



**Mobilising movement against fracking:  
An ethnographic exploration of 'Reclaim the Power'  
anti fracking action camp**

A Research Paper presented by:

***Malin Joanna Olofsson***

(South Africa)

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Major:

**Agrarian and Environmental Studies**

(AES)

Specialization:

**Environment and Sustainable Development**

Members of the Examining Committee:

Dr Murat Arsel

Dr Mindi Schneider

The Hague, The Netherlands

December 2014

***Disclaimer:***

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

***Inquiries:***

**Postal address:**

Institute of Social Studies  
P.O. Box 29776  
2502 LT The Hague  
The Netherlands

**Location:**

Kortenaerkade 12  
2518 AX The Hague  
The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 70 426 0460

Fax: +31 70 426 0799

## Acknowledgements

I feel deeply grateful for having had the opportunity to develop my academic abilities and expand my intellectual horizons at the ISS. Many have contributed in different ways during this challenging, inspiring and often emotional journey.

I would like to thank my advisor Murat for his support and gentle guidance throughout the process of writing this paper. He provided a listening ear, insightful questions and on-going encouragement which helped me gain the confidence to put my ideas on paper and find a way to transform my enthusiasm about the anti fracking movement into an academic paper.

Thank you to Mindi, my second reader for her very close reading of my drafts, detailed comments and writing tips. The writing skills I have learned during this process will serve me for years to come.

Thank you to Timothe and Nick my student discussants for generous comments, suggestions and encouragement.

Thank you to Tefera who has so patiently listened to my daily ramblings and frustrations during this process and for reading my draft and feedback.

Thank you to my dear friend Rachel who accompanied me to 'Reclaim the Power' enduring a cold, wet and windy week of camping and all the craziness that came with it.

Thank you to all the professors who have taught and inspired me during my time at the ISS and my fellow student who have walked this road with me, sharing and caring at every turn.

Lastly, but most importantly, I am deeply indebted to all the wonderful, passionate, radical and inspiring people I met during my field work who have dedicated so much to the struggle against fracking and for social and environmental justice. Without them this paper would not have been possible. Special thanks to those who so generously shared with me their stories, thoughts and feelings, it was only with these as a foundation that I was able to write this paper. A luta continua!

# Contents

<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Diversity and difference in the UK's anti fracking movement	1
1.2 Epistemology, methodology and methods	3
1.3 Scope and limitations	4
1.4 Overview of chapters	5
<b>Chapter 2 Emergence and Expansion of Fracking</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Expanding energy frontiers and growing discontent	6
2.2 Fracking becomes a global phenomenon	8
2.3 Neoliberal turn in British politics and the 'Dash for Gas'	10
<b>Chapter 3 Analytical Framework</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1 The evolving theories of social movements	12
3.2 Environmental activist in the UK	15
<b>Chapter 4 Reclaim The Power- Anti Fracking Action Camp</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1 The anatomy of Reclaim the Power	17
4.2 Anti fracking activists, ideologies and politics	19
4.3 Negotiating spaces within RTP	24
4.4 From ideology into action	27
<b>Chapter 5 Conclusion</b>	<b>31</b>
References	33
<i>Appendix A</i>	37
<i>Appendix B</i>	38

## List of Acronyms

AFM	Anti fracking movement
DECC	Department of Energy and Climate
FPA	Fuel Poverty Action
GHG	Green House Gas
NDFG	No Dash for Gas
NSM	New Social Movements
OUGO	Office of Unconventional Gas and Oil
PPT	Political Process Theory
RMT	Resource Mobilisation Theory
RTP	Reclaim the Power -Anti Fracking Action Camp
SM	Social Movement
SMT	Social Movements Theory
SNA	Social Network Analysis
TTIP	Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership

## **Abstract**

Based on ethnographic field work conducted during the 2014 Reclaim the Power- Anti Fracking Action Camps, using participant observations, informal discussion and interviews, this study explores coalition formation between actors with very different political and ideological orientations. Evidence from previous environmental direct action groups illustrates how diverse interests, motivations and tactics lead to irreconcilable tensions. This study explores the diverse political and ideological orientations of activists at Reclaim the Power, their demands and objectives, how representation within the camp was negotiated and ultimately how their demands were expressed, as a means to explore the formation of broad based coalitions. Different approaches from the social movement literature are used for analysis. The study illustrates how despite diversity a strong coalition was formed based on the broad resonance of the framing of RTP as a social, economic and environmental justice movement. Framed as such fracking provided an anchor for broad struggles against the state and the political and economic system to form alliances with struggles over localised social and environmental risks facilitating the formation of diverse coalitions.

## **Keywords**

Fracking, anti fracking movement, activism, social movements, radical environmental movements, coalitions, UK.

# Chapter 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Diversity and difference in the UK's anti fracking movement

*“Our movement is not going to change the way the politicians think or their plans but what it is going to change is people. We need people coming out and physically stopping this. We need normal people, run of the mill people who are usually watching Coronation Street or East Enders, them people, waking up and thinking why are them protestors out there doing that stuff. We need to get a mass of people standing up against this and saying we are not having this, only then will politics change” (activist from RTP).*

New practises are leading to environmental degradation, inspiring new actors into activism, resulting in the formation of broad based coalitions between people from very different socio-economic and political positions. Hydraulic fracturing (fracking), a controversial method of extracting oil and gas from unconventional underground reserves, is one such practice inspiring broad based coalition building. Although environmental justice scholars have illustrated the correlation between social and environmental inequity broadly, fracking cuts across class divides, bringing the impacts of environmental degradation ever closer to communities that were previously distanced by their class position. This paper will explore how fracking appears to be inspiring the formation of alliances between diverse groups of actors who are converging in their shared resistance to fracking while their opposition is informed by very different social positions in society, and diverse political and ideological orientations.

The UK makes for a particularly interesting case study of the anti fracking movement. Substantial shale gas reserves and a state that is overtly pro fracking has lead to more than half of the UK being advertised for exploration (Guardian 2014a). Global and national capital is eager to exploit these opportunities and has lead to the current ‘dash for gas’. Although commercial production has not yet started, exploratory fracking is currently underway at eight sites with many more currently in the process of gaining planning permission (Frack Off 2014). In response to these developments a growing anti-fracking movement has emerged and is rapidly expanding.

While following the activities of the anti-fracking movement both through online news and social media sources I was stuck by the size and speed at which the anti fracking movement in the UK has emerged. Currently there are more than 160 local anti fracking groups across the UK (Frack Off 2014). I started following many of these local groups online and was intrigued by the diversity of actors within the movement. Seemingly conservative groups in the Tori heartland of middle England were united by slogans such as “Against the industrialisation of the Countryside” and utilised well-designed websites with custom made educational videos to illustrate the potential reality of fracking bringing heavy vehicle traffic through their quiet village, disrupting wildlife and polluting local water systems (Kirdford and Wisborough 2014). Focusing primarily on the local risks of fracking such groups were advocating for engagement through the states ‘invited spaces’ for citizen participation such as public

consultation and voicing opposition through petitions. Simultaneously groups of radical leftists were occupying fracking sites in an attempt to disrupt and prevent work-taking place on the site (Crawberry Hill and West Newton Protection Camp 2014). These groups relied on direct action aimed at the fracking industry in an attempt to stop exploratory drilling, effectively bypassing the state by acting outside of the legal framework, using direct action as a means to affect the change.

Tension created by different approaches to dealing with environmental degradation is not new. Traditional reformist approaches advocate for working through the state to achieve change, focusing on command and control policy instruments. Radical approach on the other hand perceive the state as part of the problem, by being implicated in driving a specific model of development that is not sustainable and therefore seeks solutions beyond state structures which are citizen driven and often involve direct action. Environmentalism has often found expression through more radical means (Adams 2008: 369). This was especially visible in the UK's direct action networks from the early 1990's (Saunders 2012: 831). A study of the British Climate Camps which were an attempt to build the movement against climate change, illustrated how the annual camps eventually dissipated due to an inability to bridge the radical agenda of many of the founders with the increasingly reformist approaches of participants at the camps (Saunders 2012).

The preliminary evidence illustrates that the anti fracking movement is bringing together a diverse range of actors from both ends of the radical reformist spectrum who occupy very different socio-economic positions in the world. Tensions between radical and reformist approaches in dealing with environmental change, as witnessed in the UK climate camps, frames and provides the relevance for the central question of this research paper:

***How is the anti fracking movement in the UK building coalitions between a broad spectrum of actors very different political and ideological orientations?***

In order to address this question the paper focuses on one particular manifestation of the anti fracking movement; the Reclaim the Power (RTP) Anti-Fracking Action Camp which took place 14-20 August near Blackpool in Lancashire, North Western England. A broad range of actors converged at this camp, united in their shared opposition to fracking. I used this as the primary site of research in order to address the research question, operationalizing the research by focusing on the *actors*, the *processes* within the camp and the *actions* that emerged from it. The following sub questions guided this process: *Who are the different actors involved? What are their politics and ideological orientations? How is representation of different groups within RTP negotiated? What are their demands and objectives? How are these demands being expressed?*

Acknowledging the expansion of fracking and environmental degradation as a profoundly political process, I frame this research from a political economy perspective, drawing on literature from social movement theory and UK environmentalism to explain the formation of broad based coalitions within the anti fracking movement. The rationale for this research is premised on the idea that people reclaiming power through social movements can have a significant impact on challenging the dominant political and economic system. Following this reasoning, the goal of this research is to draw on detailed ethno-



graphic observations of a particular instance where the anti fracking movement is mobilising a diverse group of actors. By doing so I hope contribute to the literature on social movement and resistance.

## 1.2 Epistemology, methodology and methods

The focus of this research is on individual actors, the internal dynamics of RTP and the expression of resistance that emerged from it. Since these are deeply social and situated processes a qualitative research methodology with a strongly ethnographic orientation is used. An ethnographic orientation facilitates an interpretative approach to knowledge and is informed by a relativist epistemological position (Summer and Tribe 2009: 59). This allows for attention to be given to subjective experiences and the meanings people ascribe to their actions and acknowledging the existence and experience of multiple realities. In addition an ethnographic orientation also involves a contextual understanding of knowledge, not just privileging what people say and the meanings they ascribe to their actions but also giving weight to what they do and the surroundings within which they are situated. Both subjectivities and situated knowledges are considered key to understanding the dynamics within the anti fracking movement and the framing and articulation of their actions.

During the fieldwork I engaged in what Juris terms ‘militant ethnography’ which he refers to as “ethnographic research that is not only politically engaged but also collaborate, thus breaking down the divide between researcher and object” (2008: 20). This involved participating in the activities, actions and protests with the groups I was studying. Reflecting on research conducted on the anti globalisation movement in Spain Juris (2008) asserts that through participation in actions and protests a deeper level of emotion was evoked which contributed to the research findings. Engaging in RTP as a participant rather than a researcher, being directly involved in the daily activities, workshops, protest and direct actions allowed me to gain this ‘insiders’ view that Juris describes. Building personal relationship with many of the activists in the process provided access to their personal lives, histories, ideas, ideologies and meanings ascribed to their actions in a manner that would not have been possible had I maintained my positionality as a research only conducting interviews.

My fieldwork was carried out over the course of three weeks during August 2014. My initial contact with the anti fracking movement started some months earlier via social media platforms. Most of the local anti fracking groups, regional and national advocacy networks use social media as a primary tool for organizing and sharing information. I had been following the activities and much of the media coverage of the movement for some months before arriving in the UK and making direct contact. Initially I spent time in East Yorkshire at two ‘protection camps’- Crawberry Hill and West Newton. These are sites where activists have set up a semi permanent camp alongside fracking site in an attempt to block entry to the site for the oil and gas company, disrupt the companies operations, build public awareness about the risks of fracking and act as environmental monitors. During this time I camped on the site with the activists and took part in their daily activities, accompanied some of them to London for the court hearing for their eviction case, attended fundraiser events and a protest action. These experiences provided a broader context for my research, especially a better understanding of one particular group of activ-

ists who are part of the movement who later I refer to as '*lifestyle activist*'. It was through the people I met at these camps that I became aware of the weeklong 'Reclaim the Power' (RTP) anti fracking action that took place outside Blackpool, 14-20 August. During RTP I participated in as many diverse activities as possible in order to gain as varied an experience of the camp and the people as possible. I attending a range of workshops, took on daily camp maintenance duties, was involved in the day of direct action and during this process made many friends who generously shared their life stories, dreams and aspirations. It is on many of these informal conversations that I base my analysis.

I relied primarily on participant observation, informal conversations and personal experiences during the camp. These traditional ethnographic methods were used to generate primary data, and follow up interviews were conducted with five key informants after a camp. The informants were identified based on their representativeness of general 'types' of activists and enabled some of the preliminary findings to be elaborated on. The interviews were conducted over skype and recorded via audio recorder.

### **1.3 Scope and limitations**

The scope of this study is micro in nature focusing only on three field sites and conducted over a short time period. As such the fieldwork was very limited in scope and does not attempt to present a comprehensive account of the anti fracking movement as a whole. Neither do the activists and persons encountered during my fieldwork present a representative sample of the highly heterogeneous movement. This study is similar to most ethnographic studies which focus on small  $n$ -samples in that it does not attempt to have empirical generalizability but rather strives to make theoretical and conceptual contributions towards understanding how coalitions are being formed within the anti fracking movement.

The detailed ethnographic nature of this study has meant focusing on very specific moments and enactments of resistance on the part of the anti fracking movement focusing largely on the internal processes and dynamics. Reflecting on ethnographic studies of social movements, Edelman (2001) cautions against a narrow focus which only encompasses the movement and it's internal dynamics without taking into account the broader social and political fields within which mobilisation occurs. In an attempt to avoid falling into this fine-grained narrow focus that Edelman cautions against I have tried to position this study within the broader political context, taking into account the opportunities and/or constraints that this provides to the anti fracking movement albeit not at any great length due to the confines of this paper.

On a personal level I am clearly aligned with the anti fracking movement. I am aware this positionality brings both implicit and explicit biases. It has informed the orientation of this research and the research focus while it may have biased the research in favour of the movement. At the same time this positionality facilitated my access into the movement helping me build a genuine sense of solidarity with the activists facilitating the ethnographic orientation of this paper.

## 1.4 Overview of chapters

Chapter 2 will contextualise this research from a political economy perspective, exploring the emergence and expansion of fracking. The historical trajectories both technological and political that have facilitated the current global expansion of fracking will be traced with particular focus on the political shift within the UK that have lead to the current 'dash for gas'. Chapter 3 will briefly present an overview of key social movement theories that will form the theoretical framework for this study. Prominent trends in British environmentalism over the passed two decades will be outlines, giving particular emphasis to recent expression of radical environmental movements which will be used as a reference point against which to asses the anti fracking movement. Chapter 4 deals with the empirical findings from RTP, using social movement theory to analyse the actors involved and their relationships, the activities that took place within the camp and the direct action that emerged from it. The final chapter will pull together the analysis concluding that a strong coalition was formed between diverse actors based on the broad resonance of the framing of RTP as a social, economic and environmental justice movement. This facilitated the convergence of diverse struggles that spanned local and global, material and post material concerns which could all find a common expression in resisting to fracking.

## Chapter 2 Emergence and Expansion of Fracking

This chapter contextualises the study by tracing the development and expansion of fracking from a political economy perspective. A brief literature review highlights the broadly polarised positions around fracking, pointing to a gap in the literature when it comes to understanding citizen lead movements and resistance. The early development of fracking in the US to the global phenomenon that it is today will be traced in order to contextualise the current ‘Dash for Gas’ that is taking place in the UK. Emphasis will be given to the analysis of political and structural features that have facilitated this expansion and the divergent outcomes of its adoption within the European context.

### 2.1 Expanding energy frontiers and growing discontent

The insatiable appetite for consumption led economic growth that underpins the capitalist system is being sharply confronted by ecological limits. This is particularly visible in the energy sector where the depletion of traditional fossil fuel reserves has led to increased demand and price and led to the expansion of capital into previously uncharted energy frontiers. These new energy frontiers require increasingly extreme methods to extract fossil fuels. One such method is fracking. Over the passed decade fracking has become a highly contested process due to its social and environmental implication and risks in addition to highlighting a growing discontent with the systemic logic of neoliberalism that underpins it.

Fracking is most commonly used to extract gas from shale rock formations but also coal bed methane and tight sand that is gas bearing sandstone formations (EPA 2014). This process involves advanced drilling techniques whereby the drill head cuts vertical and then horizontal wells. Fracking fluid that consists of large quantities of water, chemicals and sand like particles are then injected into the well under very high pressure creating small fractures in the semi or impermeable rock formations. This in turn releases the trapped hydrocarbons that return to the surface together with the injected fluid and other naturally occurring materials such as radioactive molecules. This process differs from conventional natural gas extraction due to the permeability of the bedrock in which the gas is housed. Conventional gas is found in permeably rock such as sandstone and hence can more easily move through the rock and be extracted from a large area via a single vertical well whereas ‘unconventional’ gas requires multiple fracked wells within a small area.

Positions on fracking are increasingly polarized. On the one hand are those in favour of this technology, primarily industry and its allies, unified by the economic potential of fracking which is hailed as being a ‘game changer’ and carrying the potential for an ‘energy revolution’ which can increase energy security, reduce greenhouse gas emission and stimulate economic growth and generate. On the other hand are environmental organisations, local communities and activist who stand in strong opposition. Their objections focus on a

range of negative environmental, social and economic implications. For many actors opposition to fracking is framed by local concerns over falling house prices, water and air pollution and related health risks while broader concerns over climate change and corporate power and control fuel other actors in the anti fracking camp. While social groups can broadly be defined along these lines as ‘for’ or ‘against’ fracking this is a somewhat over simplified dichotomy and a more nuanced approach illustrates divergence within local communities especially amongst land owners in the US where the legislative framework gives mineral right to landowners resulting in a pro fracking local lobby due to potential capital gains. Despite this more nuanced analysis, by and large it remains a polarized debate between those who stand to gain through capital accumulation resulting from fracking and those against, be it for reasons that range the local global spectrum that may be socially, environmentally and/or politically motivated. This debate has grown in significance as fracking is fast expanding from its origin in the US to many other parts of the world.

A growing body of political science literature deals with the structural features that facilitate or hinder the development of fracking, the governance, regulatory and policy dimensions. Environmental science and technology fields on the other hand deal with the multiple dimensions of potential and actual biophysical risks associated with fracking. Both these bodies of literature do not overtly challenge the extraction of unconventional fossil fuels per se but rather advocates for more effective management of the hazards and risks through stronger institutions of governance and regulatory mechanisms (Stern et al 2014). This literature takes a narrow, reductionist and technocratic approach that does not acknowledge fracking as a profoundly political process that is deeply connected to social, cultural and environmental processors.

Within the social sciences there have been attempts to address this gap by drawing on mostly ethnographic studies of the embodied experience of those directly effected by fracking at both an individual and community level (Hudgins and Poole 2014, Somonelli 2014, Willow 2014, Wylie and Albright 2014). These authors, some more directly than others, have illustrated that there is something distinctly different about the social processes that result from fracking that set it apart from other forms of environmental degradation. The environmental justice literature has highlighted the concept of ‘environmentalism of the poor’ illustrating how communities with the least political and economic power have been disproportionately affected by environmental degradation (Martinez-Alier 2013). In the case of fracking it has been argued that a “*new* politics of environmental degradation” is emerging (Willow 2014, emphasis added) which transcends the traditional class and race divides of ‘environmentalism of the poor’. Focusing on the broader political economy of fracking authors highlight the consolidation of power between state and capital as a means to manufacture consent by delegitimizing and silencing views and alternatives that fall outside of the neoliberal agenda (Hidgins and Pool 2014, Merce et al 2014).

These studies have made valuable contributions to our understanding of the multiple levels at which fracking is affecting communities, both in terms of the broad range of social actors affected and the marginalisation of dissent through increasing concentrations of corporate power. The focus has remained primarily on the consequences and implications of fracking and as such limited to cases in the US and Australia where commercial extraction is well established.

Relatively little has been written about the emerging forms of resistance. Where scholars have focused on the anti fracking movement it has largely been through a comparative lens, looking at the divergent outcomes for the anti fracking movement on shale gas policy across countries (Kadar 2014) and how networks and framing have affected the anti fracking movement in different contexts (Bomberg 2013, Wright 2013). It is to this gap in our understanding of the mobilisation of movement against fracking that this study will turn, focusing on how coalitions are being formed between diverse actors.

A better understanding of the mechanics and mechanisms of the anti fracking movement itself is important not only because it remains a relatively underexplored and under theorised area, but also because we are at a critical juncture where fracking is set to expand globally which could have far reaching environmental and social implications. Global assessments of technically recoverable shale gas reserves show vast potential for fracking, stimulating global interest. Argentina, China, Mexico, Poland and the UK have already started the exploration process while Algeria, Argentina, Australia, China, India, Mexico, Poland, Romania, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the Ukraine have expressed interest in exploration of their shale gas reserves (EIA 2014). The mobilisation of a strong anti fracking resistance movement to confront this expansion is considered to be critical if we are striving for social, environmental and economic justice.

## **2.2 Fracking becomes a global phenomenon**

The first attempts at extracting unconventional natural gas from deep shale beds dates back to 1821 in the US (NETL 2011:1). It was not however until the 70's and 80's, prompted by the depletions of natural gas reserves and increasing gas demand, that attention in the US turned to the technology of fracking. Wang and Krupnich (2013) highlight both the important role played by the US government and the private sector in leading to the technological innovations which are considered key in ushering in the shale gas boom witnessed from the turn of the millennium. As early as the 70's the government implemented incentives in the form of tax breaks and direct funding that prompted private entrepreneurship in the unconventional gas sector that is largely responsible for the development and advancements of fracking. In 2000 shale gas made up only 1.6% of the US's total gas supply, this rose to 4.1% in 2005 and 23.1% in 2010 (Wang & Krupnich 2013:1). This rapid growth is attributed primarily to the technological innovations that resulted from the government incentivising research and development from the 70's onwards in addition to other facilitating structural features such as private land and mineral rights, conducive geological conditions, existing gas pipe infrastructure and the open access policy and market structures that existed in the US and of course the high price of natural gas (Wang & Krupnich 2013).

These technical innovations that made unconventional fossil fuels accessible for extraction resulted in significant economic benefits. Gas prices in 2012 were the lowest they had been in 10 years and the US had shifted from being the worlds largest gas importer to being self sufficient in addition to having created an additional 600, 000 new jobs by 2010 (Wang et al 2014: 1). It is these features- economic prospects, energy security, jobs and growth that influence many other countries to focus on the exploration of unconventional

fossil fuels through fracking. Currently China, India, Poland, South Africa, Australia, Ukraine and the UK are in the early stages of exploring this technology to ascertain the potential for commercial extraction to meet their growing energy needs and reduce energy dependency (Wang et al 2014: 2). China, estimated to have the worlds largest reserves of shale gas and to be the largest consumer of energy have put in place an aggressive plan to supply a quarter of their gas needs from shale gas (Wang et al 2014: 2). Despite the growing global interest in fracking and the hope that an American style unconventional gas boom can be replicated, there is growing evidence to support the idea that fracking may just be a Trojan horse for further environmental and social problems which will not deliver on economic prospects, energy security, jobs and growth (Fleet et al 2012).

The US pioneered this new technology on a substantial scale since early 2000, hence scholars look in their direction when it come to assessing the related social and environmental impacts. These concerns fall broadly into three categories- water, air and climate. Mauter et al (2014) and Vengosh et al (2014) highlight the risks associated with groundwater contamination from chemical and gas migration into shallow aquifers and point to the risk of surface water contamination through spills, leaks and inadequate waste treatment and the high volumes of water required during the fracking process. Evaporation of contaminated waste water is cited as a major cause of air pollution (Moore 2014) while methane escape from the well during the extraction process results in fracking contributes 30% more GHG than conventional gas and at least 20% more than coal (Howarth 2011: 679). These environmental risks translate into a range of potential health risks across geographical and temporal scales. Although empirical studies are emerging regarding the adverse impacts associated with fracking, the extent and magnitude of the impacts remain relatively underexplored (Algate et al 2014).

In comparison to the US, Europe has been very hesitant with the adoption of fracking and there is much scepticism about replicating the US gas revolution in Europe (Kefferputz 2010). Structural features between the two continents have been highlighted as key determinants in their respective adoption of fracking. The geology within Europe is cited as posing technical challenges which could increase costs and the geography of Europe means it is more densely populated and hence access to water and land are more restricted (McGowan 2012: 47). Additionally, McGowan (2012) point to the contrasts in regulatory environments where the US reduced regulation and incentivised innovation in order to get this industry going, in Europe since the technology is now in place this issue is more about deployment and with a stronger regulatory environment especially concerned with risk the deployment has proved more difficult. Ownership of mineral rights, availability of water, equipment shortages, labour costs and lack of significant political support for fracking within the European Union are also important determinants that could account for the inability to replicate the US gas boom. Analysing the networks and frames invoked between the US and Europe Bomberg (2013) illustrates how the US had strong government support for the fracking across levels of government whereas in the EU there has not been such a clear distinction within the government or in Brussels and the resistance movement has thus had critical support from within the government and also from the low carbon industries which was largely missing in the US. In the US the exchange of resources

brought together industry, energy academics and farmers who could unite around the message that ‘the benefits of fracking outweigh the costs’ whereas in the EU there were less opportunities for the industry to build alliances and hence their key message ‘do not worry, risks are overstated’ did not have such a broad resonance (Bomberg 2013:18).

These broad structural difference and the way in which actors have navigated within these different contexts on both sides of the Atlantic shed some light on how energy policy has evolved however within Europe there are sharp contrasts in the approach towards shale gas. Both France and Bulgaria have banned fracking, with temporary bans in Germany and Netherlands while UK and Poland are enthusiastically embraced it. Some of the structural features that are considered important in explaining the contrasting approaches to the adopting fracking are cited as being a countries previous developments of their energy sector, the importance of gas in their energy supply balance, the relative importance of energy security and the extent of grass roots mobilising. (McGower 2012:52). Kadar (2014) emphasises social and cultural factors such as the resonance of conservations frames, the history of environmental activism, the existence of NGO’s that are well connected with grass roots and the resonance of certain frames that have allowed anti fracking movements to gain ground.

This brief tracing of the evolution and expansion of fracking provides some context and explanation for the emergence of fracking, the subsequent divergent trends in the adoption of fracking between the US and Europe. The next section explores the political context within the UK that has lead to the government’s strong pro fracking stance.

### **2.3 Neoliberal turn in British politics and the ‘Dash for Gas’**

During the 11 years of Thatcher’s conservative government (1979 and 1990) a distinct new set of economic and social policies were implemented based on neoliberal principles of market liberalisation, deregulation and privatisation. This ushered in a new era of neoliberal market capitalism that established policies that favoured an enterprise culture, the private sector and facilitating capital accumulation. When Labour won a landslide victory in 1997 many were hoping that this would bring a socio-economic transformation that would address social inequality and welfare concerns. This was not the case, “rather than repealing the changes of the Thatcher years, Labour took the neoliberal transformation of Britain a step further” (Jessop 2003: 1). Building on much of what was established during the conservative years, the labour government (1997-2011) continued to prioritise markets that facilitated capital accumulation and reduced public spending on welfare measures in what became know as labours Third Way. The coalition government that came to power in 2010 continued along the same track, shaping policy along neoliberal lines that favour competitive free market as a means to achieve maximum welfare.

Following the peak of North Sea oil in 1999 the UK become a net importer of all major fuels. In 2013 47% of energy consumed in the UK was imported (DECC 2014) with gas being the most important fuel in terms of domestic consumption and the second most important fuel in the national



context and in terms of imports (DECC 2014). Following McGower's (2012: 52) argument that the importance of gas within the total energy supply and the relative importance of energy security are key determinants that explain a country's adoption of fracking can largely explain the active facilitation of the fracking industry by the UK government. In addition to the energy security element, significant revenues stand to be generated through unconventional gas extraction, unlike the US where mineral rights remain the property of the landowner, in the UK revenues from mineral rights stand to accrue to the state. According to the UK Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) "UK shale gas could be a net benefit to public finances, could attract annual investment of £3.7 billion and support up to 74 000 jobs directly, indirectly and through broader economic stimulus" (2013: 3). All these factors can be seen to inform the state's current 'dash for gas'.

The growing importance of gas within UK energy supply, prompted the state to facilitate the growth of the shale gas industry by implementing tax breaks and setting up the Office for Unconventional Gas and Oil (OUGO) with a mandate to simplify the regulatory process required for fracking. These actions are in keeping with the neoliberal ideologies of minimising regulations to facilitate a free market system. For a company to gain permission for fracking they require a Petroleum Exploration Development License (PEDL) which are issued by DECC. In July 2014 the government opened a new round of on-shore licensing, offered up more than half the country for unconventional oil and gas exploration licenses (Guardian 2014a). In addition to the license a company requires permission from the landowner, a permit from the environmental protection agency, approval from the agency and health and safety and planning permission from the local county council which usually also requires an environmental impacts assessment, (DECC 2014). These regulations are an attempt to sufficiently simplify and minimise regulations so as to attract investment while maintaining sufficient controls to avert risks. An inherent tension exists between the state's neoliberal agenda to facilitate capital accumulation through free market capitalism and the need to maintain legitimacy in the eyes of its citizens (Fox 1995). This is a fundamental challenge for the neoliberal state that is brought into sharp contrast in the UK around the issue of fracking. Currently in order to gain planning permission there is a requirement for a public consultation in addition to a mandatory payment to affected communities of £100 000 per exploratory well and an additional 1% of revenues once in full production. These measures illustrate the overt measures taken by the state to incentivise local communities through financial remuneration and gain legitimacy for the process by implementing a public consultations process.

The neoliberal turn in British politics and the facilitating role played by the state to encourage fracking provides the broad political context within which RTP and the different actors involved and their actions will be analysed.

## Chapter 3 Analytical Framework

### 3.1 The evolving theories of social movements

In search of a lens through which to analyse RTP as an expression of the anti fracking movement, I turn to the well-established literature on social movement. As social and political conditions in society have changed so has the nature of the central conflict of society, resulting in social movement and the theories developed to interpret them constantly evolving. The Marxist, class based theories used to explain the central conflicts of industrial society between classes of labour and capital were no longer considered adequate to explain the dynamics of social movements in post industrial societies (Porta and Diani 2006:6). The struggles of environmental movement, rights based and identity-based movements have been largely characterised as post material in nature and have stimulated a range of contemporary social movements theories. This study being focused on the anti fracking movement in a post industrial context would appear to fall into this later category of contemporary social movement however it will be illustrated that while the anti fracking movement can be seen as largely post material in nature this does not exclude class based struggles that find expression through the anti fracking movement. I will briefly outline the development of different approaches to analysing social movements as the diversity of the anti fracking movement means it defies easy categorisation according to one theory alone. The different approaches outlined below each carry currency in explaining groups within the anti fracking movement.

The conceptual developments in social movements studies have evolved largely through critiquing and building on one another. Prominent social movement scholars in the US began to explore and explain movements by focused on the availability and ability of movement to mobilise resources (McCarthy and Zald 1977) and the political structures (Tarrow 1998, 2006) that facilitate or hinder mobilisation. The primary focus of these scholars was on factors external to the movement. Resource Mobilisation theory and Political Process Theory have been critiqued as being too narrowly focused on structural features without giving sufficient consideration to identity and cultural elements in explaining social movements (Touraine 1981; Melucci 1989). These authors brought what they considered a new focus into the study of social movement that prioritised the subjective dimension of identity, meaning and culture in order to analyse movements, and became known as New Social Movements (NSM). Although the 'newness' of NSM has been contested and debated within the SM literature (Pichardo 1997) it is evident that a conceptual dualism exists between what Edwards (2014: 78) refers to as the 'structuralist' and the 'cultural constructivists' which has characterised the evolution of contemporary movement theories from the 1970's till today. Analysis of movements has broadly followed this dualistic approach, either emphasising the structural features as being the key determinants in analysis of a movement success or following a more constructivist approach by focusing on identity, culture and meaning. I will briefly trace the evolution of contemporary social movement theories as both the structural and constructivist approach are consid-

ered to have analytical currency in the case of understanding the emerging coalitions within the anti fracking movement.

Emerging largely out of a critique of collective behaviour theory which attributed group mobilisation to a share grievance and frustration, McCarthy and Zald (1977) offer a rational approach to understanding SM, arguing that grievances and frustrations which were largely believed to have shaped collective behaviour alone are insufficient to explain mobilisation. They argue that the process through which strong emotions are turned into sustained action requires a closer look at the resources that individuals have or are able to get access to. By resources these authors refer to both tangible resources such as access to media, finances, communication infrastructure and human resources but also intangible resources such as knowledge, skills and relationships with other movements, social networks, authorities and elites. The focus remains on resources primarily within the movement(s). A key assumption of this approach is that individuals act in a rational and calculated manner, making choices based on individuals' calculations of the costs and benefits of their participation. The availability of resources at the disposal of a movement from this perspective helps to explain the emergence and success of a SM. This approach has been criticized as laying too much emphasis on the availability of resources and how these resources shape social movement activity (Edwards 2014:74). Political process theorists have argue more emphasis need to be on the political opportunity structure (Tarrow 2006) while the new social movement theorists focus on identity, meaning and culture are key determinates of SM. While there certainly are shortcomings in attributing SM emergence and success on resources alone, it draws attention to social networks and the importance of the establishment of relationships between individuals and groups based on resource sharing as a key for understanding movements. It is this aspect in particular which will be drawn on to explain why actors with very different political and ideological leanings joined forces in the struggle against fracking at RTP.

Political Process Theory (PPT) focuses on the external environment of a SM to determine a movement emergence and outcomes. PPT considers the most important aspects in this regard the political context and the nature of the political institutions and how these are perceived as favourable or not for affecting a SM expectation of success. When the political structure is perceived to be 'open' it can facilitate opportunity for SM by providing a favourable context for action. Tarrow (1998: 76-90) identified four dimension of political opportunity that represent the degree of 'openness' of a political system, namely; increasing access to influence politics, shifting political alignments, divided elites and influential allies. Each of these dimensions are assumed to be weighed up and calculated against the perceived risks involved in engaging in contentious actions against the potential for success. This emphasis on the 'rational actor' highlights the ways people perceive opportunities and hence draws attention to cultural aspects that will influence how people perceive and pick up on these political opportunities. Collective action does not happen directly in relation to political opportunities but individuals need to construct meaning that will persuade them to act collectively and utilise the political opportunity (Benford and Snow 2000). In an attempt to better understand the subjective aspect of perceived opportunity, the concept of 'collective action frames' has emerged within the SM literature and deals primarily with the construction of

ideas and means that can help to explain collective action. Benford and Snow identify four key 'variable features' of collective action frames: Problem identification and locating the cause, flexibility and rigidity, variation in interpretive scope and influence and resonance (2000: 618-619) each of which helps to explain how actors perceive the opportunities which can then translate into collective action. Together the political opportunity structure and collective action frames have been combined in various ways to help explain the emergence and success of SM. The four dimensions that Tarrow identifies can help to explain the actions of certain actors within RTP but is not sufficient to explain the movement as a whole. Analysing the frames used by the organisers of RTP and many of the different actors who participated in RTP according to Benford and Snow's 'variable features' helps to explain the emerge of a broad based coalition within the anti fracking movement.

NSM emerged largely as a reaction to the predominant focus on RMT and PPS on the structures external to a movement as explanatory vehicles for the emergence and success of SM. NSM scholars argue that PPT cannot be seen as the key determinant for the success of a movement, challenging the underlying assumption of the rational actor that underpinned both RMT and PPT. Instead NSM scholars turn to the personal realm of 'everyday life', where struggles over the appropriation of identity, culture and meaning become the main area of contention. "New Social movements are struggles, not only for the reappropriation of the material structure of production, but also for collective control over socio-economic development i.e. for the reappropriation of time, of space and of relationships in the individuals daily existence" (Melucci 1980: 219). For many of the actors at RTP the anti fracking struggle is much broader than about resistance to fracking and can better be understood when viewed as struggles of the reappropriation of identity, social relations and collective control over socio-economic development.

Four key characteristics have been outlined by Edwards (2014: 119) which distinguishing NSM as 'new'. Firstly the politics of NSM are seen to be new primarily in their post material concerns and focus on identity and challenge dominant ideas about the workings and structure of society. Secondly the sites of struggle have become rooted in the everyday and cultural aspects of identity, values and lifestyles are brought into focus. Thirdly, the composition of the movement are no longer distinguishable by class, gender, race but cut across socially differentiated groups and lastly the organizational forms of NSM is decentralised and submerged in the everyday. Many of these characteristics were observed within RTP, suggesting that some of the key concepts that are put forward by NSM theory could help explain the emergence of the coalitions being formed within RTP.

The diversity of interests and motivations of the actors at RTP has meant it cannot be exclusively explained by PPT, RMT or NSM alone. Taking this into account this study draws on several aspects from each of these approaches in order to explain the formation of broad based coalition within RTP.

### 3.2 Environmental activist in the UK

A brief reflection on the historical trajectory of environmentalism in the UK provides valuable context for the following analysis of the anti fracking movement. Saunders (2012: 831-832) outlines three broad waves of environmentalism to characterise distinctly different approaches and actors that have played a leading role in the environmental movement. The first emerged in the nineteenth century in Western Europe with a focus on conservation; the state playing a key role in promoting the protection of nature in order to preserve it through the establishment of parks and protected areas. This 'conservationist' approach took a narrow focus on place specific interventions that was subsequently critiqued for this reason and was succeeded by 'political environmentalism' in the 1970's that broadened the scale of focus to global environmental issues such as industrial pollution. This wave saw the emergence and increased importance of environmental organisations such as Friends of the Earth (FoE) and Greenpeace who took the leading role in putting environmental issues on the agenda and driving the struggle for environmental change. The third wave of environmentalism emerged early in the 1990's and was largely a reaction to 'political environmentalism' which was criticised as being too dominated by environmental organisations whose institutionalised approach to tackling environmental issues had not resulted in significant change to the political and economic system that was considered by many to be the root cause of many environmental problems. In addition the institutionalised approach was considered to have marginalised grassroots voices, provided little space for 'real' action (Saunders 2012: 831). This growing discontent with the lack of progress in tackling environmental issues led to the emergence of 'radical environmentalism'. The anti roads protests of the early 1990's against the Thatcher government's plans for massive investment in a new road network which would traverse Britain was considered to be the first expression of this new wave of environmentalism (Doherty 1999: 276). What made these anti roads protests distinct in characterised was the explicit use of direct action as the primary form of resistance and protest. The radical environmental movements that followed is perceived to be less about working within the system on a reformist agenda as had been the case with the previous two waves and instead takes a more radical approach, based on new values and ideologies that challenge the very tenants of the capitalist system and seeks a fundamental paradigm shift away from the capitalism system (Seel and Plows in Sanders 2012:832).

This radical turn in environmentalism in 1990s has been attributed to both structural features and a deeper shift in values. Political and economic factors such as the frustration with conventional political participation processes, the alleged success of the poll tax riots which succeeded in prevented the Thatcher government from implementing a flat rate per capital tax and the anti roads protests against the massive infrastructure program to extend the British road network have been cited as providing the political opportunity which partly explains the emergence of this new wave of radical environmentalism (Saunders 2012 and Wall 2007). However, using the case of the anti roads movement, Doherty (1999) asserts that explaining the movement according to the costs and benefits perceived by the political opportunity structure is not sufficient in explaining the emergence of this radical wave on environmentalism. Instead a closer look at the internal dynamics and identity of those within the movement is better positioned to explain its emergence. Through an investiga-

tion of the anti roads movement Doherty (1999) concludes there is something qualitatively new that has emerged in terms of the organisation, resources, tactics and motivations of those within the movement. The non-violent forms of direct action that characterise these ‘new’ radical environmental movements are informed by a very different ideological justification and fuelled by counter cultural ideas.

Following the anti roads protests another significant expression of this radical wave of environmentalism was the Camps for Climate Action. These camps developed through the coming together of direct action networks to take action against carbon intensive infrastructures in an attempt to slow down carbon emissions and climate change. They went beyond localised expression of protest and resistance as was seen with the anti roads protests and become institutionalised in the form of four weeklong National camps between 2006-2009. These camps espoused radical principles went beyond just facilitating direct action and set out to demonstrate sustainable alternatives and provide alternative education strongly founded on anarchist principles (Saunders & Price 2009). Despite the apparent radical leaning of the climate camps Saunders (2012) argues that many of the participants at the climate camp did not share this radical leaning and aligned rather with reformist ideas of working through state structures and engaging institutionalised mechanisms in order to tackle climate change. In an analysis of the same camps Schlembach (2011) highlights tensions that emerged between the environmental and the social justice agenda. While some participants advocated for drastic lifestyle changes which required shifts away from high levels of consumption and targeted campaigns against new coal fired power stations and the new runway at Heathrow, others questions such ‘self imposed austerity politics’ raising concerns over the marginalisation of class and labour struggles by such a narrow focus on a green agenda. Schlembach (2011) and Saunders (2012) attribute the tensions that emerged within the climate camp between radical and reformist, environmental and social justice agendas as having lead to the ultimate demise of climate camp after 2009.

RTP, with a distinct focus in direct action appears to fall within this third wave of ‘radical environmentalism’, building on more than two decades of environmental activism that engaged direct action as a primary tactic and also on the foundation that was laid during the climate camps that helped in growing resistance through formalised action camps. While the climate camps were ultimately not able to bridge the highly heterogeneous nature of the camps the anti fracking movement appears to be succeeding. This emphasises the rationale for the primary research question that this paper addresses.

## Chapter 4 Reclaim The Power- Anti Fracking Action Camp

*“RTP aims to stigmatise the fossil fuel industry and train people up in direct action while networking between different activist struggles and supporting local struggles with direct action skills that they may not have. RTP broadly about climate change and corporate power and democracy” (professional activist)*

This chapter will focus on the RTP camp, drawing on empirical data from my fieldwork to explore how broad based coalitions emerged between actors with very different political, ideological and class positions. This analysis will draw on both social movement theories and ‘third wave’ radical environmentalism, particularly using the climate camps as a reference point.

### 4.1 The anatomy of Reclaim the Power

In 2012 a group of 21 activist climbed and occupied the chimneys of the UK’s newest gas fired power station-West Burton. They effectively shut down operations for the duration of their eight-day occupation, drawing attention to both the environmental and fuel poverty aspects of the current ‘dash for gas’. West Burton is one of the fourteen new gas fired power stations currently under construction in the UK with another eleven having been approved and further application pending (FoE 2012). This expanding infrastructure is part of the state’s energy strategy encouraging the ‘dash for gas’ despite the IPCC’s warning that climate change will have severe, widespread and irreversible impacts. “Gas is the new battle ground, we felt the fight against Heathrow and coal have largely been won by direct action and gas is the new threat, that’s why we occupied West Burton ...Direct action is an important tool in our armoury against climate change” (personal interview with activist).

The occupation of West Burton was the birth of ‘No Dash for Gas’ (NDFG), a loose network of activists who wanted to make clear the link between the gas industry and environmental, social and economic issues namely climate change, increasing energy price and fuel poverty. Most of these activists met during the climate camps and were veterans of climate activism and direct action. Their strategy was to increase public attention on gas through actively challenging and resisting the states increasing focus on both the conventional and unconventional gas industry. RTP being the main event they organise.

NDFG organised their first RTP camp in 2013 bringing together over 1000 anti fracking activists for a week long camp at an exploratory drilling site in Balcome, Sussex. According to the NDFG website the aim was to “bring together a wide range of groups and individuals from across environmental, economic and social justice networks to discuss ideas, strengthen links, and share skills in direct action and civil disobedience to take action against the Cuadrilla<sup>1</sup> site”. The location of the camp was initially planned for a site adja-

---

<sup>1</sup> Cuadrilla is an oil and gas exploration company

cent to the West Burton power station but at the last minute a decision was made to relocate to the Balcome due to a call from local residents to support their on-going protest against a local fracking site. Similarly, this year RTP responded to a call from local Frack Free Lancashire groups requesting support for their local struggle.

Mother and grandmothers have taken the lead in initiating and organising the local Frack free Lancashire campaign groups. These women have become the public face of the local struggle and although they are not all grandmothers (Nana's) they collectively identify as such, extending this image through their dress. They all wear yellow and black anti fracking aprons, headscarves and curlers when engaged in their anti fracking campaigning. The Nana's have become increasingly frustrated with the lack of responsiveness from local councillors and the state to their opposition to fracking. Inspired by numerous other anti fracking protest sites across the country they decided to take direct action in an attempt to raise awareness amongst locals and raise the profile of their struggle. In a well-planned operation they woke before dawn to occupy a local farmers field that falls within an application submitted by Cuadrilla for a new fracking site. "We have tried legal routes, filled out planning permission objection letters, got over 14 000 signatures and now we feel we have a social license to do this" (interview with one of the Nana's during the camp). All dresses in their Nan's attire they wanted to send a clear message that although they were undertaking an illegal action they were harmless grandmothers offering tea, cake and "fracking truth" to passers by as one of their brightly coloured roadside signs communicated.

None of these women had any prior history of activism, they got involved in the anti fracking movement when the first fracking took place in Lancashire in 2011 at the time largely out of fear of the potential local environment risks. Since then they have built a strong local network, closely linked primarily through social media to other local anti fracking groups. They described being inspired by the direct action that took place during the Balcombe RTP camp in 2013 and hence turned to the No Dash for Gas network for support. No Dash for Gas was able to mobilise the numbers that were required to raise the profile of their action through their national and global network of activists that included social, economic and environmental justice activists.

This collaboration between the local Frack Free Lancashire groups and 'No Dash for Gas' can be explained as a mutually beneficial one based on both parties providing resources that further their respective objectives. The resources in this case being the critical mass of people, logistical support and resulting broad media coverage from NDFG, while the struggle against fracking provides a 'physical anchor' for NDFG's broad struggle against the current political and economic system that is behind the state's 'dash for gas'. In this light the NDFG activist could be seen to be acting as 'political entrepreneurs' (Wall 1999) consciously exploiting this opportunity for collaboration. Such an analysis is based on Resource Mobilisation Theory (McCarthy and Zald 1977) which emphasis the rational calculation of benefits of both parties as the means to explain how social movements emerge and develop. While RMT has

---



analytical currency in explaining this collaboration at the level of the network or group it is not sufficient in explaining the broad coalition if one reduces the unit of analysis to the level of the individuals that made up these groups. McCarthy and Zald (1977) themselves acknowledge that resource mobilisation theory is a partial theory and while it has some explanatory power in understanding the emerging broad based coalitions it is not sufficient in explain this case. I now turn to look more closely at the individuals who participated in RTP. Neither the local groups or the activists mobilised through NDFG are homogenous groups, instead a high level of social differentiation exists within both these groups. Analysing these differences more closely by focusing on the identities and subjective meanings attributed to their actions will lead to a more nuance understanding of the emerging coalitions.

## 4.2 Anti fracking activists, ideologies and politics

The identities of the over 600 participants at RTP defy easy categorisation due to their broad and varied characteristics. For theoretical purposes I build on the approach used by Saunders (2012) to analyse the climate camp activists by way of creating a typology of actors. Acknowledging that such a typology by no means represents the diversity of participants at RTP, I use it as an analytical tool to broadly categorise the most commonly held political and ideological positions of activists at RTP. I illustrate each of these ‘activist types’ by presenting short vignette of individuals at RTP, illustrating the motivations, values and interests of participants as a means to illustrate the diversity amongst activists at RTP.

“I grew up here on the Fylde Coast, my children grew up here and no-one is listening – I need my grandchildren to now be able to grow up in a clean, safe environment. This is my obligation as a grandmother” (*local activist*). The ‘*local activist*’<sup>2</sup> had no prior experience with activism or environmentalism. She became aware of fracking in 2011 when she experienced the earthquake that she thought was an explosion. Finding out that an exploratory fracking site caused the quake spurred her into action.

I just realised that something had to be done, for the sake of my family and my grandchildren. I felt like I had no choice but to become active in this movement....The shale gas industry and Cuadrilla in particular have not acted honestly in their dealings with our community and are not to be trusted with the health and well-being of our children. We do not want them here and so are gathering to make sure we are heard and we are calling others to help us amplify this. As air and water do not recognize county boundaries, the defense is for everybody in the UK. (*local activist*)

---

<sup>2</sup> I use a generic names for each activist type, however the individuals on which these are based gave permission for their identities and the information they provided to be included in this paper

As a retiree of 62 years she had the time to take on a very active role in this struggle and has been involved in local awareness raising campaigns around Blackpool for the passed 3 years. She described the morning she and other local activist squatting the field that became the site of RTP with excitement. Being part of the anti fracking group amongst other women her age with a similar profile gave her the confidence to go beyond tradition campaigning and this process appeared to have brought a whole new level of excitement and enthusiasm to her retirement.

Despite the local councillors being described as “corrupted by the oil and gas industry and no longer acting in the interests of the community”, she went on to relate how the main focus of her local anti fracking group has been on raising local awareness about the risks of fracking and getting the community to sign petitions and submit objections letters to planning permission to the local council. This inherent contradiction between a mistrust of the processes available to the public to have a voice yet still engaging these processes as a primary means of resistance was quite apparent in discussion with the *‘local activist’*. The RTP camp itself illustrated this contradiction; one the one hand the motivation to get involved in more radical means of resistance such as ‘occupying the field’ was fuelled by the lack of trust in the state processes for consultation yet throughout the camp the local activist were primary engaged in getting petition and rejection letters signed. “There are so many reasons to be here and doing this<sup>3</sup>, we have taken this situation for too long and enough is enough, we need to stop this now.” While these actions appeared contradictory the ‘local activist’ did not perceive them as such, they were simply utilising all available means at their disposal.

The *‘new recruit’* although not new to protest action, had never had any involvement with the anti fracking moment. Only 17 years old, he left school a year ago to start his own company that provides a ecological cleaning service to offices around Birmingham. He heard about RTP through a friend and this was his first encounter with the anti fracking movement. “I went to RTP knowing no one and now I’m going heckling at all sorts of events, I was at the conservative conference on Sunday and to NATO conference a few weeks ago in Newport, showing them that I’m not going to let this government walk all over us. I made so many new friends at RTP”. The social dimension of RTP, and the social networks that it opened for the *‘new recruit’* appeared to be the highlight of the camps. His network of ‘activist friends’ now spans the whole country, and during a skype interview some weeks after the camp he related how since RTP he has spends all his free time at protests and actions spanning politics, environment and social justice issues. The social dimension and networking that happened through RTP appeared to be the highlight for the ‘new recruit’ and to have played an important part in the formation of his emerging identity as an activist.

While for the ‘local activist’ the struggle was largely to stop fracking, framed by concerns over local environmental and health risks which could largely be seen as NIMBYism, the ‘new recruit’ identified his struggle in broader terms, focusing on what he termed “real democracy” and citizens rights. He saw the state as the key vehicle through which to affect change and saw the

---

<sup>3</sup> Referring to squatting the field at RTP and setting up the illegal camp

need for direct action as one means amongst other for people to demand more democratic processes within state structures that are responsive to and represent citizens.

He did not target the state per se but rather emphasises a growing mistrust in the political system questioning the state's autonomy to effect change however he still saw the state as the primary vehicle to affect change. For him it was more a question of tactics and how best to get the attention and of the state and the means through which to forward ones claims. He frames his claims within a human rights discourse.

I'm not going to write a letter to my MP, I'm going to get out onto the street and get my voice heard, that's the only way they will listen to you. We need to tell them that this system is unfair, inequality cannot go on and we are taking a stand. We will not let this happen because it's a fundamental human right that you should feel safe in your own home. People are worried about should they heat or eat, that is how bad it is in the UK (*new recruit*).

The '*austerity activist*' was not entirely new to environmental activism. She worked in the music industry as an events organiser and during this time was part of a direct action group associated with 350.org engaged in raising awareness through direct actions and campaigning around divestment and was a voluntary political lobbyist for Greenpeace. When she lost her flat in London she could not longer afford to live there and returned to East Yorkshire to move in with her mother. It was during this time that she received a leaflet through the door informing her about an anti fracking protest camp getting set up in the area at a newly licensed fracking sites. She has been involved full time in supporting the Crawberry Hill protection camp since it was set up in June. She emphasised the important of having a broad and inclusive strategy when it comes to fighting against fracking, incorporating as many different tactics as possible in order to increase chances of success. She described such an inclusive approach as building support for the green party, engaging local MP's, working through the available legislated channels such community consultations and objections to planning applications and building awareness about the risks of fracking amongst the general public. She took a pragmatic approach and viewed a combination of both reformist and radical tactics as the most effective means of mobilising against fracking. Working within the state structures while using forms of direct action were both a means of affecting change and growing the movement. Although she is now a local resident since she returned to live with her mother and similar to the 'local activist' stand to be directly affected by the local impacts of fracking, her resistance was framed in a very different way. As a young profession who could not afford to live in London and pursue her career, her struggle against fracking was as much about a struggle against the economic and political system that underpinned it. She described fracking as a "symptom of a dysfunctional system that is making skilled and educated people surplus to the needs of the capital".

The '*profession activist*', highly educated, has been involved in activism since she first encountered with the climate camp in Oxford in 2009. She described being quite put off at first by the "crusty hippies" which she found quite extreme but later ended up getting actively involved in the climate movement

after attending some of their meetings and being really impressed by the people involved in the movement; “they were all really on it, organised and sorted, and I got involved because I really respected and admired a lot of the people involved” She has been involved in direct action and activism ever since. In 2012 she was one of a small group of activists that occupied West Burton and one of the founding activist of NDFG. She now works for 350.org and was actively involved in the organising for RTP. In line with the framing provided by NDFG, she framed fracking within a wide struggle for social, environmental and economic justice, advocating systemic change with a focus on lifestyle and cultural shifts. The camp was as much about demonstrating and promoting another way of life that involves more collaboration between people and in this striving for more autonomy from the state. “We need communities coming together, owning and controlling their own energy systems, in spaces which are increasingly autonomous”.

The *‘lifestyle activist’* has taken on direct action as a full time occupation. He grew up on a council estate and described his youth as a difficult time where he felt marginalised and had a hard time fitting in. He got involved in criminal activity and spent time in and out of prison during his youth. He gave up his small painting business after struggling to make ends meet and decided to become a full time activist. “I felt disillusion with life and seeing my friends on Barton Moss (an anti fracking protection camp<sup>4</sup> in Sussex) I started getting in touch with them and ‘liking’ statuses and just being a keyboard warrior, posting links and doing my own networking on Facebook and then I started going down there and become one of the boots on the ground”. He has been living in anti fracking protection camps across the country since 2013. “Most of the people like myself, we are just vagrants, we rely on other people for food and other basics. We couldn't carry on like this if people weren't donating”. Local residents who are against fracking but not willing to get involved in direct action show their support by providing foodstuff and other staples that sustain the camps. Referring to some of the other ‘lifestyle activists’ he stated “I feel like some of the protesters might just be there for the party and not really committed to the cause, just getting a free ride from the locals who support us with donations of food”. Becoming part of the anti fracking movement appears to have provided a sense of meaning through being part of environmental movement but also provided a socially inclusive space with social provisioning from local communities that allowed for direct action to become a full time lifestyle. “I never really fitted in, I've always felt like I was a bit of a weirdo, trying to fit into groups and here I naturally fit it, everyone is beautiful and compassionate and they have good principles”. He had been exposed to anarchist philosophies while on the camp and now much of the anti state, anarchist ideology informed his political position.

We are all obviously against politics, I didn't buy into this at first but now I am of the opinion that we don't actually need politics,

---

<sup>4</sup> Protection camps as they are commonly referred to are semi permanent squatted camp alongside proposed or active fracking sites effectively preventing access onto the drilling site for the gas company, or where this has failed squatting alongside the site in an attempt to raise awareness about fracking to the local communities about the risks of fracking and monitoring potential environmental impacts.

we could run the country better ourselves than the politicians who are actually doing it. I think the whole capitalist system is unfair and the whole system of democracy is fake, I don't believe this is a democracy. These are the things that I got into while I was at Crawberry Hill protection camp. I realised this is right, I enjoy doing this and I want to protect the land, I've always been a kind of mother nature kind of guy. I'm doing this for my children and for everyone's children; this is like a religion for me. Even though my life seems to be going downhill because of it, I feel right doing it.

The very process of engaging in the direct action movement against fracking seems to have not only provided an affinity group with other activists from socially marginalised backgrounds, but also through this engagement in the movement he had transformed his political and ideological position and taken on a politics strongly rooted in anarchist ideologies.

The *'lifestyle activist'* framed his resistance in opposition to distinct class interests by framing the state as aligned to capital classes exploiting classes of labour through the process of fracking. For him the struggle is against the state and the exploitation and inequality that result from the capitalist system.

The state will continue to protect its economic and power structure and the hierarchical structure that exists whereby superior people can not get rich unless inferior people work like dogs to give them money, so the state is going to do exactly what the rich want, it's a regime that has gone back hundreds of years, I don't envisage any way of the state helping us but it would be nice, it's Mary Poppins kind of stuff, that if an MP popped up that was actually there for the good of mankind. Imagine that, but I can't see it myself. I don't see the state doing anything other than probably bumping me off before I get too heard by people...I don't trust politics, they don't represent the people, I have no faith in any of them, even the green party is not radical for me.

The *"lifestyle activist"* goes on to define the alternative to the current political and economic system in radically different terms

It's that love of money that is killing us all off. We all need to get away from money, if I had my way we would work hard towards bankruptcy and break this economic system and become self sufficient. We need to forget about relying on the state and others to supply our needs. It's an idealistic view

These short profiles illustrate the diversity amongst actors at RTP. While the *'local activist'* tended towards reformist approaches of working through state structures as a means to affect change the very act of occupying the field and engaging with the other activists illustrates an increasing openness towards more radical tactics largely out of frustration with the lack of progress made through 'invited' spaces provided by the state. The *'new recruit'*, *'austerity activist'* and *'profession activist'* were all open to diverse approaches to tackling fracking acknowledging diverse tactics both through state structures and beyond. The main focus was on mobilizing people into action. The *'lifestyle activist'* appeared to be the most radical, taking a clear stance against the state and more broadly against the capitalist system however at the same time acknowledged mass ac-

tion or what he called ‘people power’ as the most effective means to affect change.

Apart from the ‘*local activist*’ all the other activists perceived the main contention not just about fracking but rather about deeper structural features of the current political and economic system however activists highlighted different aspects. The ‘*new recruit*’ highlighted the erosion of democracy and lack of representation and appeared to be making claims for more access to the state structures. The ‘*austerity activist*’ and ‘*lifestyle activist*’ on the other hand directly experiencing the effects of increased austerity and social differentiation that had especially affected opportunities for the ‘*lifestyle activist*’. They framed their opposition largely based on inequality and social justice. An interesting contradiction was apparent in the case of the ‘*lifestyle activist*’ who was at once ideologically opposed to the system that had marginalized him but the opportunity for direct action emerged in the form of the protection camps had also provided a livelihood opportunity for him.

Distinctly different from the other activist, the ‘*profession activist’s*’, central claims shift to the personal sphere, highlighting lifestyle changes intimately connected to cultural values. This shift in focus of contention from the public to the personal sphere of everyday life is one of the distinguishing features of NSM. Habermas called this “the colonization of the life world by the system” whereby the state and economy are increasingly shaping and controlling the personal and cultural realm leading to “cultural impoverishment” and a loss of personal freedoms (1981: 36). For NSM scholars the central contention of social movement is therefore a struggle to take back control over the personal and cultural realm through increased autonomy and citizen participation in shaping the ‘life world’. The ‘profession activists’ ideological orientation was reflected in RTP camp structure that attempted to create a non-hierarchical, participatory, inclusive, autonomous space. What is significant is the shift in focus away from claims on the state for increased representation and political power towards the personal sphere, emphasizing lifestyle changes and shifts in social relations towards increased autonomy and social solidarity.

### 4.3 Negotiating spaces within RTP

*“I’ve never fitted in anywhere, I’ve always been a bit of a weirdo but I come to these kind of places and I just feel at home” (Lifestyle activist)*

Turning to the processes and activities that took place during the week long camp I analyse how representation of the different actors was negotiated, by looking at how different interests were expressed and alliances, conflict and exchange negotiated. The camp was structured around a number of workshops that spanned a broad range of topics from energy politics and climate science, to practical session on implementing alternative sustainable practises and technical and legal skills for direct action. Besides the ‘formal’ workshop spaces the camp itself was designed to be an experience of an autonomous community, based on non-hierarchical, participatory and sustainable practises, replete with solar and wind powered energy, compost toilets, vegan kitchens, consensus based decision making.

The workshops were facilitated by representatives from professional environmental NGO’s such as Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth, social move-

ment organisations such as the World Development Movement and grassroots activist collectives namely London Roots collective and Seeds for change. This diversity of actors is illustrative of Diani (1992) conceptualisation of social movements as ‘social networks’. He describes social movements as ‘a network of informal interactions, between a plurality of individuals, groups or associations, engaged in a political or cultural conflict, on the basis of a shared collective identity’ (1992:13). Conceptualising the anti fracking movement as an informal network of multiple actors and organisations draws attention to the diversity of interests represented by these different actors but raises the question of how different interests are negotiated within the camp?

Most of the organisations, networks and ‘professional activists’ that participated in RTP framed fracking within a broader context of social, economic and environmental justice, highlighting the political-economic system that underpins it as being the real target of their struggle. While the themes addressed during workshops were diverse they all had in common their opposition to fracking. I briefly explore some of the workshops and practices that took place during the camp and then analyse how social relations were negotiated within this context.

In the UK an estimated 5 million households are experiencing fuel poverty (Association for the conservation of energy 2014). This is largely attributed to increased austerity measures and rising energy prices on the back of a three fold profit increase for the ‘big six’ energy companies over the passed three years (Ofgem 2014). Fuel Poverty Action (FPA), is a campaign group that facilitated workshops at RTP who directly challenge the state narrative of fracking bringing energy security and growth. They made a clear link between fracking and deepening poverty and inequality. Their claims went beyond merely objecting to fracking by put forward a vision for an alternative energy system, articulated in an 8-point Energy Bill of Rights, demanding decentralised and community owned energy supplies which are affordable and not harmful to the environmental. “We plan to build a movement strong enough to bring energy under democratic, public control, where people can make sure it is both affordable and sustainable for all of us and future generations” (Fuel Poverty Action 2014).

The labour movement connected to the anti fracking movement by way of challenging the current state narrative that fracking stand to generate 74 000 jobs both directly and indirectly from the fracking (DECC 2013). Promoting instead the development of renewable energy systems on the ground not only that it is green but also carries the potential for job creation, clearly making the link between renewables and employment potential through the 1 Million Climate Jobs campaign. In addition to the potential for job creation through an alternative energy system, Boycott Workfare ran a workshop raising awareness about their campaign to stop forced unpaid work in exchange for receiving benefits. Fossil fuel workers realities in the UK as well as communities affected by fossil fuel extraction which export to the UK brought the workers rights and justice agenda into the anti fracking movement by the World development movement, London mining Network and Coal Action network.

Corporate capture of the state by oil and gas industry was put forward by two watchdog organisations, Corporate Watch and Spin Watch which illustrated the close ties between senior state officials and fracking companies illustrating the increasing undermining of democratic space within the UK and broad-

er threat to democracy was highlighted through a workshop on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and what this could mean for fracking more broadly across Europe.

These workshops amongst others (see appendix 2) positioned poverty, precarious work and infringements on democracy as direct effects of the current social and political system within which fracking is framed. Many workshop went beyond making the links between fracking and broader justice issues and challenging the narratives put forward by the state regarding the potential for fracking by actively engaged with alternatives. Sessions on establishing housing cooperatives and setting up community owned and managed renewable energy system focused on presenting alternatives that would facilitate greater autonomy for communities as a means to challenge the current system. Practises within the camp attempted to ensure the camp itself was an example of how a community could function through direct participatory functioned such as consensus based decision making while the camp itself was intended to be a space where participants got to experience living in a community run on renewable energy, organised through non hierarchical principles and functioning through active collaboration of participants in all the daily activities.

Some of the key characteristics of NSM such as new sites of struggle and new organisational forms were identified in the practises within RTP and content presented during workshops. These signalled a shift in focus towards culture, values and personal lifestyle practises. While the struggle was at once against fracking and the political-economic system behind it, the strategy that came across at RTP was not oriented towards accessing more political power or the conquest over the state apparatus but rather towards more autonomy from the system in order to create a very different social system. The desired alternative system was reiterated in different ways in various workshops but the common thread was claims for more autonomy both over the material structures of production such as community based energy generation systems and also over social relations. Direct participation through consensus based decision-making and non-hierarchical collaborative ways of working were means practises in an attempt to demonstrate how an alternative way of relating and organising could look in practise.

These workshops that tackled the political economy of fracking and put forward radical lifestyle alternatives were attended by 'professional activists' 'new recruits' and 'austerity activists' and were facilitated largely by 'professional activists'. There was a noticeable absence of 'lifestyle activist' and 'local activist' participating in the workshops. The 'local activists' set up a self contained camp physically separated from the all the other activists and by and large did not integrate much with the other activists or participate in the daily activities of the camp. It appeared as just their presence at the camp fulfilled their objective that was to raise awareness in the area around fracking.

This apparent physical segregation and divergent activities during the camp between the 'local activists' and those mobilised through NDFG mirrors deeper ideological and political differences. The engagement of individuals within the camp further demonstrated these differences. Despite these differences there was no apparent tension between groups within the camp or observable effort made to push any one agenda or approach over another. The success of local environmental struggles have been cited as hinging on the ability of grass roots campaigns to simultaneously defend and transcend local is-



sues by continuously linking the local with the global by scaling up and down of the campaign objectives (Usher 2013: 813). In this case the local group achieved this scaling up of their campaign not through their own doing but rather by building a coalition with other who were able to do so. The shared objection to fracking was the glue that bound all activists together, so strongly rooted in their respective opposition to fracking the broader frames that motivated activists positions and the tactics and mean to achieve these were not contested.

#### 4.4 From ideology into action

*“RTP is a site of resistance which provides an inspiring and empowering space for a large number of people to take mass action” (Reclaim the Power 2014)*

The facilitation of direct action was a key objective of RTP. This was achieved through the popular education spaces within the camp that focused on up skilling people in direct action skills, legal workshops preparing activist for encounters with the police and the legal repercussions. These sessions formed a major part of the days leading up to the final day that was dedicated to direct action. Although opposition to fracking was framed differently by different groups of activists, there was consensus that people need to take action to affect change. Before unpacking the multiple forms of direct action I briefly assess the growing frustrations that focused on lack of progress by environmental organisations and lack of trust in the political system as a means to frame the emergence of direct action in this context.

A general critique of institutionalised environmental groups for not achieving sufficient tangible progress on environmental issues has been cited as one of the key factors in the emergence of third wave radical environmental movements. (Saunders 2012, Wall 2014). This was a common sentiment shared by activists at RTP. The *‘new recruit’* commented, “Institutionalised environmental groups are all about money, you need to pay to be a member, they are all about money and it does not end up going into real actions”. The *‘lifestyle activist’* also perceived them in a negative light as lacking legitimacy.

They are more into signing petitions and rallying MP’s and they are very heavily into the green party, they just say lets vote for the green party and they will save you. They are not friends of the earth; they are friends of their friends. They are actually very conservative; they see us as too radical for this day and age. They don’t do anything for us. If you delve deeper you find that most of the people running environmental organisations have family and stuff that are shareholders with all the corporate businesses we are against.

Organised environmental movements were seen by the “professional activist” as not being completely redundant but having a role to place in terms of providing resources which according to RMT are a vital part in ensuring the success of a movement (McCarthy and Zald 1977). “They [environmental organisations] are good at providing legal support and media though their resources, while they are not good at mobilising.....The green movement did provide some donations to RTP which was very useful”

This lack of ability to mobilise, perceived elitism and conservative approach of environmental groups was not the only reason cited for the emergence of direct action in the anti fracking movement. Frustration with the perceived lack of ability to influence political processors through standard means such as petitions, opposition to planning permission and engaging in other participatory platforms facilitated by the state were perceived to be ineffective if not combined with a mass movement taking action. The 'local activists' on the other hand have been working closely with environmental organisation in building their local movement. Friends of the Earth facilitated workshops during RTP on how to object to fracking through local council consultation processes. This was the only workshop '*local activists*' attended and there was a noticeable absence of any other activist at this workshop.

Political process theorists have argued that the more 'open' the political structure the more chance the social movement has of success. With openness being largely defined by the perceived ability to access and influence politics (Tarrow 1998). Despite the ineffectiveness and lack of impact to date of the consultation processors employed by the state as a means to access and influence politics around fracking, the local activists primarily relied on these processors. Most of the other activists did not perceive the invited spaces provided by the state as a means to access or influence politics, largely because of a deeper mistrust of the political system itself and the logic that underpins it.

Direct action has come about because of how slow the government is, people are fed up, we just want to see things happening, we don't have time to wait around for the government that's why we need to take it into our hands. Civil disobedient and action is especially important in time of austerity like this. The government has lost touch with what the people want that's why we need to take things into our hands (*new Recruit*).

Here clearly articulated is the sense that many activists shared of frustration with the growing divide between the state and citizens and the mistrust of the political system and see direct action as a means to articulate this frustration. As the professional activist stated:

People have lost faith in politicians, hence RTP target the companies involved and the strategy of the day of action as to target all aspects of the business. We need to think about new and innovative ways of making our position known (*professional activist*).

Hence, their struggle is not to gain more access to the political system in order to gain power to influence but rather to bypass the state completely and focus on direct action as a means to grow a counter power from below to challenge hegemonic power and in this way affect change. While PPT can be seen to partially explain the mobilisation of the local activist, for the other activist their actions are not based on the rational calculations of the ability to access and influence politics but rather out of a frustration with the apparently openness of the political system which is not perceived to provide any real political power.

On the final day of the camp 13 different actions took place. The primary target of actions was the oil and gas and related industries. Six of the actions targeted the industry, focusing on the key gas industry players- IGas, Cuadrilla

and Rathlin Energy but also the related industries such as the waist haulage transport company- Total Environmental Technology, Cuadrilla's public relations company and HSBC bank that is a key financier of the fracking industry. These actions involved activist preventing access and occupation of key sites such as the headquarters of these companies and active fracking sites. The strategy behind these actions was to disrupt work activities effectively costing the companies money while using key messaging to raise awareness the of health and environmental risks of fracking. Three actions primarily focused on raising public awareness around fracking through less confrontational means. An art installation of hundreds of paper crafted radium atoms scattered in the public park illustrating the risks of radioactive waste that could result from fracking. A banner drop from a bridge over the Manchester canal stating: 884 000 gallons of radioactive fracking waist has been dumped here! A creative awareness raising action took the form of a group of activist dressed up as "Fraxtons" insurance sales persons, claiming to be the only insurance company that will provide insurance to homes in fracking areas, raising awareness amongst passers by about the economic risks of falling house prices and rising insurance in fracking areas. One action targeted the financing of Swansea University by the oil and gas industry for the establishment of a fracking research institute by blocking entry onto the construction site on the campus.

While the majority of actions targeted the industry itself the state was a target too. A group of activists blockaded the entrance to the Department of Environment, Food and Rural affairs (DEFRA) in protest of the infringement of the publics right to freedom of information highlighted by the recent release of a report on the impacts of fracking on local communities of which two thirds had been redacted. "DEFRA what do you have to hide" read the banner dropped from the building. Another action brought attention to corruption of local councillors in Lancashire who are believed to have vested interests in the fracking industry.

In most cases the tactic was to undertake actions that were daring and imaginative, in most cases involving illegal activities in an attempt to get maximum attention. "Direct action is important for raising something up or maintaining it on the top of the political agenda and getting media coverage is part of keeping it up through political actions" (*professional activist*). This tactic was surprisingly met with a very different reaction from the state than was expected by the activists who were relying largely on getting arrested as part of the strategy. At least half the actions undertaken involved criminal offenses however despite heavy police presence at most of the actions there were no arrests made. This illustrated a very different stance taken by the state compared to previous mass coordinated days of action on the part of the environmental movement. During a similar day of action facilitated through RTP in 2013 over 100 activists were arrested. There was general consensus amongst the activists at RTP that this was a further illustration of how the state is working to undermine their struggle by actively keeping it as low profile as possible even at the risk of not upholding the law by taking action in the face of criminal activity.

All these actions focus on raising awareness about the direct and localised risks of fracking in line with the narrative of the local activists campaign- house prices, health and noise, water and air pollution. The more radical anti system stance articulated by most of the activists at the camp found an anchor here for

their larger critiques of the economic and political system. These actions illustrated the convergence of global and local and radical and reformist agendas through actions that had resonance for the local activists in raising awareness about local concerns about fracking and thus building their local struggle while also being symbolic acts of resistance and defiance for a broader struggle for justice.

## Chapter 5 Conclusion

The expansion of fracking into the UK has provided an opportunity for broad-based coalitions to form between actors with very different political, ideological and class positions. Local anti fracking groups opposed primarily to the process of fracking have formed alliances with activists whose struggle is framed by diverse interests and motivations, against political and economic system that supports fracking. Building on observation made during the RTP camp, local groups are opposing fracking in their local communities motivated largely by NIMBY attitudes, focusing in the potential local environmental, social and health risks, targeted their claims at the state to effect change. What I have termed ‘profession activist’ are mobilising against deeper structural features of the neoliberal economic system, the target of their claims are at once levelled towards the neoliberal logic being forwarded by the state but simultaneously focused on individual lifestyle and social change as a means to counter hegemonic power. Fracking at once provided a grounded target for the profession activist to mobilise against in order to forward their broader agenda of social, economic and environmental justice. The local activists intent on growing the movement to garner more attention for their cause saw the opportunity in this coalition with the ‘professional activists’ as a means to achieve this. The collation between these two groups of actors can be interpreted as a rational and calculated choice based on the potential benefits of the coalition for each respective struggle.

Fracking has also provided the opportunity for actors mobilised by their class position and largely fuelled by material struggles to highlight their claims for social and economic justice. In the context of increased austerity measures and lack of economic opportunities, high energy prices and lack of job opportunities, ‘austerity activists’ are finding expression for their contention through the anti fracking movement. They target fracking as an expression of the states alignment with global capital that further specific class interests and stands to perpetuate and deepen their vulnerability. In addition fracking has seen the emergence of ‘*lifestyle activist*’ who have joined the anti fracking coalition at once as a means to express their frustrations with an economic and political system that has marginalised them but simultaneously fracking has provided a livelihood opportunity through direct action in the form of semi permanent protection camps which they can occupy and in turn receive social provisioning from local communities. Resistance to fracking is proving to be a strongly unifying phenomenon with actors mobilising against fracking for multiple reasons that include material and non-material, local and global concerns.

RTP was successfully able to bring these diverse actors together facilitating the formation and strengthening of this broad based coalition against fracking. This was achieved in part by NDFG framing this struggle as one for social economic and environmental justice. ‘Justice’ as a master frame has wide resonance that can include multiple different agendas and allows for flexible interpretations of the problem and cause. For the majority of activists fracking is merely a vehicle to express broader struggles against the dominant political and economic system, climate change, material struggles perpetuated by austerity, encroachment of the state into the private sphere of everyday life and resulting lack of autonomy. While these struggles were not evident amongst local activist

for the most part the diverse struggles were not perceived to be mutually exclusive and ultimately joining forces against the process of fracking provided a physical anchor for multiple struggles. Although tactics differed regarding how best to affect change, the common thread between all activists was that people needed to be at the heart of this movement. The bigger the movement the stronger the counter power and the more chance of success was the logic that formed the foundation for the coalition. Based on this logic RTP was an inclusive space, distinctly less radical than previous direct action movements that fall within the radical wave of environmentalism, in order to attract broad spectrum of actors and initiate new actors into direct action.

## References

- Adams, B. (2008) *Green Development: Environment and Sustainability in a Developing World*. Routledge.
- Association for the conservation of energy (2014) Accessed 11 October 2014 <http://www.energybillrevolution.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/ACE-and-EBR-fact-file-2013-03-Cold-man-of-Europe.pdf>
- Benford, R.D. and D.A. Snow (2000) 'Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment', *Annual review of sociology* : 611-639.
- Bomberg, E. (2013) 'The Comparative Politics of Fracking: Networks and Framing in the US and Europe', APSA, Annual Meeting Paper
- Cerwonka, A. and Malkki, L. H. (2007) *Improvising Theory: Process and temporality in Ethnographic Fieldwork*. Chicago: Chicago University Press
- Crawberry Hill Protection Camp (2014) Accessed 23 October 2014 <https://www.facebook.com/crawberryhillcamp>
- DECC (2014) UK Energy in Brief Accessed 12 September 2014 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/350941/UK\\_Energy\\_in\\_Brief\\_2014\\_revised.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/350941/UK_Energy_in_Brief_2014_revised.pdf)
- Diani, M. (1992) 'The Concept of Social Movement', *The Sociological review* 40(1): 1-25.
- Doherty, B. (1999) 'Paving the Way: The Rise of Direct Action Against Road- building and the Changing Character of British Environmentalism', *Political Studies* 47(2): 275-291.
- Edwards, G. (2014) *Social Movements and Protest*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- EIA (2014) Accessed 16 September 2014 <http://www.eia.gov/analysis/studies/worldshalegas/>
- EPA Accessed 12 September 2014 <http://www2.epa.gov/hydraulicfracturing/process-hydraulic-fracturing>
- Fleet S, Clerck, P, and Fuhr L. (2012) 'Unconventional and Unwanted: The Case against Shale Gas'. Accessed 5 July 2014 [http://www.foeurope.org/sites/default/files/publications/foe\\_shale\\_gas\\_unconventional\\_unwanted\\_0.pdf](http://www.foeurope.org/sites/default/files/publications/foe_shale_gas_unconventional_unwanted_0.pdf)
- Fox, J. (1993) *The politics of food in Mexico: State power and social mobilization*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Frack Off (2014) Accessed 16 September 2014 <http://frack-off.org.uk/local-group-specific-pages/>
- FoE (2012) 'Enough is enough: New gas fired power stations capacity in the UK', Accessed 2 November 2014 [http://www.foe.co.uk/sites/default/files/downloads/enough\\_is\\_enough\\_2012.pdf](http://www.foe.co.uk/sites/default/files/downloads/enough_is_enough_2012.pdf)
- Guardian (2014a) accessed 28 July 2014 <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/jul/28/fracking-expansion-uk-drilling-national-parks-safeguards>

- [Guardian \(2014b\) accessed 20 August 2014](http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/sep/28/british-firm-ineos-accused-bribes-bulldozers-approach-fracking)  
<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/sep/28/british-firm-ineos-accused-bribes-bulldozers-approach-fracking>
- Habermas, J. (1981). New social movements. *Telos*, 1981(49), 33-37.
- Hudgins, A. and A. Poole (2014) 'Framing Fracking: Private Property, Common Resources, and Regimes of Governance', *Ecology* 21: 222-348.
- Jessop, B. (2003) 'From Thatcherism to New Labour: Neo-Liberalism, Workfarism, and Labour Market Regulation', in *The Political Economy of European Employment*, pp. 137-154. London: Routledge.
- Juris, J.S. (2008) *Networking Futures: The Movements Against Corporate Globalization*. Duke University Press.
- Kádár, B.Á. (2014) 'The Effect of Anti-Fracking Movements on European Shale Gas Policies: Poland and France'. MA Research Paper, Hungary: Central European University
- Kefferpütz, R. (2001) 'Shale Fever: Replicating the US Gas Revolution in the EU?', CEPS Policy Brief (210).
- Kirdford and Wisborough (2014) Accessed 23 October 2014  
<http://www.no-drilling.co.uk/>
- Luttrell, C. and S. Quiroz (2009) 'Understanding and Operationalising Empowerment', ODI, Working Paper nr. 308, 1-39. London: Overseas Development Institute
- Marcus, G. E. (1995). 'Ethnography in/of the World System: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95-117
- Martinez-Alier, J. (2014) 'The Environmentalism of the Poor', *Geoforum* 54: 239-241
- McAdam, D. (1986). 'Recruitment to high-risk activism: The case of Freedom Summer'. *American journal of sociology*, 92(1), 64-90.
- McCarthy, J.D. and M.N. Zald (1977) 'Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory', *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6): 1212-1241.
- McGowan, F. (2014) 'Regulating Innovation: European Responses to Shale Gas Development', *Environmental Politics* 23(1): 41-58.
- Melucci, A. (1980). 'The new social movements: A theoretical approach'. *Social science information*, 19(2), 199-226.
- Melucci, A. (1989) *Nomads of the Present*, London: Hutchinson Radius.
- Mercer, A., K. de Rijke and W. Dressler (2014) 'Silences in the Midst of the Boom: Coal Seam Gas, Neoliberalizing Discourse, and the Future of Regional Australia', *Journal of Political Ecology* 21: 279-302.
- Moore, C, Zielinska, B, Pétron, G and Jackson R (2014) 'Air Impacts of Increased natural gas Acquisition Processing and Use: A Critical Review'. *Environmental Science and Technology* 48(15) 8349–8359
- NETLE (2011) 'Shale gas: a short history from NETL newsroom', Accessed 10 September 2014  
<http://cce.cornell.edu/EnergyClimateChange/NaturalGasDev/Docum>



[ents/PDFs/Shale%20Gas-%20a%20short%20history%20from%20NETL.pdf](#)

- No Dash For Gas, (2014) Accessed 1 October 2014  
[www.nodashforgas.org.uk](http://www.nodashforgas.org.uk)
- OUGO (2014) UK Government Office of Unconventional Gas and Oil, Accessed 2 August 2014  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/office-of-unconventional-gas-and-oil-ougo>
- Pichardo, N.A. (1997) 'New Social Movements: A Critical Review', *Annual Review of Sociology* : 411-430.
- Rootes, C. A. (1992). 'The new politics and the new social movements'. *European Journal of Political Research*, 22(2), 171-191.
- Rose, G. (1997). 'Situating Knowledges: Positionalities, reflexivities and other tactics', *Progress in Human Geography* 21(3): 305-320.
- Saunders, C. (2012) 'Reformism and Radicalism in the Climate Camp in Britain: Benign Coexistence, Tensions and Prospects for Bridging', *Environmental Politics* 21(5): 829-846.
- Saunders, C. and S. Price (2009) 'One Person's Eu-Topia, another's Hell: Climate Camp as a Heterotopia', *Environmental Politics* 18(1): 117-122.
- Schlembach, R. (2011) 'How do Radical Climate Movements Negotiate their Environmental and their Social Agendas? A Study of Debates within the Camp for Climate Action (UK)', *Critical Social Policy* 20(10): 1-22
- Schnoor (2014) 'Regional Variation in Water-Related Impacts of Shale Gas Development and Implications for Emerging International Plays', *Environmental Science & Technology* 48(15), 8298-8306
- Simonelli, J. (2014) 'Home Rule and Natural Gas Development in New York: Civil Fracking Rights', *Journal of Political Ecology* 14: 258-278.
- Sumner, A. and M.A. Tribe (2008) *International Development Studies: Theories and Methods in Research and Practice*. Sage.
- Tarrow, S. (1998) '*Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*', (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, S. (2006) *The New Transnational Activism*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Touraine, A. and A. Duff (1981) *The Voice and the Eye: An Analysis of Social Movements*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Usher, M. (2013). 'Defending and transcending local identity through environmental discourse'. *Environmental Politics*, 22(5), 811-831.
- Vengosh, A., R.B. Jackson, N. Warner, T.H. Darrah and A. Kondash (2014) 'A Critical Review of the Risks to Water Resources from Unconventional Shale Gas Development and Hydraulic Fracturing in the United States', *Environmental science & technology*. 48(15) 8334–8348
- Wall, D. (1999) 'Mobilising Earth First! in Britain', *Environmental politics* 8(1): 81-100.

- Wang, Q., X. Chen, A.N. Jha and H. Rogers (2014) 'Natural Gas from Shale formation—The Evolution, Evidences and Challenges of Shale Gas Revolution in United States', *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 30: 1-28.
- Wang, Z. and A. Krupnick (2013) 'A Retrospective Review of Shale Gas Development in the United States', Resources for the Future Discussion Paper
- West Newton Protection Camp (2014) Accessed 23 October 2014  
<https://www.facebook.com/WestNewtonCommunityProtectionCamp>
- Willow, A. (2014) 'The New Politics of Environmental Degradation: Un/expected Landscapes of Disempowerment and Vulnerability', *Journal of Political Ecology* 21: 237-257.
- Willow, A. and S. Wylie (2014) 'Politics, Ecology, and the New Anthropology of Energy: Exploring the Emerging Frontiers of Hydraulic Fracking', *Journal of Political Ecology* 21: 222-236.
- Wright, M. (2013) 'Making it Personal: How Anti-Fracking Organizations Frame their Messages', *The Journal of Politics and Society* 24(2): 107-125.

## *Appendix A*

### **Guiding questions for Semi structured interviews**

#### Identity

1. Can you tell me a little about who you are
2. Can you tell me a little about how you got involved in the struggle against fracking

#### RTP

3. How did you come to attend RTP?
4. What do you see as the main function of RTP?
5. What do you think was the most successful part of RTP and why?

#### Fracking

6. What do you see as the main problems with fracking?
7. Who or what do you see as the main target in the struggle against fracking?

#### Affecting change

8. Who do you think is the most important agent/actor that can affect change in this case?
9. What do you see as the best means to affect change?

#### Broader context

10. What do you see as possible solutions to our future energy needs?
11. What kind of social and political change do you think are required?

## *Appendix B*

### Workshops conducted at RTP

<b>Education/ Workshops</b>	<b>Networking and movement building</b>	<b>Demonstrate alternative sustainable practises</b>	<b>Direct Action</b>
Introduction to extreme energy (Corporate Watch)	Energy workers struggles	Consensus based decision making (Seed of Change)	Creative Action (BP or not BP)
Climate Science	Fracking and energy bills (Fuel Poverty Action)	How to build a compost loo (RTP)	Building a culture of Resistance (Deep Green Resistance)
Divestment (350.org)	Frack Free Families	How to set up a renewable energy co-op	Dealing with the legal system
Introduction to Anarchist organising	Grow Heathrow	How to set up a housing co-op (Radical Roots)	Group dynamics in Action (London Roots collective)
Objecting planning permission (Friends of the earth)	International Solidarity (activists from Australia, US, Netherlands and Romania)	Safer spaces training (Seeds for Change)	Know your Rights and Legal Observe training (Green and Black Cross)
Radioactive aspects of fracking	Occupy London		Building for the Paris climate summit 2015
Researching the fracking industry and their ties to government (Spinwatch)	Rapid response online organizing (38 degrees)		
Stop corporate power grab: TTIP (World Development Movement)	Reclaiming Unions (1 million climate jobs)		
Positive policy alternative to fracking	Sabotaging hunts and the badger cull (Hunt Sabs)		
Where does energy come from and standing in solidarity with affected communities (World Development Movement & London Mining Network)	Unemployment 101 (Boycott Workfare)		