mapped in Vienna. This however is in contradiction to the Austrian website which shows a total of nine local groups for each federal region. It can be assumed that this contradictory information on the number of Austrian local XR groups is not up-to-date (XR Austria 2021c; XR global 2021b). Austria has a limited number of regional XR groups, especially in comparison to the UK, which can be traced back to its geographical size.

The idea of creating an XR movement in Austria was inspired by England in 2018. Through social media, information on the emergence of the English movement had spread to Austria. As a result, the interviewed XR activist met with a friend from Tyrol to exchange ideas about an XR group in Austria. Only a week later, several dozen people met in Vienna to discuss further proceedings concerning an Austrian XR movement. The first Austrian XR groups were founded in Innsbruck, the capital of Tyrol, and Vienna, as the two initiators come from these regions. XR Innsbruck was only founded in the beginning of October 2019, after which a seat blockade was immediately launched with about 50 activists under the slogan "ruhig aber LAUT"[23] (XR Austria 2021f). The other regional groups emerged relatively simultaneously (Interview 05/01/2021; XR Austria 2021f) and by now, in all nine federal states local groups have established (XR Austria 2021b). According to XR activists, XR Austria was founded as an association in January 2019 and is registered as "Party for the survival of humanity" (XR Austria 2021e), however, on a voluntary basis and without intentions to run for elections (Schweinschwaller 2020: 393f.; XR Austria 2021e).

The first Austria global rebellion week took place in October 2019, for which about 250 activists from different parts of Austria travelled to Vienna to protest together. Various civil disobedience actions, such as traffic blockades at the Wiener Ring or activists gluing themselves on a huge globe, took place to put pressure on the government and draw attention to the extent of the ecological crisis (von Usslar/Yossef, Der Standard 09/10/2019; XR Austria 2021a). With the exception of the COVID-19 pandemic period, the rebellion week took place regularly in Vienna as those in power are situated there, which is why Vienna as capital takes a special role within XR Austria (Interview 05/01/2021; XR Austria 2021a). "During the action week, everyone from Austria [comes together] in Vienna. That has always been the case so far." (translated, Interview 05/01/2021), the Austrian XR interviewee claims. With regard to the presence of local groups, it was expressed that actions also take place in other provincial capitals - such as Innsbruck, Graz, Klagenfurt and Linz - independently from Vienna and the action

---

[23] The slogan corresponds the English translation "quiet but LOUD".

week. In addition, decentralised actions are carried out from time to time, such as at the OMV[24] headquarters in Gänserndorf in Lower Austria, where a protest was held against gas mining (Interview 05/01/2021). Despite these past actions and the COVID-19 pandemic, XR Austria organised other actions, even if limited, in 2020. One of them was unannounced and took place at a square in Vienna's city centre, where tents were erected, the road was blocked and speeches were held accompanied by music (Der Standard 28/09/2020; Der Standard 29/09/2020).

4.2 Motivation

The global XR movement defines itself as "a decentralised, international and politically non-partisan movement using nonviolent direct action and civil disobedience to persuade governments to act justly on the Climate and Ecological Emergency." (XR global 2021a) With other nonviolent protest movements as role models, such as Civil Rights or Indian's Independence Movement, XR is confident of success and of being able to change the current system, despite having no guarantee. The activists have a clear goal and feel obliged to act against the current collapse of the ecosystem since the collapse can no longer be ignored (XR global 2021c). „We have no other choice. We rebel against the systems that got us here. We rebel for the future we want. We rebel because it is our responsibility to act. We have no more time to waste." (XR global 2021c) It also mirrors XR's philosophy "tomorrow's reality is today's concern" (XR global 2021c). Therefore, XR activists are urged to take action immediately. Due to the lack of action of governments, rebellion is inevitable to counter the given crisis. According to XR global, it is needed to protect the future of humans, regardless of race or ethnicity and nature, including climate as well as biodiversity. Hence, people and nature have to be prioritized over profits and economic growth, which calls for a shift in thinking patterns and systems worldwide by which sustainable systems and equality can be achieved (XR global 2021c). As its main goal, XR attempts "to halt mass extinction and minimise the risk of social collapse" (XR global 2021a), which for one thing stresses environmental protection, with a focus on climate and biodiversity, and for another, transformation of the current world system.

Central to XR's demands is the aspect of stopping the ongoing 6th mass extinction, also called *The Anthropocene*, which is underlined by scientific evidence. Amongst others, it is claimed

---

[24] The OMV (Österreichische Mineralölverwaltung) occupies the extraction and processing of fossil fuels such as natural gas and crude oil (OMV 2021).

that the extinction rate has increased by about 1 000 times due to human intervention in nature since the human species took over the planet variously. Current human actions, such as extensive consumption, in general lifestyles and extractive economies are promoting the process of extinction loss. XR claims that these processes will in turn affect people's lives and future in the form of lack of resources for medicines, the transmission of diseases from animals to humans, problems with the global economic and food system and extreme weather conditions, which strengthens the XR's spirit for rebellion. Also, the global movement emphasises climate change and its effects, which are already taking place and will become even more visible in the long term. In this regard, the movement refers to the IPCC special report which identifies systematic impacts of climate change above 1.5°C. The report states that carbon emissions should actually be reduced to net zero by 2030 in order to prevent a temperature rise over 1.5°C (XR global 2021c). To approach this goal, inhabitants of this world would need a radical change in their lifestyles and way of treating the environment which calls for a transformation that the movement perceives as possible. In its reasoning, XR draws attention to the quick adjustment in mass mobilisation during the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. At that time, radical measures were taken in a very short time by governments and people, which shows that if means are required to counteract a problem and minimize damage, changes can be introduced quickly around the world, which serves as a source for motivation. Accordingly, the transformation in behaviour can equally be applied to different motives as for the climate and ecological emergency. Against this background, XR calls for a shift in the global economic system towards a more renewable and distributing global economy, particularly with regard to ecological boundaries, support for the world's vulnerable citizens and an adjustment of lifestyles. Since these changes have not yet been adequately pursued by governments and global institutions to mitigate the consequences of the ongoing climate crisis, XR aims to shift power to people. A participatory democracy and Citizens' Assemblies are to be established for this purpose, which would involve people and enable them to take necessary decisions. If all those means are pursued and people work together as a collective on the named issues, transformation and a better future can still be reached (XR global 2021c).

In this section it could be observed that some elements are related to hope. Hoping for a better future, for being successful in bringing about transformation and mobilising enough people. Diane Stuart (2020) tries to capture the motivation of XR activists in her analysis. One of XR's central theses is that their hope for a future away from climate and environmental catastrophe has died, ("hope dies, action begins"). Even if hope died, Stuart (2020: 488f.) states that there must be a certain type of hope inspiring people to participate in the XR movement.

She concluded from her studies that despite activists claiming to have lost their hope, a new, radical hope emerged from this state. From this, being in average pessimistic about the chances of their central demands, despair was used as a source of hope for action (Stuart 2020: 502f.).

4.3   Demands and Values

The British as well as Austrian XR movement express and share three key demands**:** "Tell the truth!", "Act now!" and "Beyond politics!"/"Living democracy!" (XR Austria 2021a; XR global 2021a), which are all addressed to governments. The first demand, "Tell the truth!" (ibid.), calls on governments to communicate truthfully the current state of emergency of the environment, which they consider to be a climate and ecological emergency. To do so, and also to convey the urgency for action, governments are asked to work with other institutions. The second demand, "Act now!" (ibid.), calls for immediate action to stop the loss of biodiversity as well as "to reduce greenhouse gases to net zero by 2025" (ibid.). Reason for it are the rising global temperatures, more and more extreme weather conditions and immense carbon emissions. The third demand, "Beyond politics!"/"Living democracy!" (ibid.), addresses the way decisions are made on a global level in a broader sense by failing to involve civil society at a large scale. They therefore call for the establishment of a "Citizens' Assembly' on climate and ecological justice" (XR global 2021a) which is led by citizens themselves (ibid.). It would gather people from various backgrounds to share concerns, discuss and address given issues through which common ground can be found. XR claims that by this process, all kinds of people would be represented. Such Assemblies are already taking place in the UK, France and Canada (XR global 2021c). However, the vision of Citizens' Assemblies could possibly turn into a weak point for XR according to Schweinschwaller (2020: 402) as a lack of clarity about the process and the role of XR in it could cause uncertainties and thus keep potential activists from joining the movement.

The global XR movement has a decentralised, self-organising structure to enable wide-reaching, autonomous international activism. The emergence of new local XR groups across the world is desired as they bring new perspectives, expertise and inspiration. However, XR adheres to certain values as its fundamental basis, which are defined in XR's action consensus (see below). Therefore, any individual or new group worldwide who wishes to act on behalf of XR must pursue this action consensus, consisting of values and principles. Thomas

Schweinschwaller's (2020: 394, 396) research on XR Austria confirmed its strict adherence within the movement and amongst the activists.

By sticking to these values, the movement XR can hold a decentralised structure, which gives people the autonomy to organise actions independently from other XR groups, power is decentralised and a strong collective identity nevertheless remains (XR global 2021a). The following ten values are declared by the global XR movement and at the same time represent the action consensus (XR Austria 2021d; XR global 2021a):

1) *We have a shared vision of change. Creating a world that fit for the next 7 generations to live in.*
2) *We set our mission on what is necessary. Mobilising 3.5% of the population to achieve system change – such as "momentum-driven organising".*
3) *We need a regenerative culture. Creating a culture which is healthy, resilient and adaptable.*
4) *We openly challenge ourselves and this toxic system. Leaving our comfort zones to take action for change.*
5) *We value reflecting and learning. Following a cycle of action, reflection, learning, and planning for more action. Learning from other movements and contexts as well as our own experiences.*
6) *We welcome everyone and every part of everyone. Working actively to create safer and more accessible spaces.*
7) *We actively mitigate power. Breaking down hierarchies of power for more equitable participation.*
8) *We avoid blaming and shaming. We live in a toxic system, but no one individual is to blame.*
9) *We are a nonviolent network. Using nonviolent strategy and tactics as the most effective way to bring about change.*
10) *We are based on autonomy and decentralisation. We collectively create the structures we need to challenge power.*

A few of these values have been discussed in more detail in the literature, which is why the concerned ones will be briefly presented:

The second value, "We set our mission on what is necessary" (XR Austria 2021d; XR global 2021a), represents a central argument in the XR context which intends to mobilise 3.5% of the global population in order to achieve system change or more specifically, to initiate a political transformation process. In Austria, for instance, this would mean at least 300,000 people have to be mobilised, which has not nearly been met yet (Schweinschwaller 2020: 386, 389, 403). The key idea is drawn from research on civil resistance (Berglund/Schmidt 2020: 79), however, the calculation was taken from empirical research on civil disobedience carried out by Chenoweth and Stephan (2011). Their study suggests that any campaign mobilising at least this percentage would be successful on a longer term, especially nonviolent movements (Matthews 2020: 592, 596f.).

XR's third value, "We need a regenerative culture" (XR Austria 2021d; XR global 2021a), was explicitly emphasised during the interview with the Austrian XR activist. It is of essential meaning to XR Austria that regenerative culture is actually lived and that a mindful and good cooperation is cultivated (Interview 05/01/2021). In order to oppose mainstream values and

bring about transformation on a global scale, a different attitude must be cultivated within the movement as well. Regenerative culture is understood to be an ethical concept with care and emotions at its centre. Hereby, humans and the planet are connected with each other resulting in the elements self-care, people and planet care. By this, collective identity as well as internal movement dynamics are strengthened. It also functions as motivation for actions and as instrument to accept environmental consequences by giving space to (negative) emotions such as despair and grief (Schweinschwaller 2020: 388; Westwell/Bunting 2020: 546, 550). By living and having an economy in harmony with nature, regenerative culture can be understood as part of the Degrowth (see Chapter 2.1.2) movement (Schweinschwaller 2020: 388).

As the 9th value, "We are a nonviolent network" (XR Austria 2021d; XR global 2021a), says, nonviolent civil disobedience is XR's main strategy. If done at the right momentum, more people can be mobilised through a sense of solidarity (Schweinschwaller 2020: 399). This tactic was chosen following the tradition of Gandhi and Martin Luther King and because it is said to be most effective (see Chapter 4.2). Roger Hallam (2019), one of the initiators of XR, wrote that civil disobedience was the only strategy being able to halt the destruction of the world's nature. The decision for this form of protest was made based on three observations: destruction and breaking laws is necessary to get the necessary attention; activists must show willingness to make sacrifices, such as going to prison, to be taken seriously; and activists must be respectful towards themselves, the public and the police in order to get their understanding. Further, the tactic must include certain key elements to show success: a great number of participants; actions must be carried out in the capital, as this is where the government, the media and big business are located, representing the powerful and wealthy forces; reputational damage has to be imposed; and actions have to take place over a longer period of time.

4.4 Criticism

The scientific papers as well as the conducted expert interviews have expressed certain points of criticism towards the XR movement. For one part, XR's goal to mobilise 3.5% of the population and the associated belief to bring about profound system change (XR global 2021a) was criticised from several sides: Matthews (2020), himself being an XR supporter and participant, argues that the XR's vision and reasoning do not apply and success is not guaranteed. This particularly applies to Chenoweth and Stephan's (2011) study, which serves as a central orientation point, whose autocratic political context is substantially different to the

mostly liberal democratic context of XR groups. For this reason, XR's argument is misleading as strategy and might not be accurate (Berglund/Schmidt 2020; Matthews 2020), which was also emphasised by the expert interviewee from the field of social movements (see Interview 22/12/2020). This is why alternative strategies should be used, according to Matthews, which might be more effective (Matthews 2020: 592f.).

XR's strategy of civil disobedience actions have also already been criticised due to interfering with people's freedom by blocking traffic and for the purpose of deliberately causing trouble. Also, XR Austria feels sometimes misperceived by the media, for instance, as they were accused by an Austrian newspaper of being childish, as the activists wanted to creatively highlight bee mortality in the form of a creative representation of a honeycomb and costuming (Interview 05/01/2021).

Another central point of discussion within the XR discourse has been XR's unawareness towards other related issues, knowledge and the background of its activists. XR describes itself as a "political nonpartisan movement" (XR global 2021a). This characteristic refers to being free from political or cultural boundaries and indicates the movement's composition of impartial, socially and culturally diverse activists. Hence, it is said to consist of participants from different backgrounds, cultures and political opinions, united in facing the same issues and future as well as following the same goals (XR global 2021c). However, the criticism regarding this aspect has been that XR activists are from diverse communities but predominantly 'white' activists[25] and situated in the middle class, thus, 'privileged' people (Berglund/Schmidt 2020: 28, 35; Interview 22/12/2020; Kinniburgh 2020: 129).

In addition, XR was criticised for its lack of emphasising climate change consequences on 'people with colour', mainly attributed to the 'GS', which is why XR was advised 'to decolonise'[26]. As a result, the points of criticism were partly taken up within the movement by setting a focus on inclusivity and decolonisation. These changes could be observed, for instance, in the Power Together strategy plan of 2020 (see XR UK 2020) or showing posters during actions by activists from XR Scotland that read "Decolonise XR" and equated climate issues with social class struggles (Kinniburgh 2020: 130; Slaven/Heydon 2020: 60; XR UK 2020).

---

[25] Many authors such as Berglund/Schmidt 2020, Kinniburgh 2020 and Slaven/Heydon 2020 use the terms 'white' and 'people with colour' to define the ethnical background of the concerned people and the impact of these backgrounds on social occurrences. Since these terms are referred to in several texts and XR websites (XR London 2021b) in this context, they will be used throughout this thesis.

[26] Both authors Kinniburgh (2020) and Slaven/Heydon (2020) mention 'to decolonise' in the cited articles, however, the term was not explained in more detail.

This lack of awareness also came to light concerning other related discussions. In particular XR London was criticised for being in a bubble and not aware of other past and current protests, discourses and issues, such as anti-fracking or anti-racist initiatives. The interviewed social movement researcher claimed that the South of England had its own culture, which, with a few exceptions, has so far been largely excluded from other protest movements in the past (Interview 22/12/2020).

5 Findings regarding the XR Framing

In the following chapter, the results and interpretation of the qualitative content analysis are elaborated with regard to the core framing tasks according to Snow/Benford (1988) and Benford/Snow (2000), which served as deductive categories for the framing analysis. This dataset includes the presentation of highly representative notions, which were then inductively re-categorised. For this purpose, XR UK and XR Austria are presented individually along the categories of diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing. To briefly recapture these frames, diagnostic framing can be used to capture the problem definition of movements. This is accompanied by the attribution of blame to actors who have contributed significantly to the creation of the problem, their responsibility as well as the identification of innocent parties who suffer from the defined problem. In comparison, prognostic frames focus on possible solutions to the identified problem(s) and responsible actors, which also includes strategies for their implementation. Finally, motivational frames signify socially constructed vocabulary used to mobilise potential participants and obtain the participation of movement activists. This attribution is often expressed through notions of efficacy, urgency or propriety (Snow/Benford 1988; Benford/Snow 2000).

5.1 Austrian Case Studies

5.1.1 Social and ecological Collapse, Humanity, Politics and the 'toxic' System as Diagnostic Frame

As the selected XR cases of Austria groups do not pursue their own website but only build part of XR Austria's, it can be assumed that there is consent on the general problem identification. It can be read from the data that XR Austria sees the problem in the current climate change and

its negative effects. XR Austria claims that global warming is on its way to five degrees and its consequences can already be observed through increased forest fires, heat, drought, the mass extinction of species and their influence on the global ecosystem. Besides these ecological effects, the Austrian movement identifies a major part of the problem within the social consequences of the climate crisis, initiated by climate change. Through these, millions of human lives are said to be at risk because their livelihoods are not secured, which is why hunger and social collapse will occur in many parts of the world (XR Austria 2021d; XR Austria 2021g). Above all, the urgency of the problem is not perceived by people in general, claims the Austrian XR activist (see Interview 05/01/2021).

It becomes visible from the analysed data that only XR Tyrol's input refers to regional lacks in sustainability. In this context, the group offers examples such as a lack of cycling infrastructure and nature in the city, the expansion of the regional airport in Innsbruck and human intervention in the Alpes as with discussions over the potential fusion of two large ski areas in Tyrol (XR Austria 2021f).

Three central culpable actors were identified in the positioning of XR Austria: humanity itself, the global system and politics. These actors are criticised for their actions which cause environmental degradation and climate change. XR Austria blames the global "political, economic and social system" (translated, XR Austria 2021c) for the destruction of people's basis of life and the ecological crisis, which is why the movement perceives it as "toxic system" (translated, XR Austria 2021d). An interplay of the different branches of the system causes the promotion of fossil energy production, environmental pollution and land-use change which mainly contribute to high CO_2 emissions and subsequently to climate change. The role of large corporations, such as Austria's OMV, in driving fossil fuel production, including fracking, gas and oil combustion, is emphasised. Furthermore, the government is perceived as a culpable actor for its negligence. According to XR Austria, the government is not fulfilling its obligations and responsibility towards its citizens by not securing their future livelihoods. It also continues to finance environmentally damaging projects and fails, for instance, to end the use of pesticides in agriculture. In doing so, the government is preventing the implementation of climate and environmentally friendly solutions to combat the climate crisis. The content analysis shows that no individuals are blamed for the climate crisis but humanity as a whole (Interview 05/01/2021; XR Austria 2021g). The Austrian XR activist stated that XR

is simply not looking for blame. We were all born and raised in the system that is unfortunately largely based on environmental destruction and, if we now start assigning blame or vice versa, if only those who have never consumed anything harmful to the environment or have somehow participated in environmental destruction were allowed to get involved, then that would be no one;

and if that is no one, then you don't get very far. In this respect, we simply bypass this completely, so even large corporations are not directly addressed by us, but it is always about what is being done, not who is doing it. We criticise the actions, but not the individual companies and certainly not the official representatives, whose job it is. (translated, Interview 05/01/2021)

As part of the problem definition, 'victims' of current and future climate and environmental conditions are named. The focus of XR Austria on all living beings that are affected by the consequences of climate change and environmental degradation. On the one hand, humans themselves and, on the other hand, biodiversity are considered as such, both of which would be in danger. Regarding the former, XR Austria refers to millions of lives all over the world which are threatened in the future, as a social collapse would affect everyone. Here, reference is made to future generations who will be equally affected by the consequences. XR activists state that they are "afraid for the future of their children and also for their own future" (translated, Interview 05/01/2021), as their lives are threatened by a lack of livelihoods, among other things. Humans and biodiversity are closely connected, as biodiversity represents the basis for human life, which could be destroyed within this century, says XR Austria. It would be triggered by an ecosystem collapse which would occur in the near future if nothing changed. According to the activists, mass extinction and the ensuing ecological collapse is already underway (XR Austria 2021a, 2021d, 2021g).

To identify 'victims' of environmental and social collapse, the analysis shows that XR Austria strongly draws on science as proof. Findings of the global biodiversity assessment (IPBES) show a massive decline in terrestrial and freshwater vertebrates. These scientific sources point out a radical decline by at least 60-80% since the 1970s. The number of endangered animal species has increased enormously, land and sea surfaces have changed greatly and 85% of wetlands have declined (XR Austria 2021a, 2021g). These numbers are treated as facts and serve as the basis for XR's actions.

In regard to XR Tyrol, the analysed data shows a regional focus concerning its 'victim' identification as the group specifically emphasises its support for stronger protection of the Alpine region, its ecosystem and associated biodiversity. The group feels closely connected to the Alpes, which is why they set their focus (XR Austria 2021f).

5.1.2 Nonviolent, creative Civil Disobedience, regenerative Culture, Citizens' Assemblies and Governments' Responsibility as Prognostic Frame

XR Austria's proposed solutions to counter and avert an ecological and social collapse include the enforcement of concrete and immediate measures. This requires slowing down climate

change, stopping mass extinction and thus preserving biodiversity in order to prevent social collapse as a consequence. To achieve this, social transformation is needed. However, the movement itself deliberately does not propose concrete measures: "XR has made the strategic decision not to make concrete proposals on how to solve the climate and environmental crisis. There have been enough solutions and approaches for decades on how to face the omnipresent crises." (translated, XR Austria 2021d) In this context, too, XR Austria relies heavily on previous scientific research in that, for example, the limitation of CO_2 emissions plays an essential role (Interview 05/01/2021; XR Austria 2021d). Other solutions to the crisis are sustainability, which must be enforced and maintained within the economic system and can be achieved with the help of a circular economy based on energy from renewable resources, or photovoltaics for the necessary energy production (Interview 05/01/2021).

XR Austria considers it the responsibility of politics to act in these matters. Many small steps must be taken by the government to reach the goal of biodiversity preservation (XR Austria 2021d). The movement expresses three central demands directed at the government, which are as follows: "Tell the truth!", "Act now!" and "Living democracy!" (translated, XR Austria 2021d). They can be understood as actions leading on to the required changes to safe humanity, biodiversity and the environment. The first demand, "Tell the truth!" (ibid.), the truth and transparency about the current ecological circumstances. The government is asked to cooperate with the media to communicate the urgency in action to and to convince the public, including individuals, companies and communities. Further, laws that are not in line with ecological well-being and the prevention of the future ecological and social collapse need to be revised. The second demand, "Act now!" (ibid.), concerns a legally binding "climate and ecological mobilisation" (translated, ibid.) on an international dimension. International cooperation must be secured with the purpose to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2025 and to stop the destruction of ecosystems (ibid.). Governments should implement binding compensation of greenhouse gases and CO_2 emissions with, for instance, CO_2 taxes. Subsidies for renewable energy sources should also be introduced to stop the usage of fossil resources (Interview 05/01/2021). The last demand, "Living democracy!" (XR Austria 2021d), concerns the implementation of a Citizens' Assemblies (XR Austria 2021h) based on the Irish model. It is intended to function as an instrument to negotiate and monitor just measures with the help of citizens and experts. Through this, XR Austria sees a possibility to diminish hierarchies and power structures. Its participants are to be drawn at random which should provide fair access to the decision-making on such global issues (XR Austria 2021h). This is to counteract government negligence and the power of its politicians. According to XR Austria, this decision-

making system paves the way for a vibrant, just democracy and the future crisis can be stopped. It also enables transformation to a different, more just system for the benefit of humanity and the environment (XR Austria 2021d).

As part of the prognostic framing, different strategies of XR Austria and Tyrol were identified in course of the qualitative content analysis: A central strategy of the general XR movement, as it is part of the action consensus (XR Austria 2021d), is its organisational structure, which aims at autonomy and decentralisation. XR Austria's so-called *self-organizing system* (SOS) enables the implementation of these values. There are different local and regional groups as well as reference and working groups. Working groups however are founded as needed and are categorised according to key topics such as media, messaging or finance. Reference groups are reduced to 6-12 people, providing a point of contact, enabling mutual support and creating more personalised care (XR Austria 2021c).

Throughout the conducted data, nonviolent civil disobedience was strongly emphasised as XR Austria's main protest strategy. Some of its positive aspects were already broadly addressed in course of Chapter 4. Its reasoning will be only discussed in context of XR Austria's motivational framing. Both the document-based data and the interview elaborate the strategy's function, meaning and how it was carried out as for instance through street and seat blockages in central traffic hubs, especially in Vienna. The Austrian XR activist explained regarding this strategy: "Yes, it is the main strategy, it is the only strategy and it is exactly what you also join our group for." (translated, Interview 05/01/2021), which emphasis its strong role within the XR discourse. XR Tyrol also speaks in favour of civil disobedience actions and in this sense, seat blockades already took place in the city centre of Innsbruck. This XR group generally operates under the motto "ruhig aber LAUT" (XR Austria 2021f) which is focused on the Tyrol region and the Alpine region. However, actions following this motto do not aim at blocking the local traffic. Consequently, actions not adhering to this motto or regional focus, can be carried out on behalf of general XR Austria protests but not in the name of this motto, XR Tyrol states (XR Austria 2021f).

The content-analysis suggests as additional tactic to hold regular rebellion weeks. During these weeks, activists from all over Austria travel to Vienna, being the capital, to participate in symbolic and civil disobedience actions as it is the seat of the Austrian government. They primarily carry out these actions in public places and in cities, where the greatest possible attention can be attracted. Possible forms of protests are street and seat blockades. In addition

to the rebellion week, there are actions taking place decentralised and outside cities, depending on where the need for action is seen. Following this, protests were carried out at the property of OMV, Austria's main gas and oil industry, in Gänserndorf, Lower Austria (Interview 05/01/2021; XR Austria 2021c, 2021d).

The XR Austria interviewee further emphasised that certain forms of protest are less visible, but are also part of the movement's tactics, such as signing petitions and talking to politicians directly concerning possible changes. Moreover, the Austrian legal framework is regarded as a instrument as XR Austria activists "will always exhaust all legal remedies and use the authorities as much as possible. We always plead that we are in a state of justifiable emergency." (translated, Interview 05/01/2021)

XR Austria intends to visually support their protests with a creative character. This visualises and highlights their reason for protest and the issues it addresses. An example for this tactic is the display of a honeycomb made from wood during a road blockade in Vienna. Through this construct and costumes, the movement wanted to draw attention to the relevance of bees in the ecosystem and the threat of their extinction. According to the Austrian XR interviewee, people should take a close look at these creative performances and would then realise why XR resorts to such means instead of condemning them: "If you look at it with open eyes, you also see that we just point out why we are there and are not just there to annoy someone; that is the very last thing we want" (translated, Interview 05/01/2021). The creative characteristic can equally be observed with the musical accompaniment of the XR choir during the protests or in the creative redesign of a blocked bridge in Vienna's centre (Interview 05/01/2021).

The conducted data highlights XR Austria's interpersonal tactic to treat people with respect, dignity and nonviolent behaviour during its actions. This approach builds part of the XR action consensus (see Chapter 4.3) which serves as guideline for the values and approach to protests of the movement. Nonviolent behaviour is considered by XR Austria as a privilege that is not granted to all people in the world, which is why activists make use of this privilege (XR Austria 2021c). This also applies to their behaviour towards the police and people they are involved with when being arrested:

> We also make sure that, even when we are arrested, we not only show respect to the acting officers, but also say why we are there and that they should actually please make an effort themselves, so in everything we do, we work towards getting people to deal with the issue more. (translated, Interview 05/01/2021)

The Austrian expert interview underlined the positive experiences with this respectful and transparent approach as a tactic, due to which, for example, financial penalties have usually been reduced to a minimum.

The action consensus (XR Austria 2021d) moreover relies on protesting without the influence of alcohol or drugs, self-responsibility and also to keep informed about possible legal consequences, mandatory training before actions and the observance of quiet during protests in residential areas. The actions are always coordinated with current events, such as the current COVID-19 pandemic. In this regard, the movement points out the implementation of measures during actions that take place since the pandemic. All activists taking part in actions during the pandemic are therefore obliged to follow certain rules, such as wearing a mouth/nose mask, keeping their distance, using available disinfection stations and disinfecting their hands regularly.

As part of XR's action consensus, regenerative culture is seen as a tactic to support a sense of community within the movement in order to better find solutions for the crisis together (XR Austria 2021d). For example, the XR Austria activists strive for the well-being of each other by bringing and saving food during campaigns. The sense of community is also to be strengthened with the help of activities outside the protest actions. (Interview 05/01/2021). The idea of solidarity is evident in XR Austria's positioning vis-à-vis other movements. The data analysis has shown that XR Austria is open to joining forces with other actors engaged in climate justice issues, as this is understood as a complex issue for which a common front at the international level is necessary (XR Austria 2021d).

5.1.3   5 Key Motivational Frames

Forced to act-frame

It can be drawn from the content-analytical data that XR Austria strongly refers to the *forced to act-frame*. By this frame, the urgency and propriety of XR actions are emphasised. This includes a temporal component alluding to the time pressure until ecological and social collapse can no longer be stopped, which forces the activists to protest. According to XR Austria, time is limited to counteract and bring about a transformation, which is why action has to be taken and other resources have to be resorted. "All our lives are acutely threatened. We have 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" (translated, XR Austria 2021g), explains the Austrian

movement. The citation shows the severity of the situation, expressing the temporal component, pressuring people to rebel. Various steps have to be achieved until changes are initiated, which underlines the need to act.

XR Austria blames the current system, which can no longer be continued in this form which is why changes must be initiated; the system includes the politics and lacks in governmental action (Interview 05/01/2021; XR Austria 2021d). On the one side, these aspects justify the appropriateness of their actions and, on the other side, possible disruptions of the everyday life of fellow citizens. Disruptions through civil disobedience actions only occur because there is no other way, argues XR Austria. With these actions, the activists attempt to show consideration as far as possible for people who are not involved in XR but effected through their actions as their everyday lives may be affected, particularly by street blockades (Interview 05/01/2021). Thus, XR Austria activists see themselves in a moral dilemma to a certain degree, because they do not aim at disturbing people in their everyday lives, but at the same time they are forced to take such measures. The Austrian XR interviewee emphasised multiple times that no harm or disturbance is intended:

> We will at all times show the utmost consideration for members of civil society going about their daily activities. We understand that workers who are disrupted by our actions depend on their work to provide for themselves and their families. We wish that these disruptions were not necessary, but at the same time we know that the political, economic and social system in which we live forces us to take disruptive action. (translated, Interview 05/01/2021)

It can be observed that disruptive action is regarded as the last chance to achieve a sustainable system, providing the safety of human beings and the ecological system; hence, it is no voluntary choice of XR Austria's activists. Although civil disobedience is based on the occupation of streets and buildings, it can be drawn from the statement that they do not intend to restrict the freedom of people who become involved by XR actions. The activists themselves wished that it was not necessary to protest and set signs, as they would rather do other things themselves. However, fear for their future, children and the environment outweigh this moral dilemma. Above all, the negligence of politics must be compensated and made up for, which is why activists are joining the movement (Interview 05/01/2021).

This necessity to act of the *forced to act-frame* is also used as argumentation towards people who handle the cases of arrested XR activists. By arguing their actions and interests as well as showing respect towards the officials, they try to raise awareness towards the perceived issues and their position. Consequently, punishments are often reduced to a minimum but not abolished because they are legally indispensable, according to the Austria XR activist:

So far, we have always managed to reduce the fines, because it is clear to everyone who works on the case that we are people who want to do good and that the fine is necessary by law, but it is always reduced. We also make sure that we [...] also say why we are there and that they should actually also please make an effort themselves. (translated, Interview 05/01/2021)

Historical and scientific evidence of success-frame

The *historical and scientific evidence of success-frame* outlines two components: historical movements which succeeded with actions of nonviolent civil disobedience in the past, and its scientifically based reasoning. The conducted data shows that a central argument for the effectiveness of the XR movement and its main strategy is based on historical references. The historical experience so far shows that changes, and especially sustainable transformations, have mostly been initiated with help of nonviolent civil disobedience; even up to twice as many according to the data used by XR. XR Austria calls it the "most successful form of protest in history" (translated, XR Austria 2021d). However, this would only occur as long as protest actions remain nonviolent. The movement's main historical examples represent the Suffragette movements, Gandhi or the protests around the Hainburger Au (see Chapter 2.1.2; XR Austria 2021d).

The evidence of the strategy's effectiveness is underpinned by science. The scientific study Why Civil Resistance Works by Chenoweth and Stephan (2011), which was already mentioned in Chapter 4, serves as another main reference. Based on a study of 300 civil protest movements of the past 100 years, civil disobedience is the most successful democratic protest strategy, claims the study. Success would be 100% guaranteed if at least 3.5% of a population joined. XR Austria's conviction in this regard serves as a strong argument for success, their activism and a clear goal to aim for, which is manifested in their action consensus. At the same time, it leaves no room for doubt based on scientific evidence (XR Austria 2021d).

Beneficial legal framework-frame

The legal framework in Austria is regarded as a useful and helpful basis or even instrument to enact nonviolent civil disobedience actions, which leads to XR Austria's *beneficial legal framework-frame*. The legal situation is very advantageous in comparison with others, the Austrian expert notes, which is of great advantage regarding civil disobedience as the main protest tactic. The reason for this can be traced back to a few years ago when the paragraph in the penal code prohibiting the incitement to disobey laws was abolished. Due to the lack of convictions in this area over the last three decades, the need for its existence was no longer

supported (Interview 05/01/2021). As a result, calls for disobedience are currently legal in Austria, according to the XR Austria activist:

> It's just been removed by way of clearing up the legal situation and we're happy about that [...]. Thank you very much for making it legal. And I would therefore also urge everyone to make use of it as quickly as possible, because that it goes as pleasantly and easily as it does at the moment in Austria is rare and will practically not come again. (translated, Interview 05/01/2021)

Therefore, activists bear only limited consequences, which are mostly limited to a fine. Regarding fines, the XR interviewee stated that they amounted to a maximum of 200 euros for sit-in protests regardless of whether the activists immediately identify themselves or not. Also, the activists would not receive any criminal record or police cautions.

> The last one got 50 euros, where I say, okay, you don't get a police caution, you don't get a criminal record, that's...It doesn't get any better than that. You can't get much less of a fine than that. (translated, Interview 05/01/2021)

These aspects highlight the advantages of the Austrian context for such actions, especially in international comparison. The *beneficial legal framework-frame* stresses XR's decision to use nonviolent civil disobedience as its main strategy. Nevertheless, people's inhibitions towards this strategy still exist, the XR Austria activist argues, which in the interviewee's opinion would not be necessary due to the mild fines or risk. This shows impact on XR Austria's mobilisation strategy which consequently is also carried through word of mouth, as people's own experiences, positive encouragement and thus personal access are more likely to overcome this inhibition to civil disobedience (Interview 05/01/2021).

Each contribution counts-frame and individuality-frame

Throughout XR Austria's statements, reference is often made to the high value of any participation in the movement. The goal of XR can only be achieved as a community or as a mass. For this reason, every contribution, no matter how small, counts. With help of the *each contribution counts-frame*, the effectiveness of participation is underlined and thus of the movement as a whole. Different forms of activism and possibilities for participation are offered. In connection with it, various characteristics that potential activists could be good at and get involved in are listed, pointing out the multiple benefits of the individual (XR Austria 2021c). Each person can contribute in a variety of ways and groups: "Wherever your strengths and interests lie - each person can support the rebellion and help us grow as a movement! You count. What you do counts." (translated, XR Austria 2021c) On XR Austria's website, the readers are addressed directly and asked in which areas they show interest or potential, be it logistical,

creative or team activities (XR Austria 2021c), which might serve as a mobilisation tool. Individuality is highly valued in the form of one's own previous experience, knowledge and ideas. By this, the benefits of each individual's participation are highlighted. This is subsequently presented as a positive attribute of the XR Austria, making it more diverse and stronger. These notions of inclusion and individuality are indirectly used to promote the expansion of the XR community and the effectiveness of mass mobilisations.

5.2   British Case Studies

5.2.1   Intersection of global Crises, the ecological and social Collapse, Humanity with a focus on the 'GS', the UK Government, and the 'toxic' System as Diagnostic Frame

In the British context, the movement's problem identification is mainly framed by "an intersection of global crisis" (XR London 2021e; XR MCR 2021c). Both XR MCR and XR London state that climate breakdown, racial injustice and COVID-19 represent individual crisis and consequences of the system we are living in. In combination with these different issues, people are also said to be suffering from the misconduct of politics which failed to protect its citizens from climate and ecological change, social injustice, structural racism and the ongoing pandemic. Finally, the climate crisis would worsen these conditions and cause more death and destruction, according to the English XR cases (XR MCR 2020; XR London 2021e; XR MCR 2021a, 2021c).

Information on the ecological processes is drawn from scientific research (XR MCR 2020; XR London 2021e; XR MCR 2021a). For instance, XR London refers to a report of the Climate Change Committee's (CCC)[27] of 2020 which announces a global warming of four degrees due to governmental inaction. Its consequences will be seen in billions of deaths, especially marginalised people and communities in the 'GS' being affected, indicated by studies (XR London 2021e).

Different culpable actors can be determined in the positioning of XR MCR and XR London: in the first place, the global system is to be blamed which is based on exploitation, extraction, economic inequality and the degradation of the environment. The "toxic system [...] is killing us all" (XR London 2021c; XR MCR 2021c). Besides the overall system, politics and world

---

[27] The Climate Change Committee (CCC) is an independent institution and serves as advisor to the UK government on climate change, climate mitigation and its impacts and related issues (https://www.theccc.org.uk/about/).

leaders with focus on the UK government are criticised for abandoning citizens' protection and for draining money into extractive economy with help of the financial sector; this includes projects such as the third runway at London's airport Heathrow, fracking or the reversion of renewable energies expansion (XR MCR 2020; XR London 2021b, 2021e; XR MCR 2021c). In this sense, humanity is the major culpable actor by having created these deadly circumstances. XR London additionally emphasises the lack of sufficient action from the UK government despite having the means to do so which XR London equals with an inadequate democracy (XR London 2021b). Here, XR MCR identifies uneven social power structures that are determined by a certain "ruthlessly profiteering elite" (XR MCR 2020: 10). Large corporations are indicated as another actor causing harm to the environment by promoting carbon emissions and greenwashing. The UK is said to have "the two biggest private financiers of fossil fuels in Europe" (XR MCR 2020: 44). For this reason, XR MCR calls "the UK Government […] guilty of ecocide: they are giving money to destructive industries right now instead of rebuilding our economy to prioritise people and planet. They are racing us to the cliff edge of extinction" (XR MCR 2020: 7). This reveals the linkage between large corporations and politics as guilty actors. The statement underlines again the government's lack of responsibility towards its citizens and the environment. The former aspect is equated to breaking the social contract.

The content analysis of the British case data shows that humans are victimised. On the one hand, humans in their position as citizens are victims of politics and, on the other hand, as a species that is victim to the current system, ecological consequences and climate change as billions of deaths will be caused. According to XR Manchester and XR London, this particularly affects racially marginalised communities, 'indigenous people' and people in the 'GS'. The climate crisis and enhancing changes would cause deaths of all species, biodiversity and more destruction of nature. Equally, children as the future generation would suffer under these circumstances (XR MCR 2020; XR London 2021e; XR MCR 2021a, 2021c).

5.2.2   Nonviolent, creative Civil Disobedience, regenerative Culture, Cooperation, Citizens'
        Assemblies and Governments' Responsibility as Prognostic Frame

The British XR cases propose different solutions to counter the current and future crisis: In XR MCR's opinion, the solution to the future social and ecological crisis contains several aspects, which are directed at the government, implementing politics or governments as responsible actors to introduce changes. Reason for it is the government's responsibility towards its citizens,

written in the social contract, to keep them safe and thus prevent them from death (XR MCR 2020; XR London 2021b, 2021c). XR London states: "The Government is failing to do what's necessary to keep us safe. They ignored the warnings about coronavirus, now they're ignoring warnings of a 4°C warmer world" (XR London 2021c). XR MCR follows this reasoning and refers in its blame attribution to the government's responsibility to protect society from catastrophic climate and ecological changes, structural racism and pandemics. Changes to the existing social context have to be initiated as it is characterised by unjust structures, including racism and oppression (XR MCR 2020). However, none of the XR UK local groups suggest solutions themselves but outsource it to the Citizens' Assembly. "We understand that the structure of government in this country has the ability to implement the necessary changes, in partnership with local communities, but that our democracy is inadequate to overseeing this and so it needs changing." (XR London 2021b) In this framework, decisions on action are asked to be in favour of climate and ecological justice. A step already taken in this direction was the declaration of a Climate Emergency by the UK Parliament announcing its commitment to zero carbon emissions until 2050 (XR MCR 2020). These two ideas were launched as a reaction to XR's demands (see Chapter 4.3).

As part of the global XR movement, both XR MCR and XR London also share three demands, which are "Tell the truth!", "Act now!" and "Beyond politics!" (XR London 2021a; XR MCR 2020). The third demand, "Beyond politics!" (ibid.), covers the idea of the establishment of a Citizens' Assembly (XR UK 2019) which is supposed to mandate solutions and enable democratic decision-making concerning measures on the Climate and Ecology Emergency (CEE). For this purpose, a CEE Bill has been formulated by scientists and XR's political team: "We are offering our Government an invitation to do the right thing, the necessary thing. A Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill has been put together by respected scientists and our Political team." (XR MCR 2020: 7) With help of its legal implementation, the UK government would be obliged to take action and responsibility for the UK's carbon footprint and to protect nature. Therefore, they call on the Members of Parliament to support the CEE Bill, according to XR MCR (2020). Concerning the Citizens' Assembly, XR London emphasises that its members were to be selected randomly to enable just access. To this selection process quotas are added to ensure representativity in terms of gender, ethnicity, age, educational background and geography. The aim is to create transparency, effectiveness and inclusion in decision-making processes on solutions to prevent an ecological and social collapse in the future. These elements are to establish a genuine democracy in order to undermine corrupt interests of certain forces, according to XR London (2021a).

Another part of the solution to the current multiple crises is cooperation. The XR movement is seen as a first step towards this, primarily focusing on cooperation with communities affected by these crises whose majority is in the 'GS' (XR MCR 2020). Cooperation in this context means transparency, learning about how to deal with, conflicts through and resilience of these communities:

> [W]e seek to center solidarity and co-liberation as core values to overcome the oppression, racism and injustice we are facing. We need to learn from frontline communities, particularly in the Global South, about their struggles, resilience and wisdom in confronting the climate crisis. This will be a long journey, and each rebel is encouraged to make this rebellion a vital step towards co-liberation. (XR MCR 2020: 16).

The conducted data illustrates that most demands and actions of XR London and XR MCR are based on scientific research which thus represents a central source for knowledge (XR MCR 2020; XR London 2021e; XR MCR 2021a). The CEE Bill and the references to the state of biodiversity, CO_2 emissions and negative side-effects of fossil-based energy production are examples for this. "We focus on the issues that have a clear body of mainstream science with a large consensus of opinion – for example, biodiversity loss and climate change." (XR London 2021b), which confirms XR London's positioning on drawing their facts upon scientific experts. Similar statements can be found within the XR MCR context.

The content analysis revealed a number of British XR strategies to enforce their concerns and transformation. As part of their main strategy, XR MCR and XR London aim to build pressure on the UK Parliament through regular actions until it gives in and discusses XR's demands. Especially with the help of simultaneous protest actions across the country, such as the "Countdown to Rebellion" (XR MCR 2021c) in August 2020, XR's concerns and eagerness should be communicated better and make them more visible for the UK government. They want to create effects through a significant high number of participants and the community they build. It is also emphasised to connect with other people outside of the XR bubble as a goal (XR MCR 2020; XR London 2021b; XR MCR 2021c).

Civil disobedience is XR UK's main tactic, which also applies to all local XR UK groups and therefore also the selected British XR cases. By means of it, the current system should be disrupted (XR MCR 2020; XR London 2021b; XR MCR 2021c). To some degree, the movement declares to inform the police about upcoming actions but only if it appears profitable for a successful action process. However, this does not include actions designed to create a moment of surprise (XR UK 2021a). With nonviolent civil disobedience actions, XR UK

organises large actions, especially in London, which are regionally overlapping and therefore attract nationwide activists and let different local XR UK groups collaborate. London builds a central stage for XR as it is the capital of England and therefore the government's seat (XR London 2021e; XR MCR 2020, 2021c). Past XR actions at London have gathered a great number of participants (XR global 2021a; XR UK 2021a). This is also due to the large participation of activists from outside London who travel from the surrounding area or even from other parts of the South of England, such as Exeter or Stroud, for the protests (Interview 22/12/2020). Thus, it can be seen as an essential approach of XR UK to carry out joint, large-scale actions in order to gain more attention. In this context, their actions already blockaded the Parliament in London and other parts of London's city centre.

The analysis of the British XR cases highlights symbolic notions as being central to their civil disobedience actions (XR London 2021c; XR MCR 2021c). This has already been shown during first XR protest in 2018 up until now. Such actions included planting trees in London's Parliament Square, mourning marches, protesters super-gluing themselves to the gates of Buckingham Palace, publicly reading letters to the Queen regarding their concerns and burying a coffin, representing their future (XR global 2021a; XR UK 2021a). XR MCR expresses also its frustrations on the current ecological state with its actions, for which they use creative, symbolic performances. The activists want to make a greater impact by expressing their emotions combined with respect, sacrifice and disruption (XR MCR 2020).

All XR MCR actions are based on online outreach beforehand. In Manchester itself, actions have so far taken place in the city centre. Furthermore, their actions are intended to function as platforms where other individuals, activists or movements can exchange ideas. The goal is to strengthen the interaction between the different circles and form a common front. XR MCR has given attention to fossil power stations with its protests. Protests were already carried out directly at the Drax power station which represents the UK's biggest carbon emitter by coal and tree burning and is situated relatively close to Manchester. Through this, the XR group wants to demonstrate their power and willingness to carry the consequences for their actions. The approach of togetherness and mutual support could have been also observed with the protests at Drax station in terms of their handling of resources for protest actions. In advance, they announced their lack of resource production because of finances in return for which they offered to help other activists with transporting resources from their region and accommodations with crowdsourcing places (XR MCR 2020).

Another central strategy of the protest movement is media visibility. In XR's beginnings, XR related information was mainly transported by British mainstream media such as The Guardian

newspaper. Through connections to journalists such as George Monbiot, who himself is an environmentalist and political activist, XR ideas and actions could be much reported on a national level. With help of this medium, visibility progressed quickly and the movement was able to gain attention globally quickly. XR's actions were largely set up around photo opportunities, according to the interviewee, which is why the media would determine the general XR discourse and future of the movement (Interview 22/12/2020).

Concerning their internal structures and dynamics, XR London tries to establish an open-minded and respectful atmosphere to create a community in which everything can be discussed against the backdrop of XR's core values and attitudes. This tactic includes a "no shaming and blaming" (XR London 2021b) approach, which also affects their positioning with external actors. The characteristic to treat each other with respect and stay nonviolent above all must also be met towards the police. They liaise with the police with the idea that their concerns can thus be better addressed in the public discourse. XR London notes that this tactic must be coordinated and decided within the respective regional context and its usage (ibid.). The internal structure of XR London is decentralised and, thus, has a self-organising structure without consent-based decision-making. It consists of a number of working groups which are each specialised in one area or topic such as the Citizens' Assembly, finance and fundraising, training, media, legal issues, arrestee welfare, art, wellbeing, training and its actions. In this area, they are guided by the resource structure of XR UK (XR London 2021d).

In addition to illegal civil disobedience, XR MCR carries out legal actions. This included a Digital Rebellion announced by them in 2020. This sort of rebellion aimed at spamming social media or email accounts and telephone of environmentally destructive companies and government offices (XR MCR 2020). Part of XR MCR tactic to mobilise participants is social media, other online platforms and letters including their reasoning to protest, values and demands. These letters are intended to illustrate the current crisis and are written by different groups, so-called "XR Community of Identity" (XR MCR 2021a), such as XR Buddhists or XR Lawyers. This strategy is designed to reach out to particular community groups and people outside the XR environment, as this movement group believes that a broad mass is needed and must be mobilised to bring about transformation (XR MCR 2021a). XR MCR is divided into different working groups as it is constantly expanding. Similar to XR London, there exists groups responsible for actions, outreach and training, creative arts, regenerative culture and wellbeing, political strategy and media (XR MCR 2021b).

5.2.3   6 Key Motivational Frames

Forced to act-frame

XR UK's *forced to act-frame* functions as justification and mobilising tool referring to moral duty as lives as well as the ecosystem must be saved. As already outlined in the problem definition, world leaders and politics are blamed for the lack of action to confront the current emergency. XR London emphasises the propriety and urgency of their actions by saying that all parties in charge of securing lives and sustainability have failed so far which is why they are forced to rebel (XR London 2021b, 2021e). In this context, XR London refers to previous peaceful and legal activism, such as protest marches, voting or consumer and shareholder activism, which have not succeeded in invoking transformation so far. Apart from the political lack in action, the current ecological and climate state additionally forces to bring about rapid transformation, especially in economic matters as decarbonising it as quickly as possible. This is why a rebellion has to take place and alternative ways of activism have to be used to achieve it, according to XR London (XR London 2021b).

All information concerning the ecological and social state draws on science: "The science is clear: It is understood that we are facing an unprecedented global emergency. We are in a life-or-death situation of our own making. We must act now." (XR London 2021a) XR London states that scientific research had already warned the public for some time and nevertheless, no party saw the urge to act sufficiently. Hence, nonviolent civil disobedience represents the last change to disrupt the current system and to enforce decision makers to act too (XR London 2021e).

In comparison, the *forced to act-frame* of XR MCR is mainly based on the argument of lack of action by the UK government. The appropriateness of its actions is underlined by politicians and the world system putting everything on the edge of extinction. Consequences could already be observed and everything is at risk if it is continued in this way. At the moment, XR MCR sees a ray of hope or possibility to limit these effects and developments that endanger the future of all by protesting (XR MCR 2020; XR MCR 2021c). On the one hand, the movement group argues on the basis that all people are aware of these facts and, on the other hand, that the 'sad' truth and frustration about it forced the XR activists to act. According to XR MCR, it is necessary to point out these injustices and the lack of protection for citizens who are already suffering as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, structural racism and the consequences of the ecological changes.

It's simple: We Want to Live. And all the indigenous people. And all the world's children. And all the species. And all the biodiversity and creatures. And we have to ACT NOW because the science is getting worse. The science is screaming at us. (XR MCR 2021a)

To counteract the ongoing injustices and future collapses, XR rebels are forced to rebel in the name of the environment and all living beings. It can be observed here that also XR MCR reasoning is based on scientific sources, including data concerning biodiversity and mass extinction.

Historical and scientific evidence of success-frame

Another pillar of XR's argumentation, both XR London and XR MCR, is expressed by the *historical and scientific evidence of success-frame*, indicating the effectiveness of their strategy. On the one side, the historic fact side of this frame is based on XR's third call for Citizens' Assemblies which follows a long tradition within the UK democracy, as for instance in the context of a cooperation between the Citizens' Assembly on Social Care and the UK government in the past (XR London 2021a; XR MCR 2021b). On the other side, it is drawn upon the success of former historic movements such as the Civil Rights or Indian's Independence Movement (XR global 2021c). The scientific point of reference is indicated by a study by Chenoweth and Stephan (2011) which points out the success of nonviolent campaigns compared to violent ones during conflicts between state and non-state actors. XR London is also aimed at combining structural and prophetic demands as a hybrid of these two is supposed to be the most effective (XR London 2021b).

Activism as a privilege-frame

XR London regards civil disobedience activism as necessary because it represents a privilege, which is why their *activism as a privilege-frame* serves as an argumentation basis for the appropriateness of their actions. Fundamental to this argument is that 'white people' are much more likely to be treated better or get away without harm in a confrontation with the police compared to 'people with colour'. The XR group claims that on a global scale, 'people with colour' have had many conflicts in the past to defend their property and the environment in the past. In the process, many 'people of colour' environmental activists around the world have already lost their lives. In addition, according to XR London, the ecological consequences and a possible collapse have unequal impacts and affect 'people and communities of colour' more. In order to sensitise XR activists to this issue, they are informed at the beginning about the problems that can arise in connection with civil disobedience actions (XR London 2021b).

Structural racism and injustice in legal and policing system are acknowledged by XR London activists but at the same time amplifies the need to rebel and thus make usage of this privilege: "It is time to for white people to take this risk too so that PoCs [people of colour], who are threatened by structural racism, don't have to." (XR London 2021b)

Inclusion-frame

In the XR MCR context, a strong *inclusion-frame* can be observed. Hereby, reference is made to marginalised communities that had not sufficiently been taken into account in various processes. For instance, the group revealed its awareness of the effects[28] its strategies had on these communities. To counteract this, they are seeking to put in the centre solidarity and cooperation as movement values. In doing so, they want to improve and appropriately design their approach to issues such as oppression, racism and other kinds of inequalities. The aim is to include all people, which goes hand in hand with cooperation with frontline communities, especially from the 'GS', in terms of sharing experiences and knowledge (XR MCR 2020, 2021c). Furthermore, XR MCR explicitly invites people to participate in direct or civil disobedience actions who would normally be less able to do so; for instance, parents with newborns, minors, but with a reference to parents' permission to participate, or people with disabilities (XR MCR 2020). Each of these social groups is explicitly addressed and taken into consideration within XR MCR's Handbook for Life (2020), as for example:

> Rebelling with disability: We want our actions to be accessible for everyone. However some actions, such as climbing Big Ben, may exclude some rebels and where an action excludes some people additional inclusive actions will be considered to involve everyone. (XR MCR 2020: 24)

The *inclusion-frame* thus combines the propriety and efficacy notions in its motivational vocabulary as well as different facets of inclusion, being on a socio-structural or social group basis.

Each contribution counts-frame and individuality-frame

Concerning the efficacy vocabulary, it becomes clear that XR London promotes activism of the individual which then in turn contributes to the strength of the whole movement. The *each contribution counts-frame* is attributed to the fact that the group repeatedly points out different ways through which every person can participate and support XR through their skills and personal interests; be it in different focus groups like regional working groups or interest

---

[28] However, these 'effects' were not specified in the XR London and XR MCR data.

groups. The former are London-wide groups that focus on a certain XR area such as Art and Culture, Affinity Group Support, Arrestee Support, Disabilities inclusion and accessibility, Integration, Media, Outreach, Finance (see XR London 2021c). The Arrest Welfare Team, for instance,

> aims to help the XR community support its rebels before, during and after arrest. [...] We believe that as a community that believes in a sustainable and regenerative culture, that we have a personal, and collective responsibility to support our rebels throughout the arrest process. (XR London 2021d)

The interest groups, as the name already implies, is based on activists' specific interests, which can be pursued in this context, some of which work UK-wide and some only at local level. Within this framework, XR London offers groups such as Scientists for XR, XR Disabled Rebels, XR Jews, XR Grandparents, XR Youth and XR Rainbow Rebellion (see XR London 2021c). This broad differentiation in opportunities for activist participation addresses the individual diversity of potential participants and personal development opportunities that draws on the *individuality-frame*. XR MCR also embraces the aspect of individual participation opportunities and the importance of each contribution, whereby the mass can be strengthened. "Our strength is in our community. Rebelling together is more fun and more effective." (XR MCR 2020: 4) Therefore, anything can be achieved as a community and if people work together and against the background of individuality power is seized, according to XR MCR. The group welcomes all people regardless of age, religion, race or political party. "The climate emergency is everyone's problem. We welcome your support, no matter who you vote for, or whether you vote at all. […] We are all in this together." (XR MCR 2021b) Consequently, people's background is not of importance, but only their will and commitment. This is why the XR movement has to reach out of its bubble and include all kinds of people, XR MCR notes. The *each contribution counts-frame* emphasises that no matter what skills a person has mastered, every kind of contribution is helpful for the XR movement, which emphasises the importance of new participants encouraged to participate (XR MCR 2020).

5.3 Summary Comparison

The qualitative content analysis of the diagnostic framing showed that XR Austria's problem identification can be assigned to the ongoing ecological crisis, future ecological and social consequences. Global warming shows its consequences already which is connected to diverse observable effects of the ecological crisis, including the extreme loss of biodiversity and

different natural disasters such as droughts and forest fires. By referring to the lack of people's basic needs, particularly in regard to more vulnerable and marginalised communities in the world, the Austrian XR movement draws attention to the social aspects of ecological imbalance. As a central cause, the movement holds humanity itself responsible for the fact that the current global political, economic and social system, which ultimately led to the crises, was created, for example, through the profit interests of larger corporations. Hereby, the focus is laid on governments who have not followed up their responsibility to the citizens. However, in the context of XR Austria's problem identification, no specific persons, politicians or companies are blamed, but only actions or the lack of them. The local XR Tyrol group on the other hand, reduces its focus to the regional nature threat which is characterised by the risks for the alpine region and its ecosystem.

In comparison, XR UK's groups explicitly identify the current problem from an intersectional perspective within their diagnostic framing. The environmental crisis goes hand in hand with a social crisis, which is also strongly influenced by inequalities and racist structures, according to XR Manchester and XR London. As in the case of the Austrian XR context, the British XR cases note that all species of the world, including humans, would be affected by these consequences; especially marginalised, vulnerable people, mostly located in the 'GS'. As part of their diagnostic framing, the two English XR groups, similar to XR Austria, regard the current system as main culpable. Besides global political actors, the blame is attributed in particular to the British government, as it has failed in its responsibility to protect citizens. It also contributes to ongoing ecosystem degradation through its support of fossil fuel producers and greenwashing. In this context, XR MCR highlights unequal social power structures that contribute to these dynamics being dominated by certain interest groups.

With regard to XR Austria's prognostic framing, possible solutions and clear goals to counteract ecological and social collapse were identified. The data shows that XR actively opposes concrete proposals for solutions, as these are already existing in the scientific field, which is why the movement considers additional proposals to be unnecessary. The goals of XR Austria are, among other things, the limitation of CO_2 emissions, sustainability on an economic basis and social transformation illustrate; these resolutions underline the essential role of science in this context. In addition, the key demands - "Tell the truth!", "Act now!" and "Living democracy!" (translated, XR Austria 2021a) – are central goals and, thus, solutions as they represent possibilities to halt the ongoing extinction and to counteract an ecological and social collapse. In general, XR Austria addresses its demands to the Austrian government. Likewise,

politics is primarily named as the bearer of responsibility, as it is said to have the necessary means and power to bring about change at a national level.

In the British context, too, a variety of goals and solutions are proposed within the framework of the prognostic frame analysis. Both local XR groups are committed to the implementation of the three central demands of the XR movement, which overlap with those of XR Austria's, except for one point that advocates "Beyond politics!" (XR London 2021a; XR MCR 2020). Although the content of the requirements is identical, different formulations have been chosen regarding the third demand. However, goal is to shift power from certain ruling actors to citizens themselves through Citizens' Assemblies. On the one hand, as with XR Austria, the solutions are to be drawn from science and, on the other hand, XR London and MCR see above all the Citizens' Assemblies as an instrument for finding solutions. Ultimately, however, it is up to politics and especially the UK government to implement the proposals and initiate transformation in the current social and ecological system. In one aspect, the solutions proposed by the two English groups differ from XR Austria's in that cooperation with vulnerable communities from the 'GS' is proposed as an approach to further possible solutions.

Summarising XR's central strategies as part of its prognostic framing it could be drawn from the qualitative content analysis that many tactics of the analysed XR cases overlap, especially the aspects connected to the general XR action consensus. This includes the strategy to use nonviolent, creative civil disobedience and mobilising 3,5% of the population, which according to scientific research can bring about system change. Exclusively in the case of XR Tyrol, it is pointed out that the group does not support blockades of local traffic, which is in contrast carried out intensively with XR Austria and both English XR groups. This also concerns the creative and artful form of protesting in order to convey messages and the purpose of XR protests. For this purpose, civil disobedience is carried out in public places, mostly in big cities to draw maximum attention and build pressure as their governments are situated there, for which people from other regions come to join. In XR Austria's case, it is Vienna that serves for the display of protests as capital. The same applies to the British study cases, which focus on civil disobedience actions in big cities, particularly London as capital, for which people from surrounding areas and further regions come to join protest actions. In both countries, the XR groups protest directly at fossil energy producers to bring them into focus as the biggest carbon emitters. In general, strong similarities were found in the internal structure of all XR cases, as they are autonomous and decentralised. Both UK cases offer working groups focused on specific activities or tasks.

Certain differences can be recognised concerning the strategies: firstly, the British XR cases expressed the tactic to take actions simultaneously nationwide in order to draw more attention to their concerns. This is accompanied with protests directly at certain institutions and corporations perceived as powerful, such as at the Bank of England and the Treasury as essential financial bodies of the country while this is more of an exception for XR Austria. The British XR movement is said to actively work in favour of gaining photo opportunities through their protests, which in course are mirrored in the media. Media functions also as instrument through personal connections to journalists which in turn write about the movement. In regard to its actions, XR London specifically lists to involve the police in their actions to show respect, unless a moment of surprise is planned, what could not be read from the data of the other XR groups. Furthermore, the legal tactics show different priorities, a XR Austria focuses on signing petitions and seeking dialogues with politicians. None were observed with XR London, which is in contrast with XR MCR digital or spamming rebellions as part of their legal strategy repertoire. This direct way of communication also becomes visible in their mobilisation tactics, which consist of reaching out to people through letters and formulating their demands, concerns and strategies. The active goal of XR MCR is to function as a platform for other local movements or groups that identify with XR's goals to cooperate or to exchange knowledge or concerns.

Although the data on the internal structure largely overlap, differences were also found: XR London includes interest groups and invites potential activists to join in such groups, for instance, XR Disabled Rebels or XR Grandparents. In comparison, XR MCR data showed the existence of identity communities, including XR Buddhists or XR Lawyers; the scope and number of these groups is limited compared to XR London. XR Austria does not provide interest groups which makes this structural aspect a central point of difference, however, the Austrian branch offers reference groups that aim at creating a personal dimension and point of reference for its activists.

Additional tactics could be observed with XR Austria and its subgroups: Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, regular rebellion weeks were held that included cross-regional activists who travelled to Vienna for the events. Other tactics are to show respect and refraining from alcohol or drug use during XR actions, adaptation to COVID-19 measures to some degree. Apart from this, the XR regenerative culture forms an important reference point, which is expressed in solidarity with other movements through its reference groups, adaptation to COVID-19 measures, providing food and musical support during protest days or rebellion

weeks. Since XR Austria served as the main source of reference, it is assumed that these strategies apply to the data stock of XR Vienna and Tyrol.

The motivational framing of the studied XR groups from the UK and Austria proves to overlap in certain elements and to differ in others. Based on the data of the XR groups from both countries, motivational vocabulary was determined especially with regard to appropriateness in combination with urgency and effectiveness. The central motivational frames of the XR groups, which serve as an instrument to mobilise potential activists and to maintain the already existing XR participants by creating consent, are now briefly elaborated:

With the XR Austria five central motivational frames were identified: *forced to act-frame*, *historical and scientific* evidence of success-frame, *beneficial legal framework-frame, each contribution counts-frame* and *individuality-frame*. Due to the small data base of the two Austrian XR groups from Vienna and Tyrol, only categories for the general XR Austria movement could be formed within this framing process. The *forced to act-frame* is mainly used to indicate the urgency and appropriateness of XR Austria's rebellion. Essential to this element is the lack of action by politicians, the threat by the current system and the ongoing as well as future ecological and social consequences. Data for the latter reasoning is drawn from scientific research, which also applies to XR Austria's *historical and scientific evidence of success-frame*. The other frames mainly contribute to the argument of effectiveness of the movement and its strategies. Hereby, an individual, collective and nationwide dimension for this efficacy is established. In particular, the *beneficial legal framework-frame* stands out in the Austrian XR context as it could not be identified in the British one. This framing element aims to emphasise the advantages of the Austrian legal framework compared to other countries as nonviolent civil disobedience is legal. Accordingly, it is not particularly restrictive measures or serious legal leniency, as relatively low fines and no police cautions are usually imposed.

The content analysis showed that both XR London and XR MCR groups share four of the motivational frames with XR Austria, which are the *forced to act-frame*, *historical and scientific evidence of success-frame, each contribution counts-frame* and *individuality-frame*. This indicates a strong expression of these topics within the general XR context. Since all of the analysed XR cases make use of these four frames, they are relatively similar in terms of content and, thus, also in their argumentation basis. It is notable that the *individuality-frame* of XR London is expanded by the interest groups offered, which are more strongly towards the individuality of the potential activists. This allows people to be mobilised on the basis of

possible affiliations, which are reflected in interest groups that can be associated with social groups.

Two additional motivation frames were determined in the British XR context which are the *activism as a privilege-frame and inclusion-frame*. The former could only be observed with XR London. Hereby, the term 'privilege' is mainly associated with not being affected by structural racism which also functions as justification for the appropriateness of XR's protest actions. Thu, 'white people' are supposed to have advantages over 'people with colour' in regard to protest restrictions, especially concerning civil disobedience actions, to be treated better in police confrontations and to suffer less ecological and social consequences from the crisis. The *inclusion-frame* was found in the context of XR MCR. By means of it, the English group aims at strengthening XR's solidarity and cooperation values. The aim is to include marginalised and frontline communities from the 'GS' more in the process of finding solutions for the ongoing crisis as well as to make the XR community itself more diverse and inclusive. Concerning the second aspect, various social groups, such as 'disabled' or parents with newborns, are explicitly addressed to join XR.

6   (Counter-)Hegemonic Elements within the XR Movement

The next chapter serves to discuss in which aspects the selected British and Austrian XR cases showed Gramsci's (counter-)hegemonic elements in course of the qualitative content analysis. For the analysis, the conducted data was deductively categorised in regard to Gramsci's central hegemonic elements according to Benjamin Opratko (2014) and counter-hegemonic elements according to Sekler/Brand (2011) presented in Chapter 2.

The state, civil and political society

The listed elements represent central actors in Gramsci's concept of hegemony as it refers to a national dimension in comparison to neo-Gramscian thoughts. The analysis showed that they can be applied to the XR context: In all XR groups analysed, governments or politics are regarded as essential actors which impose the means to maintain structures, but also to transform them. For this reason, Gramsci's state can be interpreted as a political force from an XR positioning. This would mean that the state is to be equated with the political society or state which is controlling civil society (Opratko 2014: 39). The conducted data indicates that XR believes governments hold power that needs to be redirected to more meaningful,

sustainable and social issues. XR MCR highlights in this regard that "[t]he state and those in power will always have greater means to employ violence" (XR MCR 2020: 15). It can be drawn from this is that, from XR's point of view, governments hold the power position which is imposed on society. Both the government and society itself contribute to the existing hegemonic structures and thus form their dimensions of power by being the dominant and dominated parties (Opratko 2014). Gramsci's situational meaning of the so-called integral state, consisting of political and civil society together, can be assigned to XR's vision of decision-making processes. In this sense, the state would remain divided into different social groups but there would not exist a clear hierarchical structure in which the state equals the political sphere.

Consent

In the context of the XR movement, the role of consent was identified on different levels. Gramsci's two main parties, the dominant and the dominated people, that maintain consent (Opratko 2014), are highly represented in the data conducted. On the one hand, the dominant part of society can be assigned to political and economic actors who act in their own favours instead of taking into account citizens and possible consequences for them and the environment or ecosystem. In XR Austria's context, mainly politicians and environmental harming corporations, such as fossil energy producers, are society's rulers who are associated with hegemons. These in turn are embedded in the overall global system which is dominating actions and causing harm in all concerned areas. Similarities apply to the XR UK groups, where the global toxic system and governments, especially the UK government, are seen as actors ruling society. Both XR London and XR MCR hold the same view in this regard. XR MCR additionally points to the country's financiers who are supported by the government's investments, which decide where the money is invested and accordingly leads to the support of money-creating fossil fuel production. The dominated or ruled entities of society represent all people or citizens, including XR activists, who suffer from the rulers' decisions and therefore will face the future social and ecological collapse's consequences. As the two opposing fronts were identified, it appears that consent between them does not exist concerning XR's problem identification, since it stresses them to rebel against the named actors. The points of contention are in particular the treatment of the environment, decision-making processes in this regard, profit orientation of the dominant actors instead of socially sustainable and environmentally friendly actions, existing socially unequal conditions, and unjust effects on global society in terms of an ecological and social collapse. In case of the British local groups the dissatisfaction

with unequal social conditions stands out, expressed in structural racism and the unequal global distribution of the consequences of the collapses.

Compromise

The elaboration on the role of consent within the XR discourse indicates that consent is to be found once the demands of the XR movement are addressed and met by the government, which can be equated with establishing new compromises. As mentioned in Chapter 2.3.1, compromises have a central role in that only through them consent can be obtained. They require the integration of certain ideas of the dominated groups into those of the hegemons. Only in this way universalisation of values and ideologies of the hegemonic power can be constantly reproduced and thus guaranteed (Opratko 2014). In case of the XR movement, their demands and basic values correspond to values and ideas that are asked to be integrated, which are clearly expressed in the framing, particularly the diagnostic and prognostic framing, of both the Austrian and UK movement branches. The demands must be met to satisfy XR and until then the rebellion will continue, the XR groups state. Hence, the hegemons are indirectly forced to sacrifice certain intentions or ideas in order to offer incentives to the ruled people. For this reason, compromises between the dominant and dominated groups have to be renewed so their universalisation and reproduction can be continued (Opratko 2014: 43).

Common sense

Antonio Gramsci's element of common sense is assigned to everyday practices as well as thought patterns of the subalterns. It mainly influences their self-perception and the world. As common sense is equally needed for dominant groups to maintain their power, it must be pervaded with hegemons' eligible ideas or ideologies as they can be universalised by this element (Opratko 2014). The content analysis suggests that in all selected XR cases, the movement cannot be assigned to common sense of the broad civil society, at least concerning sustainability and certain social issues. It makes part of the movement to convince the broad civil society of their opinion, values and demands through which they are to be mobilised. In Gramsci's opinion, common sense also represents the starting point for possible questioning or struggling of the subalterns, which is why only through this process, counter-positions might evolve within the broad civil society (Opratko 2014). This is similar to the XR movement in that it questions conditions and fundamental ideas of the everyday mind of broad civil society, such as action on the environment, the ecosystem, social conditions, structural racism, and

existing decision-makers. By this, certain aspects of common sense are questioned which enabled the establishment of the XR movement.

Counter-hegemonic elements

Following Ulrich Brand's description of counter-hegemony saying it is a process that aims at the "dissolution of current power relations and structures and the creation of alternative forms of socialisation" (translated, Brand 2011: 160), the qualitative data implemented that XR's approaches can be regarded as such to a certain degree. The subalterns of society are able to organise themselves, according to Gramsci, which enables them to form a rebellion or counter force. XR activists take the social position of subalterns in this case as it is a movement emanating from civil society. XR is not in agreement with the dominant groups as it is directed against the implementation of the interests of these actors. XR MCR especially illustrates its action against the dominance of profit-oriented thinking of the UK government, financial institutions and extractive corporations. These interests dominate the current system and prevent changes towards an alternative form that acts in the interest of people and the environment. According to XR, these power relations should be replaced by socially oriented and participatory decision making in politics. Above all however the 'toxic' system worsens the circumstances. Thus, it can be considered as a power entity against which the movement is united. With regard to Brand's (2011) description of counter-hegemony, it becomes clear that XR does justice to it in some aspects, since certain power structures are to be dissolved and alternative forms of social interaction and interaction with nature on a global dimension are envisaged. The movement evolved from civil society, which makes part of existing hegemonic structures, by questioning social defaults and structures. This means that previous social conditions and structures no longer functioned successfully, giving rise to doubts towards them. This can be compared to questioning common sense, which is seen as the source of counter-positions or possible rebellion from civil society (Sekler/Brand 2011; Opratko 2014). Especially political decision-making, the lack of action and economic dynamics are criticised by the XR movement. Since consent as well as hegemonic structures are processes that have to be constantly (re)produced (Opratko 2014), it follows that they have not been successfully reproduced regarding these issues. This lack of consent enabled criticism and rebellion by XR, asking for enhancing current structures. Because of this, XR demands for Citizens' Assemblies to give access to non-political parties to get involved in decision-making processes in particular regarding environmental politics. Additionally, XR UK strongly addresses the involvement and consideration of vulnerable social communities of the 'GS' particularly with regard to

environmental policy and the restrictions on resistance. This could be associated with taking into account progressive activities. In other words, it aims to broaden the action framework of marginalised, vulnerable and emancipatory communities. According to Brand (2011), this is an essential aspect of counter-hegemonic or resistant forces. Through this, norms within existing social structures can be changed, which contribute to common sense, thinking patterns and perspectives on issues.

Nevertheless, XR's concerns have not spread yet within broad civil society whereas it does not represent a counter-movement which overthrows the existing system or power structures (Sekler/Brand 2011). XR does also not aim to change and reorganise the entire system, but merely to make certain structures of the system as well as supporting actors such as governments and extracting companies more aware of certain issues, thus enabling changes towards a more social and sustainable system.

7   Discussion of the results

This work aimed to extend previous research on the international XR movement in terms of its frames, strategies and possible (counter-)hegemonic elements. With the help of an initially deductive and then inductive qualitative content analysis, it was possible to identify central frames and strategies, as well as some (counter-)hegemonic elements, which will now be briefly discussed.

As there was less data available for the Austrian case analysis in the first place, especially compared to the British XR data, the major part of the findings concerning the Austrian XR cases refer to XR Austria in general. The qualitative data additionally showed that both XR Vienna and XR Tyrol, with few exceptions of XR Tyrol, share the positioning with XR Austria. On the one hand, XR Tyrol sets a more regional focus as an Alpine region within its diagnostic framing and on the other hand, the group is generally in favour of civil disobedience as protest strategy, however, traffic blockades are not welcomed and should be carried out on behalf of XR Austria. In regard to XR Vienna, no specific findings were identified. The British XR cases in contrast showed individual approaches, particularly in the context of their diagnostic and motivational framing, assumingly because more data was available.

7.1 Central Frames

Overall, many similarities were observed between XR Austria and the British cases which was foreseeable to a certain degree, since they are part of the same international movement. The content analysis revealed that climate justice can be referred to as the overall master frame of all selected case studies, which particularly became evident regarding their problem identification and resolutions in context of their diagnostic and prognostic framing.

The diagnostic framing of all analysed groups can be assigned to the climate justice frame, highlighting the vulnerable position of communities from the 'GS' in regard to ecological consequences and unjust pollution burden. The current capitalist and interest-based system builds the source of blame which mirrors a climate justice-oriented approach. Aspects, such as the position of politics and people affected by the environmental crisis, are more differentiated in case of XR London and XR Manchester. A decisive difference can be hereby seen in their strong intersectional approach regarding their problem and 'victim' identification, looking at inequities in terms of racism, exclusion and power structures. This aspect could even be attributed to the environmental justice frame, as social injustice, race, power and related stronger environmental risks are essential elements of its problem identification.

Furthermore, the information base of XR in the diagnostic framing is mainly drawn from scientific research, including reports from IPBES or the CCC. The reports concerned point to rising climate levels as well as the ongoing and future extinction of thousands of species, thus, the global loss of biodiversity. Both XR Austria and the British XR cases identify the overall 'toxic' system as the main culpable agent. Furthermore, they blame politics and especially their national governments for the extent of the current crisis. However, more facets of their culpability and actions are highlighted within the XR London and XR MCR discourse.

The climate justice notion clearly comes through in XR's prognostic framing, including resolutions and responsible actors. This particularly concerns changes in politics towards participatory and transparent decision-making processes. Further, social transformation is demanded by taking into account and cooperating with frontline, vulnerable and marginalised communities. XR Austria emphasises the role of sustainable energy generation, applying to green economy as a solution to current ecological issues, which is associated with the climate change approach. Governments play an essential role as they are blamed for the current crisis but at the same time regarded as solution and source for changes. Nevertheless, the XR groups

demand a transformation of the system. This shows that XR is not completely against politics and thus not entirely against the current system. Since the climate change approach advocates solutions within the system and climate justice advocates argue for a complete system change, XR's positioning could be placed in between.

This brief excerpt shows that XR's diagnostic and prognostic frames are in accordance. As Benford and Snow (2000: 616f.) have argued, these two framing processes can match for some movements. For the selected XR groups, problem identification was strongly associated with the lack of political action leading to the current crises, and at the same time, their proposed solutions are also attributed to the political sphere. Similarly, all XR groups refer to scientific data for problem identification, which is also the case for their proposed solutions.

In terms of motivational vocabulary, notions of effectiveness and appropriateness in combination with urgency came to the fore. In course of the qualitative content analysis, seven central motivational frames were identified, of which the first four occurred in both the Austrian and the British XR context:

(1) The *forced to act-frame* encapsulates XR's need to protest and take more radical action. It expresses the movement's sense of being compelled to act because of politicians' lack of action, the threat posed by the current system as well as the ongoing and future environmental and social consequences.

(2) The *historical and scientific evidence of success-frame* relates, on the one hand, to the role model function of nonviolent movements of the past, such as the Indian Independence Movement or the protests around Hainburger Au, and the long tradition of Citizens' Assemblies in the British context. On the other hand, the chances of success of nonviolent civil disobedience as a strategy are pointed out by the scientific references.

(3) The *each contribution counts-frame* emphasises the importance, necessity and effectiveness of any kind of participation or contribution in the XR movement. For this purpose, a variety of possible functions are presented on the XR websites and potential activists are addressed directly.

(4) The *individuality-frame* highlights the value of individuality and previous experience, knowledge and ideas of each person who joins the movement. Through this positive connotation, individual qualities gain in importance for XR. In the context of XR London, the frame is particularly expressed through its provision of interest groups, such as XR Grandparents, XR Jews or XR Disabled Rebels, by which individuals can be mobilised according to personal interests or characteristics.

(5) The *beneficial legal framework-frame* emphasises the advantages of the Austrian legal framework compared to other countries. Nonviolent civil disobedience is said to be legal and participation in such actions is not accompanied with restrictive measures or serious legal leniency, since relatively low fines or criminal record are imposed.

(6) The *activism as a privilege-frame* of XR London highlights the privilege of 'white people' compared to 'people of colour'. This concerns being less affected by structural racism, protest restrictions in regard to civil disobedience, being better treated in police confrontations and bearing fewer ecological and social consequences of the current and future crisis.

(7) The *inclusion–frame* of XR Manchester aims to strengthen the movement's values of cooperation and solidarity. This particularly concerns the inclusion of marginalised and frontline communities from the 'GS' in solution-finding processes. It also communicates the goal of expanding the XR community to become more diverse.

In course of the qualitative content analysis, two frame bridging processes were identified within XR, which confirms Snow et al.'s (1986) observation that frame bridging is the most common frame alignment process among social movements. The XR movement and its subgroups can be classified under the master frame of climate justice, which della Porta and Parks (2013) already claimed is characterised by various thematic overlaps as issues from different movements are combined.

(1) The regenerative culture approach of the Austrian and British cases combines countermeasures against ecological and social issues with individual behaviour. Through a considerate way of togetherness and mindful behaviour towards each other, a necessary transformation can be initiated with regard to the problems perceived by XR. This corresponds to frame bridging at the individual level (Snow et al. 1986), as it occupies behaviour and change in attitude intended to create consent between XR and potential activists.

(2) Among the British XR groups, a second frame bridging process has been determined as they link perceived ecological and social issues with issues of racism and discrimination. This places environmental activism in an additional framework corresponding to the organisational level (Snow et al. 1986). This process has been observed particularly in the diagnostic and motivational framing, especially within the *activism as a privilege-frame* and *inclusion-frame*.

86

7.2   Central Strategies

With regard to the strategies of the Austrian and British XR groups, the following results were obtained as part of the prognostic framing analysis, which includes tactics and strategies for implementing the XR solutions to the perceived ecological and social problems:

(1) The strategies mainly include nonviolent civil disobedience actions with an artful, creative approach. They are carried out in public in order to draw maximum attention. There is a tendency to carry out joint actions in the capitals, being Vienna and London, as governments and essential institutions are located there; the British XR groups also carry out simultaneous nationwide actions. In certain cases, actions are also carried out directly at fossil energy producers.

(2) Certain legal protest strategies were explicitly mentioned by XR Austria and XR MCR. In the case of the former, these include participation in petitions and direct dialogue with politicians, but above all, actions of nonviolent civil disobedience are considered legal in Austria. The legal tactic repertoire of XR MCR comprises direct dialogue through letters with potential activists and Digital or Spamming Rebellion actions.

(3) Through these legal and illegal actions, XR groups aim to mobilise 3,5% of the population, thereby initiating system change. This information is drawn from a scientific study on civil resistance by Chenoweth and Stephan (2011).

(4) Another tactic represents the internal structure which is autonomous and decentralised. It is intended to facilitate decision-making processes, allowing local XR groups to be independent of each other and easily establish new XR groups worldwide.

(5) Police forces also hold a special role within XR, as they are involved in case of XR London, unless the planned actions aim to create an element of surprise. Apart from this, respectful and mindful interaction with the police is maintained by all groups.

7.3   (Counter-)Hegemonic Elements

The findings of the qualitative content analysis showed that certain (counter-)hegemonic elements were highly representative and others hardly or not at all. In general, the results in this regard were unsuccessful in showing significant differences between the XR UK and XR Austria cases. One possible explanation is that the data on XR is limited in content and the theoretical categories are more applicable to the XR movement as a whole. In the XR context,

the following hegemonic and counter-hegemonic components were identified: consent, compromise, common sense, the actors civil and political society have strong correspondences. In contrast, few indications of Gramsci's (1971) traditional intellectuals, integral state, and neo-Gramscian perspectives, society as well as counter-hegemonic elements were found, and none at all in relation to organic intellectuals, universalisation and ideology.

(1) Civil and political society as actors are representative in that a majority of XR's demands are addressed to governments, be it Austrian or British; this also characterises the national dimension of XR's concerns, which applies to Gramsci's concept of hegemony. By addressing politics with its demands, XR ascribes power to the political sphere, as it is presented as the main actor responsible for initiating change. In doing so, governments represent the state and are portrayed as political force which controls civil society, e.g., through decision-making. As a consequence, the XR movement and its activists take on the role of civil society. Only if politicians complied with XR's demand by establishing Citizens' Assemblies could the state be understood as consisting of civil society and political power in relation to decision-making processes. Therefore, from an XR perspective, governments take on the role of Gramsci's hegemons. This applies equally to large corporations and environmentally harmful institutions. Here, the correlation between the hegemons and the culpable actors for the current ecological and social state identified in the diagnostic framing is evident.

(2) Consent was highlighted primarily through the distinction between dominant and dominated people. Dominant people are associated with the overall global 'toxic' system and the political sphere, which represent the hegemons. The dominated side is represented by all citizens, including XR activists. Since the XR movement focuses on social and ecological issues, consent is not established concerning these issues, which is equivalent to a lack of consent on a moral, ethical and, to some extent, cultural level (Opratko 2014). However, the extent to which XR activists are in line with the dominant parties on other issues cannot be determined.

(3) The findings on consent illustrate the role of Gramsci's compromise. The dominant entities could accommodate the concerns and demands of citizens', in this case the XR activists. XR does not call for a complete system transformation, but only for participatory democracy, a moral change of behaviour in terms of a regenerative culture and a sustainability-oriented attitude of the current system. Hence, the movement does not actively oppose the capitalist or neoliberal system, but only seeks to overturn certain

aspects of it, not the entire distribution of power. By integrating social or ideological ideas of Gramsci's subalterns, represented by expectations and demands of the XR movement, compromise could be established and thus consent restored, which in turn would enable the dominant forces to maintain hegemonic structures.

(4) Common sense was identified in that XR's concerns challenge certain aspects of common sense, namely aspects of everyday life, social structures, and the current system, which was elaborated in the diagnostic frame analysis. However, XR challenges common sense only in the areas of sustainability, the current socio-ecological state, its consequences and the future challenges posed by the ongoing crisis and future collapses.

(5) Intellectuals are only found to a limited extent in the XR movement of both countries studied. Although both groups are fundamentally based on scientific reports and thus on scholars, they hold neither an independent role within the XR groups nor the function of intellectuals according to Gramsci within society. Only in XR London traditional intellectuals can be observed to a certain degree, since the interest group 'Scientists for XR' exists there, which corresponds to the autonomous character of scientists of the traditional intellectuals. However, there is no concrete or more detailed information about their function within the British XR group.

(6) Several counter-hegemonic elements have been identified within the XR groups: XR activists can be classified as members of civil society, reflecting the values of the dominant forces, which in turn are part of the current system. All XR cases speak out against the imposition of political and financial interests that do not act in harmony with the ecosystem and the people. Accordingly, the movement can be regarded as counterforce with regard to ecological and social issues. The demand for alternative structures, which in Brand's (2011) sense speaks for counter-hegemonic processes, has been strongly identified within XR, since the movement advocates for an ecologically oriented system and against social injustices; the latter also includes expanding the scope of action of vulnerable groups in society, which should be more involved and taken into account. The movement supports the restructuring of existing social and power structures, but only in relation to ecological and certain social aspects. This reveals the contradictory character of civil society according to Sekler and Brand (2011), as it is considered the main source of resistance within society, but at the same time it cannot capture all facets of common sense and thus all issues, which shows the limitations of the XR movement as a counter-hegemonic movement.

(7) Neo-Gramscian perspectives have been determined regarding two aspects: On the one side, the issues outlined by the XR cases largely relate to power dynamics and ecological as well as social issues at the global level, such as the relationship between the 'GS' and 'GN', aspects of racism and the role of international political actors concerning social and ecological issues. On the other side, XR's frame of reference includes the role of neoliberal, capitalist interests, which are indirectly expressed through the framing of the movement. Apart from these aspects, other Neo-Gramscian elements remain absent in relation to the movement.

8   Conclusion

This thesis has analysed the frames, strategies and (counter-)hegemonic elements of the XR movement, focusing on the Austrian and British contexts. The framing analysis offers a possibility to approach the positioning of XR activists, which allows to identify the power structures perceived by XR following Antonio Gramsci's (1971) concept of hegemony. Against this background, expert interviews and a document analysis were conducted in order to then examine the data with regard to these aspects using Philipp Mayring's (2015) qualitative content analysis. The subsequent evaluation was carried out by means of initially deductive categories based on the literature presented (Chapter 2), followed by inductive categories reflecting highly present and recurring topics. Selected cases, namely XR Vienna and Tyrol for the Austrian context and XR London and XR Manchester for the British context, offered an insight into the positioning and strategies of the XR movement in these regions and extended the previous analysis on XR.

Based on the results of the framing analysis, climate justice could be determined as the master frame of the Austrian and British XR groups. In certain cases, however, overlaps with the climate change or environmental justice frame were observed, such as in the resolution proposals of the Austrian XR groups or the problem identification of the British ones. In general, many similarities were found along the core framing tasks (Snow/Benford 1988; Benford/Snow 2000). The diagnostic framing mainly refers to the degradation of the environment and its biodiversity as well as the resulting future ecological and social collapse. The British XR cases add an intersectional approach to their problem identification as they link social injustice and structural racism. Politics and regional governments are perceived as main culpable actors. On the one hand, the current situation is blamed on politics and, at the same

time, the responsibility to take action is attributed to politics. Through this, XR's diagnostic and prognostic framings are consistent with each other. The latter aims above all at the transformation of the current system, which, however, does not correspond to a complete system change, but only to a more ecological and socially acceptable one. The establishment of Citizens' Assemblies that enable more democratic and inclusive decision-making processes concerning ecological issues is considered as central solution approach. As part of the prognostic framing, nonviolent civil disobedience actions in combination with symbolic, creative performances were identified as the main strategy. In addition, four motivational frames are applied by all selected XR cases: the *forced to act-frame, historical and scientific evidence of success-frame, each contribution counts-frame* and *individuality-frame*. XR Austria additionally expressed the *beneficial legal framework-frame* with its lenient fines and legal exercise of civil disobedience protests, highlighting its legal advantages compared to other countries. Two additional motivational frames were determined with the British XR cases: XR London emphasises an *activism as a privilege-frame*, outlining a tendentially privileged position of 'white people' over 'people of colour'; this concerns the freedom to carry out (illegal) protests, confrontations with the police and being less affected by ecological consequences. Finally, XR Manchester provides an *inclusion–frame* by actively promoting cooperation and solidarity with people from the 'GS' and directly addressing different social groups as potential activists.

The analysis revealed two frame bridging processes in the context of the XR movement: On the one hand, the regenerative culture approach stresses frame alignment on an individual basis, linking the success of ecological activism to considerate, respectful interaction. On the other hand, in case of the British XR branch, a connection is established between environmental activism and issues of racism and discrimination.

Gramsci's (1971) hegemony can be applied to certain perspectives of the XR movement, such as its dominated position within perceived power relations dominated by the current system, especially politics and governments representing the hegemons. In particular, the elements consent on ecological and social issues, compromise by meeting XR's demands, questioning common sense, civil and political society as actors, and certain counter-hegemonic elements following Sekler/Brand (2011) are reflected in the XR groups. With regard to XR's international dimension and the role of the capitalistic system, a neo-Gramscian perspective is more suitable.

With the selected research method, the research interest was successfully pursued. As partially expected, the identified frames and strategies can be assigned for the most part to the previous

frames debate of environmental activism. For some, this was not the case, which is why the frames had to be expanded, especially with regard to motivational frames. It is evident that similarities between the Austrian and British XR branches dominate the findings, as they are both part of the same movement. Nevertheless, a closer look revealed a number of differences concerning the core framing tasks. Further, an attempt was made to analyse perceived power relations and the role of XR activists within the given social power structures on the basis of (counter-)hegemonic elements. Through this, more general findings could be obtained. For certain aspects of the XR cases, hegemonic and counter-hegemonic elements were clearly identified. However, for some aspects there was no consensus at all.

With this thesis, I aimed to shed light on the relatively new and scientifically unexplored international XR movement in terms of its positioning and strategies, equated with frames, as well as the applicability of Gramsci's concept of hegemony. In part, new frames were formed and later analysed in the context of the existing frame debate on climate activism. This allowed new insights to be gained. The international comparison of British and Austrian cases in this paper, especially as XR emerged in the south of England, expands the research field of XR. In particular, the combination of the framing analysis commonly used in movement research with Gramsci's hegemonic elements brings a new perspective to the academic debate. This work represents a contribution to previous XR analyses and can serve as a basis for further research on the XR movement, especially with regard to the relatively neglected Austrian XR context.

Through these findings, a clear and extended view on XR has emerged, despite several limitations due to the research method chosen, the selection of case studies and the impact of the researcher's position. Considering the selective data base of this thesis, it must be taken into account that the findings only apply to this specific context. Adjustments to the data base and/or the research focus could significantly deviate the results. Nevertheless, the results imply a relatively wide common approach of the XR branches within the European context.

Research on the XR movement, its positioning, strategies and placement in perceived power structures is an exciting field of research, especially since frames and interpretations are constantly changing in accordance with its activists and because there can be considerable differences within the various regional XR movements. The findings suggest frame bridging processes and motivational frames around the issues of racism, inclusion and privilege among the XR London and XR Manchester. More attention could be given to XR in this regard in the future. As part of the climate justice movement, the climate justice frame might develop similarities with the environmental justice frame, which represents an interesting question for

future studies. As the XR movement as a whole has only a manageable academic echo, there is considerable scope for various research foci, especially given the rapid growth of XR regional groups since its emergence. However, the extent to which the COVID-19 pandemic will continue to influence the possibilities for protest and thus the movement in the future cannot be predicted.

9 References

Anderl, Felix; Wallmeier, Philip (2019): „Institution" als Scharnierkonzept zwischen Herrschaft und Widerstand. Ein Vorschlag zur empirischen Analyse transnationaler neoliberaler Herrschaft. In: *FJSB* 32(2), 192-206.

Arendt, Hannah (1972): Crises of the Republic. London et al.: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Benford, Robert (2005): The Half-Life of the Environmental Justice Frame: Innovation, Diffusion and Stagnation. In: Pellow, David N./Brulle, Robert J. (Eds.): Power, justice, and the Environment. Cambridge: MIT Press, 37-53.

Benford, Robert D.; Snow, David A. (2000): Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. In: *Annual Review of Sociology* 26(1), 611-639.

Berglund, Oscar; Schmidt, Daniel (2020): Extinction Rebellion and Climate Change Activism. Breaking the Law to Change the World. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beyer, Heiko; Schnabel, Annette (2017): Theorien Sozialer Bewegungen. Eine Einführung. Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.

Blee, Kathleen M.; Taylor, Verta (2002): Semi-structured Interviewing in Social Movement Research. In: Klandermans, Bert/Staggenborg, Suzanne (Eds.): Methods of Social Movement Research. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 92-117.

Bogner, Alexander; Littig, Beate; Menz, Wolfgang (2014): Interviews mit Experten. Eine praxisorientierte Einführung. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Bohl, Clemens; Daniel, Antje (2020): Klimaproteste in Wien. Motive und Emotionen der Fridays for Future. In: *Kurswechsel* 1, 62−74.

Bowen, Glenn A. (2009): Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. In: *Qualitative Research Journal* 9(2), 27-40.

Brand, Ulrich (2005): Gegen-Hegemonie. Perspektiven globalisierungskritischer Strategien. Hamburg: VSA Verlag.

Brand, Ulrich (2011): Post-Neoliberalismus? Aktuelle Konflikte. Gegen-hegemoniale Strategien. Hamburg: VSA Verlag.

Brand, Ulrich; Wissen, Markus (2017): Imperiale Lebensweise. Zur Ausbeitung von Mensch und Natur im globalen Kapitalismus. München: oekom Verlag.

Brand, Ulrich; Krams, Mathias (2018): Zehn Jahre Degrowth als radikale politische Perspektive: Potenziale und Hürden. In: *FJSB* 31(4), 18-26.

Bryman, Alan (2012): Social Research Methods. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buechler, Steven M. (1995): New Social Movement Theories. In: *The Sociological Quarterly* 36(3), 441-464.

Čapek, Stella M. (1993): The "Environmental Justice" Frame: A Conceptual Discussion and an Application. In: *Social Problems* 40(1), 5-24.

Chenoweth, Erica; Stephan, Maria J. (2011): Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict. New York: Columbia University Press.

Cox, Robert W. (1983): Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method. In: *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 12(2), 162-175.

Cox, Laurence (2018): Why Social Movements Matter: an introduction. London/New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

della Porta, Donatella; Diani, Mario (2006): Social movements: an introduction. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

della Porta, Donatella; Parks, Louisa (2013): Framing-Prozesse in der Klimabewegung. Vom Klimawandel zur Klimagerechtigkeit. In: Dietz, Matthias/Garrelts, Heiko (Eds.): Die internationale Klimabewegung. Ein Handbuch. Wiesbaden: Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 39-56.

Dietz, Matthias; Garrelts, Heiko (Eds.) (2014): Routledge Handbook of the Climate Change Movement. Milton/New York: Routledge.

Dolezal, Martin; Hutter, Swen (2007): Konsensdemokratie unter Druck? Politischer Protest in Österreich, 1975-2005. In: *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 36(3), 337-352.

FfF Austria (2021): *Über uns*. https://fridaysforfuture.at/ueber-uns (accessed 28/04/2021).

Gamson, William A.; Fireman, Bruce; Rytina, Steven (1982): Encounters with Unjust Authority. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Goffman, Erving (1974): Frame analysis: an essay on the organization of experience. New York: Harper and Row.

Gottweis, Herbert (1992): Neue soziale Bewegungen in Österreich. In: Dachs, Herbert et al. (Eds.): Handbuch des Politischen Systems Österreichs. Wien: Manz, 309-324.

Gottweis, Herbert (2000): Politische Mobilisierung. BürgerInnenbewegungen und Ansätze zur Ausbildung neuer Organisationsformen von Politik in Österreich. In: Forum Politische Bildung (Ed.): Zum politischen System Österreich. Wien/Innsbruck/München: Studien Verlag, 60-67.

Graham-Leigh, Elaine (2014): The green movement in Britain. In: Dietz, Matthias/Garrelts, Heiko (Eds.): Routledge Handbook of the Climate Change Movement. Milton/New York: Routledge, 107-116.

Gramsci, Antonio (1971): Selections from the Prison Notebooks. (edited and translated by Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Gukelberger, Sandrine; Gerharz, Eva (2019): Qualitative Protest- und Bewegungsforschung. In: *FJSB* 32(1), 19-28.

Hallam, Roger (2019): Now we know: conventional campaigning won't prevent our extinction. In: The Guardian, 01/05/2019, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/may/01/extinction-rebellion-non-violent-civil-disobedience (accessed 28/04/2021).

Hayes, Graeme; Ollitrault, Sylvie (2019): Civil Disobedience. In: Sommier, Isabelle/Hayes, Graeme/Ollitrault, Sylvie (Eds.): Breaking Laws. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 123-246.

Heuwieser, Magdalena (2016): System Change, not Climate Change! Perspektiven der kritischen Zivilgesellschaft. In: *Kurswechsel* 3, 55-64.

Humphrey, Mathew (2006): Democratic Legitimacy, Public Justification and Environmental Direct Action. In: *Political Studies* 54(2), 310-327.

Jasper, James M. (2010): Cultural Approaches in the Sociology of Social Movements. In: Klandermans, Bert/Roggeband, Conny (Eds.): Handbook of Social Movements Across Disciplines. New York: Springer, 59-109.

Johnston, Hank (2002): Verification and Proof in Frame and Discourse Analysis. In: Klandermans, Bert/Staggenborg, Suzanne (Eds.): Methods of Social Movement Research. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 62-91.

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

Matthews, Kyle R. (2020): Social movements and the (mis)use of research: Extinction Rebellion and the 3.5% rule. In: *Interface* 12(1), 591-615.

Mayring, Philipp; Fenzl, Thomas (2014): Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. In: Baur, Nina/Blasius, Jörg (Eds.): Handbuch Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 543-556.

Mayring, Philipp (2015): Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken. Weinheim/Basel: Beltz.

Morton, Adam D. (2007): Unravelling Gramsci: Hegemony and Passive Revolution in the Global Political Economy. London: Pluto Press.

N.A. (2019): Tausende Schüler in Wien beim weltweit ausgerufenen Klimastreik. In: Der Standard, 25/05/2019, https://www.derstandard.at/story/2000103750251/klima-demo-hunderte-schueler-in-wien-unterwegs (accessed 28/04/2021).

N.A. (2020): Verkehrsblockade von Extinction Rebellion am Wiener Michaelerplatz. In: Der Standard, 28/09/2020, https://www.derstandard.at/story/2000120305036/verkehrsblockade-von-extinction-rebellion-am-wiener-michaelerplatz (accessed 28/04/2021).

N.A. (2020): Klimaaktivsten-Camp auf Wiener Michaelerplatz geräumt. In: Der Standard, 29/09/2020, https://www.derstandard.at/story/2000120328852/camp-von-klimaaktivisten-am-wiener-michaelerplatz-geraeumt (accessed 28/04/2021).

OMV (2021): *Über uns*. https://www.omv.at/de-at/aktivitaeten/exploration-und-produktion/laufende-aktivitaeten (accessed 28/04/2021).

Opratko, Benjamin (2014): Hegemonie. Politische Theorie nach Antonio Gramsci. Münster: Verlag Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Pelinka, Anton (1991): The Study of Social Movements in Austria. In: Rucht, Dieter (Ed.): Research on Social Movements. Frankfurt am Main/Colorado: Campus Verlag/Westview Verlag, 230-246.

Pelinka, Anton (1998): Austrian Political Culture: From Subject to Participant Orientation. In: Luther, Kurt R./Pulzer, Peter (Eds.): Austria 1945-95. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 109-119.

Pike, Andy; Rodríguez-Pose, Andrés; Tomaney, John (2014): Local and regional development in the Global North and South. In: *Progress in Development Studies* 14(1), 21-30.

Prendiville, Brendan (2020): Introduction & Poltical Ecology and Environmentalism in Britain: An Overview. In: Prendiville, Brendan/Haigron, David (Eds): Political Ecology and Environmentalism in Britain. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 1-48.

Przyborski, Aglaja; Wohlrab-Sahr, Monika (2014): Forschungsdesigns für die qualitative Sozialforschung. In: Baur, Nina/Blasius, Jörg (Eds.): Handbuch Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 117-134.

Rawls, John (1971/1999): A Theory of Justice. Revised edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Reichertz, Jo (2014): Empirische Sozialforschung und soziologische Theorie. In: Baur, Nina/Blasius, Jörg (Eds.): Handbuch Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 65-80.

Rootes, Christopher (Ed.) (2003): Britain. In: Environmental Protest in Western Europe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 20-58.

Rootes, Christopher (2004): Environmental Movements. In: Snow, David A./Soule, Sarah A./Kriesi, Hanspeter (Eds.): The Blackwell companion to social movements. Malden et al.: Blackwell Publishing, 608-640.

Rootes, Christopher (2012): Climate change, Environmental Activism and Community Action in Britain. In: *Social Alternatives* 31(1), 24-28.

Rucht, Dieter (1996): Wirkungen von Umweltbewegungen: Von den Schwierigkeiten einer Bilanz. In: *FJ NSB* 9(4), 15-27.

Salheiser, Axel (2014): Natürliche Daten: Dokumente. In: Baur, Nina/Blasius, Jörg (Eds.): Handbuch Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 813-827.

Schlichting, Inga; Schmidt, Andreas (2012): Strategische Deutungen des Klimawandels. Frames und ihre Sponsoren. In: *FJ NSB* 25(2), 29-41.

Schlosberg, David; Collins, Lisette B. (2014): From environmental to climate justice: climate change and the discourse of environmental justice. In: *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 5(3), 359-374.

Schweinschwaller, Thomas (2020): Zwischen Achtsamkeit und Aktion – Extinction Rebellion (XR) als neue soziale Bewegung in Österreich. In: *SWS-Rundschau* 60(4), 385-406.

Sekler, Nicola; Brand, Ulrich (2011): Eine «widerständige» Aneignung Gramscis. In: Opratko, Benjamin/Prausmüller, Oliver (Eds.): Gramsci global. Hamburg: Argument Verlag, 224-240.

Slaven, Mike; Heydon, James (2020): Crisis, deliberation, and Extinction Rebellion. In: *Critical Studies on Security* 8(1), 59-62.

Snow, David A. (2004): Framing Processes, Ideology, Discursive Fields. In: Snow, David A./Soule, Sarah A./Kriesi, Hanspeter (Eds.): The Blackwell companion to social movements. Malden et al.: Blackwell Publishing, 380-412.

Snow, David A. et al. (1986): Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation. In: *American Sociological Review* 51(4), 464-481.

Snow, David A.; Benford, Robert D. (1988): Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization. In: *International Social Movement Research* 1(1), 197-217.

Snow, David A.; Benford, Robert D. (1992): Master Frames and Cycles of Protest. In: Morris, Aldon D. (Ed.): Frontiers in social movement theory. New Haven et al.: Yale University Press, 133-155.

Snow, David A.; Benford, Robert D. (1999): Alternative Types of Cross-national Diffusion in the Social Movement Arena. In: della Porta, Donatella/Kriesi, Hanspeter/Rucht, Dieter (Eds.): Social Movements in a Globalizing World. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 23-39.

Snow, David A.; Trom, Danny (2002): The case Study and the Study of Social Movements. In: Klandermans, Bert/Staggenborg, Suzanne (Eds.): Methods of Social Movement Research. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 146-172.

Snow, David A.; Soule, Sarah A.; Kriesi, Hanspeter (Eds.) (2004): The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements. Malden et al.: Blackwell Publishing.

Stuart, Diana (2020): Radical Hope: Truth, Virtue, and Hope for What is Left in Extinction Rebellion. In: *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 33(1), 487-504.

Taylor, Matthew (2020): The evolution of Extinction Rebellion. In: The Guardian, 04/08/2020, https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/aug/04/evolution-of-extinction-rebellion-climate-emergency-protest-coronavirus-pandemic (accessed 28/04/2021).

Taylor, Matthew (2021): Extinction Rebellion to step up campaign against banking system. In: The Guardian, 05/04/2021, https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/apr/05/extinction-rebellion-to-step-up-campaign-against-banking-system-climate-crisis (accessed 28/04/2021).

Teune, Simon (2008): „Gibt es so etwas überhaupt noch?" Forschung zu Protest und sozialen Bewegungen. In: *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 49(3), 528-547.

Thoreau, Henry David (1996): Political Writings. (edited by N. L. Rosenbaum). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tokar, Brian (2019): On the evolution and continuing development of the climate justice movement. In: Jafry, Tahseen (Ed.): Routledge Handbook of Climate Justice. Milton/New York: Routledge Handbooks, 13-25.

Touraine, Alain (1985): An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements. In: *Social Research* 52(4), 749-787.

Touraine, Alain (1991): Commentary on Dieter Rucht's Critique. In: Rucht, Dieter (Ed.): Research on Social Movements. Frankfurt am Main/Colorado: Campus Verlag/Westview Verlag, 385-391.

von Usslar, Maria; Yossef, Ayham (2019): Extinction Rebellion: Die gewaltfreien Radikalen. In: Der Standard, 09/10/2019, https://www.derstandard.at/story/2000109643582/extinction-rebellion-die-gewaltfreien-radikalen (accessed 28/04/2021).

Wahlström, Mattias; Wennerhag, Magnus; Rootes, Christopher (2013): Framing "The Climate Issue": Patterns of Participation and Prognostic Frames among Climate Summit Protesters. In: *Global Environmental Politics* 13(4), 101-122.

Wahlström, Mattias et al. (Eds.) (2019): Protest for a Future: Composition, mobilization and motives of the participants in Fridays for Future climate protests on 15 March, 2019 in 13 European Cities. https://bit.ly/3vts9T4 (accessed 28/04/2021).

Westwell, Emily; Bunting, Josh (2020): The regenerative culture of Extinction Rebellion: self-care, people care, planet care. In: *Environmental Politics* 29(3), 546-551.

Wösendorfer, Hans (1988): „Hainburg" - Konflikt und Planung. In: Burger, Rudolf et al. (Eds.): Verarbeitungsmechanismen der Krise. Wien: Braunmüller, 113-145.

XR Austria (2021a): *Home*. https://xrebellion.at/home/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR Austria (2021b): *Extinction Rebellion Wien*. https://xrebellion.at/werde-aktiv/regionalgruppen/xr-wien/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR Austria (2021c): *Mach mit*. https://xrebellion.at/werde-aktiv/regionalgruppen/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR Austria (2021d): *Über uns*. https://xrebellion.at/ueber-uns/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR Austria (2021e): *Spenden*. https://xrebellion.at/spenden/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR Austria (2021f): *Extinction Rebellion Tirol*. https://xrebellion.at/werde-aktiv/regionalgruppen/extinction-rebellion-tirol/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR Austria (2021g): *Fakten*. https://xrebellion.at/klimakrise-oekologischer-kollaps/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR Austria (2021h): *Leitfaden Bürger*innenräte in Ö*. https://xrebellion.at/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/XR-BuergerInnenrat-main-info.pdf (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR Austria (2021i): *Welle 2021*. https://xrebellion.at/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR global (2021a): *What is XR?* https://rebellion.global/about-us/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR global (2021b): *Find your group*. https://rebellion.global/groups/#countries (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR global (2021c): *Why rebel?* https://rebellion.global/why-rebel/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR London (2021a): *About*. https://xrlondon.org.uk/about/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR London (2021b): *Strategy*. https://xrlondon.org.uk/strategy/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR London (2021c): *Join us*. https://xrlondon.org.uk/groups/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR London (2021d): *Resources*. https://xrlondon.org.uk/resources/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR London (2021e): *Home*. https://xrlondon.org.uk/london-rebellion-1-september-2020/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR MCR (2020): *The Handbook for Life*. https://extinctionrebellion.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/XR-Handbook-for-life-v4-print.pdf (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR MCR (2021a): *The We Want To Live Handbook*. https://extinctionrebellion.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/XR-We-want-to-live-v5.pdf (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR MCR (2021b): *FAQs*. https://xrmcr.org/frequently-asked-questions (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR MCR (2021c): *Home*. https://xrmcr.org/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR UK (2019): *The Extinction Rebellion Guide to Citizens' Assemblies*. https://extinctionrebellion.uk/wp/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/The-Extinction-Rebellion-Guide-to-Citizens-Assemblies-Version-1.1-25-June-2019.pdf (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR UK (2020): *Power Together*. https://extinctionrebellion.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/XRUK-Strategy-Document-2020.pdf (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR UK (2021a): *About us*. https://rebellion.earth/the-truth/about-us/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR UK (2021b): *FAQS*. https://rebellion.earth/the-truth/faqs/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

XR UK (2021c): *Press*. https://extinctionrebellion.uk/press/ (accessed 28/04/2021).

10 Annex

Annex 1: Overview of Interviewees

№	Activity	Presence	Date
#1	Social Movement Researcher	Ireland	22/12/2020
#2	XR Activist	Austria	05/01/2021

Annex 2: Questionnaire

Questionnaire for Expert Interview on XR UK

Interview Partner:
Date and place:
Duration of the interview:

Thanking for the willingness to interview
Clarifying the purpose of the interview
Assure anonymity
Asking permission for recording

Main questions:

1. How would you assess the discourse on XR in the European movement research field/ in the UK/in the British environmental movement scene?

2. Why do you think XR was able to spread so widely in such a short time?

3. Does the XR UK regional group represent all four parts of the UK or just the English region?

4. Are some regional XR UK groups more active and present than others with regard to the movement's emergence in Southern England?

5. How would you assess the interaction between the XR UK regional/local groups?

6. Are there differences in content or strategies between the regional XR UK groups?

7. How would you assess the role of XR UK within the European XR movement?

8. What potential do you see in the movement and its resistance?

Open questions

Questionnaire for Expert Interview on XR Austria

Interview Partner:
Date and place:
Duration of the interview:

Thanking for the willingness to interview
Clarifying the purpose of the interview
Assure anonymity
Asking permission for recording

Main questions:

1. Wann und wie ist XR in Österreich entstanden? Gab es einen Zusammenhang mit XR United Kingdom?

2. Wie würden Sie die Interaktion zwischen den unterschiedlichen XR Gruppen in Österreich beschreiben? Sind manche österreichische XR Gruppen aktiver als andere?

3. Wofür setzt sich XR Österreich ein? Wogegen richtet sich XR Österreich?

4. Wer trägt Schuld an der aktuelle Klimakrise?

5. Welche Lösungen werden für die Probleme vorgeschlagen und wer soll sie umsetzen?

6. Welche Strategien werden von XR benützt und warum genau diese?

7. Unterscheidet sich XR Österreich im Hinblick auf Forderungen und Herangehensweisen zu den ursprünglichen britischen XR Gruppen? Wenn ja, wie?

8. Wie mobilisiert XR Österreich?

9. Wie würden Sie den Diskurs zu XR in Österreich einschätzen?

Offene Fragen