

AGAINST ALL ODDS: A SOCIOLOGICAL EXAMINATION OF THE SOCIAL
MOVEMENT THAT OPPOSED THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE XL

by

Nicholas Kalich
A Thesis
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Arts
Sociology

Committee:

_____ Director

_____ Department Chairperson

_____ Dean

Date: _____ Spring Semester 2015
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Against All Odds: A Sociological Examination of the Social Movement that Opposed the
Keystone Pipeline XL

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Arts at George Mason University

by

Nicholas Kalich
Bachelor of Arts
Baldwin Wallace University, 2006

Director: Lester Kurtz, Professor
Department of Sociology

Spring Semester 2015
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to all the participants that volunteered to be a part of this study and those who bravely enact their constitutional rights to protest peacefully for positive social change.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would not have been possible without the collaboration, assistance, and support of many individuals. Each member of my committee has imparted a unique and invaluable contribution to both my professional and personal development. I would never have developed an idea for my thesis had it not been for Dr. Lester Kurtz's course on Nonviolent Civil Disobedience. This course inspired me to engage in social movements, take action against social injustices, and apply Sociology beyond the classroom. Also, Dr. Johanna Bockman highly influenced my interest in modern Sociological theory. Previously I was obsessed with only classical theorists such as Marx, Durkheim, and Weber, but Dr. Bockman exposed me to the richly complex writings of Foucault, Habermas, and Gramsci that I continue to explore. Meanwhile, Dr. Bockman developed my appreciation for applying Sociology to events occurring even in my own neighborhood. Finally, I am someone who needs a lot of guidance (and gentle shoving), which was provided by Dr. John Dale during my educational journey at George Mason University. His patience and advisement began with the initial research proposal and remained constant through the final submission of my thesis. Together, my committee encouraged my research's progress and provided me with the necessary insights to strengthen and support my arguments. I also acknowledge the assistance from George Mason University Dissertation and Thesis Services editor Sally Evans, for her guidance on the overall format of my thesis.

My love for research exists in discovering previous literature, incorporating classical theory, and collecting data in the field. However, writing has never been one of my strongest skills. Without the assistance of Dr. Natalie Marie Kalich, my sister, my writing would have suffered from common word choices, unclear sentence structures, and grammatical errors I did not spot during my second and third review. She worked tirelessly to provide feedback in a limited timeframe, before I even had the courage to send it to my committee for their review. Thank you, Natalie, for always looking out for your little brother.

Furthermore, I would not be the person I am today without the love and support from my parents, Ray and Veronica Kalich. My mother provided the much-needed moral support and always made me feel that I was doing something important by sending daily reminders to keep the end goal in sight. My father also provided moral support, especially when I felt like giving up, but he managed to push me forward and "just get it done." To my extended family: my grandmother Mildred Kalich; my aunts, Larissa Kyzour, Rebecca Kalich, and Roberta Kalich-Paley; my uncles, Jim Kyzour and Jim Gephart; and

my cousins Mark Davis and Aaron Paley—for the love and support that got me through all the difficulties in working on this research. I would also like to acknowledge my grandparents who have passed, but who are always in my thoughts. Both my DC and Cleveland friends, some of whom I consider family, provided necessary periods of release so that I could come back to my work with a clearer mind and focused approach.

I also want to thank the environmental organizations and participants I dedicated this research to. Without these climate protectors, the world might be in far worse shape. I hope my research properly illustrates the efforts and importance of your cause. Next, I must acknowledge the support from my employer, American Institutes for Research. AIR provided the financial support to make my graduate career possible and encouraged my continual educational development.

Finally, a very special appreciation and acknowledgement is reserved for my life-mate, Jessica Fern Crutchfield. You came into my life rather unexpectedly, but I knew from the first glance that we would live an amazing adventure together. Your patience, support, and love have propelled me to the end of my research. Thank you for never allowing a dull moment to pass in our lives. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	vi
List of Abbreviations	vii
Abstract.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: The Keystone Pipeline XL	5
Chapter Two: Theoretical Foundation	13
Chapter Three: Methods	31
Chapter Four: Environmental Movement Organizers.....	35
Environmental Movement Organizations	35
Framing the Issue.....	38
Communication Strategies.....	41
Mobilization.....	47
Strategizing.....	50
Nonviolent Civil Disobedience	52
Chapter Five: Social Movement Activists	60
Chapter Six: Conclusion	69
Purpose	69
Findings.....	70
Future Research Recommendations	77
Appendix A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	78
Appendix B: Recruitment Script.....	80
Appendix C: Verbal Consent Script	81
References.....	83
Biography.....	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1 Environmental Movement Organizers.....	36
Table 2 EMOs Campaign Chant Sheet.....	47
Table 3 Field Observations from Demonstrations.....	54

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Environmental Impact Statement.....	EIS
Environmental Movement Organization.....	EMO
Environmental Protection Agency.....	EPA
Chesapeake Climate Action Network.....	CCAN
New Social Movements	NSM
Not In My Back Yard	NIMBY
Rapid Response Network.....	RRN
Social Movement Organization	SMO

ABSTRACT

AGAINST ALL ODDS: A SOCIOLOGICAL EXAMINATION OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT THAT OPPOSED THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE XL

Nicholas Kalich, M.A.

George Mason University, 2015

Thesis Director: Dr. Lester Kurtz

The purpose of this study is to investigate why people engage in civil disobedience against powerful corporations and how social movements attract and mobilize protestors, even when the odds are against them. Given that both supporters and opponents of the Keystone Pipeline XL considered its construction inevitable, I was surprised by the number of people who continued to protest against it. I explore this dynamic through an ethnographic study of the social movement opposed to the Keystone Pipeline XL, thus contributing to our understanding of the environmental movement and the general knowledge regarding both individual interest in joining social movements as well as the ability of social movement organizers to mobilize individuals.

In August 2011, the social movement opposed to the Keystone Pipeline XL construction organized a week-long act of civil disobedience that ended with 1,252 people arrested in front of the White House. The following November, 12,000 people

organized again in a demonstration to encircle and create a symbolic chain around the White House (no arrests were made). Organizers have continued to call upon supporters to participate and contribute towards various acts of civil disobedience against the Keystone Pipeline XL, yet many participants did not believe their protests would be successful.

This research outlines three conditions why people participate in social movements. First I identify key decisions that lead individuals to participate in collective action throughout various observed demonstrations. Rational choice theory seeks to identify just how these preferences (attitudes, belief, and values) determine behavior (Aldrich 1993), but the decision to participate in a movement goes well beyond the narrow understanding of rational choice theorists and includes the role of emotions in mobilizing protest (Goodwin et al., 2001; Eyerman, 2007). Next, I identify motivational factors that social movement organizers used to bring people together and demonstrate for their cause. Conflicts can mobilize the people that are most directly affected by oppressive manipulations of social and economic resources (Melucci 1980) yet other factors can be identified as sources of motivation towards collective action. This describes how environmental movements must convey certain motivational messages to encourage the individual's rational decision to participate. Finally, I identify interactions between the social movement and the individual to describe how this relationship affects the participation and effectiveness of planned demonstrations. Nonviolent movements obtain their strength from the participation of people from all areas of society and the more members the movement has supporting it, the more effective the tactics will be

when implemented (Stephan & Chenoweth 2008; Chenoweth & Cunningham, 20013; Merriman 2010). The results of this research are derived from field research at movement protests, content analysis of movement publications, and fifteen interviews of participants at planned actions organized by the environmental movement.

INTRODUCTION

On October 7th 2011, the Department of State (USA) held a final public town hall meeting in Washington, D.C. on the proposed construction of the Keystone Pipeline XL. This particular pipeline would carry crude bitumen oil from the tar sands deposit in Alberta Canada through the United States to oil refineries in Texas. Similar meetings were held in each state where the pipeline would pass through, including Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, South Dakota, and Oklahoma. Each meeting gave the public an opportunity to voice its opinion on the construction of the pipeline in order to compile a report. This report would be sent along to the President with all accompanying reviews regarding the project for him to determine if the pipeline was in the nation's interest. Then, the President could use this information to make a decision to approve or veto the necessary Presidential permit for the pipeline's construction, which would cross over the Canadian border and into US territory.

The Tar Sands Action group, an organization that opposes the construction of the pipeline, sent a call to arms for people to show up in mass numbers at the meeting in D.C. to contribute their views to the impact statement and declare that the pipeline would significantly accelerate climate change and was not in the nation's best interest. Participants that attended other state public meetings described acts of foul play committed by the company responsible for the pipeline's construction, TransCanada. The

participants claimed that TransCanada had bused construction employees to attend the meetings in overwhelming numbers and speak in favor of the project. To counter this threat, mass emails were sent out to Tar Sand Action members and other activists of the movement to attend the various public hearings. Reminders were also posted on the Tar Sands Action group website and their Facebook page, which encouraged more people to attend. To prevent TransCanada from dominating the public hearing in D.C., a team of activists spent the night in front of the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center to secure a position from which to voice their view, which was on a first come basis and only between the hours of 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM.

While observing a town hall meeting in D.C., I spoke with an activist sitting next to me who opposed the pipeline. He asked me if I had written anything to present at the public hearing, and I replied I was merely there as a witness. He then showed me his several-paged speech he planned to deliver, but stated it didn't matter because he felt that President Obama planned to approve the permit, allowing construction of the pipeline. This sentiment was shared among many activists that I came across in various demonstrations throughout this study. This sense of futility among the activists made me curious as to how a social movement could nonetheless mobilize so many supporters. The intention of this research is to examine how the Keystone Pipeline XL construction permit spawned a social movement, which methods were used by the social movement to counter the pipeline's construction, the perspective of the activists, and how this movement was able to maintain its resource of supporters against all odds.

The purpose of this study is to investigate why people engage in civil disobedience against large corporations and how social movements were able to attract and mobilize protestors when even the participants were pessimistic about the efficacy of the movement. This research identified strategies used by the social movement that worked best to attract participants to various demonstrations. I also identify conditions that lead to individual decisions regarding participation. Finally, I analyze the correlative relationship between the structural conditions of the social movement and the conditions that lead to individual participation with the movement.

During my research, I discovered that the social movement attempting to block the Keystone Pipeline XL utilized resources identified in the social movement literature, which contributed to its high levels of attendance at various events. These variables include gathering resources through proper strategizing, carrying out tactics of nonviolent direct action, communicating to its participants effectively, and responding properly to the movement's opposition. I also learned that if a social movement fosters a strong network and frame its agenda to connect with a large group of environmentally sensitive people, it can accumulate more resources towards its final goal. This means that the social movement had to portray the construction of the Keystone Pipeline XL as a serious threat to the environment and health of the American community.

I expected to find that an individual's rational choice to participate is positively impacted by the variables mentioned in previous literature. Individuals who are negatively affected by the construction of the pipeline, either directly or indirectly will be more likely to attend various demonstrations sponsored by the social movement that

seeks to prevent the pipeline's construction. The "free rider" dilemma is also likely to be overcome as long as the individual feels that their attendance is vital to the strength of the social movement. Finally, I predicted that individuals who valued the expected outcome of the social movement's goals and perceived the pipeline as being extremely detrimental to the environment are more likely to be intensely engaged in the social movement and its various collective actions.

Ultimately, I examined the combination of the social movement's ability to frame, present, and carry out its agenda (structural conditions) paired with passionate individuals who strongly believe in the social movements mission (individual conditions) and increase the movement's ability to mobilize resources and participation. By bridging the gap between the structural and individual conditions, I believe social movements can benefit by understanding how people make decisions to participate in various forms of collective action and attract more participants (especially those on the fringe). To do this I used a qualitative study, which I considered to be the most effective means of achieving my objectives, combining content analysis with field observations and direct interviews of participants at various demonstrations in the D.C. area.

CHAPTER ONE: THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE XL

A social environmental movement has surfaced to oppose the extraction of crude bitumen oil from the tar sands in Canada and the transportation of this oil through the construction of the Keystone Pipeline XL. The tar sands are “a type of unconventional petroleum deposit that consists of a mixture of 85 percent sand, clay, and silt; 5 percent water; and 10 percent crude bitumen, the tar-like substance that can be converted to oil” (p. 8).¹ The majority of the tar sands are located in Canada’s Alberta province, and the oil extraction requires vast open-pit strip-mining because it is stored in sandy, muddy formations that must be super-heated and blasted with chemicals to refine. Once the tar has been extracted, a hot water based separation is used that requires massive amounts of boiled water to separate the tar from the sand. This process uses four barrels of water for every one barrel of oil produced and the water becomes permanently contaminated. The social movement arose from the concern over the hazardous, detrimental impact this extraction process has on the environment.

To acquire the oil, the Boreal forest was cleared out, rivers diverted, and wetlands stripped and drained. The majority of the tar is located in deep reserves, requiring high pressured steam to be injected into the ground and the bitumen pumped to the surface. The effects of this process not only releases three times the amount of greenhouse gases

¹ All information regarding the tar sands was acquired from Woyntillowicz (2007).

than conventional oil extraction, but also destroys natural habitation for various species who live in the Boreal forest. The tar sands development is expected to clear out about 3,000 square kilometers of Boreal forest and the remaining 137,000 square kilometers will be carved out for pipelines, transportation roads, well pads for the injection process, and storage deposits for contaminated water. Continual productions and industrial development will eventually destroy the Boreal forests ecosystem beyond repair, leading to significant ecological damage and loss of biodiversity. TransCanada is currently trying to expand its production by easing the transportation of the extracted oil and increase its market to the United States and abroad through the construction of the Keystone Pipeline XL.

The Keystone Pipeline XL project would consist of approximately 1,850 miles of pipeline, including about 767 miles in Canada and 1,082 miles in the United States, all constructed by the TransCanada Corporation.² The Keystone Pipeline XL would interconnect with other existing crude oil pipelines that currently exist in Oklahoma and the U.S. Gulf Coast. The Keystone Pipeline XL would initially have the nominal transport capacity of 435,000 barrels per day of crude oil, increasing with further production from the tar sands each year. Current pipelines that are used for transportation of bitumen from the tar sands use conventional pipeline, which require higher operating temperatures and pressures to move the thick tar through the pipeline.³ These pipelines, however, pose new risks of pipeline ruptures and leaks due to the extremely corrosive

² All information regarding the Keystone Pipeline XL project was acquired from the State Department's website: <http://www.keystonepipeline.state.gov/clientsite/keystone>

³ All information regarding pipeline transportation and the Keystone Pipeline XL was acquired from Swift, Casey-Lefkowitz, & Shope (2011)

nature of the bitumen oil and its unstable mixture during extraction. There is considerable evidence that bitumen oil is more corrosive to a pipeline system than conventional crude oil, especially when one considers that the Alberta pipeline system had “approximately sixteen times as many spills due to internal corrosion as the U.S. system” (p. 3).

The current pipelines in the United States that the Keystone Pipeline XL would connect with are only designed to handle conventional crude oil. The proposed route would threaten farming land and natural habitation through deforestation and construction of the pipeline, in addition to contaminating sources of fresh drinking water from both the Great Lakes to the Ogallala Aquifer caused by potential spills due pipeline corrosion. Given bitumen’s volatility and that current regulations and safety practices in the United States are designed to respond to conventional crude oil, such regulations and practices are not effective enough to respond to leaks and contaminations caused by bitumen oil.

Pipeline leaks or ruptures caused by the transportation of bitumen crude are also more difficult to detect by current practices. As natural gas liquid flows through a pipeline, the pressure in the pipeline can cause the crude to change from the liquid to gas phase. This transformation creates a gas bubble that obstructs the oil flow, in which the proper response from a pipeline operator would be to pump more oil to “pop” the bubble and continue the flow. However, pipeline ruptures are easily confused with gas bubble obstructions and, given the highly corrosive nature of bitumen, pipeline leaks might be confused with an obstruction which may at first receive the same solution of pumping

more oil into an area already contaminated by a spill.⁴ These potential hazards are exactly why the Keystone Pipeline XL became the central issue behind the social movement.

According to the executive summary report, filed by the United States Department of State and the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, cross-border oil pipelines, such as the Keystone Pipeline XL, require a Presidential Permit certifying whether or not it is in the “national interest” to construct the pipeline.⁵ The variables used to determine national interest include foreign policy, compliance with relevant federal regulations, energy security, and environmental safety. At the time of the initial executive summary report, proposed construction would have commenced in 2013.

The report outlined the considerable threat the construction posed to the nation: “a spill in environmentally sensitive areas, such as the wetlands, flowing streams and rivers, shallow groundwater areas, areas near water intakes for drinking waters or for commercial/industrial uses and areas with population of sensitive wildlife or plant species,” (p. 9). The report voiced concern about the potential impacts to the Ogallala Aquifer and other groundwater areas, noting the shallow ten-foot depth that runs for approximately 65 miles of the proposed pipeline route. Finally, the report considered minority communities and low-income areas that might be at greater risk for detrimental

⁴ An example of this happened when the Enbridge pipeline ruptured into the Kalamazoo River. The operator pumped oil for more than 12 hours, leaking oil into the river the entire time. When investigated, the monitoring system interpreted the leak as an obstruction rather than a leak and emergency responders were not notified to clean the spill for more than 19 hours after the spill had started (Swift et al., 2011)

⁵ All information regarding the summary report was acquired from Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (2011)

impacts of a pipeline spill than other communities, especially if those areas have reduced access to health care.

The report concluded that negative environmental impacts could be reduced as long as the pipeline complied with all regulations and applicable laws; TransCanada agreed to implement measures that would reduce impacts to the environment, and they would obtain and incorporate all permits issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) during the pipeline's construction, operation, and maintenance. Alternative routes were also proposed to the project that might mitigate spills to the Ogallala Aquifer and other groundwater areas, but the State Department decided that the agency proposed route, with minor realignments, would have the least impact on the environment overall. TransCanada also agreed to implement certain actions to address the impact on low-income areas and minority communities. They would remediate spills immediately, provide alternative drinking water supplies in situations of ground water contamination, and restore affected areas as close as possible before contamination.

In November 2011, the US State Department determined that additional review of the proposed pipeline route was required to address major public concern regarding routes within Nebraska, more specifically potential impacts to the Ogallala Aquifer.⁶ In December 2011, however, Congress placed a provision in the Temporary Payroll Tax Cut Continuation Act that required the President to make a decision within sixty days on the proposed Keystone Pipeline XL route. Skeptical that the deadline would allow the State

⁶ All information regarding the additional review was acquired from Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (2014)

Department to produce a transparent, objective, and more rigorous review of alternative routes through Nebraska, the President rejected the permit.

TransCanada demonstrated to the State Department that building the southern portion of the pipeline would have beneficial economic utility and the company planned to move forward with its construction. Since the southern portion, known as the Gulf Coast Project, did not cross any international border, TransCanada did not require a Presidential Permit. Since then, the construction of the Gulf Coast project has been completed.

In May 2012, during the construction of the southern portion of the pipeline, TransCanada filed for a new Presidential Permit for the portion of the pipeline that would cross the international border between the United States of America and Canada. The new application included a different route through Nebraska and outlined a greater need for the completion of this pipelines construction. The State Department, in turn, added a final supplement to the original Environmental Impact Statement. In it, the State Department provided a revised analysis detailing the environmental impact of the pipeline's construction, review of the new proposed route, reviewed market analysis and potential economic impacts, and addresses the 1.5 million public submissions the State Department received during the draft of EIS.

The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement was largely identical to the original Environmental Impact Statement, but new to this report was the market analysis summary in which the State Department outlined rising demands for imported foreign crude by U.S. refineries. This demand for foreign crude could be met by the

expanding production of bitumen from Canada's oil sands. The report also details how the industry has invested heavily in rail transportation of crude oil to US refineries in lieu of the pipeline. Reliance on a rail system over a pipeline, according to the report, not only decreases the amount of crude oil that could be supplied to meet this demand (due to the various restrictions of rail transportation, such as limited containment and the time needed to transport), but also poses a greater risk to the environment. Rail transportation threatens the environment due to its higher reported release of crude oil per ton-mile during containment breaches, which is more than any existing pipeline. Rail transportation also has a greater potential for injuries and fatalities relative to pipeline transportation.

The report concluded that demand for crude oil could not be met with any alternative source of energy. A rejection of the Presidential Permit would not offset the demand for foreign crude oil and alternatives to its transportation posed a significantly higher risk than the proposed pipeline. Finally, the newly proposed route would avoid surface water when possible and would drill underneath major rivers in order to mitigate significant impact. Opposition against the Keystone Pipeline XL believed that the report positioned the pipeline as the only viable option. The social movement continued to refute the results of the Environmental Impact Statement and believes that the State Department has not been objective in its analysis of the pipeline's effects on climate change.

The central goal of the social movements is to use nonviolent means of civil resistance to prevent the construction of the Keystone Pipeline XL. Their mission is to

bring national attention to the Tar Sands and the construction of the Keystone Pipeline XL, to emphasize and remind the President that the decision is his alone to make regarding the approval of the Pipeline, to deny the Keystone Pipeline XL permit, and to use peaceful and nonviolent civil disobedience to acquire their goals.⁷ According to the social movement, preventing the Keystone Pipeline XL's construction would stop further production and extraction of the bitumen oil would be deadlocked since there is no other efficient and cost productive form of transportation to other markets.

⁷ Mission goals and information regarding the Tar Sands Action movement is available on their website: <http://www.tarsandsaction.org/>

CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

This research examines the social movement that opposes the construction of the Keystone Pipeline XL. Specifically, I investigate the organizations involved in the social movements, the activists who participate in direct action related to those social movements, and develop research objectives that explain the relationship between the social movement organizers and participants. While I outlined the background of the issue surrounding this movement in the previous chapter, it is not the intention of this report to weigh in on the merits of the pipeline or the social movement that opposes it. Instead, this report focuses how the social movement organizers mobilize people and why participants attend the various demonstrations.

The environmental movement is considered the most successful of all social movements in the last part of the twentieth century (Mertig & Dunlap, 2001). Environmental movements have also become a prime interest in the study of New Social Movement theory studies. New Social Movements (NSMs) largely exist in post-industrialized societies (Mertig & Dunlap, 2001). New Social Movement theory conceives contemporary social movements as avoiding radical aims of destabilizing and recreating a new system of government, and instead operating in an established society “in favor of the idea of structural reform” (Cohen, 1985: 664). Rather than form political

parties seeking to redefine government ideology, they operate within the system by creating grass-root movements and politics to obtain their goals (Cohen, 1985).

Conflicts can mobilize people who are most directly affected by oppressive manipulations of social and economic resources (Melucci, 1980) yet other factors can be identified as sources of motivation towards collective action. The collective interest model states that people participate in social movements and environmental activism when their subjective impressions of the value derived from participation is positive and beneficial (Lubell, 2002). The expected value for environmental activism includes “the development of public policies designed to prevent pollution, problems or, conversely, to protect the natural resources that support the economy and the health of human communities” (Lubell, 2002: 434). The individual is likely to overestimate the effectiveness of their own participation and, in turn, is more likely to engage in the demonstrations and actions of the movement (Lubell, 2002). The individual participant will make other rational choices before participating in collective action.

Collective action is a direct reaction to a disruption of the “equilibrium of the social system” (Melucci, 1980: 200). While the disruption may also be the cause of collective action, the intention is to eventually restore balance (Melucci, 1980). Social movements utilize this conflict-based behavior usually when a struggle exists between those who appropriate and distribute various social resources and those who receive them (Melucci, 1980). Collective action amasses the marginalized into solidarity and unites the underprivileged, shifting the social scales to a more equitable position. The more dissatisfied an individual is with the societal imbalance “the more likely he or she is to

join in collective political protest” (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989: 887). The demonstrations of the social movement seeking to prevent the pipeline’s construction are expressions of class conflict because those that profit from its construction are doing so at the expense of the health and land resources of individuals who do not have the means to take on the fight alone. Collective action is one of the few resources at hand to protect their interests.

A person’s constructed identity influences participation in collective action (Kitchell, Hannan, & Kempton, 2000). People that self-identify as an environmentalist are, “internally motivated to act in ways that consistent with that identity,” (Kitchell, Hannan, & Kempton, 2000: 96). Identity is also an impetus to join certain organizations partly because the character of an individual, in both self-perception and the perception of others, is generated by group affiliation (Goffman, 1963). Political behavior and activism requires certain attitudes, beliefs, and values to determine behavior, and rational choice theory seeks to identify precisely how one’s ideology determines behavior (Aldrich, 1993).

When an individual takes action there is a subjective meaning oriented in the way the action is carried out, which might be done openly or out of habit (Weber, 1968). This action becomes social when the individual carries out the action with account the behavior of others and how it is perceived (Weber, 1968). There are several reasons that may influence an individual’s orientation to take action. First, the individual may pursue action out of his/her own calculated ends, an *instrumentally rational* orientation (Weber, 1968). The individual may also carry out an action due to his/her own conscious belief in

the value of the action, a *value-rational* orientation that ignores the results of the action since the cause is more important (Weber, 1968). Finally, an action may be carried out due to the specific individual's feelings and emotions, or his/her *affectual* orientation (Weber, 1968). An instrumentally rational orientation is typically involved only in the calculation of various to end (Weber 1968), which is the kind of motivation to action explored by rational choice and resource mobilization theorists.

Resource mobilization theory posits that people join movements after making certain rational calculations (Gillham, 2008). These calculations involve weighing the costs and benefits of their participation (Klandermans, 1984). According to this theory, people will consider personal costs of participating (financial and physical), expectation of how their participation will help produce the collective good, and if their participation will contribute to the success of the movement's campaign (Klandermans, 1984).

Rational choice theory measures how the expected return value of the outcome from the collective action induce or incentivizes individuals to participate in the collective action at hand (Aldrich, 1993). Rational choice theory is also mindful of the "free rider" dilemma, the belief that the individual in large groups involved in political or environmental protest has minimum impact on the overall contribution of the group's success; therefore the individual will refrain from participation (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989). The rational individual is mindful of participation costs (such as financial, physical, and loss of leisure time) and so refrains from participating, knowing that s/he will most likely reap the social benefits if the movement is successful (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989). This dilemma can be countered if the movement overwhelmingly influences

the demand for their cause into the individual's rationality "without violating the logic of free riding" (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989: 886).

Individuals are also more likely to participate in collective action when they perceive that the value of their participation is greater than not participating (Lubell, Zahran, & Vedlitz, 2007). Moreover, the collective interest model considers the strategic nature of collective action in describing how people consider the societal differences their participation will make (Lubell, Zahran, & Vedlitz, 2007). People will also create an expected value of participation that is inclusive of the total value of the public good the movement seeks to achieve, the probability that their participation will affect collective outcomes, and the benefits and costs of participation (Lubell, Zahran, & Vedlitz, 2007). Expected value of participation in a collective political action is also equal to the value the individual attaches to the public good the movement is trying to achieve. (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989).

Mark Lubell and Arnold Vedlitz's (2006) identified five key collective interest factors an individual considers before engaging in political and environmental action. First is the perceived value of the collective good that would be achieved with the movement's success (Lubell & Vedlitz, 2006). If the individual truly values the movement's end goal, the decision to participate will be increased. Second is the movement's likelihood for success. If the movement is perceived as having an overall successful impact an individual is more likely to participate, whereas if the movement is perceived to be ineffective the individual will make the rational decision to not participate (Lubell & Vedlitz, 2006). The third factor includes the selective costs and

benefits of participation (Lubell & Vedlitz, 2006). The individual will weigh the financial costs, time spent during the participation, possible physical injury, and potential penal sanctions against the benefit of participation when making a rational decision (Lubell & Vedlitz, 2006). The fourth factor involves expected reciprocity, or the notion that the individual is influenced to participate if they believe others will participate with the same or greater effort, and political figures will respond to the group's actions by creating policies representing their efforts (Lubell & Vedlitz, 2006). A final factor is the self-perception of the potential environmental risks if the movement is unsuccessful (Lubell & Vedlitz, 2006). When individuals believe that certain conditions will pose a serious threat to the environment, they are more likely to take action or support political policies that will oppose or reduce those threats (Lubell & Vedlitz, 2006).

Individual participation is also influenced by factors beyond rational choice theories. Social network theory suggests a way of “bridging structural-level and individual level factors,” creating an impact on participation in collective actions (Passy & Giungi, 2001: 124). Networks create a social environment that influence cognitive choices, both in the short- and long run, leading either to participation in or avoidance of social movements (Passy & Giungi, 2001). Social networks operate on three basic functions: “structurally connecting prospective participants to an opportunity to participate, socializing them to a protest issue, and shaping their decision to become involved” (Passy & Giungi, 2001: 125). These functions affect the individual's cognitive ability to make a decision whether or not to participate. Social networks act as a “socialization device” crafting the potential towards mobilization and reinforcing

political and environmental awareness towards a particular issue (Passy & Giungi, 2001). Participants are also more likely to engage if they already have strong ties to recruiters involved in the social movement, especially if friends or family are involved or part of the network (Passy & Giungi, 2001).

Until now, this section has focused on the factors influencing the individual making a rational choice when deciding to participate in various collective actions arranged by a social movement. The next section will focus on the proliferation, strategies and tactics, communications, and responses to the opposition by social movements to attract more participants and effectively carry out their campaign. For social movements to succeed, they first must consider how to properly proliferate among the population and effectively mobilize necessary resources.

Resource mobilization theory examines the various assets necessary to assemble supporters to continue the social movement phenomena (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Social movements are “a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution of society” (McCarthy & Zald, 1977: 1218). Social movements occur among an aggravated population, which represent the principle source for necessary financial and physical resources (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Once the proper resources have been mobilized, the social movement needs to plan out necessary strategies and allocate those resources towards proper tactics to achieve the desired outcome.

Gene Sharp (2010) emphasizes the importance of strategic planning for any movement using nonviolent resistance. Such strategy requires “[very] careful thought

based on a realistic assessment of the situation and the capabilities of the populace” (Sharp, 2010: 39). Strategic planning facilitates the most efficient use of all available resources, effective mobilization, and successful deployment of tactics and people (Sharp, 2010). Strategic planning consists of clearly stated objectives with highly calculated course of actions that “consist of a phased series of campaigns and other organized activities designed to strengthen the oppressed population” to achieve objectives (Sharp, 2010: 40). Sharp outlines four important terms that are involved in strategic planning: grand strategy, strategy, tactics, and method (2010).

The grand strategy is the movement’s conception that serves as the blueprint to coordinate all available resources (financial, volunteers, media, etc.) towards achieving the movement’s goal (Sharp, 2010). The grand strategy determines the most effective technique of actions and decisions of proper deployment. Strategy concerns how, when, and whether to carry out those actions, operating along the guiding principles of the grand strategy (Sharp, 2010). Tactics are the direct and limited actions used to achieve a singular objective that helps carry out the strategy of the movement (Sharp, 2010). Each direct tactic deployed is necessary to achieve the end goal, but each must be chosen and applied with constant focus on the overarching strategic objective (Sharp, 2010). Tactics are deployed at key phases of the movement with a singular purpose to aid its objectives and strategies are the ideas behind those tactics that provide direction and support. Methods are the actual weapons or means of action used by the nonviolent struggle (Sharp, 2010). They represent the types of actions carried out, including, strikes, boycotts, noncooperation, sit-ins, etc. A successful nonviolent struggle requires the

“careful formulation and selection of the grand strategy, strategies, tactics, and methods” (Sharp, 2010: 45).

Civil disobedience is the sustained use of nonviolent actions - including the deliberate breaking of laws - to combat perceived injustices enacted by the government (Thoreau, 2004). Nonviolent disobedience channels a group’s grievances and transforms it into a, “civilian-based method used to wage conflict through social, psychological, economic, and political means without the threat or use of violence,” (Stephan & Chenoweth, 2008: 9). Environmental Movement Organizations (EMOs) that pledge nonviolent methods increase their national and international legitimacy while encouraging higher rates of participation from a broader network of participants, as well as increasing pressure on political targets to succumb to their campaigns goals (Stephan & Chenoweth, 2008). Acts of civil disobedience include nonviolent tactics of protests, public sit-ins, public demonstrations, and other applications of unarmed civilian based actions that do not use threat of physical or material harm against the opponent (Chenoweth & Cunningham, 2013).

Peter Ackerman (2007) establishes three categories of skills necessary in the strategy of civil resistance movements. First is the capacity of the movement to organize and sustain a mass mobilization against the opposing group (Ackerman, 2007). Mass mobilization is readily achieved through strong leadership with explicit and legitimate goals that unify a movement towards a common purpose. The second category of skills includes the ability of the movement to funnel resources efficiently through many different forms of tactics that yield successful results (Ackerman, 2007). These tactics

include a “sequence of engagements” that targets the opponent’s pillars of support (Ackerman, 2010: 2). A third category of a movement’s skills involves the effective execution of each tactic in a manner that maximizes disruption of the opposition while maintaining a nonviolent discipline, to highlight the injustice of the opposition’s repression (Ackerman, 2010). These skill categories, if utilized correctly, are a movement’s best chance for achieving its goals.

Robert Helvey (2004) stresses strategic estimates as a critical tool for strategic planners. Strategic estimates allow “a systematic approach to developing the best course of action to accomplish a mission” (Helvey, 2004: 47). The strategic estimate begins with the formation of the movement’s mission statement. The mission statement should include the movement’s objective of struggle, the type of struggle selected, and how the struggle will be waged (Helvey, 2004). These strategic estimates are necessary to identify and analyze important factors and capabilities of the participants while comparing the opposition’s strengths and vulnerabilities to develop specific courses of action (Helvey, 2004). Once a strategy has been identified and actions are carried out that target those vulnerabilities, it is important that the movement remains current and the planners are quick to respond to new information, adding additional actions or adjusting operations if significant changes occur (Helvey, 2004). By developing clear definitions of the problems and creating proper tactics to attack those problems, the movement can disperse their resources more effectively and be more successful in achieving their ultimate objective.

Another important factor to consider when developing a strategy is the movement's explanation of its message; in other words, how it frames the struggle. Hardy Merriman (2010) provides a fundamental insight regarding power: "nearly all institutions, organizations, and systems in a society depend on the ongoing consent, cooperation, and obedience of a large numbers of ordinary people" (p. 2). If the people then choose to protest and/or cooperate in an organized and strategic way, then the people can wield "coercive power," (Merriman, 2010). The skills and agencies of the movement can control the movement's action and the language it uses to mobilize and maintain people's involvement. Framing the issue then becomes important to build on the political process countering the opposition, as well as properly mobilizing enough people behind the movement. For an action to be carried out against an oppressive or unjust situation, people must reinterpret the situation as unacceptable through a cultural process to overcome "apathy, fatalism, and grudging acceptance" (Schock, 2005: 14). The strategy for the movement must then demonstrate significance and legitimacy through the ideas and symbolism used to express their struggle through the construction of a counter-cultural framing process (Schock, 2005).

Framing helps render the underlying meaning and serves to guide action (Benford & Snow, 2000). Collective action frames are a set of beliefs that not only legitimize the activities and campaigns of the EMOs, but also persuade activists to participate in their planned actions (Benford & Snow, 2000). Collective action frames are constructed by EMOs and identify a problematic situation they believe warrants urgent attention. The first step is to clearly define the issue, identify who is to blame, craft a probable solution,

and announce what others can do to achieve the solution (Benford & Snow, 2000). There are three core tasks of framing: diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational (Benford & Snow, 2000).

Diagnostic framing seeks to remedy or change a problematic situation and is contingent on identifying the source of “causality, blame, or culpable agents” (Benford & Snow, 2000: 616). Once the EMOs diagnosed the issue and framed their message as a matter of dire urgency, a new approach was necessary to articulate the solution and take action. This procedure is also known as prognostic framing (Benford & Snow, 2000). Motivational framing focuses on the issue’s urgency to demand that people engage in collective actions (Benford & Snow, 2000).

Environmental movements must convey certain motivational messages for the individual to make the rational decision to participate. First, the movement must make clear the personal effectiveness of each individual participant (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989). If the individual believes that they are personally effective and their participation will contribute towards the overall goal, they are more likely to overcome the free rider mentality (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989). Participation is also more likely if personal effectiveness is coupled with the belief that the group has a higher chance of succeeding (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989). The next step is the individual adoption of collective rationality, or the belief that success directly depends on the contribution of all participants (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989). If personal influence is not valued or communicated by the social movement and the group appears to be ineffective in achieving their goals, the individual is more likely to make the rational choice to remain

absent from participation and subscribe to the free riding mentality (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989).

Nonviolent movements obtain their strength from the participation of a diverse demographic. The more members the movement has supporting it, the more effective the tactics will be when implemented (Merriman, 2010). The participants in the movement become signifying agents, actively engaged in the production of and maintenance of meaning behind the movement. Therefore, movement's strategy must maintain a strict nonviolent discipline while clearly and effectively communicating the issue by framing it in a way that gains and increases support.

Tactics are the skillful use of a movement's power to the best advantage in a limited situation (Sharp, 2010). Tactics are carried out through limited actions that demonstrate a direct opposition in a highly effective manner. Tactics seek to weaken the opposition while gaining people's attention making them aware of the movement's primary purpose. The choice of tactic is dictated by the grand strategy crafted by the movement to effectively carry out a single action that best targets the opposition (Sharp, 2010).

These tactics include verbal, written, or symbolic acts of protest against the opposition or attempts to persuade people to support the movement (Merriman, 2009). Examples of protest and persuasion tactics involve petitions, rallies, sending letters, distributing literature, displaying symbols, singing songs, street theater, vigils, public statements, and creating new websites (Merriman, 2009). Protest and persuasion tactics are important in mobilizing a movement, undermining the loyalties of some of the

opponent's supporters, and shifting support towards the movement or against the opposition (Merriman, 2009). The most successful outcomes tend to come from nonviolent maneuvers.

Nonviolent action “does not involve physical violence or the threat of physical violence against human beings—and its active—it involves activity in the collective pursuit of social or political objectives” (Schock, 2005: 6). Nonviolent action is a process that involves risk and places nonviolent coercions through interactions between opposing groups (Schock, 2005). Civil disobedience is a nonviolent tactic that demonstrates open and deliberate violation of a law for a collective purpose (Schock, 2005). Nonviolent tactics seek to shift the power from the opposition towards a collective recognition of unjust action.

It is important for a movement to communicate before, during and after nonviolent tactics (Merriman, 2009). Without communicating the reasoning behind the movement's actions and ultimate objectives, any tactics (rallies, petitions, or other acts of nonviolent civil disobedience) will be unsuccessful. The purpose of communication is to activate support, provide participants with reasons for giving up their time and resources towards the cause, justify participation in risky activities, and explain why participants should make necessary sacrifices that benefit the movement's end goal (Merriman, 2009). The communication must express common values and interests that appeal to a larger population, for nonviolent movements obtain their strengths by increasing their numbers (Merriman, 2009). Therefore, an effective movement is one that communicates an ideology of shared values and holds an inclusive vision that benefits a large

population. Communication of nonviolence can have the added effect of breaking down the opposition's pillars of support, and eroding loyalties by appearing non-threatening compared to the repressive nature of the opposition (Merriman, 2009).

Communication can occur through conventional forms of media, such as newspapers, radio broadcasts, and mainstream news channels (such as Fox, CNN, or MSNBC). However, traditional forms of media have the tendency to promote "collective passivity" since they tend to be one-directional and controlled by a small number of people that transmit their agenda to a much larger collection of people (Schock, 2005). In contrast, newer forms of decentralized media create forms of direct dialogue and interactions among the participant (Schock, 2005). Moreover, they create the opportunity for participants to leave constructive feedback.

These new forms of media include email, blogs websites, Twitter, Facebook accounts, and YouTube videos. New media frames protest activity and creates group understandings regarding the meaning and significance of the movement's existence (Aday et al., 2010). It also has the potential to reach out to a larger collection of support rather than ceding control to selected influences, like those that control conventional forms of media. However, the potential for participant's inactivity is high within the realm of new media. New media directs the participants' energies away from centralized organizations that promote strategic and disciplined activity and shifts those energies towards activities that promote resilience, adaptability, and empty banter (Gladwell, 2010). New forms of media allow for activities to express themselves more easily, but it is harder for those expressions to have a substantial impact (Gladwell, 2010). People may

join a group on Facebook, participate in a blog, or follow a Twitter feed and express their dissent virtually, all while not actually participating in any organized movement in real life. Also, the movement might not be able to effectively answer every comment on the Internet, as it could have in a town hall meeting or community session.

Repressive acts by the movement's opposition can generate greater movement mobilization so long as the repression is perceived as unjust and has the potential to generate mass public outrage against those responsible (Hess & Martin, 2006). This reaction to repression is also known as backfire. Backfire is more likely to occur around censorship, extreme use of police force, various forms of corruptions, or political misconduct (Hess & Martin, 2006). Violent repression against a peaceful nonviolent demonstration is also likely to contribute to backfire. Moreover, exposure of media manipulation and authoritarian use of disinformation, when discovered and brought out into the spotlight, tends to create public outrage and increase mobilization (Hess & Martin, 2006).

Two important factors are necessary for backfire to generate more support for the movement. First, people must be exposed to the unjust repression (Hess & Martin, 2006). Second, the information regarding the repressed situation must be effectively communicated to the receptive population in a way that casts doubt on the authority's use of power (Hess & Martin, 2006). If the authority is successful in preventing the public's awareness of the repressive acts or the movement is ineffective in communicating unjust use of force, then the strategic use of backfire may not exist. Tactics used to counter

repression and backfire from the opposition can be effective in mobilizing more participants and resources to further the social movement's goals.

After reviewing the previous literature on collective action and social movements, I have identified similar conditions that existed in my research. The social movement that opposes the Keystone Pipeline XL has framed the potential environmental risks caused by its construction similar to the methods of frame analysis (Merriman, 2010; Schock; 2005; Benford & Snow, 2000). The development of the frames was then used to motivate participants to attend demonstrations (Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989). Large networks of environmental organizations coordinated its efforts to pool resources and target a wider group of activists (Ackerman, 2007; Merriman 2010). Through proper strategizing, communication, and deploying skillful tactics the social movement developed effective methods of targeting the opposition (Sharp, 2010; Schock, 2005; Aday et al., 2010). The movement also utilized nonviolent civil disobedience which encouraged higher rates of participation, increased pressure on political targets, and obtained sympathetic support during acts of repression (Stephan & Chenoweth, 2008; Chenoweth & Cunningham, 2013; Hess & Martin 2006). These conditions are further developed in Chapter Four and supported with data gathered from content analysis and field observations.

I also identified similar conditions from the previous literature that contributed to the decision making process individuals made to participate in the movement. The primary purpose of individual participation was to disrupt the construction the Keystone Pipeline XL and influence positive environmental policy (Melucci, 1980; Finkel, Muller, & Opp, 1989). A person's constructed identity, especially those that identified as an

environmentalist, were more likely to take action because of their *value-rational* orientation (Kitchell, Hannan, & Kempton, 2000; Weber, 1968; Aldrich, 1993). These activists were also part of multiple networks that informed them of current events regarding the Keystone Pipeline XL as well as protests planned by environmental organizations. These group affiliations increased the likelihood of individual participation (Passy & Giungi, 2001; Goffman, 1963). While certain *instrumentally rational* decisions were made regarding individual participation, the movement's ultimate success played a minor role in attendance at various demonstrations (Weber, 1968; Gillham, 2008; Aldrich, 1993; Klandermans, 1984). These conditions are further developed in Chapter Five and supported with data collected from field observations and individual interviews with participants at various demonstrations.

In the end, I hope to bridge the gap between structural networks and individual decision making when analyzing social movements. Social movements and individuals that decide to participate do not exist independent of each other. This research analyzes the conditions social movements create to mobilize participation and examine conditions that promote individual decisions to support and demonstrate for social movements. The next chapter discusses the methods used to gather the data used to support my research.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

In order to understand how the social movement against the Keystone Pipeline XL could mobilize protest in the face of overwhelming odds against achieving its goal, I chose a number of qualitative methods to explore it in depth. Qualitative research allows for the incorporation of a diverse range of data and its analysis to develop coded variables for the purpose of interpreting the social movement phenomena. The data for this analysis was collected through various methods. First, I performed a content analysis of the movement's emailed newsletters, websites, and transcribed recordings I collected from various organizers behind the social movement. Second, I engaged in participant observation at various demonstrations, campaigns, and meetings in Washington D.C. and took extensive notes on those events. Finally, I gathered data from semi-structured interviews with participants who attended the various demonstrations in the Washington D.C. metro area.

Content analysis is the process of coding and analyzing related accessible materials, including written text, photographs, and recorded videos (Strauss, 1987). My research strategy was to collect data from a wide variety of sources and subject it to systematic analysis regarding framing and mobilization strategies of the organizations I was observing. First, I subscribed to email lists servers and newsletters of the principal organizations including 350.org, TarSandsBlockade.org, the Sierra Club, Rising Tide

North America, and Chesapeake Climate Action Network. These communications from the EMOs provided primary source data for how these organizations framed their issues, content of the movement's agenda, updates on previous and present activities, and information on future planned events and demonstrations. Next, I collected relevant data from various Internet websites and Facebook pages. New social media has become a valuable means of communications for social movements to connect and share information with participants who, in turn, can communicate with each other. Through various websites and Facebook pages, I have also collected data relating to my objectives. Following Strauss (1987), I analyzed the content through open coding, or identifying key concepts that fit the data. Through my coding I produced concepts and themes that surfaced through the material and related them to my research objectives.

My field observations came from direct participation in various activities sponsored by the principle organizations supporting the social movement. The activities included strategy meetings, planned demonstrations, various forms of protest, as well as a congressional hearing. After each event, I recorded notes containing information I heard and various stimulants I observed. Once all observations were compiled, I conducted the same open coding method I used for content analysis.

A final source of data came from direct interviews with those participating at various demonstrations. An application had been submitted and approved by the George Mason Institutional Review board that enabled me to conduct these interviews.

Throughout the duration of this project, I attended fourteen demonstrations, four strategy meetings, one congressional hearing, and interviewed fifteen participants.

At each planned demonstrations, I interviewed a sample of those participating and asked them a series of questions designed to illicit responses related to concepts regarding my research objectives (see Appendix A for interview questions). I attempted to interview as many respondents as possible throughout the duration of planned demonstration. Each interview was completed at the demonstration without a follow-up interview. Individual participants that consented to being interviewed were asked a total of fifteen questions. The interviews length varied according to individual responses to each question, ranging from fifteen to sixty minutes.

My interviews were based on non-randomly selected participants over the age of eighteen present at various movements' planned actions occurring in the D.C. metro area. Since the interviews are contingent upon those that attend the demonstrations, the ethnographic population was unknown prior to planned events. I approached participants to engage in an interview and fully notified him/her of the intent and purpose of my research (see Appendix B for recruitment script). I then proceeded to read the verbal consent form (see Appendix C) and properly notified the respondent of his/her right to refuse before questioning. I also notified the respondent of his/her right to withdraw at any point during the interview and asked permission to record the interview. I attempted to target all genders and people of all race/ethnic origins present at the planned event equally.

All interviews were electronically transcribed for data analysis and saved as password protected files on my personal computer. Once all interviews were transcribed, I conducted the same open coding as described in the content analysis of my field

observation section. The interview questions were designed to illicit responses that are expected to outline codes and themes fitting my objective category.

Nonetheless, my methods have certain limitations. First, my attendance to the demonstrations was limited by my location and the amount of demonstrations in D.C. Additionally, I was only able to directly interview two representatives from principal organizers. I had sent emails to all organizations, but many declined due to time constraints. I was also limited to the amount of people I interviewed due to the length of the interview and the amount of attendees at each demonstration. Finally, I was unable to interview individuals that have an interest in the social movement, but chose to abstain from demonstrating. Overall, I am confident in my research design and feel that the qualitative methods is one that has been minimally applied in terms of researching social movements and its participants which has the potential of uncovering new results.

This method produced direct responses from the people that participate and uncovered their reasons for attending, which corresponded to the previous literature and supports my main objectives. I also uncovered additional responses that did not fit my main objectives, but suggested avenues of further research. Through my content analysis and field observations, I uncovered the social movement's agenda, its method behind the message, the strategies and tactics used to achieve its goal, as well as how they recruited and mobilized the resources necessary to carry out its agenda. Through direct interviews, I uncovered the rationale behind individuals' decisions to attend the various planned demonstrations and campaigns. I also correlated the social movement's efforts with respondents' reception.

CHAPTER FOUR: ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT ORGANIZERS

This chapter covers the environmental movement organizations (EMOs) that oppose the Keystone Pipeline XL and the tactics they used to combat its construction. This campaign was carried out by a coalition of environmental organizations collaborating to achieve a common cause with other social organizations providing support. The organizations I observed were 350.org, the Sierra Club, the Chesapeake Climate Action Network (CCAN), and Climate First!. These organizations played an important role in framing the movement's message that was used to gain support for the movement. 350.org, CCAN, and the Sierra Club were responsible for majority of the demonstrations that occurred in Washington, D.C. All organizations also played a key role in developing strategies that targeted influential political figures. Each action adhered to nonviolent tactics, which contributed to increasing support and mobilization. Though I was only able to directly observe four organizations, there were many environmental groups that assisted and supported this campaign.

Environmental Movement Organizations

Numerous environmental movement organizers have contributed to the Keystone Pipeline XL protests. Table 1, while not an exhaustive list, includes the EMOs encountered throughout the duration of this study. Each EMO has played an important role in gathering resources, spreading information, and mobilizing activists towards

various planned demonstrations. I was fortunate enough to have direct involvement with four EMOs to examine how they were able to accomplish their various objectives.

Table 1 Environmental Movement Organizers

350.org	Chesapeake Climate Action Network (CCAN)	Climate First!
Bold Nebraska	Sierra Club	Tar Sands Action
Credo Action	Tar Sands Blockade	Reject and Protect
Rainforest Action Network	Cowboys and Indians Alliance	The Other 98%
Hip Hop Caucus	National Resources Defense Council (NDC)	National Wildlife Federation (NWF)

Climate First! is a local grassroots movement in the D.C. metro area that organizes peaceful direct action for environmental justice.⁸ Climate First! was created by founder Ted Conwell in 2012 and is currently run by three other board members (T. Conwell, personal communications, December 11th, 2013). Presently, this organization relies on public donations and is applying to become a nonprofit organization with membership enrollment, once the IRS approves their application. Climate change and developing campaigns against corporate entities that contribute to carbon emissions, either directly or through financial support, is their major focus. Climate First! started campaigning against TD bank. TD Bank is an American subsidiary of Toronto Dominion bank in Canada that provides loans to TransCanada (the company constructing the Keystone Pipeline XL). Climate First! is a secular agency committed to nonviolent and peaceful means in accomplishing their goals.

⁸ See <http://www.climatefirst.us/>

Meanwhile, the Sierra Club is a national grassroots and nonprofit organization. The Sierra Club was founded conservationist John Muir back in 1892.⁹ They are a membership-based organization (collecting yearly dues from registered members) with chapters nationwide, including a local chapter in downtown D.C. Historically, the Sierra Club has focused on climate change by influencing political members to introduce environmental protective legislation. However, they have recently taken a more proactive approach on the Keystone Pipeline XL campaign by participating in various civil disobedient events. The Sierra Club has assisted in planning, providing resources, and mobilizing activists all across the nation.

The Chesapeake Climate Action Network (CCAN) is another local D.C. metro area grassroots and nonprofit organization.¹⁰ CCAN takes on environmental concerns throughout Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. Their focus includes stopping the Keystone Pipeline XL, banning hydraulic fracturing, stopping off-shore drilling, and supporting offshore wind turbines. CCAN organizes various acts of civil disobedience and helps influence politicians to introduce environmental protective legislation. CCAN receives financial support from public donations, but are not a membership based organization.

350.org is the largest and most influential EMO opposing the Keystone Pipeline XL.¹¹ Their name derives from the amount of CO² parts per million that the atmosphere can endure while still preserving a sustainable planet.¹² The organization was created in

⁹ See <http://www.sierraclub.org/>

¹⁰ See <http://chesapeakeclimate.org/>

¹¹ See <http://350.org/>

¹² As of February 2015 the level of atmospheric CO₂ was at 400.26 ppm, see <http://co2now.org/>

2008 by author Bill McKibben. 350.org operates in various countries across the world, including a local chapter in D.C. They participate in direct action that promotes positive environmental change. This includes direct action, peaceful acts of civil disobedience, and assisting with legislation that protects the environment. 350.org was the first organization to get involved in the social movement against the Keystone Pipeline XL and organized the first act of sustained nonviolent civil disobedience. Their actions resulted in the arrest of over 1,000 activists in front of the White House in August 2011.

These EMOs and others have tasked themselves as climate champions. Their primary goal is to take certain measures to ensure the planet continues to enjoy a sustainable environment. To achieve this objective, EMOs “frame” the issues that are negatively affecting the climate to reach and influence the population, thereby aiding their campaign.

Framing the Issue

It is important for EMOs to project a particular framework of the situation that seeks to control the impressions on the situation and of their campaign. As identified by Benford and Snow (2000), framing renders the underlying meaning of the campaign that is then used to guide people to action. The EMOs constructed collective action frames by identifying the Keystone Pipeline XL as a danger to the environment that requires public attention. The solution, or diagnosis, was to demonstrate against the pipeline’s construction in order to alleviate additional contributions to climate change.

Though there are many organizations that provide support and participate in this campaign, all organizations have framed the issue similarly: allowing construction of the

Keystone Pipeline XL would be catastrophic for the environment. This was made apparent through most of the EMOs' newsletters, similarly stating, "You must reject Keystone XL to protect our land, water and climate" (T. Glick, CCAN, personal communications, April 22nd, 2014). Other newsletters stated that, "We need to demonstrate that the environment is not some fringe concern—that there are lots of us who care about the future" (B. McKibben, personal communications, February 12th, 2012) It is crucial that each EMO cooperates in delivering the same message to maintain the definition of their campaign (Goffman, 1959). Every EMO against the Keystone Pipeline XL has revealed TransCanada as the clear target of culpability. This was made apparent in the EMOs' communications that stated, "TransCanada announced plans to build the half of the pipeline that runs from Oklahoma to Texas, it's a blow for folks along the southern half of the route, who we'll keep fighting side by side with" (B. McKibben, personal communications, March 8th 2012). The situation is TransCanada's desire to construct the pipeline, which the EMOs have repeatedly underlined as a direct threat to the environment. Also, all EMOs appeal to the same authority in repeating former Director of NASA Dr. James Hansen's slogan that the construction of the pipeline would essentially mean "game-over" for the planet (B. McKibben & M. Tidwell, personal communication, November 18, 2012).

When TransCanada first applied for the Presidential permit in September 2008, they expected to commence construction with minimum objection (OES, 2011). This was a clear political opportunity for the EMOs since the permit only requires the President's approval. Thus, the solution laid out by the EMOs was to demonstrate to the President

that there was public support for him to reject the permit. The EMO's encouraged this sentiment in their newsletters:

You guys are the pioneers in the Keystone fight. When you came to Washington in August to get arrested no one had heard of the pipeline. When you came to Washington in November to encircle the White House, no one thought we had a real chance to defeat it. But thanks to you President Obama killed Keystone. (B. McKibben, personal communication, February 12th, 2012)

Therefore, prevention of the pipeline relied on two fronts: publicizing information regarding the pipeline and motivating people to demonstrate against it.

EMOs have engaged in motivational framing by publicizing the dire environmental consequences of the pipeline through their websites and newsletters, which emphasize that without public outcry the President will pass the permit. On CCAN's website, they describe TransCanada as wanting to build a pipeline that carries the "world's dirtiest oil" across America's heartland, offering many avenues for people to contact the president and take action against it.¹³ The EMOs state that TransCanada has influenced politics to fast-track the approval process, and it is up to the people to demonstrate their disapproval to halt construction. In every form of communication, the EMOs have made it abundantly clear that collective action is the only means of stopping the pipeline's construction, "We've been playing defense for months, now we've got to go on offense" (350.org, personal communications, March 8th, 2012).

¹³ See <http://chesapeakeclimate.org/dc-federal/keystone-xl/>

Communication Strategies

Once the frames have been established, it is important for the EMOs to communicate to potential recruits, bystanders, and elites as well as to garner support. This important step includes recruiting, mobilizing, and obtaining resources that support the campaign (Benford & Snow, 2000). I found that communication occurred in two forms, the *technological sphere* – websites, social media, emailed newsletters, and cell phone technologies – and the *physical sphere*, which involved direct interaction of the EMOs with the public.

The Technological Sphere

In the first form of communication, the *technological sphere*, the EMOs targeted the Keystone Pipeline XL as a disastrous project for the environment (diagnostic frame). 350.org stated on its website that “tar sands oil has a massive carbon footprint – sometimes requiring more energy to produce than it creates – and Keystone XL is the key to making burning that oil economically feasible.”¹⁴ Next, the EMOs made it clear that it was the President’ decision to reject the permit (prognostic frame). 350.org constantly stated in its newsletters that people needed to “show the President that he has a strong environmental base who gives him the political space to reject the pipeline and move forward on climate” (S. Shor, 350.org, personal communications, June 24th, 2013). Finally, the EMOs argued that the only way to accomplish this task was through collective action (motivational frame). Most of these messages were included during recruitment for demonstrations:

¹⁴ See <http://350.org/campaigns/stop-keystone-xl/>

It's time to Draw the Line. On Saturday, September 21, thousands of people around the country will take action against Keystone XL and tar sands. The size and scope of these actions – over a hundred around the country – will show how much our movement has grown since the fight against Keystone XL began. The day of action was called by 350.org and is supported by a national coalition of organizations, including Tar Sands Blockade, but it's people like you who will make it powerful and make it real. (E. Moll, Tars Sands Blockade, personal communications, September 12th, 2013)

Delays to the pipeline were also announced through these outlets, which would serve to motivate future participation and recruit new participation. CCAN announced in its newsletter that while it was disappointing President Obama didn't take a stand instead of delaying the process, they did express that “this delay would have never happened if it weren't for our movement” (T. Glick, CCAN, personal communications, April 22nd, 2014).

Additionally, EMOs expanded their networking strategies through cellular technologies. CREDO Mobile is an American mobile phone company that was launched in 2000.¹⁵ The company connects its customers to a vast network of nonprofit and social movement organizations. Customers can receive updates on organizations, upcoming events, and petitions regarding social causes. The company also offers opportunities to donate money to various companies through two methods. Customers can either donate to recognized organizations at the end of each billing cycle or vote on one of three

¹⁵ See www.credomobile.com

organizations for CREDO Mobile to donate a percentage of their monthly profits to. Through CREDO Mobile, the EMOs have expanded to an additional network where they can provide information regarding their campaigns. As of 2014, CREDO Mobile has a membership of 3.4 million activists.¹⁶ CREDO Mobile would also send out newsletters to its members regarding the movement against the Keystone Pipeline XL, stating, “That’s why we need thousands of people, in hundreds of communities around the country, to come together and show that we are prepared to hold the president to his commitment to take action on the climate, and reject the Keystone XL pipeline” (E. Zarlin, CREDO Action, personal communications, February 1st, 2014).

The Physical Sphere

The second form of communication, the *physical sphere* encompasses direct interaction from the EMOs to the public. During my fieldwork, I encountered four different ways the EMOs accomplished this form of communication. The first was through a series of organized meetings sponsored by the D.C. chapter of 350.org. The second was through a cross country tour sponsored by three groups – CCAN, the Hip Hop Caucus, and 350.org – in 2012. A third form was through direct phone calls, in which organizational volunteers or staff members would call activists who have registered their phone number via websites or at various planned events. Finally, the fourth form was through demonstrations where activists interacted in a public space spreading the message of the campaign through banners, signs, chants, and slogans.

¹⁶ See “A Field Guide to the U.S. Environmental Movement” at www.insideclimatenews.org

The D.C. chapter of 350.org was set up by the national headquarters due to the political opportunity it would afford them. Political opportunity includes the perspective that there are certain context- dependent prospects for advancing a particular campaign, mobilizing support, and affecting influence (Meyer, 2004). Certain strategies and tactics are not developed in a “vacuum,” but rather are dependent on certain political context (Meyer, 2004). Establishing a local branch in D.C. would be fundamental in getting access to networks of people to inform, motivate, and respond to events towards targeted political figures. To gain support, the D.C. chapter would hold public meetings and advertise through the *technological sphere*.

Each meeting held by 350.org’s D.C. chapter would start with staff introductions in which they would cover the history of the pipeline, provide updates on current events of the pipeline, and publicize upcoming events or planned demonstrations. The meetings also offered an opportunity for those present to provide an introduction and explanation for their attendance. This event was not only an opportunity for the EMO to articulate their framing of the issue, but also enabled participants to digest and incorporate those frameworks into their own understanding. The meeting would then split up into different groups to cover ways to combat the pipeline. These groups were categorized by focus: recruitment, media outreach, and event logistics. The principal goal of each group was to further people’s investment with the cause while encouraging people to taking on leadership roles with the campaign. The meetings were also devised as a means to spread the word about the campaign and its purpose. These meetings were focused on promoting

a single issue and a single voice, so as not to detract or vary from the framework presented by the overall organization.

In conjunction with CCAN and the Hip Hop Caucus, the 350.org “Do the Math” tour hit twenty cities across the nation, concluding in Washington, D.C. For the admission price of \$10, people heard from EMO leaders such as Mike Tidwell of CCAN, Reverend Yearwood of the Hip Hop Caucus, and Bill McKibben of 350.org. The purpose of the tour was to jump-start the movement that would tackle climate change. During the event, each presenter communicated the issues that were a threat to the environment including the Keystone Pipeline XL. During the presentation, Mike Tidwell stated “You know Dr. James Hansen has said famously, ‘if you build the Keystone XL Pipeline its game over for the climate’ and it turns out he’s not alone in that opinion” (personal communications, November 18th, 2014). Examples of natural catastrophes across the globe were attributed to rising levels of CO² in the atmosphere. Bill McKibben informed everyone that we “burn enough coal and oil and gas to raise the temperature about a degree.” Past acts of civil disobedience were also mentioned as success stories against the Keystone Pipeline XL. Furthermore, the presenters attributed the success of the movement to all those that participated and those in the audience. They indicated that more sustained involvement was necessary to combat the oil industry, as Mike Tidwell stated “we need to stop this pipeline.” The D.C. tour ended with a planned demonstration in which the audience was invited to march around the White House in protest against the Keystone Pipeline XL.

Phone banking is an important tool to maintain motivational frames and keep people informed of events and issues related to the pipeline. The EMOs would task volunteers and staff to call from a bank of phone numbers registered by participants online (via websites or social media sites). Most calls would take place a few days prior to a planned demonstration or event and the volunteer would read from a script prepared by the EMO to briefly inform the receiver about the status of the pipeline, the impact it would have on the climate if constructed, and the importance of attending organized events. Phone banking was significant in spreading the message of the EMOs, and as a tool to mobilize people into action.

Another method of communicating through the *physical sphere* is with the use of slogans chanted and signs held during protests. Table 2 outlines the most commonly used chants at each demonstration. These chants were used to motivate and project the campaigns views and collective identity. Collective identities are revealed through symbols, verbal narratives, clothing, and other expressions of a common goal (Polletta & Jasper, 2001). Relying on the same set of chants, holding the same signs at each event, and receiving the same messages through email creates this internalization in each activist that participates.

Table 2 EMOs Campaign Chant Sheet

<p>Seventeen hundred Miles of pipe Seventeen hundred Miles we'll fight For the air we breathe And the water we drink And the whole planet Is on the brink No KXL (x4)</p>	<p>TransCanada You shall not pass TransCanada You will not last No KXL (x4)</p>
	<p>Keep the tar sands in the soil We don't want this dirty oil Leave the tar sands where they are Climate change has gone too far</p>

Mobilization

Persuading people to attend demonstrations is the EMOs primary directive during their campaigns. At each demonstration, people were asked to take time out of their lives and participate in something they otherwise wouldn't without pay. Mobilization efforts on the part of the EMOs must persuade people to accept their targeted goals and support their movement through material and non-material means (Klandermans, 1984). While grievances and ideology are not enough to account for people's motivations in participating, they do play a role in the decision-making process (Klandermans, 1984).

Activism is ultimately determined by the individual's choice to participate (Botetzagias & van Schurr, 2012). All EMOs planning their campaigns eventually rely on the individual's decisions to show up. To do this, EMOs must frame their campaign in a way that encourages community consensus regarding the issue's urgency. The EMOs under examination have achieved this consensus through several different methods. First, they have clearly outlined the facts regarding Keystone Pipeline XL, tar sands oil production, and the process of construction approval. Secondly, they have appealed to authority figures to stay on message. Each EMO has countless recited the same phrase

spoken by Dr. James Hansen that construction of the pipeline would mean “game-over” for the planet. Bill McKibben during the Do the Math tour referred to Dr. James Hansen as the Paul Revere of this movement and quoted from him that “if we burn off from the tar sands and all other unconventional things that we are finding, on top of everything we are already burning, it will be game over for the planet” (B. McKibben, personal communications, November 18th, 2012). On Climate First!’s website, Dr. James Hansen is referenced stating “the world may not have more than a decade or two to dramatically reduce greenhouse gas emissions.”¹⁷ EMOs have also publicly named political figures, clergy members, celebrities, and international figures that stand behind their cause. Through both the *technological* and *physical sphere*, they have developed a frame to foster consensus amongst the population.

Action mobilization is the process by which EMOs directly approach people to participate in their campaign (Klandermans, 1984). Similar to their communication of the issue, EMOs have achieved this form of mobilization through both the *technological* and *physical spheres*. Social media has been used to announce various events and offers the opportunity people to register online. This method creates a snowball effect as others connected to social media can see who and how many are planning on attending, which might influence their decision. Those that have registered have the ability to share news of their attendance separately on their own personal page. Advanced emails are sent out in an effort to mobilize those outside of social media. People that receive the email can register directly through the EMOs website, which often require a phone number.

¹⁷ See <http://www.climatefirst.us/>

Members of CREDO Mobile may sign up to receive text alerts from the EMOs regarding planned demonstrations.

Action mobilization in the *physical sphere* manifested in phone banking, canvassing predetermined locations, and providing notifications at previous events. Fliers for various events were posted in several popular D.C. areas (Dupont Circle, Adams Morgan, and U Street) and D.C. university campuses (such as American University and Georgetown University). Fliers would include event descriptions, the organizations running it, dates and time, as well as web addresses to access further information. People attending demonstrations were approached by EMOs to acquire contact information for future events.

On February 6th, 2013, I volunteered with the D.C. chapter of the Sierra Club to participate in phone banking. The Sierra Club office was located on 50 F Street, near Union Station. I first met with staff members who explained the evening's task. I was told that a computer software program would dial randomly from a phone bank of registered activists to attend a climate rally on February 17th. The program would keep dialing numbers until a person would answer and then shift the call to a volunteer, such as myself, who would then read from a script prepared by the Sierra Club. The script addressed the basic nature of the event, the importance of letting the President know the opposition, and asked if they would be attending. I was unaware of the person's name and number called (in keeping with the nature of the program), but was instructed to collect personal information from people interested in volunteering for phone banking and their availability. The staff randomly monitored my phone calls to provide feedback

and ensure I was reading from the script. At the end of the hour, I had successfully reached fifteen people and recruited two.

Mobilizing people into action is an important feature of any social movement. Various methods can be applied, both in the *physical* and *technological sphere*. These were the few methods deployed by the EMOs observed during this study. In addition to mobilizing people, EMOs must create strategies that ensure their demonstrations are effective and successful.

Strategizing

Creating an effective strategy allows a “movement to capitalize on opportunities by turning the resources they have into power they need to attain their objective” (Schock, 2013: 285). Strategy requires assembling skillful leadership, planned structuring among members, interaction among a targeted audience, and careful selection of a battle field (Schock, 2013). This campaign has successfully united leadership from a variety of different EMOs on international, national, and local scales. Unification has increased not only the pool of resources financially, but also increased the network of people for mobilization.

EMOs have also structured their staff into distinctive roles that have been extremely efficient for the planning and carrying out of each demonstration. During the protests organized by 350.org, I observed specific staff coordinators who directed the demonstration. In addition, I observed designated staff that communicated with law enforcement and handled necessary permits. Other staff members handled press media and articulated the campaign’s message and legal staff was present to assist in times of

arrest. EMO staffers created and collected the materials used at the demonstrations. Finally, there were always trainers working with the volunteers on how to successfully carry out the demonstration.

Moreover, the EMOs communicated often with the general public. Through both the *technological* and *physical spheres*, the EMOs would announce news related to the pipeline. They would also discuss successful demonstrations to bolster support for future events. Ultimately, EMOs provided several opportunities for the public to get involved.

Social movement organizers prioritize strategies based on costs related to their resources and anticipated success (Cunningham, 2013). The EMOs involved in this campaign largely depend on public donations and a network of volunteers. National EMOs such as the Sierra Club also have a network from which they collect monthly and annual dues. However due to limitations of financial support primarily through public donations, the strategies had to be extremely cost effective. Meetings were held in public domains such as libraries, religious institutions, or universities that donated space. Demonstrations required assistance from people willing to donate their time without pay. Planned actions also had to be arranged months in advance to give participants time to plan and finance travel and other expenses. Materials such as signs and banners were often distributed to keep the messages unified, but they were collected afterwards to reuse in future demonstrations. Only nonviolent tactics were deployed to attract a large turn out and support from public observers.

Nonviolent Civil Disobedience

Social movement organizers can enact a variety of tactics in pursuit of their campaign ranging from nonviolent to violent tactics (Cunningham, 2013). As mentioned, one of the main distinctions of the NSMs is their ability to operate within a society and not revolutionize the established form of government (Cohen, 1985). Nonviolent tactics are a form of non-routine political behavior directed toward the political establishment (Cunningham, 2013). Such tactics do not run the risk of being stigmatized or viewed as inappropriate (Goffman, 1963). The EMOs involved in the campaign against the Keystone Pipeline XL have vowed to maintain peaceful and nonviolent acts in pursuit of their overall cause, and each participant has been trained to comply with the law and accept the consequences of their civil disobedience respectfully.

EMOs against the pipeline garnered the attention of mass media with their first act civil disobedience. On August 20, 2011, over a thousand concerned citizens, organized primarily by 350.org and various other national EMOs, staged a sit-down in front of the White House, which resulted in arrests. Protesters are not allowed to demonstrate on the sidewalk in front of the White House gates (which is considered the “postcard picture” view). The purpose was to pressure President Obama to deny the permit and shine attention on an issue that had received little notice in the news media. The demonstrators were given three opportunities to vacate the sidewalk, and after the third warning those that remained were promptly arrested and processed. The demonstration lasted an entire week and resulted in the arrest of 1,252 demonstrators. On

the first day, protestors experienced repression, which sought to deter the demonstration, but this ended up backfiring.

Repressing nonviolent campaigns have the tendency to backfire. Backfire occurs when suppressive acts recoil against the oppressors and result in continued or even increased support for the campaign (Stephan & Chenoweth, 2008). The demonstrators on the first day of the White House protest were arrested and jailed throughout the weekend for failing to obey an officer, a misdemeanor offense. For acts of repression to generate backfire, information regarding the harsh tactics needs to be communicated to the receptive public, which perceives the act to be unjust and demonstrates their outrage to deter further acts of repression (Schock, 2013). News of the jailed protestors quickly circulated through EMOs websites, emails, and social media pages, resulting in higher attendance rates. After news of the arrests went public, demonstrators were no longer jailed; instead, they were quickly processed and ticketed with a fine of fifty dollars.

Table 3 contains field observations from various demonstrations I observed throughout the study's duration. The categories include civil disobedience, protest marches, bird dogging, and staged sit-ins. Bird dogging refers to the tactic of following key political figures and protesting outside their public appearances. Rapid Response Networks (RRNs) were set up for this exact purpose. RRNs consisted of registered volunteers willing to show up at moment's notice to demonstrate whenever a targeted politicians' public appearance was publicized by the EMOs. Similar actions have been carried out nationwide, including campaign office visits during election year. Planned actions with the highest rate of attendance were those orchestrated and attended by

multiple EMOs who provided advanced notice phrased with urgency. The purpose of each action was to pressure the President to deny the permit and each event was documented and displayed through the *technological sphere* by all organizing EMOs.

Table 3 Field Observations from Demonstrations

Date	Category	Description	No. of Attendance
08/20-09/3/2011	Civil Disobedience	A weeklong act of civil disobedience in front of the White House. Demonstrators staged a sit-down on the sidewalk in front of the White House. The police delivered three warnings to disperse and vacate. Those that stayed were arrested for failure to obey a police officer. Demonstrators were peaceful and complied with the arrests. Demonstrators held signs with slogans such as, "The XL Pipeline is Game Over for our Climate and Communities," "No Tar Sands XL Pipeline," and, "We Sit in Against the XL Pipeline." Obama will you stand up to Big Oil." Among the demonstrators that were arrested were several EMO leaders including Bill McKibben (350.org), Mike Tidwell (CCAN), Ted Conwell (Climate First!), Phil Radford (Greenpeace), Reverend Yearwood (Hip Hop Caucus), and Michael Kieschnick (CREDO Mobile). This event was organized by multiple EMOs including 350.org, Sierra Club, CCAN, Credo Mobile, Tar Sands Action, Greenpeace, and the Hip Hop Caucus.	1,253

Date	Category	Description	No. of Attendance
11/6/2011	Protest March	<p>Demonstrators circled the White House in a peaceful protest. The purpose was to give the President a symbolic hug of support to deny the permit for the Keystone Pipeline XL. A pseudo pipeline was inflated and carried around the White House with, "Stop the Keystone XL Pipeline."</p> <p>Demonstrators held signs with slogans such as, "No Tar Sands, No Pipeline," "Pipeline = Game Over," as well as various quotes from President Obama on climate change with NO KXL underneath.</p> <p>Demonstrators chanted various slogans such as, "Yes you can, stop this dirty pipeline plan," and "TransCanada has got to go." Demonstrators connected hands once the entire White House had been encircled. No arrests were made. This event was organized by multiple EMOs including 350.org, Greenpeace, Occupy, Sierra Club, CCAN, Credo Mobile, Tar Sands Action, and the Hip Hop Caucus.</p>	15,000
03/14/2013	Bird-dogging	<p>Obama was scheduled to speak to campaign contributors at Capital Hilton, located at L street and 16th Washington, D.C. Demonstrators were on the corner of L and 16th across from the corner of Capital Hilton with a giant banner that read, "Stop the KXL pipeline." Visibility of demonstrators was only available to the President, as promised by the police, when the limo first pulled up to the hotel. The President was not seen for the windows were tinted and once the car pulled up to the hotel the car was covered with a curtain. Demonstrators chanted "Obama yes you can, stop the dirty pipeline plan!"</p> <p>Another group of demonstrators were on the opposite street demonstrating against the use of drones.</p>	20

Date	Category	Description	No. of Attendance
06/25/2013	Bird-dogging	<p>President Obama was scheduled to present to the students of Georgetown University. People came to demonstrate in an area off to the side of the main administration building. The protest area was sectioned off by the police who told the demonstrators to remain in the marked the area gated off from the front of the building. Demonstrators were only visible to the audience standing outside and waiting to get in. Several media press was present and interviewed the demonstrators. Secret service and police took pictures of the demonstration. Demonstrators were directed by organization directors to keep chants positive. Slogans chanted were, "Yes we can, Create Comprehensive Climate Plan," "No Coal, No Oil, Keep the Tar Sands in the Soil," "End Carbon pollution Green Energy is the Solution," and, "Fired Up Ready to Go Fossil Fuel Has Got to Go". Slogans on the protest signs contained messages against the pipeline and included direct quotes from Obama on climate change. Focus not just primarily KXL, but also dangers of coal and support for alternative energy. There was no clear visibility of President Obama. This event was primarily organized by 350.org and Chesapeake Climate action.</p>	70
05/18/2013	Bird-dogging	<p>Secretary of State John Kerry was schedule to present at National Geographic Society. Demonstrators showed up out front of the building and waited for his arrival. When John Kerry arrived and parked in front of the building, he walked out of the car and to the building while giving a wave to the demonstrators out front. Demonstrators chanted the following slogans, "Yes we can, stop the dirty pipeline plan," and "TransCanada has got to go." Demonstrators were within eye sight of the</p>	11

Date	Category	Description	No. of Attendance
		windows of where he delivered his speech and proceeded to chant loud enough for everyone there to hear. This event was organized primarily by 350.org	
11/4/2013	Bird-dogging	Demonstrators attempted to deliver an “On Notice” letter to state department, directed to Secretary of State John Kerry. The letter stated that if the State Department would make the recommendation to approve the pipeline permit, a group of concerned citizens would stage a sit-in at the state department. Demonstrators walked up to the State Department, but were unable to get the letter delivered. They were told no one would be able to accept the letter. Demonstrators then made a second attempt at the Visitor Center, but were told the same thing. Security guards said if no appointment was made anyone would accept the letter. A PR manager was called, but protestors were put on hold and no one showed up. A separate letter had been mailed an hour before to the State Department directed to Secretary of State John Kerry. This event was organized primarily by Climate First!	3
12/6/2013	Bird-dogging	The plan was to target the Annual National Christmas tree lighting ceremony and President Obama. Demonstrators made signs with Christmas tree lights that read “No KXL for Xmas.” Demonstrators were unable to get direct access into the ceremony. Their plan was to get as close to press entrance and be seen for possible coverage. Few people from the public walked by and asked questions. After an hour, demonstrators moved over to	8

Date	Category	Description	No. of Attendance
		Constitution Avenue to get better pictures with signs and the Christmas tree with the White House in background. Pictures were posted on organizer websites and social media pages. The purpose was to get attention and place pressure on President Obama. This event was primarily organized by 350.org	
01/28/2014	Protest March	Demonstrators carried an air blown pseudo-pipeline around the US Capital building. While the pipeline was being inflated, cops appeared to provide a route that was just behind the Capital because demonstrators did not have a permit. Police proceeded to escort the demonstrators during the event. Several media outlets were present. Painted across the pipeline was the message "Pipeline President or Climate Champion." Once behind the Capital, demonstrators paused for pictures. After fifteen minutes, the march continued back to where it started, and the pipeline was deflated while people dispersed. The only mainstream outlet to cover the event was RT. Pictures were uploaded on EMO websites and social media pages. This event was organized primarily by 350.org and CREDO Mobile.	150
04/21/2014	Staged Sit-In	An event leading to a weeklong protest in which various marches would occur around Washington, D.C. with sit-ins on the National Mall. Demonstrators helped erect nine teepees led by Native Americans directly impacted by the route of the pipeline. The Native Americans traveled to D.C. and would stay on the National Mall throughout the entire week. Necessary permits were obtained prior to the sit-ins. The purpose of the teepees were to attract	22

Date	Category	Description	No. of Attendance
		the attention of the public, spread the information regarding the pipeline, and allow people to ask questions as well as take pictures inside the teepees. This event was primarily organized by the Cowboy and Indian Alliance and 350.org	

The social movement targeting the Keystone Pipeline XL can be considered a New Social Movement because it operates within a civil society and is willing to work with the government to achieve their goals (Cohen, 1985). The EMOs behind the movement have framed their issues in a manner that builds consensus among the population against the pipeline and motivate them to action. The EMOs have adopted different strategies to mobilize people towards various planned demonstrations and maintain a policy of nonviolent civil disobedience. These events' sole purpose is to put the pressure on targeted political figures responsible for approving or rejecting the pipeline permit.

Social and environmental movement organizers do not work in isolation to achieve the goals of their campaign. A campaign needs the support of a large number of people and the ability to mobilize them into collective action. Collective action ultimately hinges on the decisions individuals make to show up. The next chapter of this study examines the reasons people decided to take interest and participate in this campaign. These examinations are based on direct interviews from demonstrations against the Keystone Pipeline XL.

CHAPTER FIVE: SOCIAL MOVEMENT ACTIVISTS

Social and environmental movements are dependent on the choices individuals make to participate in their campaign. Individuals also determine the level and type of participation within the campaign, ranging from full time commitment to one time financial contribution (Barkan, 2004). The previous chapter examined the ways in which the EMOs against the Keystone Pipeline XL influenced individual decisions to participate in their campaign. This chapter examines participants' interviews from various demonstrations and identifies their choices for attending these events.

The majority of participants belonged to one or more of the EMOs involved and had participated in several demonstrations by those organizations, so seemed to be part of a protest culture. I discovered that affiliation with an EMO is loosely defined by the participant's level of participation and involvement at several levels. Certain participants registered to various EMOs' events, signed up for email newsletters, and joined social media webpages. Those participants still did not believe they were affiliated with or members of the EMOs. For the purpose of this study, I define "affiliation" as a person that either pays membership dues, works either full time or part time for an EMO, volunteers on a regular basis, or the participant specifically mention affiliation with an EMO. Based on the fifteen participants interviewed, twelve mentioned being directly affiliated with an environmental movement organization. Of the remaining three

participants, one mentioned having friends that were environmentalist, one mentioned following the movement online actively, and the final participant had no knowledge of any of the EMOs involved. Overall, thirteen participants identified themselves activists who had participated in other social movement campaigns.

Most of the participants I interviewed have been actively involved in some form of collective action throughout their lives. Only one participant had been brought by a friend was ignorant of the campaign and planned to participate in the future. A female participant admitted to protesting for the first time with the campaign against the pipeline. Neither of these participants were affiliated with the EMOs behind the campaign. All other interviewees have been involved with other campaigns and engaged in many demonstrations. One female participant had demonstrated against Proposition 8 and had marched from the Capital to the Washington Monument in fall of 2008.¹⁸ Another participant had mentioned that he grew up in the 60s in atmosphere of protest, and had been actively engaged all of his life (ranging from protests against the Vietnam War, Civil Rights demonstrations to various gay rights campaigns). Another participant mentioned being a part of multiple social movement organizations (SMOs) and had attended multiple campaigns with collective action. The participants without affiliations had limited experience with collective action.

Social networks play an important role in mobilizing people to action (Snow et al., 1980; Diani, 2013). For mobilization to happen, the collective action must first be publicized. Deciding to participate is more likely to occur if an individual is encouraged

¹⁸ Proposition 8 was an initiative started by proponents against marriage equality in an effort to get a state amendment that would ban same sex marriages

to go by someone they know (Lim, 2008). Individuals affiliated with EMOs and in direct contact with organizers have higher rates of attendance regardless of the level of intimacy (Lim, 2008). Five participants had received direct emails or phone calls from the EMOs prior to the demonstration, and two that had mentioned being friends with the movement organizer. The more social networks participants engage in, the more likely they are to participate in the campaign (Butcher & Svensson, 2014). The participant I interviewed that had zero affiliation or even knowledge of the campaign, still attended one demonstration due to his network with an activist.

Fourteen participants in this study had registered for email notifications with several different EMOs. One mentioned receiving email notifications from Bold Nebraska, 350.org, Chesapeake Climate Action (CCAN), Earth Justice, and the Sierra Club. Many other participants only received emails from CREDO and 350.org. These networks were a major source of information regarding the tar sands oil production and the Keystone Pipeline XL. Only two participants heard about the issue outside these networks, which was through a friend or from the Nation magazine. A majority of the participants heard about the collective actions from email notifications by the EMOs. Only three participants had received news of the demonstrations beyond email, of which two participants had been part of the organization process. However, obtaining information about the campaign does not entirely account for the choices these participants made to attend. The next section outlines key decision-making concepts that outlines why they participated in collective action..

Several participants mentioned that they were more likely to attend if they thought a large group would be present. Other participants mentioned the scheduling of various events as a factor, finding it impossible to attend if the event conflicted with work or personal obligations. Finally, some participants mentioned transportation costs as a deciding factor. If the event was in a location near public transportation or either volunteers or campaign organizers offered rides, they were more likely to attend. Rational choice and resource mobilization did not seem to have a large impact on their overall involvement with the campaign, but rather which event they could attend. While majority of the participants mentioned in similar reasons for joining this movement, what was surprising was the perceived futility of this campaign which did not dissuade or prevent future plans of demonstrating.

Contrary to research linking the perceived success of a campaign to participation in collective action (Hornesey et al., 2006), many of the participants had a rather bleak outlook on the success of this campaign. When asked if the President would approve the pipeline, the most common response was “50/50.” Only one male participant went beyond that and said “60/40,” while two female participants were convinced the President would definitely approve it. Another male participant felt that President Obama never even considered rejection for the permit. When asked if the approval would deter him/her from future action, almost everyone said no. Despite the lack of perceived success, the participants became involved with this campaign due to their value-rational orientation, which is “determined by a conscious belief in the value for its own sake of some ethical, aesthetic, religious or other form of behavior, independently of its prospects

of success” (Weber, 1968: 24-25). The participants valued the cause of this campaign and took up action against the Keystone Pipeline XL, which they believed would contribute to additional climate change.

There are social psychological considerations that examine values and beliefs held by people and used to dictate behavior (Gillham, 2008). People that are concerned about the environment are largely so because they believe it poses a risk to the health to the general population (Stern, 1992). Research indicates a correlation between environmentally orientated values and willingness to either financially support or take action with an EMO’s campaign (Stern & Dietz, 1994). Resource-mobilization theorists largely reject the emphasis of the individual’s feelings and grievances to explain why people attend various collective actions (Cohen, 1985). However, each of the participants in this study expressed a heightened concern regarding the pipeline’s impact on the environment and cited it as the main reason he/she came out to demonstrate.

All fifteen participants expressed concerns over the pipeline’s approval and what it would mean for the environment. The majority of these concerns regarded the expansion and further development of the tar sands oil. Tar sands production was perceived as a significant contributor to rising CO² levels in the atmosphere. Several participants mentioned Dr. James Hansen’s comment that the approval of the pipeline would mean “game-over” for the environment. One female participant even went on to further quote Dr. James Hansen, stating that the world has eight to ten years to dramatically reduce CO² emissions before the damage is irreversible. Regarding the possibility of the pipeline’s approval, one participant ominously queried, “What do we

do?” Five participants also indicated their concern over water contamination caused by pipeline leaks. All of these concerns were largely expressed as being dangers to the entire population and future generations.

None of the concerns expressed by the participant were based on a fear of individual impact, but always given with a global perspective. Location to the site also did not seem to impact his/her concern or participation. There is conflicting research regarding proximity to the site of an environmental hazard and the effect it has on participation. This is often referred to as the not-in-my back-yard (NIMBY) phenomenon. Douglas Lober (1995) found that increased distance to a waste facility led to a decline in public opposition. In direct opposition, Johnson and Scicchitano found that people’s distance to a landfill from their home did not alter perception of its environmental risks (2012).

None of the interviewed participants lived near the proposed path of the pipeline. Only one participant had family in one of the states the pipeline would pass through, but not near its construction. Even though all of the participants were miles away from the pipeline, they all felt the dangers of its construction. Similar to the study of Johnson and Scicchitano (2012), there was a complete lack of trust in governmental protection or preventive measures, which also contributed to their decision to participate in demonstrations.

All participants in this study agreed that the government would not set up effective safety measures to prevent environmental hazards caused by the Keystone Pipeline XL. In fact, seven participants firmly said, “No,” without any doubt and did not

elaborate any further. A female participant mentioned that the government is not willing to make the investment, while others recognized the close relationship that government has with TransCanada. A couple participants believed that the government might set up regulations, but would not enact them. Ten participants mentioned the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a helpful government agency (“not the enemy”), but did not believe it would have the staff or funding to handle additional regulations. This distrust in the government contributed to most of the participant’s reasons for demonstrating. They felt a strong desire to stop the pipeline from being constructed because the government wouldn’t regulate or prevent environmental risks. People that believe there are overwhelming corporate influences on the government often develop a sense of powerlessness. They believe that nothing can be done through conventional means to change the decisions made by legislators. This is what pushed many of the participants into collective action. This social conflict is caused by class antagonism due the wealthy corporations flexing its influence over government policy.

Many of the participants were emotionally motivated to take action. The campaign offered a release of their emotional tension caused by their affectual orientation (Weber, 1968). The participants viewed TransCanada as trampling their protections and wanted to get back at them through actions that sought to block the pipeline. As one participant stated in her interview, “There’s all this tremendous corporate influence to try and undo environmental protections that we already have, especially some of these politicians we have in Congress, they are working to get rid of the Clean Water Act, and all these different things.” Class antagonism stems from the difference in power between

the owners of production in a capitalist society and those whose only means to production is their labor power (Marx, 1973). Even though the state was created to regulate the effects of class antagonism, the state is often comprised of the most powerful and economically elite ruling class that creates new means of exploiting the oppressed (Marx, 1973). This pushes the oppressed into social conflict, mobilizing into collective action to “seek the transcendence of a dominant structure of entrenched needs and capacities and the constitution of altogether new forms of social organization in which an emergent structure of radical needs and capacities can be fully instantiated and realized” (Nilsen, 2009: 129).

In this campaign, the class antagonism stemmed from the belief that TransCanada, a wealthy corporation, had exerted its influence on the State Department to quickly approve the application for the Keystone Pipeline XL. As one male participant justified his involvement: “because of all the ties, pretty tight and interwoven with all our agencies and their workers and officials [TransCanada] that have, I can’t put my finger on the person off-hand, I think Hillary had some connections to some of the companies.” The majority of the participants felt that the only way to exert their influence over the decision process was to get out on the streets and show a strong opposition against it. While the conflict remained nonviolent, it would sometimes lead to the arrests of the participants (such as the sit-down in front of the White House or during the occupation of Congressional offices). Many of the participants deemed these forms of protest as the only means available to exert their influence over President Obama’s decision, especially since the pipeline had popular support by members of Congress.

There are many factors an individual makes when deciding to attend a collective action. The limitations of my study and the amount of people I interviewed could not produce an exhaustive list of why people decide to participate in this campaign. I was able to uncover many factors that had already been outlined in empirical research. My research also illustrated an alternative perspective: perceived futility of a campaign does not always deter participation. Deciding to participate in collective action is not often made in isolation, but is rather enhanced by the efforts made by social and environmental movement organizers. The next chapter concludes this study by discussing how both organizers and participants contribute to higher rates of attendance.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the reasons why people participate in social movement campaigns and how movements can mobilize people to engage in high risk tactics of protest even against all odds. This study was fortunate enough to occur during what may have been the largest environmental movement. The campaign has targeted the Keystone Pipeline XL, a controversial issue that has support on both sides. The campaign has managed to stall a decision by the President for a permit since TransCanada's original application in 2011. As of April 4, 2015, President Obama has still not made a decision to either approve or deny the permit, but has admitted that the oil from the tar sands is "extremely dirty" and that his administration is "not going to authorize a pipeline that benefits largely a foreign company if it can't be shown that it is safe and if it can't be shown that, overall, it would not contribute to climate change."¹⁹

I took an ethnographic approach to this study to see if qualitative analysis would yield answers to my research questions. I engaged in the movement by gaining access into local Environmental Movement Organizations (EMOs). I then participated in various demonstrations and interviewed fifteen people that were also present. The goal was to examine the decisions and tactics EMOs used to mobilize people effectively toward their

¹⁹ See <http://www.sierraclub.org/compass/2015/03/extraordinarily-dirty>

campaign. I also wanted to take those findings and compare them with people's decision to attend demonstrations. Interviewing participants at the actual demonstration alleviates the shortcomings of survey data, which primarily measures the feelings of a respondents and the likelihood of attending a demonstration. My research collected data directly from people at the demonstrations and his/her reason for being there. My results uncovered similar findings to the previous research and uncovered a contradiction as to why people are willing to participate in a social movement campaigns.

Findings

Social movements are “the organization of multiple forms of skilled activity around rationality expressed and organized by dominant social groups, which aims at the maintenance or modification of dominant structure of entrenched needs” (Nilsen, 2009: 113). Environmental movements are an extension of social movements “conceived as broad networks of people and organizations engaged in collective action in pursuit of environmental benefits” (Rootes, 1999: 2). To ensure success, environmental movements need to actively broadcast their campaign goals to the general public and put pressure on political opposition (Cohn, Barkan, & Halteman, 2003), to pit their skills against the conditions that restrain successful protest.

The EMOs in the campaign against the pipeline have influenced environmental activists to participate and received generous support across the nation despite the odds. As one participant stated, “I still think 350 and the various alliance that have popped up around tar sands are really effective and really good at inspiring people to care about this particular issue and framing it as a line in the sand.” The EMOs have continued to project

the same message about the pipeline, appealed to authority figures to stand against the pipeline, and expressed a dire need to immediately halt construction of the pipeline and future development of the tar sands oil production.

The EMOs have framed a set of concerns regarding the pipeline that shape perceptions and responses to the environmental issues surrounding the campaign. Creating these alternate viewpoints leads to the formation of networks. These networks influence people to internalize and accept these frames as reality (McLaughlin & Khawaja, 2000). Changing widespread public opinion creates the political opportunity to mobilize activists into collective action (Polletta, 1999) – it is, in fact, a type of agency that changes structures and constructs opportunities rather than passively accepting existing structural conditions.

Maintaining nonviolent tactics also increases rates of participation since it is more appealing to people if they know they will not risk physical harm. As Chenoweth and Stephan (2011) demonstrate, the key variable predicting the success of a movement's campaign is the level of participation and nonviolent civil resistance presents fewer barriers to participation (physical, emotional, etc.) than violent resistance. Civil resistance incorporates the continued use of nonviolent actions by activists engaged in ongoing conflicts with opponents not averse to using violence (Schock, 2013).

The EMOs have deployed various acts of civil resistance, such as peaceful protests and bird-dogging. Activists who partake in higher levels of nonviolent actions are thoroughly trained. This campaign has not been met with serious violent resistance due to careful planning, training, and communication with proper authorities. For the

larger campaigns, permits were filed and approved. The EMOs that organized the demonstrations were well staffed with experts to assist participants in case of arrests.

Of the demonstrations I observed, there was only one repressive act, which kept activists in jail over the weekend. This repressive act backfired, demonstrating what Smithey and Kurtz (1999) call the “paradox of repression.” The arrest and jailing of the protestors only increased visibility of the movement and the number of activists willing to be arrested in front of the White House.

Nonviolent civil resistance incorporates a sense of community in people aligned against a common enemy and “the underlying premise of the sanctity of life” (Bond, 1988: 87). This sentiment was deeply felt by the group I was arrested with, especially as we rode in the back of a police wagon while talking to one another and giving each other courage to remain strong. My own sense of solidarity and comments made by others arrested with me provided evidence for the importance of affective motivations for mobilizing sustained participant movement.

Social and environmental movements also allow activists to affirm their identity. The networks of EMOs empower people into action and allow activists to take on the role of a reformer for environmental protection (Kitchell, Hannan, and Kempton, 2000). The majority of participants I interviewed considered themselves environmentalists and a few even identified themselves as activists. Joining the networks of EMOs gave them an outlet to act against what they perceived as violations against the environment. This relationship was mutually beneficial, allowing the participants to feel accomplished in acting on their values while aiding the campaign to pursue its goal.

EMOs that work together are more likely to establish an extensive social network. Extensive social networks allow for higher rates of mass mobilization (Butcher & Svensson, 2014). Participants who were heavily involved in the campaign belonged to multiple networks and often registered for email notifications from 350.org, CREDO mobile, Climate First!, Sierra Club, and Bold Nebraska. This would increase the amount of emails and phone calls they received regarding planned demonstrations.

The main reason participants attended demonstrations for this campaign was concern over the pipeline and how it would impact the environment. As one participant mentioned, “I just feel like I have to show up because it’s the very least I can do for something I think is a morally compelling issue.” The apparent motivation for her involvement was value rational and affective. This could be attributed to the EMOs effective communication and their presentation of urgency, which created in the participant a sense of obligation moving her to action. Research has shown that particular environmental concerns often arise from engagements with environmental movements (Dietz, Stern, & Guagnano, 1998) – one of the major consequences of mobilization is education not only of the public and hopefully other targets of the protest, but also of the participants themselves. Most of those I interviewed heard about the pipeline for the first time due to their affiliation with the many EMOs. Many in the movement often communicated the same messages contained in emails and postings on EMO social media sites. Dr. James Hansen’s “Game Over” tagline was probably the most commonly used phrase in all the interviews I conducted as well as mentioned at each observed demonstration; it was an effective mobilizing framing of the issue that communicated the

urgency for action and helped to instill feelings of obligation among potential participants. While the value rational convictions of the participants were primarily what drove them to the campaign, certain rational decisions were also made when determining which demonstration to attend.

The decision to participate in activism is partly made by the individual and influenced by “socially meditated calculations of costs and benefits” (Botetzagias & van Schurr, 2013: 513). One cost-benefit perspective is related to the amount of time spent by the participant and the demonstration’s location (Botetzagias & van Schurr, 2013). This campaign relied heavily on volunteers, some of whom held full time employment. The timing of the demonstrations affected attendance if they occurred around business hours. Most demonstrations occurred after 5 p.m. on the weekdays or early afternoon on the weekends. The duration of each demonstration was between one and three hours. Each demonstration allowed people to come and go as they pleased. The demonstration’s location of the demonstration also influenced attendance. The more convenient the location was to public transportation the easier it was for participants to attend. Sometimes networks were set up to make rides available to and from the location of the demonstration. This was expanded to a national level, creating a network of carpooling for people across the nation to Washington, D.C. Housing was also made available through a network of volunteers. All of these networks assisted in increasing attendance rates for the campaign’s demonstrations.

Some participants mentioned their decision to attend as the only way to “let the powers be know we are very much aware that they are poisoning us and that they are

greedy and hopefully this gets into their psyche.” This sentiment closely aligns with Marxist theory of class antagonism, a feeling of powerlessness stemming from wealth and political influence being concentrated in the hands of the elite few (Marx, 1973). Many participants viewed TransCanada as wealthy corporation that had more influence over political legislation than any one person could combat. Distrust in the government was a sentiment felt by all participants I interviewed. Many did not feel that the government would bother to regulate the pipeline and that the EPA is “vastly under resourced for what it needs to do.” This lack of faith in the government and its agencies encouraged participants to engage in collective action, demonstrating people power as a stronger force to influence political decisions.

There were also various observable variables that led to increased participation throughout the campaign. Attendance at demonstrations was higher if multiple organizations were involved informing affiliated members through *physical* (phone calls) and *technological* (email) *spheres*, showing the importance of coalition building for movement success (Ackerman & Karatnacky, 2005). Attendance was also higher when the events were announced well in advanced of the actual demonstration. Participants I interviewed mentioned being more likely to attend if they thought the event was going to attract a large crowd. This was observed through the EMOs social media page and live Internet footage posted during the demonstration.

Several actions carried out by the EMOs did not work well to attract large levels of attendance. 350.org set up a rapid response network as a tool to alert activists of a key political figure’s public appearance. Knowledge of their appearance was often discovered

by the EMOs only few hours prior. The key was to have the activists appear outside the political figures location and put pressure via bird-dogging. Bird-dogging often resulted in shallow attendance rates because, most of the time, it occurred during business hours.

Many of the participants identified themselves as activists and mentioned participating in social movements prior to the pipeline campaign. I did not observe any tactics of trying to engage people beyond the established networks of known activists. Only one participant I interviewed was there because of a friend and did not plan on attending any future demonstrations. Environmental movements might increase their rates of attendance by working with non-environmental networks and other individuals that are not affiliated with environmental organizations.

In conclusion, neither social movement organizers and nor activists operate in isolation. Effective campaigns must establish a mutual interest for both parties. In my research, I uncovered key variables used by the EMOs to mobilize concerned activists into participation, including framing of the issue, communicating the issue, establishing a relationship with multiple EMOs, strategizing effective tactics, and maintaining a nonviolent campaign. Social activists were able to affirm their identity by participating in the campaign as an environmentalist, facing many rational choices and feelings of obligation to attend organized events, and perceiving the campaign as their only means to influence the President's crucial decision on the pipeline's future. There are certain limits to the application of this research (see Chapter Three), but these limitations also create opportunities for future research.

Future Research Recommendations

This research finished before the decision for the Keystone Pipeline XL permit was completed. Unfortunately, I was unable to analyze the success or failure of this campaign. Further research is recommended to study the effect the decision has on the overall campaign. One factor that needs to be addressed is whether the acceptance or denial of the permit will have any impact on future participation. How does the campaign keep this momentum towards future environmental campaigns? A national longitudinal study would also be useful to analyze participation effects by location and time. Was participation higher in other regions, and did the campaign maintain the same level of participation at the beginning as it did towards the end? In addition, increasing the amount of participants interviewed and pulling from multiple locations would produce significant representation of the population. Finally, research that could combine both qualitative (interviews and field observations) and quantitative approach (surveys and statistical analysis) would yield interesting results that could bridge the gap between what people say they will do and what people actually do. Research contributions are important for social movements as it provides reliable information that may assist future campaigns and impact social change.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Are you over the age of 18?

What brought you out here today?

How did you hear about today's demonstration?

Are you affiliated with any of the organizations that assembled this demonstration?

How did you first hear about the tar sands oil and the Keystone Pipeline XL?

Do you reside in any of the states directly impacted by the route of the Keystone Pipeline XL?

What do you want to accomplish with today's demonstration?

How long have you been involved in this cause?

Are you involved in any direct action with other causes?

Have you participated in any other demonstrations against the pipeline?

How likely do you feel the permit will be rejected?

What concerns you most if the permit for the Keystone Pipeline XL passes and TransCanada completes construction?

Do you feel the government will implement necessary regulations to protect the environment from any potential hazards that might come from the completed pipeline?

Do you feel the EPA is effective enough to protect the environment from any potential hazards that might come from the completed pipeline?

What do you feel would strengthen the movement against the pipeline?

APPENDIX B: RECRUITMENT SCRIPT

Hello, my name is Nicholas Kalich and I am a Master's student in the Department of Sociology at George Mason University. I am conducting research on the social movement that opposes the construction of the Keystone Pipeline XL. The intent of this research is to generate further contributions to general knowledge regarding the ability of social movement organizers to mobilize individuals towards planned demonstrations.

I was hoping to speak with you and learn more about your reasons for participating at this demonstration. I will also ask you questions about your background regarding this movement. I will not ask any questions regarding personal information and each interviews will be assigned a number in order to protect your confidentiality and maintain anonymity. The interview will take between twenty minutes to a half an hour.

I would like to assure you that this study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance by the Office of Research Integrity and Assurance. However, the final decision to participate in this interview is entirely yours to make.

Would you be willing to participate?

APPENDIX C: VERBAL CONSENT SCRIPT

RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND PARTICIPATION

This research is being conducted to study the social movement that opposes the construction of the Keystone Pipeline XL. If you agree to participate, you will be asked a set of general interview questions regarding your participation at today's demonstration. Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. If you decide not to participate or if you withdraw from the study, there is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The estimated maximum time for this interview is thirty minutes.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The data in this study will be confidential. Your name will not be asked during the interview or any identifiable questions will be asked that would link this interview back to you. With your permission I will be recording this interview in order to transcribe your responses later today. A number will be placed on the collected interview and the audio file will be deleted. Once that happens, no one will be able to link your interview back to you.

RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research.

BENEFITS

There are no benefits to you as a participant other than to further research in contributions to general knowledge of social/environmental movements and the potential for strengthening collective action during planned demonstrations.

CONTACT

This research is being conducted by myself, Nicholas Kalich, and overseen by Dr. Lester Kurtz, Sociology professor at George Mason University. I can be reached at 216.410.1318 for questions or to report a research-related problem. You may contact the George Mason University Office of Research Integrity & Assurance at 703-993-4121 if you have questions or comments regarding your rights as a participant in the research.

This research has been reviewed according to George Mason University procedures governing your participation in this research.

CONSENT

Do you agree to participate in this study? [If Agreed] Please let the researcher know whether or not you agree to have your interview audio recorded.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, Peter. (2007). "Skills or Conditions: What Key Factors Shape the Success or Failure of Civil Resistance?" *Conference on Civil Resistance and Power Politics*. St. Antony's College: University of Oxford.
- Ackerman, Peter & Adrian Karatnacky. (2005). *How Freedom Is Won: From Civic Resistance to Durable Democracy*. Washington, D.C: Freedom House Publishing.
- Aday, Sean, Henry Farrell, Marc Lynch, John Sides, John Kelly, & Ethan Zuckerman. (2010). "Blogs and Bullets: New Media in Contentious Politics." *Peaceworks*. 65:1-36.
- Aldrich, John H. (1993). "Rational Choice and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science*. 37, 1: 246-278.
- Barkan, Steven E. (2004). "Explaining Public Support for the Environmental Movement: A Civic Voluntarism Model." *Social Science Quarterly*. 85, 4:913-937.
- Benford, Robert D. & David A. Snow. (2000). "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 26:611-639.
- Bond, Douglas. (1988). "The Nature and Meaning of Nonviolent Direct Action: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Peace Research*. 25, 1:81-89.
- Botetzagias, Iosif & Wijbrandt van Schuur. (2012). "Active Greens: An Analysis of the Determinants of Green Party Members' Activism in Environmental Movements." *Environment and Behavior*. 44, 4:509-544.
- Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs. (2011). *Executive Summary: Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Keystone XL Project*. Washington, DC: United States Department of State.
- Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs. (2014). *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL Project*. Washington, DC: United States Department of State.

- Butcher, Charles & Isak Svensson. (2014). "Manufacturing Dissent: Modernization and the Onset of Major Nonviolent Resistance Campaigns." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 1-29.
- Chenoweth, Erica & Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham. (2013). "Understanding Nonviolent Resistance: An Introduction." *Journal of Peace Research*. 50, 3:271-276.
- Chenoweth, Erica & Maria J. Stephan. (2011). *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cohen, Jean L. (1985). "Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements." *Social Research*. 52, 4:663-716.
- Cohn, Steven F., Steven E. Barkan, & William A. Halteman. (2003). "Dimensions of Participation in a Professional Social-Movement Organization." *Sociological Inquiry*. 73, 3:311-337.
- Cunningham, Kathleen Gallagher. (2013). "Understanding Strategic Choice: The Determinants of Civil War and Nonviolent Campaign in Self-Determination Disputes." *Journal of Peace Research*. 50, 3:291-304.
- Diani, Mario. (2013). "Networks and Social Movements." *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*.
- Dietz, Thomas, Paul C. Stern & Gregory A. Guagnano. (1998). "Social Structural and Social Psychological Bases of Environmental Concern." *Environment and Behavior*. 30, 4:450-471.
- Finkel, Steven, Edward N. Muller & Karl-Dieter Opp. (1989). "Personal Influence, Collective Rationality, and Mass Political Action." *The American Political Science Review*. 83, 3: 885-903.
- Eyerman, Ron. (2007). "How Movements Move: Emotions and Social Movements." *Emotions and Social Movements*. Ed. Helena Flam & Debra King. New York: Routledge. 41-56.
- Gillham, Patrick F. (2008). "Participation in the Environmental Movement: Analysis of The European Union." *International Sociology*. 23, 1: 67-93.
- Gladwell, Malcolm. (2010). "Small Change: Why the Revolution Will Not Be Tweeted." *The New Yorker*. <[http:// www.newyorker.com](http://www.newyorker.com)>

- Goffman, Erving. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identities*. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper, & Francesca Polleta. (2001). *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Helvey, Robert L. (2004). *On Strategic Nonviolent Conflict: Thinking About the Fundamentals*. East Boston: The Albert Einstein Institution.
- Hess David & Brian Martin. (2006). "Repression, backfire, and the theory of transformative events." *Mobilization*. 11, 1: 249-267.
- Hornsey, Matthew J., Leda Blackwood, Winnifred Louis, Kelly Fielding, Ken Mavor, Thomas Morton, Anne O'Brien, Karl-Erik Paasonen, Joanne Smith, & Katherine M. White. (2006). "Why Do People Engage in Collective Action? Revisiting the Role of Perceived Effectiveness." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 36, 7:1701-1722.
- Johnson, Renée J. & Michael J. Scicchitano. (2012). "Don't Call Me NIMBY: Public Attitudes Toward Solid Waste Facilities." *Environment and Behavior*. 44, 3:410-426.
- Kitchell, Anne, Erin Hannan, & Willett. Kempton. 2000. "Identity Through Stories: Story Structure and Function in Two Environmental Groups" *Human Organization*. 59, 1:96-105.
- Klandermans, Bert. (1984). "Mobilization and Participation: Social-Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization." *American Sociological Review*. 49, 5:583-600.
- Lim, Chaeyoon. (2008). "Social Networks and Political Participation: How Do Networks Matter?" *Social Forces*. 87, 2:961-982.
- Lober, Douglas. (1995). "Why Protest?: Public Behavioral and Attitudinal Response to Siting a Waste Disposal Facility." *Policy Studies Journal*. 23, 3: 499.
- Lubell, Mark. (2002). "Environmental Activism as Collective Action." *Environment and Behavior*. 34, 4: 431-454.
- Lubell, Mark & Arnold Vedlitz. (2006). "Collective Action, Environmental Activism, and Air Quality Policy." *Political Research Quarterly*. 59, 1: 149-160.
- Lubell, Mark, Sammy Zahran, & Arnold Vedlitz. (2007). "Collective Action and Citizen Responses to Global Warming." *Political Behavior*. 29, 3: 391-413.

- Marx, Karl. (1973). *On Society and Social Change*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- McCarthy, John D. & Mayer N. Zald. (1977). "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology*. 82, 6: 1212-1241.
- McLaughlin, Paul & Marwan Khawaja. (2000). "The Organizational Dynamics of the U.S. Environmental Movement: Legitimation, Resource Mobilization, and Political Opportunity." *Rural Sociology*. 65, 3: 422-439.
- Melucci, Albert. (1980). "The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach." *Social Science Information*. 19, 2:199-226.
- Merriman, Hardy. (2009). "Theory and Dynamics of Nonviolent Action." *Civilian Jihad: Nonviolent Struggle, Democratization, and Governance in the Middle East*. Ed. Maria J. Stephan. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 17-29.
- Merriman, Hardy. (2010). "The Trifecta of Civil Resistance: Unity, Planning, Discipline." *Open Democracy*. <http://opendemocracy.net>.
- Mertig, Angela G. & Riley E. Dunlap. (2001). "Environmentalism, New Social Movements, and the New Class: A Cross National Investigation." *Rural Sociology*. 66, 1: 113-136
- Meyer, David S. (2004). "Protest and Political Opportunities." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 30:125-145.
- Nilsen, Alf Gunvald. (2009). "'The Authors and Actors of Their Own Drama' Towards a Marxist Theory of Social Movements." *Capital & Class*. 33:109-139.
- Passy, Florence & Marco Giugni. (2001). "Social Networks and Individual Perceptions: Explaining Differential Participation in Social Movements." *Sociological Forum*. 16, 1: 123-153.
- Polletta, Francesca. (1999). "'Free Spaces' in Collective Action." *Theory and Society*. 28, 1:1-38.
- Polletta, Francesca & James M. Jasper. (2001). "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 27:283-305.
- Rootes, Christopher. (1999). "Environmental Movements: From the Local to the Global." *Environmental Politics*. 8, 1:1-12.
- Schock, Kurt. (2005). *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in*

Nondemocracies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Schock, Kurt. (2013). "The Practice and Study of Civil Resistance." *Journal of Peace Research*. 50, 3:277-290.

Sharp, Gene. (2010). *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation*. Fourth Edition. East Boston: The Albert Einstein Institution.

Smithey, Lee & Lester R. Kurtz. (1999). "We Have Bare Hands: Nonviolent Social Movements in the Soviet Bloc." *Nonviolent Social Movements*. Ed. Stephen Zunes, Lester R. Kurtz & Sarah Beth Asher. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers. 96-124.

Snow, David A., Louis A. Zurcher Jr., & Sheldon Ekland-Olson. (1980). "Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructural Approach to Differential Recruitment." *American Sociological Review*. 45, 5:787-801.

Stephan, Maria J. & Erica Chenoweth. (2008). "Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict." *International Security*. 33, 1:7-44.

Stern, Paul C. (1992). "Psychological Dimensions of Global Environmental Change." *Annual Review of Psychology*. 43, 1:269-302

Stern, Paul C. & Thomas Dietz. (1994). "The Value Basis of Environmental Concern." *Journal of Social Issues*. 50, 3:65-84.

Strauss, Anselm L. 2007. *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. Fourteenth Edition. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Swift, Anthony, Susan Casey-Lefkowitz, & Elizabeth Shope. (2011). *Tar Sands Pipelines Safety Risks*. New York: Natural Resources Defense Council.

Thoreau, Henry David. (2004). *Walden and Civil Disobedience*. Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Media Group, LLC.

Weber, Max. (1968). *Economy and Society*. Ed. G. Roth & C. Wittich. New York, NY: Bedminster Press Incorporated.

Woynillowicz, Dan. (2007). "Tar Sands Fever!" *WorldWatch*. 20, 5.

BIOGRAPHY

Nicholas Kalich received his Bachelor of Arts from Baldwin-Wallace University in 2006. Nicholas Kalich is currently employed at the American Institutes for Research (AIR) as a Statistical Support Specialist. Nicholas received his Master of Arts in Sociology from George Mason University in 2015. He enjoys science fiction, C. Wright Mills, Karl Marx, the great outdoors, and video games.