

**A Critical Discourse Analysis of Non-violent Direct Action within
*This Is Not A Drill: An Extinction Rebellion Handbook***

Sanna Thöresson

Supervisor: Lauren E. La Fauci, Gender Studies, LiU

Master's Program

Gender Studies – Intersectionality and Change

Masters Thesis 15 ECTS credits

May 2020

ISRN: LIU-TEMA G/GSIC1-A—20/017-SE



Abstract

This thesis investigates the portrayal of non-violent direct action (NVDA) in *This Is Not a Drill: An Extinction Rebellion Handbook* by considering the two chapters “Courting Arrest” by Jay Griffiths, and “The Civil Resistance Model” by Roger Hallam. Using critical discourse analysis in the style of Norman Fairclough, I examine the textual features, discourse practices, and social practices of the chapters by applying theories of environmental justice, intersectionality, and embodiment. I argue that Griffiths and Hallam reproduce oppressive power structures by excluding certain identities and experiences from their discourse. First, the lack of a discussion of the situatedness of violence within the NVDA strategy employed by Extinction Rebellion – focusing on having as many protestors arrested as possible – represents the acts of arrest as inherently non-violent. This representation erases other possible experiences of arrest from the discourse. Second, the authors portray their own experiences as universal, and thereby create a universal subject that is white, middle-class, able-bodied, and a legal resident of the UK. Discourse is seen as both constitutive of, and constituted by, the social world; this portrayal of subjectivities is shown to have very real effects on to what degree certain identities feel at home within the Extinction Rebellion movement. I conclude the study with a discussion of possible paths for Extinction Rebellion and other similar movements to become more inclusive by adopting a more intersectional perspective that acknowledges the embodied realities of different identities. By applying this perspective, these movements can start working against hegemonic structures of oppression that exclude certain (non-white) identities from decision-making processes.

Keywords: Extinction Rebellion, social movements, critical discourse analysis, non-violent direct action, environmental justice, intersectionality, embodiment

Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	3
2 Literature Review.....	5
3 Environmental Justice, Intersectionality, and Embodiment.....	9
4 Methodology.....	12
5 Analysis.....	14
5.1 Textual Features.....	14
5.2 Discourse Practice.....	22
5.3 Social Practice.....	33
6 Discussion.....	41
7 Conclusion.....	44
References.....	46

1 Introduction

Few environmental movements have gained as much public attention in the past decades as Extinction Rebellion (XR). Founded in 2018 by British activist Gail Bradbrook and social movement researcher Roger Hallam (Kinniburgh, 2020, 127-128), it has mobilized a large following in many parts of the world, resulting in globally coordinated acts of resistance during 2018 and 2019. XR held its first mass protest on Parliament Square in London on October 31st, 2018. Here it announced its “Declaration of Rebellion” against the British government, presenting the movement’s three demands: 1) tell the truth, 2) act now and 3) go beyond politics. Briefly, these three demands translate into calling upon the (British) government to tell the truth about climate change and environmental degradation by declaring a climate emergency, to act directly to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to zero by 2025 and halt the loss of biodiversity, and to create a citizens assembly that can advise the government in matters of environmental and ecological justice (Extinction Rebellion, 2020). National XR groups have in turn made these demands to their respective governments.

XR describes itself as “an international apolitical network using non-violent direct action to persuade governments to act justly on the Climate and Ecological Emergency” (Extinction Rebellion, 2020). The movement has developed a toolbox for civil resistance, focusing on non-violent direct action (NVDA) and based on research by, amongst others, Gene Sharp and Erica Chenoweth (Kinniburgh, 2020). This strategy of NVDA is described in length in *This is Not a Drill: An Extinction Rebellion Handbook* and has a seemingly odd goal: to have as many protestors arrested as possible.

NVDA has for many years been a vital strategy of environmental movements in Europe and around the world. One of the first people to link NVDA to more environmentalist goals was H. D. Thoreau (1849) who wrote “Civil Disobedience: Resistance to Civil Government” while in jail for not paying a tax that he believed would be used to fund the Mexican-American war. He effectively linked social and environmental causes by claiming that slavery was not only morally and ethically detestable, but also an “environmentally unsustainable system that would have to grow new territory to survive” (Finley, 2013, 2), thereby degrading the natural ecologies he so cherished (see e.g. the new edition of *Walden* by Thoreau from 2016). His commitment to NVDA has been described as an “inspiration and guidance for the

subversive activism of the recent ecology movement” (Newman, 2005, 1) and well demonstrates the historical linkage of NVDA and environmental social movements.

NVDA is often used interchangeably with similar terms such as “‘civil resistance’, ‘nonviolent struggle’, and ‘strategic nonviolence’” (Chenoweth & Cunningham, 2013, 273); I will use “NVDA” to represent all of these forms in this study. Gene Sharp (1980) describes NVDA as referring to “those methods of protest, resistance, and intervention without physical violence in which the members of the non-violent group do, or refuse to do, certain things” (Sharp, 1980, 218). NVDA can therefore be both active (as when shutting down traffic through road blockages) and passive (as when choosing to boycott certain products based on where they are made). Chenoweth and Cunningham (2013) also point out the importance of distinguishing NVDA from “nonviolence”, as NVDA is a strategic use of nonviolence within civil resistance, and nonviolence instead refers to a “moral commitment to avoid arms” (Chenoweth & Cunningham, 2013, 273). For the purpose of this study, NVDA refers to the former of these.

Some examples of NVDA within previous environmental movements include shutting down coal-fired power stations, giving monuments anti-pollution masks, or occupying offices of companies damaging the environment (Greenpeace, 2018; Kyllönen, 2014). Due to the broad meaning of the concept however, also many other less drastic acts may constitute NVDA, dependent on the desired outcome of that act. Importantly, as seen in Sharp’s (1980) definition, there should however be an absence of physical violence, although movements employing the strategy often miss to clearly delimit what actually constitutes this physical violence for whom.

XR seeks to court the arrest of protestors for a number of reasons. Primarily, arrests are seen as an effective tool by which to engage the public due to the seeming illegitimacy of arresting non-violent protestors, thereby winning sympathy for the cause. Due to the focus on this strategy of courting arrests, the movement has however been criticized from numerous sides, including other social movements and networks such as Wretched of The Earth, Black Lives Matter UK, the Green Anticapitalist Front, and the Hambach Forest occupation (Wretched of The Earth, 2019). The main point of critique is that the strategy of courting arrests is exclusionary, as identity markers such as race, gender, ability, and class have a very real effect on how these arrests are carried out and experienced.

The aim of this study is therefore to analyze the discourse of non-violent direct action within *This Is Not A Drill: An Extinction Rebellion Handbook* using critical discourse analysis (CDA) as developed by Fairclough (2010) in *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. I will employ an intersectional perspective with a focus on embodiment and environmental justice when examining the discourse, in an effort to highlight how different intersectional identities may give meaning to courting arrests as a part of NVDA. This perspective will problematize the representation of actions as non-violent versus violent, as the embodied realities of people engaging with the movement can play a central role in shaping these categories. Through this, I hope to illuminate the dialectic relationship between discourse and actual societal change, and thereby present ways for XR to become more inclusive, which will be important when moving forward to combat climate change in a more intersectional manner.

To fulfill the aim of analyzing NVDA within *This Is Not A Drill: An Extinction Rebellion Handbook* using CDA and an intersectional perspective, I will use the following research questions to guide this study:

- 1) How is the discourse of NVDA portrayed by XR with regards to its textual features, discursive practice and social practice?
- 2) How may different intersectional identities have an embodied experience of NVDA and how does this work to exclude certain identities?

I employ these research questions in order to ensure that the use of CDA as the method of the study will be fruitful. Simultaneously they require me to link the findings to social practices working to reproduce oppressive power structures excluding certain identities from the discourse of combatting climate change, thereby pointing to alternative and more just ways forward in the future of climate movements.

2 Literature Review

I see this study as filling a gap within existing research, with regards to methodology, theoretical framework, and the linkage to societal processes. I believe that the use of CDA can shine light on the relationality between discourse and actual societal change, which will be

important when moving forward to combat climate change in a more intersectional and inclusionary way.

The use of strategic nonviolence in protest movements has been examined by a number of researchers, however as Chenoweth and Cunningham (2013) critically point out, non-violence still does not take up as much space within academia as more violent protest movements do. This may be because violence is viewed “as a more pressing and troubling global problem, distracting researchers from the equally common, civilian-led, unarmed struggles and revolutions that have always been present” (Chenoweth & Cunningham, 2013, 272).

Research focusing specifically on non-violent direct action includes a detailed account of the strategy in different social movements between the years 1900 and 2006 by Chenoweth and Stephan (2011). They have created the “Nonviolent and Violent Conflict Outcome data set,” which examines “106 primarily nonviolent resistance campaigns from 1900 to 2006 with maximalist political objectives” (Chenoweth & Schock, 2015, 427) in an effort to map out the success rate of these movements. They conclude that non-violent movements are twice as effective as violent ones in achieving their goals¹¹.

Chenoweth and Schock (2015) develop this comparative analysis further by applying it to examine the effect of violent outbursts in otherwise non-violent protest movements; this seems to be the field of NVDA that has generated most research. Tompkins (2015), Enos, Kaufman and Sands (2017), Huet-Vaughn (2013), Muñoz and Anduiza (2019) and Simpson, Willer and Feinberg (2018) for example also examine such dynamics. Enos, Kaufman and Sands (2017) conclude that violent outbursts indeed may be beneficial to the cause, examining actual policy change in light of the 1992 Los Angeles riot. Chenoweth and Schock (2015) and Tompkins (2015) conclude that such outbursts may be beneficial in the short-term success of the movement, however may prove harmful to the objective in the long term. Simpson, Willer and Feinberg (2018), Huet-Vaughn (2013) and Muñoz and Anduiza (2019) instead come to the conclusion that violent outbursts in protest movements lead to a loss of support for the movements under investigation.

¹ This research by Chenoweth and Stephan (2010) is one of the few scientific sources that is cited directly in *This Is Not a Drill: An Extinction Rebellion Handbook* (see e.g. page 126).

Other research on NVDA includes Howes (2013) who examines the difference between pacifism and nonviolence, making a similar distinction as Chenoweth and Cunningham (2013), where nonviolence is seen as a more strategic and less holistic rejection of violence than pacifism, and therefore is more likely to create change.

The abovementioned literature points to the contradicting findings when examining the use of violence versus nonviolence in social movements. Sometimes violence is shown to increase the support for the movement, while in other cases it instead decreases this support. This may have a number of reasons, for example as Chenoweth and Cunningham (2013) point out, it can prove hard to measure the success of non-violent actions empirically which may lead to contradictory findings dependent on the method of the study.

Further, I believe the historical and local context of the movements to play a crucial part in how violence affects the public perception and support for it. If the affected society has a long history of struggle, for example within the civil rights movement, certain tactics may be endorsed more actively than in societies with less experience in civil resistance. This may explain the different findings when comparing some American research to European research on the efficacy of protest movements.

The methods used in most of the examined literature are primarily quantitative, focusing on statistics and big data sets. Such data collection and analysis is important, especially in the context of the earlier critique of the difficulty of measuring the effects of nonviolence empirically. I believe, however, that it is also important to investigate the effect of nonviolence on a more personal and qualitative level, with regards to research focus, researcher reflexivity, and choice of method; this dimension is missing in most of the examined literature.

The literature mentioned above has no direct link to environmental movements per se. However, as social movements can be seen as an umbrella term for movements uniting people to protest something seen as wrong, unfair or harmful, I believe that the findings are also applicable to movements specifically combatting climate change and other environmental harm. As mentioned in the introduction, NVDA and environmental movements have a long and global history. Regardless of this history, however, the field is still somewhat under researched, especially in a European setting.

Naides (2014), for example, examines NVDA used in both indigenous and environmental movements in New Zealand. Due to the very specific local and historical context, the results of the study are not necessarily applicable to contemporary European movements. This also applies to research done by Motavalli (1995), who instead examines Greenpeace's use of NVDA in the 1990's. The article was written 25 years ago, and current strategies for battling the arguably even more pressing environmental problems make more contemporary research necessary. Burkett (2016) is one such example, and she instead draws parallels between NVDA in contemporary (American) climate movements and the anti slavery- and civil rights movements there, but without a particular focus on contemporary Europe.

De Moost et al. (2020) are an example of such contemporary research with a focus on Europe, as they have conducted a study on the recent "Fridays for Futures" movement. They have examined 13 countries in Europe as well as Australia and the United States of America, in an effort to demographically map out participants at the 2019 protests. They split their findings with regards to age, gender and educational profile; however, they fail to incorporate an intersectional dimension in their analysis of the results.

Research looking specifically at the XR movement includes Gunningham (2019), who analyzes the effectiveness of climate movements in instigating policy change, Kinniburgh (2020) who problematizes the apolitical nature of the movement, Booth (2019) who examines the relationship between social work and the movement, and Westwell and Bunting (2020) who examine the internal culture of the movement, based on an ethics of care. Examining the discourse of NVDA within the XR movement has, however, not yet been done.

Finally, I want to briefly mention research examining the possible exclusion of certain identities within environmental movements, as this is one of the points of critique XR often faces. Curnow and Helferty (2018), for example, show how the racialized histories of the United States and Canada have led to the creation of an environmental movement that is "a default white space" (Curnow & Helferty, 2018, 145) built on a colonial history. Erickson (2020) and Crist (2013) instead investigate how the discourse of the "anthropocene" within environmental movements has been developed and how it leads to these movements actively ignoring "structures like colonialism" (Erickson, 2020, 111), instead focusing on technological innovation, where "colonial structures privilege whiteness in our environmental future" (ibid.). This relationship between the discourses of environmental movements and the reproduction of certain power dimensions will also be examined in this study.

3 Environmental Justice, Intersectionality, and Embodiment

As shown in the research questions of this study, I will focus on intersectionality and embodiment in relation to how XR discusses the use of NVDA in their handbook. These concepts thereby become the second part of my theoretical framework for this study after the application of CDA, which will be explored as the study's method. I have chosen this as my point of departure for several reasons. As a white, able-bodied, heterosexual, educated, middle-class woman who has grown up and spent most of my life in Western Europe, I have sometimes struggled with the feeling that I should not take up any space within the academic field of intersectional gender studies. There are so many other intersectional identities that have not been given room in the past, and by taking up some of this room I have sometimes felt complicit in reproducing an unjust and unequal field where some voices speak louder than others (see e.g. Lewis (2013), Levine-Rasky (2011) or Zingsheim and Goltz (2011)).

Coming from a background in development studies, I have developed a postcolonial perspective in order to understand the global power dynamics of the world today; this perspective has furthered my uncertainty in trusting my own (white) voice. To combat this, I have spent the past year focusing largely on critical whiteness studies as part of this master's program. It has been an attempt to become more reflexive about how my own embodied self, of which my race is part, forms how I see the world, and how I interpret the practices and relationships therein.

My background has also made me aware of how these global power dynamics spread the effects of climate change very differently on different communities, thereby creating great environmental injustices. Robert Nixon (2011) strikingly portrays this in *Slow Violence And the Environmentalism Of the Poor* by discussing how globally marginalized communities are hit hardest by environmental damage that most often is a direct outcome of actions by the global North. He weaves in the concept of embodiment when discussing environmental justice by showing how different bodies are valued differently in regards to the violence they face. He presents a quote by Njabulo Ndebele stating: "We are all familiar with the sanctity of the white body. Wherever the white body is violated in the world, severe retributions follow [...] The white body is inviolable, and that inviolability is in direct proportion to the vulnerability of the black body" (Nixon, 2011, 59). Here, racial embodiment becomes a marker for the justice a body can expect after violation. The erasure of non-white bodies from the narratives in, for example, movements seeking to combat climate change, reproduces this

structure and furthers environmental injustices by not problematizing dimensions of (for example) race or geopolitical location in relation to climate change and its mitigation. I therefore see an incorporation of embodiment and climate justice as crucial for this study.

The interplay of identities and environmental justice is one of the main reasons I have chosen to focus this study on the XR movement. I see it as an important social movement that, together with Fridays for Futures, has been one of the most prominent environmental movements in the last years. I see climate change as the most pressing issue we face today, one that encompasses all intersectional identities and is experienced very differently based on one's embodied self and social and local context. Therefore, I believe that any movement that can mobilize such a large following and create more public awareness should be seen as a success. At the same time, I have always felt bothered by XR, and I could not figure out exactly why until a friend lent me the XR handbook. After my first reading, it became clear to me what had caused my unease: it was the obvious lack in intersectional awareness. This lack became almost ironic to me, as the use of NVDA in the handbook is described as a way to actually be more inclusive. Together with my background within postcolonialism and critical race theory, this obvious lack of a perspective on intersectionality and environmental justice in the handbook led me to develop the research questions listed above. I hope that this study may uncover some ways in which XR and future similar movements can apply a more intersectional perspective, thereby including more people in discussions of possible ways out of the very real lived effects of climate change on different bodies.

I further see intersectionality as a necessary lens by which to analyze all societal processes, especially ones that may have a very real effect on different communities. It enables me to problematize my own subject position and epistemological standpoints, so that I can continuously work against the reproduction of oppressive societal structures and dynamics.

Intersectionality is a term with many possible uses and there have been many discussions about what intersectionality really *is*. Should it be referred to as a theory, an analytical tool, a perspective, a nodal point, a methodology or a method (see e.g. Lewis, 2013; Cho, Crenshaw & McCall, 2013; Carbin & Edenheim, 2013; Lykke, 2005)? I believe it could be all these things, dependent on how it is used and to what ends. In this study however, I will primarily use intersectionality as a theory of power and a lens by which to analyze discursive and societal processes. Cho et al. (2013) see the illustration of “how practice necessarily informs

theory and how theory ideally should inform best practices” (Cho et al., 2013, 786) as one of the desired outcomes of using intersectionality to analyze a diverse range of social issues, and this is what I intend to achieve with this study. By using an intersectional lens to analyze the discourse of NVDA employed in the XR handbook, I hope to point to possible ways forward in creating a more inclusive discourse within social movements, with a particular focus on environmental movements.

Whether intersectionality as a concept of power should deal primarily with dynamics, subjectivities, or structures has also been discussed (Lewis, 2013, 883). I do not see these different levels as exclusionary of one another, and as I have attempted to show, I intend to use intersectionality in different ways. First, an intersectional perspective acknowledges that different subjectivities and embodiments (including my own) have different lived realities and experience power along a multitude of different axes. As I will not use interviews in this particular study, theories of intersectional embodiments will be the primary mode of incorporating subjectivities that are not my own. Second, CDA as a method sees discourse as being in a dialectical relationship with societal processes, which can be extended to larger societal structures. Structures that work to silence or exclude certain identities are also perceived differently dependent on subjectivities. Any analysis of discourses is necessarily also an analysis of structural power. Lastly, the social interaction between actors, limiting what some can do or say while illuminating other perspectives is also an outcome of power, and must be analyzed through an intersectional lens. Specific identity markers or intersectional dimensions that may come to be important in this analysis include gender, race, ethnicity, citizenship and immigration status, ability, and class².

My focus on subjectivities also implies an importance of embodied realities. How our body functions, how we perceive it, and how others perceive it affects our understanding of the world and the dimensions of power therein, as discussed by Zeiler (2013). She describes the body as a mind-body unity, existing as neither just a body nor as just consciousness (Zeiler, 2013, 3), which I believe effectively highlights the relationship between embodied realities and the understanding of dimensions of power and oppression. Ahmed (2006) also problematizes this relationship between the body and the outside, or that, which is not the

² Without wanting to fall into the “etc”-trap described by Butler (2011), I want to acknowledge that a wide range of other intersectional dimensions could be included here.

body, when discussing orientations. These orientations can be analyzed to show “how social differences are the effects of how bodies inhabit spaces with others” (Ahmed, 2006, 5). Here, I see spaces as also being organizations or movements, and here this space represents the XR movement. Different bodies will thereby inhabit XR differently, and have different understandings of the discourse of NVDA within the movement based on their orientations.

4 Methodology

CDA provides “theories and methods for the empirical study of the relations between discourse and social and cultural developments in different social domains” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, 55). When used as in this study, CDA therefore does not only provide a certain methodology, but also becomes part of the researcher’s theoretical framework, based on its epistemological and ontological perspective. This perspective includes the assumption that not all social phenomena are of a linguistic-discursive character (ibid.), as discursive practices (such as the production and consumption of texts) form social practice (of which social identities and relations are part). Therefore, the discursive analysis of texts can uncover certain processes or changes in social practice. Second, this relationship is seen as dialectic, meaning that discourse both constitutes and is constituted by the social world and the practices therein. Therefore, “language-as-discourse is both a form of action [...] through which people can change the world and a form of action which is socially and historically situated” (ibid., 56; Fairclough, 2010, 92) in a dialectical relationship with other social practices. Finally, discourses can function ideologically, meaning that not only is the dialectical relationship between text, discursive practice and social practice analyzed, but so is the “role that these discursive practices play in furthering the interests of particular social groups” (ibid.). This ties in well with the last theoretical standpoint within CDA: its focus on critical research. CDA is both critical and political; it is “committed to social change [and] take[s] the side of oppressed social groups” (ibid., 58). This critical and political perspective is the main reason I have chosen CDA as the method of this study.

The ontological standpoints described above are some of the corner stones of CDA, and well point to the application of a critical realist perspective therein (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, 63). The use of a critical realist perspective may seem ontologically contradictory, as critical realism sometimes is described “an ontological assumption that there is a real world ‘out there’, which can be separated as an entity separate from the researcher and from language and discourse” (Lykke, 2010, 147). This full separation is not the case within CDA, due to the

dialectical relationship between discourse and social practice. The world “out there” exists (as a sphere separate from the discursive practice), but it is still affected by (and affects) this discursive practice.

Further, I as a researcher cannot separate myself from the analysis of the discourse - and therefore also the social world it is part of. The world “out there” may exist, but it is only through my prior knowledge and categorizations that I can use the tools of CDA to uncover both the discursive and social practices within the material. In CDA, the influence of a critical realist perspective works mainly to stop the researcher from losing themselves in an all too post-structuralist relativism (Flatschart, 2016, 22), and to point to the importance of a critical perspective, as discourse can affect the lived reality of social groups, with a focus on oppressed groups in society. This focus on lived realities becomes extra important when looking at the discourse of climate change and environmental degradation, as different social groups experience climate change very differently, due to their socioeconomic, cultural, local and historical contexts. This lived reality must be seen as existing “out there,” in order to ensure topical and valid steps when combatting climate change.

In the style of Fairclough (2010), I will apply a three-dimensional framework to CDA, which includes examining the textual features, discourse practice and social practice of the material (Fairclough, 2010, 94). The analysis of textual features includes looking at how the world and experiences are represented and signified, how the identities of participants and the relationships between them are constituted, as well as examining the distribution of different kind of information in the chosen material. To do this, a detailed examination of the textual features is required, including the generic form and structure of the text and its narrative, the organization of the text, the relations between sentences and clauses therein and the use of grammar and vocabulary (ibid.).

The analysis of the material’s discourse practice involves several interrelated steps, with a focus on how the text is produced and consumed (Fairclough, 2010, 94). Here one may even look at the actual, physical production of the text, by for example examining how the printing process is organized (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, 72). Further, it includes an analysis of the material’s intertextuality and interdiscursivity (Fairclough, 2010, 95). Both of these concepts apply a “historical view of texts as transforming the past – existing conventions, or prior texts – into the present” (ibid.), i.e. investigating what texts and discourses the chosen material

builds upon how these are transformed. This historical investigation can give insight to the power dimensions at play within the discourse. Fairclough (2010) correlates the creativity with which prior discourses are used and transformed to the state of hegemony and knowledge contestation within that field. Complex interdiscursivity implies a hegemonic struggle within the field of the discourse (ibid., 88). An interdiscursively uniform text instead implies the absence of a such a hegemonic struggle.

The final part of CDA is analyzing the social practice to which the discourse relates. As discourse practice and social practice are understood as being in a dialectical relationship with each other, the information that the researcher has gathered in the past two steps should indicate something about the social practice of the discourse. As these should link to a lived social reality, it is also important to historically and locally situate the findings. First, the researcher should explore “the relationship between the discursive practice and its order of discourse” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, 75) by examining how the findings from the previous steps relate to what Fairclough (2010) describes as the “totality of discursive practices of an institution, and the relations between them” (Fairclough, 2010, 96). Second, the researcher should “map the partly non-discursive, social and cultural relations and structures that constitute the wider context of the discursive practice” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, 75). Examining what conditions the discursive practice is subjected to becomes important, and simply analyzing the discourse cannot necessarily do this. Instead, the researcher should link the findings to their theoretical framework “that shed[s] light upon the social practice in question” (ibid.).

Informed by intersectionality, environmental justice, and embodiment, I thereby operationalize CDA to explore the discourse of NVDA in the two chapters “Courting Arrest” by Jay Griffiths (2018) and “The Civil Resistance Model” by Roger Hallam (2018). I have chosen these chapters because they explicitly deal with the issues that motivated this study in the first place – the glorification of arrests and the use of NVDA within the movement.

5 Analysis

5.1 Textual Features

I will begin my analysis by examining the textual features present in “Courting Arrest” by Jay Griffiths. Although Griffiths does not explicitly identify herself in the chapter, I have gathered from background research that she is a British white woman with the ability to walk around

without support. She has published several books, and also regularly writes for *The Guardian*, thereby leading a seemingly middle-class life.

The chapter is short, consisting of four pages in which Griffiths describes her personal experience of being arrested as part of her involvement in the XR movement in London. As such, the overall style of the text is that of a personal narrative, where she describes her experience in the first person. This style of writing has several implications for the text. It creates a tone of personal reflection, much like a diary, and thereby also a sense of honesty. It is easier to believe the tales of someone who has actually experienced whatever she is speaking about. This sense of honesty is an especially important factor in manifestos or other types of texts that are seeking to engage the public and create change. Honesty can be seen as a tool by which to strengthen the relationship between the writer and the reader, and thereby between the reader and the movement. We are given the chance to see the world through the author's eyes, and it is her representation of the world we are presented with.

Griffiths sets the scene by describing the event that will consequently lead to her arrest; being hand locked to a metal pipe during an XR protest. She goes on to present the main identities within the piece: First, herself as one of the last protestors "to hold out" (95), creating almost an imagery of a hero, or of a last survivor; second, the identities of the police she encounters. Throughout the text the identities of the police forces are explored in most detail. She begins by presenting them as enemies, as people that are scaring her as they cut her loose from the metal pipe. Here a strong sense of an "us versus them" is created, in which the police act in an almost violent way as Griffiths writes: "I felt my vulnerability intensely. I could feel the heat of sparks flying around my head and smell burning metal as the police cut me out" (95). Using the senses, Griffiths creates a very striking scene and shows why she was afraid, evoking empathy in the reader. The image of the police in this first encounter is however the only negative description of them throughout the text.

In the coming paragraphs, Griffiths instead describes them as friends, helpers, people who cheer the protestors on and admire them, and even as well-meaning hosts. This change indicates a renegotiation of the relationship between them, which may be due to the bodily threat Griffiths experienced when being the subject of the police's intervention in the introductory scene. At the end of the chapter, she instead writes "[i]n the cells, the police checked on us all throughout the night, offering us food and drinks, and asking what they

could get us, in acts of dear hospitality” (98). By using the word “dear” to describe the police’s actions, Griffiths renegotiates the act of arrest from being something frightening and unpleasant to instead being warm, caring, and even intimate. The relationship between herself and the police is thereby portrayed as one of friendship. The use of the word “hospitality” would already have been enough to convey the feeling of the arrest as something pleasant, and the use of “dear” strikingly increases this effect. She creates a scene that is more similar to something one might experience in a hotel or when visiting family or friends, but not in a prison cell. She signifies being arrested as a positive experience, constructing a particular version of reality that is very different from how most people probably would describe being arrested under normal circumstances. The violence of forcibly removing a body from point A (the place of protest) to point B (the prison cell) is erased from Griffith’s account of the event, implying that the act is inherently non-violent. The statements throughout the text have a strong modality and the transitivity is direct, creating subjects and objects strongly linked to their actions, which fits well with the personal narrative style and the use of NVDA described by Griffiths.

This personal tone and informal vocabulary is however contrasted with a strong use of religious imagery and comparisons. When describing the motivation behind courting arrests, Griffiths writes:

This is the self-sacrificial idea of arrest at the core of Extinction Rebellion’s strategy, and it gives you strength from within. Ancient values are overtly resurrected in the Easter rebellion in London: the values of chivalry and honour, faith in life and being in service to Our Lady, Notre Dame, Mother Earth, the mother on whom everything else depends. Everything. As both Notre Dames were burning (96).

Here, she uses comparisons, similes and personification to describe the feeling of standing up for what one believes in by willingly getting arrested as words “are not enough” (98). It becomes an almost ancient sacred duty, something everyone must do in order to save our mother, the planet. Concepts that seem outdated and even troublesome, such as chivalry, honor, and “earth as mother” are pulled to the forefront. This use of language may be an attempt to engage a more conservative audience, further distancing the movement from a more leftist politics, and is intensified through the use of religious symbols and imagery. It may also be a tool by which to engage more hegemonic masculinities, which Griffiths may

see as not necessarily adhering to concepts of care and familial sacrifice, but instead to these more traditionally male and colonial concepts, linking to a history of knighthood.

By portraying the earth as our mother, Griffiths does not only create a holy bond between the earth and us, but implicitly also between each other as we share the same mother. This renegotiation of the relationship between the reader and herself might be meant to further the bond of trust Griffiths attempts to establish through her use of a personal narrative style. Further, it awakens a sense of familial duty within the reader, creating a stronger incentive to actually care for the planet and thereby implicitly for the family of human kind. Taken together with the more masculine concepts of chivalry and honor, Griffiths uses the concept of care to play with the dichotomy between the masculine and feminine, attempting to address both identities in their stereotypical realms. Here she reproduces the classic image of the family, with a mother and a father, albeit now with a larger scope, as it should encompass all of humanity, and again may be a way to engage a more conservative audience to an arguably more progressive cause of combatting climate change.

Further, the act of seeking arrest means sacrificing the self for the family, for the greater good, or at least what Griffiths represents as the greater good. What this actually entails is not explored in great depth, other than the main idea of standing up for the future of the earth. The power behind the act of seeking arrest, and thereby self-sacrifice, is also undermined somewhat by the positive terms with which she describes her experience of it and the very friendly encounters with the police that were part of it. Instead of coming across as a dramatic act of self-sacrifice, it comes across as something resembling a joke or prank, as Griffiths does not take the implications of getting arrested seriously, nor does she have any negative experiences during her time in custody. On the contrary, the reader is left with the impression of the experience being an overall positive one. Further, as she is a well-established writer who often focuses on the environment in her work, Griffiths probably does not have to worry about any long-term impacts that the arrest may have on her career.

The vocabulary in this section is more formal, drawing on old and outdated concepts, which fits the religious tone of the paragraph and stands in stark contrast to the rest of the chapter. This religious tone is deepened further by her description of her partner singing “Hallelujah” by Leonard Cohen as she is being arrested, making both herself and others around her cry. It presents the act of being arrested as something that deserves a hallelujah, further adding to her

self-portrayal as a hero doing her sacred duty, or even as a martyr for the cause. When bearing in mind the positive descriptions of her relationship with the police during her time in custody, this self-portrayal as a martyr becomes almost humorous. Yes, she is seeking an arrest and is taken into custody, but her time there resembles the experience one would have when visiting family or friends, and not the self-sacrifice that would entitle martyrdom.

The chapter by Griffiths has many interesting textual features that work to represent identities and concepts in certain ways. First, she describes the police in a very positive light. Apart from a very brief introduction of them as an enemy during the initial encounter when they are cutting her from the metal pipe that she is attached to, she presents them as friends, helpers and supporters of the cause. This representation is deepened by Griffiths' description of her time in police custody. The use of the descriptor "dear" when describing their act of hospitality toward the protestors increases this effect and creates an almost familial setting. It also distances the act from any serious implications, and instead presents it almost as a pleasantry. Second, she uses a religious tone and imagery to imply the morality of courting arrests. She also uses it to increase the sense of trust between herself and the reader, and between the reader and the world, showing how we are all connected through sharing the same mother earth. Here, she also plays with typically masculine values of chivalry and honor and feminine values of care. Using this dichotomy may work to somewhat distance the movement from a more leftist politics, which may instead seek to dismantle such stereotypical representations, and engages a more conservative audience by reproducing classical family values. Finally, she represents herself as a martyr for the cause, being carried away to the sounds of "hallelujah," creating a sense of sentimentality.

All of this works together to present the act of arrest as something that does not have to be taken seriously, and which does not carry with it any harmful consequences. It becomes a universal responsibility, applying to both masculine and feminine identities, as something everybody can and should do for the sake of our survival. The use of religious imagery furthers a sense of courting arrests as a moral duty that is shared by all of humanity, regardless of identity. This implies that identity and thereby embodiment does not matter in encounters with the police, and presents Griffiths's subjective understanding as universal.

I will now move on to examine the textual features used in "The Civil Resistance Model" by Roger Hallam. The chapter has six pages and is a mix of a personal narrative, an overview,

and an instruction manual for obtaining maximum change through the use of NVDA. Hallam directly establishes an image of himself as someone who *knows* the truth and has all the answers, thereby creating an identity with a very strong modality between the speaker and his words. Examples of this include statements such as “We have to be clear. Conventional campaigning does not work [...] You can only do it by disruption” (100) or “Rebellions are created because some people have had enough [...] It is the only thing that can save us now” (105). Not only do these statements create an identity of the author as all knowing, they are also presented as absolute truths. Hallam has the interactional control. Here, his representation of the world develops from being just a representation to the inevitable way forward if we as a people want to survive. This narrative style works differently from the one employed by Griffiths, yet works towards the same end. Where Griffiths created a bond of trust between the reader and the movement based on honesty and personal reflection, Hallam instead attempts to create this trust through authority. Depending on who the reader is, either of these techniques may be more effective, or possibly a mix of both was purposely included to engage as many readers as possible in the movement.

Interestingly, however, the vocabulary throughout the chapter is very informal, and Hallam mixes sentences, clauses and phrases quite freely. For example, when describing the atmosphere he wishes to create at XR protests he writes, “We’re gonna have a party. Obviously” (102). This would usually create a less authoritarian tone, which typically is achieved by employing a more academic or scientific discourse. Here however, the tone amplifies one of the main goals of XR: to create a fun rebellion. As Hallam writes; “if we can’t dance at it, it isn’t a real revolution” (102). By using an informal vocabulary, he thereby practices what he preaches and makes the chapter more fun and engaging to read. He may be attempting to attract a younger audience and renegotiate the feelings of hopelessness and despair in regards to the climate crisis that are described in other chapters of the handbook. Hallam portrays joy as a main motivator for engagement rather than sorrow or anger, which instead can be paralyzing. This focus on joy also stands in contrast to conventional protests and/or social movements where feelings of anger or outrage against different injustices can be seen as the main motivator for mobilizations. Hallam is thereby further distancing the movement from others that he sees as less effective, which works to create incentives for the reader to become involved in the movement.

Not only does Hallam create a strong self-identity, he also spends time portraying other activists in an almost dismissive tone, describing other efforts to instigate change as a waste of time. For instance, he writes “We all know A-to-B marches get us nowhere” (102) or “Conventional campaigning has failed” (100) or “Emailing and marches don’t roll the dice” (104). This minimizing tone works to further the interests of the movement: to gain a larger following, by becoming “the only thing that can save us.” It portrays joining the XR movement as the only logical step by which to create real change, which fits well to the style of a manifesto that the handbook has.

Lastly, Hallam establishes the identities of what he refers to as “the elite.” Throughout the chapter he describes the relationship between an “us” and a “them,” where “we” are the protestors fighting for our lives, and “they” are the elite, the government, or the rich and powerful. In this relationship or social interaction, we must hit this elite where it will hurt them the most: in their pockets. Here he is describing a renegotiation of power dynamics, where they have the power and the money that has put us in this mess in the first place as “the rich and powerful are making too much money from our present suicidal course” (100) to act to stop it. By creating an economic burden for them through the use of NVDA - for example halting traffic for weeks on end through road blockages - he describes “us” as finally catching “their” attention, since “without economic cost the guys running this world really don’t care” (102). NVDA thereby renegotiates the power dynamics between society and the elite, playing on the greed of the latter to catch their attention.

The identity of the elite is made to be that of “the greedy bad guys,” while the movement is seen as the brave underdog for standing up to them, similarly to the story of David and Goliath. This imagery is one that Hallam is aware of, and employs to create maximum political effect:

You have to break the law. This is the essence of the non-violent method because it creates the social tension and public drama which are vital to create change. Everyone loves an underdog narrative. It’s the great archetypal story in all cultures: against all odds, the brave go into battle against evil (101).

The quote is taken from one of the listed steps Hallam presents as necessary for achieving real societal change through the use of NVDA. The tone becomes very dramatic and seems to fit

better in a movie script than in a manifesto or handbook. It demonstrates the strength in mass organization and mass arrests, and it cements the identity-building of the good/brave versus the bad. It also presents the public onlookers as objects without agency who can be dazzled with a bit of drama. Simultaneously, it works to signify the arrests as minor happenings. Hallam fails to take the possible implications of arrests seriously, seeing them only as a tool by which to engage the public. The arrests become a necessary part of furthering the narrative of the underdog fighting for its life, and they are not presented as having any significant consequences on the real and embodied lives of people. By repeating the importance of the movement in actually furthering our survival, by for example writing “we’re not sitting around waiting to die any longer” (102) or “it is the only thing that can save us now” (105), Hallam creates the impression that individual harm is secondary to the harm facing humanity if we do not act now. This larger perspective may be a further reason for the lack of focus on the consequences of arrests on individuals and also links to Griffiths’s description of the importance of self-sacrifice for the greater good.

Finally, I want to comment on the structure of the chapter. As mentioned, Hallam mixes different styles and tones. The most striking of these is a numerated list, consisting of steps to take to ensure the success of any social movement employing a NVDA strategy. The list contains six points ranging between six to thirteen lines, and helps create a more straightforward tone, much in the style of a step-by-step manual. It also fits very well with the subtitle of the book: *An Extinction Rebellion Handbook*, as it gives the reader clear and practical instructions to employ during protests³. The shortness of this list also works to underline the simplicity of the strategy, which can be seen as an additional way to convince the reader to join the movement. Further, this adds to the image of the author as all knowing, as this one short list is presented as all that is needed to ensure the success of the movement.

Taken together, Hallam employs an authoritative tone when making his knowledge claims, presenting them as truths and the only way forward. His authority is amplified by his dismissive tone when mentioning other activists and movements, which further portrays his truths, and thereby XR, as the only logical solution to combat the climate crisis. His use of informal vocabulary stands in stark contrast to this authority, but, as one of the main goals of the movement is to have a fun rebellion, the vocabulary echoes this less serious attitude. It

³ Such practical instructions are also printed at the end of the book, explaining how to block a road and how to shut a bridge.

may also be a tool by which to engage a younger audience, and to balance some of the feelings of hopelessness and despair that are present in earlier sections of the book. Hallam also spends time navigating the relationship between the elite and “us,” portraying “us” as the underdog fighting the greed of the elites for our survival. He uses dramatic language to build this narrative, and thereby portrays arrests as a means to an end, without reflecting on the consequences it may have on real people. The focus he puts on the mission of XR actually being a fight for our survival may be one of the reasons he does not reflect on these possible consequences. The survival of the planet, through the mobilization of a larger XR-following, becomes more important than the individuals taking part. However, I would also argue that Hallam lacks the same perspective as Griffiths, and, like her, portrays his subjective understanding as a white, middle-class, and legal resident of the UK as universal.

5.2 Discourse Practice

As stated within the short overview of my theoretical framework, analyzing the material’s discourse practice involves several steps, including examining how it is produced and consumed and the text’s intertextuality and interdiscursivity. I will begin with a brief presentation of the production process. Penguin published *This Is Not A Drill: An Extinction Rebellion Handbook* on the 13th of June 2019, less than a year after the XR movement had started formally organizing. Flood (2019) describes the publishing process as having been rushed, where the book went from manuscript to print in just ten days. In the same article, she speaks to one of the editors, William Skeaping, about certain parts of the printing process. The initial plan had been to create a manifesto: however due to the limited timeframe and newness of the movement itself, XR instead chose to call it a handbook, which gives it a less political connotation and would give the movement more time to develop their agenda. As a large part of the essays in the book also deal with very personal reflections on feelings of guilt, shame and sorrow in regards to the environment and the climate crisis, he believes the term manifesto to have been misleading (Flood, 2019). I have chosen to still refer to it as written much in the style of a manifesto, as I very much see it as a commentary on contemporary politics and a call for action, if yet not an outspokenly political one (Hazelton & Parker, 2017, 2).

In Flood’s (2019) article, Skeaping further comments on the choice of publisher and choice of physically printing the handbook. As XR is an environmental movement, he acknowledges the conflict of printing physical copies of the book, but underlines that the paper used in print

came from a carbon neutral paper mill that plants two trees for every tree it uses in its paper making process. This comment can be seen as an attempt to salvage the choice to print the book from a sense of hypocrisy, and shows an awareness that this is how it may be interpreted. This is not the only conflict that has been critiqued in regards to the handbook. Liz Lee Reynolds (2019) presents a number of problematic points resulting from XR's publishing choices. First, she sees the use of such a large publisher as Penguin as troublesome as the publisher undoubtedly is making revenue from the sales, and has a repertoire of published works that do not line up with the beliefs of the movement (she mentions *The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels* as one example). Second, the handbook is being sold on Amazon, which Lee Reynolds (2019) describes as a company that "actively encourages increasing consumption and has been criticised for its treatment of its staff" (Lee Reynolds, 2019). Becoming part of the Amazon franchise is thereby neither environmentally nor socially sustainable, and may be seen as hypocritical by some. Further, the handbook is sold for £7.99 (the version I have borrowed from a friend has a price tag of 12€ on the back of it), which is not an insubstantial amount of money, especially for young people, and thereby already begins to exclude a certain audience from the movement.

In "Courting Arrest," Griffiths employs the discourse of a personal narrative, much as if she is telling a personal story. As such, the interdiscursivity of the chapter is hard to evaluate since many different styles, tones and discursive practices can be said to be part of a story telling discourse. I did however manage to identify some interesting discursive mixes. The most striking discursive change occurs when Griffiths explains the motivation behind "rebels" courting their own arrests. She moves from a more personal reflection of her own experiences during the protest to slowly employing a more political reflection on the act of arrests. She begins by describing why she has not been arrested earlier: "for all the usual reasons: a desire to be law abiding; concern about acquiring a criminal record; nervousness about imprisonment; fear of being isolated in a locked cell" (96). The connotation with the act of arrests is negative here as it may have a detrimental effect on one's future (by leading to a criminal record) and being imprisoned is linked to feelings of nervousness and fear. All of these claims probably hold true for most people, but may seem like a large understatement for some, especially marginalized communities. Again, Griffiths presents her subjective understanding as universal ("for all the usual reasons") without reflecting on what other consequences people may experience due to their arrest, or why people might not want to court them. If you already have a criminal record, another arrest may be punished far more

harshly, having larger consequences than for a first-time offender. If you are not a legal resident of the country you are protesting in, an arrest may lead to fines or even deportation. If you are not able-bodied, the direct physical power that the police can assert over you may be greater, with a larger risk of actual physical harm or loss of mobility. The list could go on and on, but Griffiths misses this opportunity to show a consciousness for subjectivities that are not her own.

By stating, “I had never in my life been arrested, for all the usual reasons” (96), Griffiths implies that not being arrested earlier has been an active choice. She suggests that as long as someone is law-abiding, zhe will not get arrested. This indicates that an individual only needs to feel fear and/or nervousness when encountering the police after breaking the law, as there is no risk for imprisonment if the citizen is law-abiding. This premise ties in well with the positive tone Griffiths uses when describing the police throughout the chapter. In short, the premise is that as a law-abiding citizen, one has nothing to fear from the police. As long as one makes an active choice not to be arrested, by not breaking the law, one will indeed not be arrested. This may seem a ludicrous statement when keeping in mind other social movements such as Black Lives Matter, which seek to draw attention to the racialized violence of the police, both in the US and Europe and around the globe. Racialized, non-white identities still run a far larger risk of police assault than do whites and are overrepresented in the penal system. Griffiths’s color blindness reinforces preexisting racial power structures, portraying white subjectivities as universal, and erases the very real embodied experiences of racialized identities.

Further, Griffiths develops this discourse of individual choice by explicitly renegotiating the meaning of choice, taking it back from “consumerist pap” (97) and instead describing it as “[t]here is a choice. To take sides. To be on the right side of history. To choose life over extinction. There is a choice to put yourself on the line” (97-98). This reflection on individual choice portrays individuals as the main actors that can bring about change, and that this choice must include putting yourself (and thereby your body) on the line. This resonates with her description of not being arrested earlier in life. She made a choice not to be, simply by abiding by the laws of her society, and this choice is presented as accessible to anyone and everyone. When making the choice to court arrests, protestors are portrayed as “unfrightened and non-violent, [...] irrepressible” (98), making the lack of fear a key ingredient in creating social change by creating actors that cannot be muzzled. Fear as a natural reaction to

something that may harm you, or has harmed you in the past, becomes invalid. The situatedness of fear is erased, and fear is instead presented as an obstacle keeping the universal subject from its moral duty of self-sacrifice.

Griffiths, however, goes on to redefine these feelings about the act of arrests in regards to NVDA. “When you seek arrest, calmly and willingly, the idea of it is no longer a deterrent. The sting is gone. So is the fear, because the way to stop being scared is to actively attempt it” (96). Here, Griffiths renegotiates the power dynamics behind the act of arrests. Rather than seeing the power lying in the act itself, as an act of violence in containing a body by force, it is presented as lying in the fear and unwillingness of the individual to be arrested. The police have power over the individual only in so far as the individual does not want to become arrested. Once this unwillingness is removed, the power dynamics within the action are changed, leading the individual to no longer feel fear when facing them. The power within the action is instead moved to the individual successfully obtaining their goal of becoming arrested for NVDA.

This shift in power, if we agree with the premise of courting arrests within XR, in turn makes the movement as a whole more powerful by mobilizing a larger following and public sympathy. This reflection on power within arrests, and between the police and the individual, seems almost ignorant when analyzed through an intersectional lens. If we imagine a scene where Griffiths is explaining this point to, for example, a largely racialized community, in a low-income/working class area in the outskirts of London, where several individuals already have had a negative experience of the police, by saying that “the key to stop being scared [of arrests] is to actively attempt it” (96), the statement becomes almost bizarre. It minimizes the very real feelings of fear that racialized police violence may cause in these communities as well as the consequences the act of arrests may have. Marginalized communities are often more vulnerable and susceptible to police violence. I do not mean to say that this vulnerability is inherent within these racialized bodies, but instead want to point to the structural injustices and power dynamics that keep certain bodies in a more vulnerable position. By not reflecting on the implications of arrests on different bodies, Griffiths erases the possible experiences of subjectivities that are not her own, thereby reproducing the structure that shuts certain identities out of the discourse. This erasure implies an illegitimacy in their experiences, which keeps their bodies in a more vulnerable position, as they do not fit the mold of the (white) body Griffiths is portraying as universal.

Griffiths moves on from the reflection of power within arrests to employ a brief historical discourse when discussing the power of using a NVDA strategy. She links the strategy to the suffragette and civil rights movements, stating “[o]ne of the most powerful ways to bring about change is when people are willing to be imprisoned for non-violent civil disobedience” (96). This historical discourse lends itself as a tool by which to convince others of using arrests in protests, by showing how it has been successful in the past. However, as she does not go on to explain how or why this act of civil disobedience is so powerful, the reader is left with a superficial historical account of the use of NVDA in prior movements. Here, Griffiths misses an opportunity to demonstrate how the strategy has been changed or developed to the “here and now,” thereby demonstrating the historical and contextual importance of such strategies. Further, this historical perspective would have added a dimension with regards to the discourse’s interdiscursivity and the analysis of its social practice, as I then could have compared the contexts of the discourses, and attempted to start mapping out the relationship between the discourse and its local and temporal context.

Taken together, the storytelling discourse, the discourse exploring the power dimensions within arrests, the discourse of individual choice, and the historical discourse show an interdiscursive mix within the text. This mix indicates the presence of a hegemonic struggle within the order of discourse and will be discussed later on. Further, the different discourses all work to portray Griffiths’s subjective understanding of the act of arrests as universal by erasing other narratives and experiences from her account and reflection. She thereby reproduces racial power structures where the white experience is portrayed as universal and true for all. That she presents the white experience as universal becomes extra apparent when creating different imaginary scenarios that move her knowledge claims to a non-white context.

The interdiscursivity in “The Civil Resistance Model” is easier to identify, as the chapter is not written primarily using a personal storytelling discourse. Hallam opens the chapter using a somewhat academic discourse, applying this to superficially explain where his knowledge claims come from regarding why the NVDA strategy is proven to be the most effective in instigating real change.

... we went to the library. We studied decades of work looking at organizational systems, collaborative working styles, momentum-driven organizing and direct action campaigning. This research, alongside the site research we have varied out ourselves, has been invaluable to the development of our ideas (99).

Taken individually, this statement does not give the reader much more information than that his knowledge claims are based on previous research (albeit not which research he is referring to). Hallam may be applying this (superficial) academic discourse in an attempt to create a greater scientific authority, using it to show that the NVDA strategy within XR is scientifically proven to work based on past experience. Exactly which research he is referring to remains unclear. In other sections of the handbook, Chenoweth and Stephan (2011 & 2014) are two of the few researchers who are actually cited directly. As mentioned during my literature survey, Chenoweth and Stephan (2011) created a data set of social uprisings between the years 1900 to 2006, thereby attempting to map the success rate of violent versus non-violent movements; it seems that this is the research that Hallam mainly builds upon. I make this assumption based on his estimate that between 1 and 3 percent of the population are needed to create sustainable change, which has also been pointed out in Chenoweth and Stephan's (2011) work.

Hallam likely also builds on Chenoweth and Stephan's (2011) research when presenting the first step in his "to-do" list of organizing a successful social movement: "you need the numbers. Not millions, but not a few dozen people either. You need several thousand: ideally 50,000" (101). Even having read Chenoweth and Stephan's (2011) work, as well as the rest of the handbook, this number seems a bit random. Depending on the size of the city or country where the movement should take place, 50,000 people may be a large or small portion of the population. The simplicity of the steps in the list here affects the credibility of Hallam's statement, as the reader is not presented with a background by which to judge his estimates. It becomes apparent that Hallam does build upon earlier research, but as this research is not explicitly referred to, it becomes hard to create an intertextual chain. I assume that he is primarily using the research by Chenoweth and Stephan (2011); however, this remains an assumption.

I would conclude that Hallam quite freely has used earlier research to fit his argument concerning the strength of NVDA, using the results without regards to their context. Hallam

thereby has interpreted the material and changed its contextual scope (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002). In an attempt to apply an academic discourse to present his strategy of NVDA as proven to work, he has instead created the opposite effect by not being transparent with his knowledge claims. Rhetorical simplicity has been chosen over accountability, and the critical reader will rightly inquire where his information comes from. As I have knowledge of the book in its entirety, as well as of the research he is (probably) referring to, my subjective understanding allows me to interpret his representation based on earlier research. A reader without this prior understanding will however have a harder time doing so.

Hallam goes on to employ an economic discourse, explaining that the input the movement has received through professional's and activist's volunteering, "anyone could estimate at hundreds of thousands of pounds" (99). By monetizing the knowledge and wisdom of those involved he may be attempting to further illuminate the scope and strength of the movement, using the commercial language in which value often is described in today's late capitalist society. This use of language is in line with his argument about creating an economic cost for the elites that was explained in the last section, where he for instance writes "[y]ou have to hit them where it hurts: in their pockets. That's just the way it is" (102). This argument can be read in different ways. On the one hand, it is a critique of the established order, where economic cost is the only thing that can create a reaction from the elite, and is thereby weighted heavier than, for example, the loss of biodiversity and mass extinction. This recognition adds a class dimension to his argument where certain classes have more power to shape the future than others, implying that injustices are also class-based. On the other hand however, it is an acceptance of the capitalist order (by presenting it as a truism as it is "just the way it is"). This is an interesting argument coming from someone explaining the vision of the movement to be "radical system change" (99). Here, the use of an economic discourse serves to create a more leveled field between the movement and the elites they are rising up against, by describing the movement in terms these capitalist elites may understand, thereby reproducing the hegemonic discourse of neoliberalism and broadening the possible audience of the text.

Hallam also employs a democratic discourse condemning violence. He writes, "violence [...] is often disastrous when it comes to creating progressive change. Violence destroys democracy and the relationships with opponents that are vital to creating peaceful outcomes to social conflict" (100). This argument effectively illuminates the movement's goal: bringing

about progressive and sustainable change peacefully and democratically. It also becomes clear that Hallam values political dialogue, involving opponents in the process to create change. This focus on dialogue may also begin to explain why XR chooses to describe itself as apolitical, or beyond politics. If it is so greatly valued, strict political distinctions may be seen as an obstacle. From the rest of the chapter, I assume the opponents he refers to are the “elite,” which includes both the government and the “rich and powerful”, and the dialogue to take the form of the citizen’s assembly, which is one of the demands of XR UK.

The organization of protests can be seen as one of the cornerstones of democracy, where the repression of social movements almost always is linked to oppressive regimes. This distinction is something that Hallam also argues for, and can be seen as the prime motivation for the coordinated acts of civil disobedience: keep going and the state has no other choice than to react by inviting a dialogue, as repression of peaceful protests is not an option.

This discourse of democracy links well to Griffiths’s reflection on the power dynamics within the acts of arrests. Where Griffiths deals with the obligations of the individual towards the state (such as being law-abiding), Hallam instead speaks of the rights of the individual in the relationship (such as organizing protests). For Griffiths, the power of arrests is redistributed from the police (and thereby the state) to the individual once the individual no longer fears arrests and actively attempts them. Hallam takes this one step further by redistributing the power from the individual to the movement as a whole, once again reproducing the idea that the individual consequences per se do not necessarily matter in the greater context. The power in numbers thereby forces the state to open up for dialogue, and power is once again renegotiated through, for example, a citizen’s assembly.

Hallam builds his argument for NVDA on the premise that the state will not use violence to shut the protests down, as this only happens in “oppressive” governments. The acts of arrest will be seen as wrong and unjust by the general population, due to the peaceful nature of the protests, but will not necessarily be classified as violent. This assumed absence of violence, even within the acts of arrests, shows Hallam’s two-dimensional understanding of what actually constitutes violence. Both Hallam and Griffiths see changing the attitudes of those under arrest as the only thing necessary to remove violence from the act. The state monopoly on violence is not problematized, and the embodied reality of people being removed from a

location with physical force, to be put in a position of powerlessness when in custody, is also ignored.

Both chapters employ a wide range of different discourses, thereby showing an interdiscursive mix. Both Hallam and Griffiths creatively transform discourses, genres, styles and information from (presumably) other texts to fit the arguments in their respective essays. Returning to Fairclough (2010), we should remember that an interdiscursive mix indicates that there might be a hegemonic struggle taking place within the field.

Here it becomes important to clarify what this field actually is, and this may be up for debate depending on the reader's subjective understanding of the material and the movement as a whole. I, however, identify two main fields: first, the use of NVDA in protest movements and second, the larger field of climate protests and their relationship to actual change. Remember that hegemonic struggles deal with questions of ideology, and can show the role of discursive practices in furthering the interests of different groups in society. The discourses employed by Griffiths and Hallam can be seen as a critique against the hegemonic order, presented here as neoliberalism and late capitalism, working to further the interests of an elite group rather than ensuring the survival of the human race and the rest of the planet. Through truisms and comparative identity building, Hallam creates a class narrative that shows how certain groups of people have more power to affect the future than others. The reason change has not yet occurred is presented as financial, as the elites simply earn too much to question the status quo and thereby endanger their economic status. Here, Griffiths and Hallam attempt to use NVDA to renegotiate this hegemonic order, by redistributing power to all people (rather than an elite group), as we are all in danger of losing our lives due to the climate crisis. Rather than valuing growth and economic gain, we as a society should value nature and work to protect it, much in the spirit of Thoreau (1854).

By transforming NVDA into a contemporary global strategy to combat unjust power dimensions in shaping the future, the handbook also critiques traditional European democracy. This critique is given by calling for a more direct dialogue between the state and its citizens, and larger direct influence over the decision making process by citizens (through e.g., a citizen's assembly). The handbook and the chapters analyzed in this study therefore should be seen as a critique of the hegemonic structure of neoliberalism and non-direct democracy.

I will now go on to briefly discuss the importance of subjectivity when interpreting the material. Discourse analysis has its epistemological base within social constructionism, which Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) describe as having the starting point that how we speak does not “neutrally reflect our world, identities and social relations, but, rather, play an active role in creating and changing them” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, 9). This starting point has two main implications. First, the material must be seen as historically and culturally contextual, and should be analyzed as such. Second, the findings I make cannot be seen as objective or neutral, but are also based on my prior understandings and categorizations of the world and the material and social identities presented therein.

Having deeply engaged with earlier research on NVDA and social movements, I have an understanding where some of the overarching generalizations that both Griffiths and Hallam present in their essays come from. I can indirectly create an intertextual chain, which allows me to both comprehend and critique some of their knowledge claims. This may, however, lie outside the scope of a large section of the audience of the book, and so the authors fail to be transparent and open up their production of knowledge to an ethical critique.

Further, these overarching generalizations may work to alienate an audience that, similar to myself, have a background that allows them to employ an intersectional lens and have a political agenda. By choosing to present themselves as apolitical, and not giving a detailed analysis of steps forward in combatting climate change and reaching their goals (other than causing mass disturbance), the XR handbook instead comes across as almost sensationalist, playing on the reader’s emotions to create maximum effect. Simultaneously, it points to the contradictory elements in the movement, as they on one hand describe themselves as apolitical, but on the other hand call for a radical system change and more direct democracy.

Here one should remember that the handbook was written in the midst of the seemingly endless Brexit debate in the UK, where very hard political fronts were created. By choosing not to employ a politics, XR may have attempted to take a step away from these fronts, thereby broadening the possible audience of the movement.

As someone following the development of climate change closely, many of the knowledge claims made in the chapters used in this study (as well as in the rest of the book) seem very

obvious and almost too superficial to include. Often, however, these were presented in very personal and moving ways, leading me to shed tears at several occasions and increasing my feelings of climate anxiety and powerlessness. Looking back on the experience of first reading the handbook, I get the feeling that I was almost being emotionally manipulated to feel such a range of emotions, in an attempt to draw me in and win me over to the cause. This does not necessarily have to be a point of critique, as we should remember that the handbook is written in a style similar to a manifesto, and therefore rightly attempts to stir something within the reader. This first emotional response would, however, have had more lasting effects if XR used this chance to give a more detailed account of the crisis and how it attempts to combat it, rather than just presenting overarching generalizations and superficial accounts.

While I choose to live my individual life in an environmentally conscious way and thus believe in the power and necessity of individual choice in combatting climate change, I am also tired of the focus being put primarily on the individual in our market economy, while letting multinational corporations, states and other large actors continue on their environmentally destructive path. Unfortunately, I see the XR handbook as reproducing this hegemonic discourse of individual choice, even as it attempts to criticize the larger hegemonic structure of neoliberalism of which it is part, due to my personal political beliefs and understandings. This reproduction of the hegemonic neoliberal structure applies both to Griffiths's view on arrests and how to avoid them, and both authors' views on putting one's body on the line for the greater good.

To conclude, both pieces employ an interdiscursive mix, implying that a hegemonic struggle is taking place within both the neoliberal capital system and European democracy. Griffiths and Hallam both fail to reflect on certain power dimensions and implications of their knowledge claims, as well as to be transparent with their intertextuality. As white middle class writers/researchers, they are not only reproducing a hegemonic structure of racial oppression by erasing other narratives from their account, but they are also portraying their own subjectivities as universal. By taking up public space and attempting to shift power dimensions in society without applying an intersectional lens, they are also reproducing the power structures keeping some, often marginalized, voices from being heard. They determine what questions are on the agenda, and what strategies are to be employed, without leaving much room for identities other than white, middle-class, and legal residents to navigate the movement on their own terms.

By largely focusing on individual choice, Griffiths and Hallam further reproduce the neoliberal structure (of which individual choice may be seen as a corner stone) that they simultaneously seek to criticize. Hallam's attempt to create a class dimension in his argument about the redistribution of power falls flat due to this focus on individual choice. The choice to be part of the movement, and potentially even being arrested, may have severe implications based on class. You may be assaulted, miss work, lose your job and only source of income, not have anyone to look after your children or even be deported (amongst many other possible consequences). The XR NVDA strategy of "courting arrests" is only accessible to a very privileged group in society that does not have to worry about such consequences.

5.3 Social Practice

The analysis of the social practice of a discourse includes two steps. First, I will examine the relationship between the discourse of NVDA as part of the XR handbook and its order of discourse, and second, I will map the non-discursive social and cultural structures of which the discourse is part.

The order of discourse is the set of social practices that constitutes a particular field, such as "education" or "the university" (Fairclough, 2010, 233). Social practices would then, for example, include communication between the teacher and students or between the school and the public through advertisements. These social practices may stand in different relationships to each other and they can act in concert, inclusively/exclusively, or in opposition to each other (ibid.,93). I place the XR handbook (and the discourses of NVDA therein) within the order of discourse "social movements" for several reasons. First, the style of a manifesto that is employed in the handbook points towards the political nature of the order of discourse (even as the movement explicitly calls themselves apolitical), which can be seen as a common ground for most social movements. I see this claimed apolitical stance as being overshadowed by the demands of XR, including the founding of a citizen's assembly to promote more direct democratic involvement by the public. I would claim that the movement indeed has very political goals, but shies away from the political dichotomy of left and right, so as not to alienate certain audiences. Social movements should be seen as an umbrella term for movements uniting people to protest something seen as wrong, unfair or harmful, often with political motives and/or outcomes, and this is exactly what XR is attempting to do.

Further, the handbook should be seen as a form of this protest and critique against the hegemonic structures of neoliberalism, which have led to environmental degradation. As discussed earlier on, this critique is presented by creating an “us” and “them” narrative, where certain societal groups have more power to shape the future than others. This power imbalance is deepened by the uneven distribution of resources and financial means, creating an incentive for “the elite” to retain the status quo, where economic growth is valued more than averting the climate crisis. By critiquing this hegemonic neoliberal structure, XR further roots itself within the order of discourse of social movements.

There are several social practices that are part of this order of discourse, and I will here list a few of them: communication between members of XR (locally, nationally and internationally, across different channels and structures) and between XR and the general public (through e.g. direct communication during protests, the actual handbook, social media postings, or op-eds), communication between XR and stakeholders (through e.g. the citizen’s assembly), the planning and implementation of marches, road blockages and other acts of civil disobedience, acts of courting arrests, and the interactions and relationships between the police force and XR protestors. In short, the order of discourse includes all social practices that may take part therein.

The discourse of NVDA within the handbook influences several of the social practices within the movement. First, it aims to renegotiate the power dimension between the state (in the form of the police) and the individual during their social interactions at protests. This renegotiation is attempted by an effort to remove any fear the individual may have with regards to getting arrested. That this social practice may take very different forms depending on the individual’s identity is, as stated previously, overlooked by both authors.

Furthermore, other forms of NVDA, such as A-to-B marches, are deemed ineffective. Here, the authors are redefining the use of NVDA within social movements, thereby affecting the social practices behind organizing these more classic protests. Public perception is presented as an important factor that affects the movement’s impact, and is most effectively created by dramatic scenes of arrests of non-violent protestors, rather than conventional A-to-B marches. Protest organizers should therefore redefine their course of action and follow the checklist presented by Hallam. An analysis of the relationship between this discourse of NVDA and

other social practices within the order may point to further possible conflicts within the movement.

The main goal of the movement in creating the handbook seems to be to engage the public, thereby helping the movement to grow. To achieve this goal, the movement presents easy to grasp information about the climate crisis in often very personal and emotional accounts. XR has undoubtedly had a large impact on people all over the world, which the large numbers of protests and participants has shown. However, as mentioned, XR has also faced critique for its exclusionary strategy and lack of intersectional and postcolonial perspective. Therefore, there remains a conflict between the audience and the movement, based on the communication in the handbook. The discourse of NVDA employed within the handbook thereby also acts to create a social practice of critique against the movement. The objective to create an incentive for people to join the movement has thereby been missed, leading some people to instead feel alienated or left out. This sense of alienation may also be furthered by the apolitical aspirations of the movement, leading to almost sensationalist overarching generalizations instead of practical steps forward in their communication. Where the movement sought through an apolitical stance to act *more* inclusively, it has instead alienated those who seek more direct political action (see e.g. Kinniburgh, 2020). Therefore, the discourse of NVDA within the XR handbook can be seen as both constituting and constitutive of the social practices within its order of discourse.

As it is a handbook, written as a mix between a manifesto, personal reflections, and a manual (including “to-do” lists), this relationship between the book and the reality of the movement may seem obvious: it is there to guide people who want to become part of the movement, and thereby forms how the movement will take shape. As such however, it also creates inflexibility in the ways forward and cements the exclusion of certain identities, particularly through the use of truisms in the examined chapters. The representations of, for example, identities in the book, lead to the reproduction of hegemonic power structures of oppression, where certain intersectional identities are excluded from the discourse. This is primarily done by the creation of a universal subject in both Griffiths’s and Hallam’s chapters, presenting their own subjectivities as universal with regards to, for example race, class, and citizenship status.

To conclude, I would argue that the discourse of NVDA within the handbook has five main relationships to the order of discourse “social movements.” First, it seeks to redefine the relationship and social interaction between the state and the individual during protests by changing the power dynamics within the act of arrests. Second, it redefines the appropriate use of NVDA within social movements, portraying strategies other than mass arrests as inefficient. Third, it creates tension between the movement and certain audiences, due to its exclusionary nature. Fourth, it affects the social reality of the movement, limiting what steps can be taken by whom and how identities within the movement are created. Fifth and finally, it reproduces harmful power structures by excluding certain identities from the discourse.

When examining the results of the analysis of the textual features and the discourse practice of both chapters we can begin to identify how certain identities are created in relation to NVDA. Griffiths creates three main identities in her essay: her own, those of the police force, and a universal subject. The most striking example of a renegotiation of identities takes place in the shift of how the police are presented. In the first paragraph, the police are portrayed as a violent force, leading to feelings of fear and vulnerability in Griffiths. This is also the only scene where Griffiths actually presents her body as being in danger of physical harm, as the police are cutting her out of the metal pipe that she is attached to. Once this act, leading with it the risk of losing a finger or hand, is over, the police are presented in a much more positive light.

Zeiler (2013) describes the body as “influenc[ing] our ways of interacting with others and the world” (Zeiler, 2013, 2). When applied to the scene described by Griffiths, the position of her body here informs her interpretation of the world and the identities (that of herself and the police) and the relationship (between herself and the police) within it. How the body is oriented within the spectrum of violence affects the creation of identities and relationships, which also ties to the mind-body described by Zeiler (2013). As embodied beings, the mind-body leads us to act in certain ways and interpret the lived world and the relations and meanings within it. The embodied act of being cut out by the police leads Griffiths to indirectly define violence as physical violence, as it is only when there is a risk of physical harm that the police are portrayed as dangerous. This is the only (if yet indirect) definition of what constitutes violence in the essay. Here it is also important to keep in mind that these violent actions however still are part of Griffiths’ definition of NVDA, as it is in relation to the strategy that the police react as they do. This implies that violence may still be part of

NVDA, dependent on *who* actually is being violent. Here the violent act is committed by the police, but instigated by Griffiths. She makes no attempt of condemning either the violence in the act or the act per se (other than employing a somewhat negative tone towards the police). This implies that she sees it as a legitimate reaction by the police, and echoes with her desire to be arrested.

When examined through a perspective on embodiment, this reflection on the use of violence within NVDA becomes interesting. The police may often be seen as an extension of the state, compiled of a large number of anonymous objects rather than of individual subjects for a number of reasons. First, during protests, they are often perceived as a “them,” different from the “us” that are protesting. An obvious example of this split is the orientation that the police and the protestors have during protests, where they are usually facing each other, becoming almost opposite images. Further, their uniforms also create anonymity among them, as does the lack of personal connections with them during these encounters. If we attempt to unveil this anonymity by extending subjectivities to also incorporate their experiences, we may begin to instead understand that the police force is also made up of individuals who, just like the protestors, are diverse in background and orientations. The embodied realities of the members of the police may differ greatly from one to the next, and so they will also give different meanings to actions such as arresting “non-violent” protestors. By forcing an arguably violent act on the police through actively courting arrest, Griffiths and XR are reproducing the depersonalization of them, and erasing their experiences from the discourse. The physical, mental and emotional effects on members of the police who may be sympathetic to the cause but have to obey orders, and thereby become a public enemy by arresting protestors, are deemed unimportant. Again Griffiths misses an opportunity to problematize the embodied and situated nature of violence, disregarding any subjectivities that are not her own. Returning to the scene of her arrest, Griffiths’s embodiment leads her to renegotiate the identities of the police as well as her relationship with them once the risk of her own physical harm is gone.

This portrayal of the police links well with the creation of the third identity in the essay: that of the universal subject. Griffiths makes an effort to demonstrate the diversity of the protestors, describing her fellow activists as “Hannah, seven months pregnant [...] together with a solitary fourteen-year-old and a man in a wheelchair” (95). Here, different identity markers with regards to gender, age and ability are used, all of which are very embodied

identities, and which presumably would experience the act of arrest and being cut out of metal pipes quite differently. The pregnant woman might fear for her unborn child and any type of physical violence towards her, the fourteen-year-old may feel more vulnerable due to the age difference between the police and themselves, and the man in a wheelchair may fear the risk of mobility loss during the interaction with the police. No mention of the protestor's class, race or citizenship status is made, giving the impression that a) these are not important in this particular situation, and b) that all protestors share these markers. Both points enforce the image of the movement as white and middle-class, which has been widely critiqued (see e.g. *Wretched Of the Earth*, 2019 or Akec, 2019) and demonstrates the lack of an intersectional perspective. Again the movement misses an opportunity to examine “why racialized embodiment, in practice, may correlate with social inequalities” (Zeiler, 2013, 3), such as racial profiling or racialized assault by the police.

Griffiths develops this universal subject further, regardless of the different identity markers of the protestors. As described earlier, Griffiths sees the act of arrests within NVDA as one of the “most powerful ways to bring about change” (96). She encourages the reader to join in and try it, “because the way to stop being scared of something is to actively attempt it” (96). Griffiths presents a simple trick by which to renegotiate the power dimensions within the act of arrests, implying that it works for everyone, thereby creating a universal subject that simply has to try to be arrested to see that it is “not that bad.” Again, she fails to incorporate any reflection on how arrests may affect identities differently.

Even when imagining how the embodied identities she described earlier on might interpret the act of arrest, a wide range of possible interpretations become apparent. Ahmed (2006) describes this embodied difference in relation to orientations. In regards to fear, she writes “for an object to make this impression [of fear] is dependent on past histories, which surface as impressions on the skin” (Ahmed, 2006, 2). It is not simply the embodied self that negotiates the identities and relationships between different social actors and practices, but also how prior experience has oriented us towards that object. As a white, able-bodied, middle-class woman who has never before been arrested, Griffiths is not necessarily oriented towards the police as an actor and the arrest as an action in the same way that other intersectional identities may be. By not reflecting on this and instead creating the illusion of a universal subject, Griffiths reproduces unequal power dimensions often found within white

feminism, criticized by for instance Lewis (2013), by erasing certain identities from the discourse of NVDA.⁴

“The Civil Resistance Model” also creates identities in relation to NVDA. First, Hallam uses “authoritative assertions of truisms” (Fairclough, 2010, 248) to establish himself as an almost all-knowing leader. His authoritative tone makes his representation of NVDA come across as universal and true for all, furthered by his adversarial tone and dismissal of movements not employing the type of NVDA he advocates. Presenting the strategy as the universal key to success opens it up to a critique with regards to embodiment and orientations, similarly to what I discussed in relation to Griffiths. By establishing NVDA as the universal answer by which to bring “the elite” to listen, Hallam indirectly creates a universal subject in relation to his representation of the strategy. He goes on to describe the movement as diverse; however, he seems to only mean diversity of occupations, naming “scientists, academics, lawyers, diplomats, councilors, campaigners, teachers, doctors, [and] nurses” (99) as some of the occupations held by members of XR. These occupations further add to the image of the movement as predominantly middle-class.

Hallam goes on to mention “the young, the old and the vulnerable” (101) members of XR when discussing the use of violence and how violence may come to “destroy the diversity [...] upon which all successful mass mobilizations are based” (101), thereby beginning to explore identities and their reactions towards violence somewhat more deeply. However, here he does not reflect on what actually constitutes violence for whom or acknowledge that the strategies within NVDA very well may be seen as violent for someone who has a particular embodied reality or orientation. Violence is simply presented as something that hurts the cause by excluding certain people, such as the young, old and vulnerable. Further, it is presented as something different from NVDA and the acts therein, implying that courting arrests also is non-violent. Similar to Griffiths, Hallam disregards what implications courting arrests may have on, for example, members of the police.

⁴ I want to acknowledge that Cathy Eastburn (2018) recognizes that different identities may experience time in jail as a result of NVDA differently in the chapter “Going to Jail” in the handbook. This brief reflection in a chapter that otherwise explores the author’s personal experience of spending time in jail was, however, too limited to include in this study.

Hallam does not mention any other identity markers until the last paragraph of his essay, where he describes a scene out of the movie *Freedom Riders*, portraying white and black students during the civil rights movement:

Black and white students are preparing to go on coaches down to the segregated South and break the law – to sit together side by side on the bus. They know this could lead to injury or even death. The interviewer asks one of the freedom riders if he is scared. The guy looks at the camera and says with great force: “I’m ready”. (105)

Here Hallam uses the American civil rights movement as an example of NVDA employed successfully (without acknowledging more explicitly violent factions therein such as the Black Panthers). The quote is an interesting example of identity-building in relation to the discourse of NVDA. Hallam mentions that there are both black and white students on the coach, but that is where any racialized reflection ends. He acknowledges that there is a risk of injury or even death in relation to their actions, yet still creates the image of this risk being the same for all students, regardless of their skin color. This portrayal is very similar to the universal subject created by Griffiths. The black students in the group face much larger risks of violence, especially in the segregated South, than their white peers when protesting segregation and unjust racial politics. By not describing the student who answers the interviewer’s question with regards to their race, Hallam implies that their race is of no importance in that particular situation. This implication completely ignores the embodied realities of race, leading to the very injustice that particular movement is seeking to stop. Here an intersectional lens would have allowed a more nuanced reflection on the lived realities that different embodiments carry with them.

Such a lens would also have been important with regards to questions of class within XR. Hallam superficially touches upon class when describing the power imbalance allowing “the elite” to have larger influence in shaping the future than those outside that particular group, but neither he nor Griffiths reflect more on the implications of arrests and disturbances for people in, for example, the working class. When arrested for disturbance in the UK, one can count on being released on bail. By playing down the seriousness of arrests, both authors ignore that not all people have the ability to pay bail, or to miss time off work to sit in a jail cell in the first place.

Furthermore, some have also critiqued how the realities of workers who must commute to and from work is ignored in the very strategy of mass disturbance employed by XR. For example, Rowlatt (2019) describes a scene occurring during XR's two-week rebellion in London in 2019, where protestors blocked the Underground during rush hour in the largely working-class neighborhood of Canning Town. The action led to violent outbursts where protestors were attacked by commuters, thereby adding a violent dimension to what is presented as NVDA. Here, a similar point of critique as with regards to the police force can be made: by instigating a violent act through a non-violent act, the protestors are simply moving the responsibility of violence to different actors, thereby deflecting from the act that initially calls for such a response. Had the group reflected more on embodiment through an intersectional lens, and the very real implications thereof, they may have come up with a better strategy, actually targeting the elite they are opposed to instead of the working class trying to get to work.

6 Discussion

I have now presented a few examples of how identities are created in relation to NVDA within “Courting Arrest” and “The Civil Resistance Model,” and how these identities create certain social practices and relations. The discourse of NVDA employed by both authors has the effect of erasing certain intersectional identities from the discourse, and thereby also ignores how these identities may experience NVDA (and the possible violence therein) differently. Lewis (2013) writes that an unwillingness to include certain identity markers when examining power relations can lead to an “erasure of contemporary realities of intersectional subjects” (Lewis, 2013, 887), and Zeiler (2013) and Ahmed (2006) both point towards the importance of recognizing embodied realities, especially in regards to social injustice based on e.g. racialization. Ahmed (2006) writes that “social differences are the effects of how bodies inhabit spaces with others” (Ahmed, 2006, 5), and by excluding certain embodied realities, Griffiths and Hallam both limit the space of XR as only available to certain (privileged) identities.

This exclusion becomes extra detrimental, as the book is a *handbook*, working to inform participants about the NVDA strategy within XR. Here, the dialectical relationship between the discourse and the social practice of which it is part must be problematized. By reproducing unjust power dynamics and erasing certain identities from the discourse, the authors cement the hegemonic power structure working to exclude certain groups of people

from any decision-making processes. Power to shape the future is unfortunately still distributed very unjustly, especially with regards to climate change and mitigation. Exclusion of certain identities thereby also becomes problematic out of an environmental justice perspective. XR portrays itself as a movement standing up to “the elite,” when in reality the movement actually represents part of this global elite, as it is primarily white, academic, middle-class, and originated in the global North. By not problematizing the movement’s actual position within a global power hierarchy, it instead reproduces this hegemonic structure of excluding certain groups from the discourse. This reproduction happens both nationally and on a more global level. As stated by Nixon (2011), climate change affects communities very differently, and marginalized communities are globally those who are hit first and hardest by a changing climate, but are least present in discussions about how to combat environmental despoiling (see also Kyllönen, 2014; Vaughan et al., 2013). Unfortunately, the discourse of NVDA within XR, and the portrayal of universal subjects therein further strengthen this.

As mentioned in the introduction, the local and historical contexts of discourses are important and may shape how they are applied. Here I want to acknowledge that some national XR groups have indeed reworked some of the original cornerstones of the XR movement, thereby challenging the reproduction of unjust and oppressive power dimensions therein. One such example is the North American XR movement, which has added a fourth demand to their “Declaration of Rebellion”:

We demand a just transition that prioritizes the most vulnerable people and indigenous sovereignty; establishes reparations and remediation led by and for Black people, Indigenous people, people of color and poor communities for years of environmental injustice, establishes legal rights for ecosystems to thrive and regenerate in perpetuity, and repairs the effects of ongoing ecocide to prevent extinction of human and all species, in order to maintain a livable, just planet for all (Extinction Rebellion US, 2020).

Instead of reproducing unjust power dimensions working to exclude certain groups from the decision-making process, this fourth demand illuminates the importance of redistributing this power to marginalized groups by calling for reparations for climate injustices. I believe a similar demand to also be important in the European context. By acknowledging that different

identities have different experiences (of both NVDA and the real life effects of climate change), XR could work to become more inclusive and horizontal in its exercise of power, both nationally and internationally. Ahmed (2006) describes orientations as crucial in affecting how we “feel at home” in a certain space (Ahmed, 2006, 7), and by acknowledging the different orientations of different bodies, XR can make a wider range of identities feel at home and included in the movement. This acknowledgment of embodied differences could be a first step in creating a more just and inclusive way to combat climate change, an undertaking that needs all the hands it can get.

I also briefly want to reflect on the ethical considerations of this study. The subjective understanding of the researcher becomes extra important within discourse analysis, and this subjectivity is also one of the main critiques of discourse analysis as a method. As Haraway (1988) states, “translation is always interpretative, critical and partial” (Haraway, 1988, 589), and my subjectivity has undoubtedly affected how I have interpreted the material in this study, and which categorizations I have identified or remained unaware of. As such, questions of generalizability and validity also arise.

Here, these questions of limitation and ethical considerations go hand in hand. If we agree that the god trick of objective science cannot produce any trustworthy results (Haraway, 1988, 589), then my subjective perspective instead may be seen as a strength of this method. I have attempted to apply a reflexive dimension to my knowledge claims, and to be transparent and accountable. I see this as the main ethical consideration in these types of studies where the focus is not the personal interaction with research participants, and I also see it as an argument for the validity of the results in this study. My results may not be reproducible, due to my subjective perspective, but this does not negatively affect the results according to the epistemology of situated knowledge. Further, I would situate this study within the environmental humanities (albeit applying a social science methodology), and therefore this subjective understanding should be assumed and does not diminish the study’s reliability.

With that said, however, I still see this research as an important examination of the relationship between discourse and social reality. Other subjective understandings may have identified other categories in relation to the handbook, but I still think that the lack of an intersectional perspective is a point of critique that most subjectivities would comprehend and agree with. The links between the lack of an intersectional perspective and the reproduction of

unjust power dynamics may, however, be more or less developed dependent on the researcher's local and historical context and understanding, as the fourth demand from the XR US movement reminds us.

7 Conclusion

Some may argue that the discourses presented within the handbook should be taken with a grain of salt, giving the readers more agency in choosing how to employ the strategy and which representations to internalize, thereby questioning the dialectical relationship between the discourse and social processes. As I have shown, some local XR movements have indeed done so; however, I still believe it to be important to understand how a critique of certain discourses may work to question oppressive structures in society, in a critical and political manner. This critique should, however, only be seen as a first step for research examining the reproduction of unjust power structures within XR and other social movements or organizations.

Having used Ahmed (2006) and Zeiler (2013) as part of my theoretical base, I have also become intrigued by what a phenomenological approach to identity-building within XR would look like. Future research based on the real experiences of participants would be a fruitful way to examine how individuals navigate the identities presented in the XR handbook, as well as in the organization per se. This perspective would allow a more in depth account of the real social relationships within the movement, or even between the research participants and the police during protests. I hope to explore this further in future research, by working closely with XR protestors with different intersectional identities and embodied realities. This study has laid a theoretical groundwork for how intersectionality and embodiment may affect the lived reality of NVDA, and it should be assessed in light of real embodied realities.

I want to conclude this study with an acknowledgement of the work the XR movement is doing, regardless of the critique I have directed towards it here. Together with Fridays for Futures, XR has been able to mobilize more people to their cause than many previous environmental movements have. This mobilization is so important in the face of the current climate crisis, and I thank all XR protestors for "putting themselves on the line" for the climate. I do not wish to minimize any experiences of arrests as a part of NVDA within XR, and I am aware that certainly not all experiences of arrests have been as positive as the one described by Griffiths. But it is exactly here the problem lies. I hope that this study can work

to inspire members of XR to think more critically and intersectionally, thereby changing the movement to become more inclusive from within.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2006). *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Akec, A. (2019, October 19). When I look at Extinction Rebellion, all I see is white faces. That has to change. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/oct/19/extinction-rebellion-white-faces-diversity?>
- Booth, E. (2019). Extinction Rebellion: social work, climate change and solidarity. *Critical and Radical Social Work*, 7(2). 257-261.
- Burkett, M. (2016). Climate Disobedience. *Duke Environmental Law & Policy Forum*, 27(1). 1-51.
- Butler, J. (2011). *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge.
- Carbin, M., Edenheim, S. (2013). The intersectional turn in feminist theory: A dream of a common language?. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 20(3). 233-248.
- Chenoweth, E., Cunningham, K. G. (2013). Understanding nonviolent resistance: An introduction. *Journal of Peace Research*, 50(3). 271-276.
- Chenoweth, E., Stephan, M. J. (2011). *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chenoweth, E., Stephan, M. J. (2014). Drop Your Weapons: When and Why Civil Resistance Works. *Foreign Affairs*, 93(4). 94-106.
- Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Application, and Praxis. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(41). 785-810.
- Crist, E. (2013). On the Poverty of Our Nomenclature. *Environmental Humanities*, 3(1). 129-147.
- Curnow, J., & Helferty, A. (2018). Contradictions of Solidarity: Whiteness, Settler Coloniality, and the Mainstream Environmental Movement. *Environment and Society: Advances in Research*, 9(1). 145-163.
- Cunningham, N. (2019). Averting Climate Catastrophe: Environmental Activism, Extinction Rebellion and Coalitions of Influence. *King's Law Journal*, 30(2). 194-202.
- Eastburn, C. (2018). Going to Jail. In Farrell, C., Green, A., Knights, S., & Skeaping, W. (Eds.). *This Is Not a Drill: An Extinction Rebellion Handbook* (pp. 131-136). London: Penguin Books.

Erickson, B. (2020). Anthropocene futures: Linking colonialism and environmentalism in an age of crisis. *EPD: Society and Space*, 38(1). 111-128.

Extinction Rebellion. (2020). *Our Demands*. Retrieved 2020-05- 21 from <https://rebellion.earth/the-truth/demands/>

Extinction Rebellion US. (2020). *Demands & Principles*. Retrieved 2020-05-21 from <https://extinctionrebellion.us/demands-principles>

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. New York: Routledge.

Finley, J. S. (2013). “Justice in the Land”: Ecological Protest in Henry David Thoreau’s Antislavery Essays. *The Concord Saunterer: A Journal of Thoreau Studies*, 21(1). 1-35.

Flatschart, E. (2016). Critical Realist Critical Discourse Analysis: A Necessary Alternative to Post-Marxist Discourse Theory. *Journal of Critical Realism*, 15(1). 21-52.

Flood, A. (2019, April 26). Extinction Rebellion rushes activists’ handbook This Is Not a Drill into print. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/apr/26/extinction-rebellion-rushes-activists-handbook-this-is-not-a-drill-into-print>

Greenpeace. (2018). *Six Greenpeace Non Violent Direct Actions*. Retrieved 2020-05-21 from <https://www.greenpeace.org.uk/news/six-greenpeace-non-violent-direct-actions>

Griffiths, J. (2019), Courting Arrest. In Farrell, C., Green, A., Knights, S., & Skeaping, W. (Eds.). *This Is Not a Drill: An Extinction Rebellion Handbook* (pp. 95-99). London: Penguin Books.

Hallam, R. (2019). The Civil Resistance Model. In Farrell, C., Green, A., Knights, S., & Skeaping, W. (Eds.). *This Is Not a Drill: An Extinction Rebellion Handbook* (pp. 99-105). London: Penguin Books.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3). 575-599.

Hazelton, R., & Parker, A. M. (Eds.). (2017). *The Manifesto Project*. Akron: University of Akron Press.

Howes, D. E. (2013). The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence. *Perspectives on Politics*, 11(2). 427-226.

Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.

Kinniburgh, C. (2020). Can Extinction Rebellion Survive?. *Dissent*, 67(1). 125-133.

Kyllönen, S. (2014). Civil Disobedience, Climate Protests and a Rawlsian Argument for ‘Atmospheric’ Fairness. *Environmental Values*, 23(5). 593-613.

- Levine-Rasky, C. (2011). Intersectionality theory applied to whiteness and middle-classness. *Social Identities*, 17(2). 239-253.
- Lewis, G. (2013). Unsafe Travel: Experiencing Intersectionality and Feminist Displacements. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(41). 869-892.
- Lykke, N. (2005). Nya perspektiv på intersektionalitet. Problem och möjligheter. *Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift*, 26(2). 7-17.
- Lykke, N. (2010). *Feminist Studies. A Guide to Feminist Theory, Methodology and Writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Motavalli, J. E. (1995). In Harm's Way. *The Environmental Magazine*, 6(6). 28-37.
- Muñoz, J., Anduiza, E. (2019). 'If a fight starts, watch the crowd': The effect of violence on popular support for social movements. *Journal of Peace Research*, 56(4). 485-498.
- Naides, S. (2014). *Philosophy & Praxis of non-violent direct action from (past) indigeneous resistance to (present) environmental campaigning in Aotearoa – New Zealand*. (Bachelor's Thesis). Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Facultat de Ciències.
- Newman, L. (2005). *Our Common Dwelling: Henry Thoreau, Transcendentalism, and the Class Politics of Nature*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nixon, R. (2011). *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Reynolds, L. L. (2019, June 26). Is XR selling out?. *The Ecologist*. Retrieved from <https://theecologist.org/2019/jun/26/xr-selling-out>
- Rowlatt, J. (2019, October 17). Extinction Rebellion protestors dragged from Tube train roof. *BBC News*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-london-50079716>
- Sharp, G. (1980). *Social Power and Political Freedom*, Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers.
- Simpson, B., Willer, R., & Feinberg, M. (2018). Does Violent Protest Backfire? Testing a Theory of Public Reactions to Activist Violence. *Socius*, 4. 1-14.
- Thoreau, E. D. (1849). *Civil Disobedience: Resistance to Civil Government*. Aukland: Floating Press.
- Thoreau, E. D. (2016). *Walden*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Tompkins, E. (2015). A Quantitative Reevaluation of Radical Flank Effects within Nonviolent Campaigns. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*, 38(1). 103-135.
- Vaughan, D., Comiso, J., Allison, I., Carrasco, J., Kaser, G., Kwok, R., Mote, P., Murray, T., Paul, F., Ren, J., Rignot, E., Solomina, O., Stefan, K., & Zhang, T. (2013). *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Working Group I Contribution to the Fifth Assessment*

Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Wretched of the Earth. (2019, May 3). An open letter to Extinction Rebellion. *Red Pepper*. Retrieved from <https://www.redpepper.org.uk/an-open-letter-to-extinction-rebellion/>

Zeiler, K. (2013). A Phenomenology of Excorporation, Bodily Alienation and Resistance: Rethinking Sexed and Racialized Embodiment. *Hypatia: A Journal for Feminist Philosophy*, 28(1). 69-84.

Zingsheim, J., Goltz, D. B. (2011). The Intersectional Workings of Whiteness: A Representative Anecdote. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 33(3). 215-241.