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ABSTRACT

In this research, the tools and tactics of Greenpeace to protest are analyzed. In the last decades, new communication technologies such as social media have changed the way how people communicate and form groups. People can access and publish information and together form a public opinion by debating on social media platforms. This not only resulted in a shift from physical gatherings to gatherings online, but also changed activism. This close-up study of how one of the frontrunners of activism uses social media to its advantage is not only interesting to analyze the possibilities of social media, and Twitter in specific. It is also interesting for it gives insight in how not only organizations such as Greenpeace, but also unconventional organizations and even terrorist groups such as ISIS can implement social media as a tool to promote their own cause. Applying theories from both cultural and media studies, this research argues that Greenpeace used social media, and Twitter in specific, to create a dynamic collective identity through a performative discourse around the imprisonment of the crew of the *Arctic Sunrise* after protesting against oil drillings by Gazprom in the Pechora Sea. This identity was created in the global public space both by Greenpeace and their large group of online supporters who were willing to share that identity. Once this was created, Greenpeace reinforced it by feeding it representations of itself through a network of social spaces, with the official website of Greenpeace in the center. This allowed the NGO to condense discontent of the swarm and translate it into direct action to support the release of the 30 crewmembers of the *Arctic Sunrise* and the icebreaker itself, both online and offline.
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INTRODUCTION

Since the creation of Facebook in 2004 many social media platforms of diverse categories have taken over the Internet, and even our daily routines. While some of these platforms are limited to a single language or country, most of them are global, accessible in all countries with an Internet connection. The Internet and social media have opened up the gates to information, and private individuals can distribute information or even break stories just as news media can do via social media. But not only the news media have a difficult time in controlling the stream of information, which now seems to flow freely through social media. The traditional gatekeepers consisting of "politicians, PR people and media" (Heinrich, 2011, p. 76), who used to decide which information would or would not be passed on to private individuals, saw their power to control information crumbling down. Private individuals are no longer bound to the mass media and official statements to get information about everyday events. Social media offer private individuals the tools necessary to both access and publish information to fulfill their needs, thereby helping private individuals to debate with each other and voice opinions online. However, not only private individuals use social media to access and publish information.

Among the many companies and organizations who are active on social media, Greenpeace in specific seems to understand the power of social media. Using multiple platforms, and sometimes multiple accounts on a single platform, the NGO publishes information for their cause. This can vary from fighting the chopping of rainforests to protesting against illegal fishing. In September 2013, however, there was a more pressing matter than the environment. An environmental protest by a crew of 30 activists manning the icebreaker the Arctic Sunrise against oil drillings by Gazprom in the Arctic led to the arrest of all 30 members by the Russian Coast Guard. All activists were imprisoned without charges in Russia and the Arctic Sunrise itself was towed to Murmansk, where it was impounded by the Russian government.

Within minutes of this event, private individuals could watch a video of the arrest taking place in the Pechora Sea on YouTube and follow the event via social media such as Twitter, where updates were posted and people soon showed their support for the 30 activists. During the event this support evolved and activists took the cause up the streets, demonstrated in front of Russian embassies all over the world, and wrote letters to the Russian government. In just a matter of weeks, or even days, Greenpeace managed to get support from hundreds of thousands private individuals who participated in a campaign to have the Arctic Sunrise and its crew freed out of the hands of Russia. Support that took place both online and offline and was covered by mass media outlets. But how can it be that this event, which started with the arrest of 30 activists in the Pechora Sea, resulted in mass protest all around the world?
As the term suggests, social media allow users to participate in social networking (Oxford Dictionary, c). Users can assume different identities, not only individual identities, but also collective identities with other users, by creating and sharing content on social media platforms and forming groups with like-minded people. A collective identity is an identity shared with others, resulting in a group, or a community. This means that social media can be used to form groups of activists. However, social media itself are merely tools. The platforms offer possibilities, but take no action themselves. This is where the professional Media Unit of Greenpeace steps in. The early recognition of the importance of media for Greenpeace seems to have resulted in a successful adoption of social media in their protest repertoire, and could be the reason why Greenpeace has the supporters base it claims to have, consisting of 10 million social media subscribers (Greenpeace International, 2013). This thesis is dedicated to study this online protest repertoire of the NGO in order to gain insights how Greenpeace and its supporters covered the arrest of the Arctic Sunrise crew.

Why is it relevant to study the use of social social media, and Twitter in specific, by Greenpeace? Even though social media is a relatively new phenomenon in media studies, it has been the topic of numerous research from different perspectives. For example, the relation between social media and journalism practices (e.g. Heinrich, 2011; McNair, 2012; Poell & Borra, 2011; Volkmer, 2005), the relation between social media and politics (e.g. Bennett, 2003a & 2004; Castells, 2008; Hutchins & Lester, 2011; Shirky, 2014) and the relation between social media and activism (e.g. Anderson, 2003; Cottle & Lester, 2011; Gerbaudo, 2012; Poell & Darmoni, 2012). However, most of the research on the relation between social media and activism concerns loosely organized groups of people, instead of the more professionally organized form of activism Greenpeace undertakes. While NGOs like Greenpeace "play an important coordinating function in promoting a vigorous transnational message" (Reese, 2011, p.82), this form of activism has received little scholarly attention. Moreover, it is interesting to study the use of social media by organizations to get more insight in the workings of not only environmental groups, but also more unconventional and even terrorist groups such as ISIS, to promote their cause. This leads to the following research question:

*What is the protest repertoire of Greenpeace and how do they use it?*

To answer this, the following sub questions will be researched by means of a quantitative analysis of the tools and tactics used by Greenpeace in the case of the *Arctic Sunrise*:

- *Which different social media platforms does Greenpeace use?*
- *How does Greenpeace use Twitter to articulate protest?*
- *Who does Greenpeace link to on Twitter?*
What can you expect next?

The first chapter gives a short overview of the case of the Arctic Sunrise, followed by an elaboration on Greenpeace as a professional Non Governmental Organization (NGO) covering environmental issues. This short background of both the NGO and the case gives insight in the size of Greenpeace, which has offices all around the world, and elaborates on its social media practice. In the second chapter the information age will be described, a process in which the public sphere evolved into the public space. This process, which is called the information age, is of importance for this research because it explains the communication ecosystem in which the event of the Arctic Sunrise took place. Furthermore, it points out the value of social media in a democracy. But what is social media exactly? That will be discussed in chapter three, followed by elaborations on the consequences of the digital age for the notions of agenda-setting and gatekeeping, and the impact of social media on activism. Not only the act of activism itself, but also the formation of a group of activists through the creation of a dynamic collective identity, or a swarm, and the mobilization of this identity will be discussed. Concluding this third chapter, activism in the global public space will be illustrated, with the accent on online activism. This all leads to chapter four, where the research question is formulated and the method to answer this question is described, including some of its limitations. The methodology, namely a quantitative content analysis of 453 Tweets by @Greenpeace published between September 18, 2013 and January 1, 2014, will take place by coding these Tweets, together with a limited qualitative assessment of the Tweets in light of the theory. The codebook and the body of sampled Tweets can be found in the appendices. This is followed by a thorough analysis of the data which provides insights in the tools and tactics employed by Greenpeace to promote their causes in the global public space.
1 GREENPEACE AND THE ARCTIC SUNRISE

The Internet and social media have created a new arena for activists where they can show their dissent and fight for their causes. In this arena, or "battleground" as Manuel Castells (2008, p. 85) calls it, where people battle over accessing and publishing information, NGOs can place themselves next to governments. How this battleground has been formed over the last decades will be discussed in the following chapters. First, it is important to introduce Greenpeace and the case of the Arctic Sunrise, which has led to this research on the potentials of the public space for online activism.

1.1 The case of the Arctic Sunrise

Greenpeace is one of the best-known pressure groups in the world and has, amongst others, three ships, namely the Arctic Sunrise, the Esperanza and the Rainbow Warrior (Greenpeace International, 2014). A crew of 30 people, from 19 different countries, embarked the icebreaker Arctic Sunrise in 2013 and went to the Pechora Sea, which lies north of Russia. Their aim was to campaign against oil drillings by Gazprom, a Russian energy company, and took place in the vicinity of the Prirazlomnaya oil rig (Deutsche Welle, September 25, 2013). Their protest against the Russian energy company was ended on September 18, 2013, when the Russian government seized the Arctic Sunrise and its crew (Deutsche Welle, November 23, 2013). This imprisonment gained worldwide attention, not only by the media, but also by activists as it resulted in both online and offline forms of protest and demonstrations which called for the release of the crew and the icebreaker itself, which was towed to Murmansk (Deutsche Welle, September 24, 2013).

The conflict became a global challenge for the Russian government when the Arctic Sunrise became a case of interest in the media worldwide. Eventually the United Nation's (UN) International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea demanded the Russian authorities to immediately release the Arctic Sunrise and its crew, on November 22, 2013. Of the 21 judges of the tribunal, 19 supported it. The two judges that opposed the motion were the representatives from Russia and Ukraine (Deutsche Welle, November 23, 2013). What is so interesting about this case, is that within a few hours after the arrest, not only activists, but also mainstream media reported about the conflict between Greenpeace and Russia. Furthermore, within a few days people showed their support for the Arctic Sunrise in various ways, both online as well as offline, by protesting in front of Russian embassies and offices of Gazprom.
1.2 Navigating the case of the *Arctic Sunrise* in the communication ecosystem

The reason why news about the *Arctic Sunrise* spread within a few hours can be found in the communication ecosystem, a concept which C. W. Anderson (2013, p. 3) defines as an environment in which different types of media "interact, they balance each other and, if the ecosystem is healthy, they harmonize". It is the "complex network or interconnected system" of communications (Oxford Dictionary, b). In the last decades, social media have given an impetus to the changing network of communication, a change which is based upon the expansion of a web-based communication infrastructure (Bennett, 2003a). These changes have not only affected the communication ecosystem, but also the communication policy of governments and corporations, as well as that of journalists and activists. For Greenpeace, it has become essential to distribute the information activists need to mobilize them for the causes of Greenpeace. Distribution which mostly takes place online, in the form of mailing lists, but also in the form of messages on social media platforms. Furthermore, it is important for protests and the issues at stake that they actually get covered by the news to make them more successful (Poell & Borra, 2011).

After the 1992 'Earth Summit' in Rio de Janeiro, Chris Rose, then Greenpeace UK's Programme Director, argued that Greenpeace needed to professionalize and specialize by acquiring a media unit (Eden, 2004). Chris Rose's call for a media unit in 1992 didn't go unnoticed within Greenpeace. Nowadays they even have a Mobilization Lab, which continues "to explore the forefront of online and offline activism" (Greenpeace International, 2013, p. 41). According to their own numbers, the number of subscribers grew from 10 million to 23.6 million subscribers worldwide in 2012 (ibid). These are, however, not all unique subscribers since the number contains all e-mail, social media and mobile subscriptions. Nevertheless, Greenpeace has a lot of subscribers, with approximately 10 million e-mail subscribers and 10 million social media subscribers. Of the social media subscribers, more than half of them use Facebook and a quarter of them use Twitter to follow Greenpeace (ibid). The media unit disseminates information online, so people can access it. Note that the international hierarchy between national offices and top-down approach within Greenpeace makes it different from most NGO's. Some critics like Sally Eden (2004) claim Greenpeace has become a corporation over the years, because they maintain this hierarchy "by hiring professional and full-time staff to organize and implement campaigns" (Eden, 2004, p. 599). However, Greenpeace is an organization that doesn't strive for profit, but strives to promote environmental causes, using the revenue from their supporters for their campaigns. So even with the hiring of professional staff, Greenpeace can be classified as NGO and not as a corporation.

The importance of social media for the NGO leads to expenditures in 'Media & communications' of 22.4 million euro in 2011 and 24.8 in 2012, which amounts to respectively 12.6
and 14.3 percent of the total expenses. Apart from that, Greenpeace also spent 11.3 million euro in 2011 and 10.3 million euro in 2012 on 'public information & outreach' (Greenpeace International, 2013). This illustrates that Greenpeace is aware of the power of media campaigning as a tool to fight for their cause, and is willing to invest in their public outreach activities. By having a media unit and a budget for media and communications and for public information and outreach, they try to ensure the flow of information to their subscribers worldwide.

The early recognition in 1992 by Greenpeace of the importance of a professional media unit, the number of subscribers to Greenpeace, and the position which the NGO has amongst influential policymakers, makes Greenpeace an interesting player in the field of activism. Furthermore, while activism has been researched, activism by NGOs have received little scholarly attention. This research aims to reveal the protest repertoire of Greenpeace, i.e. tools and tactics used by Greenpeace, by using theories about social media and online activism and applying these to the case of the Arctic Sunrise. The organization had already positioned itself amongst influential policy makers before the rise of social media. It "garnered enough respect in policy circles to serve as representatives on various countries' delegations to important UN summits such as the 'Earth Summits' in Rio in 1992 and Johannesburg a decade later" (Willetts, 1996 cited in Pickerill, Gillan & Webster, 2011, p. 43). However, the creation of a professional media unit seems to have made Greenpeace even more successful in disseminating information in such a way that not only their own supporters, but also the mass media can access the information within a few hours or even minutes, which indicates a change in the notion of gatekeeping access to, and dissemination of information, the notion of agenda-setting and the notion of the public sphere. These changes in turn had a significant impact on activism, as will be discussed in chapter 3. Yet, before diving into these changes, one first has to understand the process which has made these changes possible.
2. FROM GLOBAL PUBLIC SPHERE TO GLOBAL PUBLIC SPACE: MARKERS OF THE SHIFT

In the last decades the Internet and social media have not only changed the process of distributing digital information, they have also changed the way how private individuals receive information and interact with each other. These changes are the results of the information age, in which “the power of flows takes precedence over the flows of power” (Castells, 2010, p. 500). So the way in which information is being distributed has taken precedence over the power of the elite to control this distribution. As a result, mediators of messages “play an important part within their cultural environment” (Heinrich, 2011, p. 6-7). These mediators are the people who construct the message, a position that used to be privileged to "a small elite of politicians, PR people and media" (ibid: 76), but now consists of private individuals with access to the Internet and social media. One of the most important aspects of this new age is that it gave the "public sphere" (Habermas, 1964) an impetus which transformed the public sphere into the public space, which is the space where the case of the Arctic Sunrise gained attention from both activists and the mainstream media. This chapter will discuss the idea of the public sphere, the information age in which the public sphere transformed, and the idea of the public space, which is the result of this transformation.

2.1 Public sphere explained

The public sphere is "first of all a realm of our social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed" (Habermas, 1964, p. 49). Therefore, the public sphere is not an assembly of people, but rather the assembly of opinions and a forum for debate. This realm, which consists of a deliberative debate between private individuals, is accessible to all citizens and guarantees "freedom of assembly and association and the freedom to express and publish their opinions" (ibid, p. 49). This freedom is necessary because it is through the on-going development of a rational-critical discourse that public opinion is formed (Graham, 2015). As Halpern & Gibbs (2013) explain, a deliberative debate consists of a form of communication emphasizing the use of logic and reasoning, focusing on social or political issues to identify solutions to a common problem, where individuals are open to opinions and ideas expressed by others. Furthermore, this form of communication "is governed by rules of equality, symmetry and civility" (Halpern & Gibbs, 2013, p. 1160). People can only participate in this debate as private individuals, not as bankers or politicians to shape public opinion for their own good. This implies that there is no room "for strategic communication and the presentation of private interests as generalizable public interests" (Dinan & Miller, 2009, p. 254). Neither for bankers or politicians, nor for NGO's and activists.
However, at the time that Habermas created the concept of the public sphere, the media consisted of the printed press, radio and television, which had the function of controlling the flow of information. This made it difficult to publish opinions for most private individuals, and social life was limited to the offline world, in the form of face-to-face meetings, letters, phone calls and other forms of communication. This was an obstacle for the public sphere and the forming of public opinion, since the public sphere ideally also offers "communicative links between citizens and the power holders of society" through the media (Dahlgren, 2005, p. 148). In 1964, Habermas wrote:

Only when the exercise of political control is effectively subordinated to the democratic demand that information be accessible to the public, does the political public sphere win an institutionalized influence over the government through the instrument of law-making bodies (p. 49).

This means that in order to successfully form a public opinion which will be adhered to by those in power, information has to be accessible to all private individuals and those individuals should be able to communicate with the elite. Moreover, private individuals also need to be able to publish their own opinions and ideas to participate in the deliberative debate. The importance of the public sphere lies in its ideal outcome, namely the formation of a public opinion to which the handling of those in power can be compared to. Without a public opinion, there is no real democratic government, since the legitimacy of democratic societies is the result of the deliberation by the subjects of the democracy (Dryzek, 2001). This means that if the subjects of a democracy, i.e. private individuals, do not engage in the public sphere, where ideally information is considered and discussed, there is no way of legitimizing or de-legitimizing the handling of those in power. This is also why the public sphere is important to activism. It provides the premises on which activists decide to campaign against those in power, or to agree with them. This is also where the public sphere has received some critique (Eriksen & Fossum, 2000; Klein, 2000; Sklair, 2002), since the democratic deliberation could in theory also be undermining democracy by giving in to popular pressures in the public sphere (Dinan & Miller, 2009).

Since Habermas first wrote about the public sphere in 1964, much has changed in the communication ecosystem. The Internet has become as common as radio was in 1964 and social media turned the control over the flow of information around. It is considered a revolutionary technology "because it is a hybrid of the largely one-directional print, audio, and video media while offering the opportunity for a two-way communication feedback loop" (Tedesco, 2004, p. 510). Online communication via social media alone has a reach of 22.7 percent of the world population, with an estimated 1.61 million people who log in at least once a month on social networking sites,
from any electronic device (eMarketer, 2013). In 1996, Habermas adapted his concept of the public sphere by adding the notion of the public sphere as:

[A] highly complex network that branches out into a multitude of overlapping international, national, regional, local, and subcultural arenas. Moreover, the public sphere is differentiated into levels according to the density of communication, organizational complexity, and range – from the episodic publics [...] up to the abstract public sphere of isolated readers, listeners, and viewers scattered across larger geographic areas, or even around the globe, and brought together only through mass media (p. 373-374).

By doing so, the public sphere enables both public and private communications, broadening the conception from "simply the role of mass media and including also online and virtual communications, as well as elite communications and processes of lobbying" (Dinan & Miller, 254). This means that social media not only allow access to and publication of information, but also social interaction, whether it is to send a simple message to a relative, updating a politician about an event, or trying to persuade politicians for a certain cause. Habermas adhered to the original concept of the public sphere, which consists of the formation of public opinion to guide the political system, but added the notion of the public sphere as a network, which encompasses the entire globe. An adaptation which falls in line with the ideas on and concepts about the information age. The public sphere, therefore, is not only limited to the physical world, but encompasses "any and all locations, physical or virtual, where ideas and feelings relevant to politics are transmitted or exchanged openly" (Bennett & Entman, 2001, p. 2-3).

2.2 The information age

The Internet has changed the structural dimension of the public sphere (Dahlgren, 2005). It can be described as a new technology that induced the information age. It's the information age that brought Habermas to his new concept of public sphere, and it's the information age that later would change the ideas on how the public sphere operates again, transcending it into the public space, which will be discussed below. According to Castells, the beginning of the information age is marked by "the transformation of our 'material culture' by the works of a new technological paradigm organized around information technologies" (2010, p. 28). A transformation which began in the last two decades of the twentieth century, in which the importance of physical aspects of culture, e.g. face-to-face meetings or gatherings in buildings or squares, lost terrain to their digital versions, e.g.
online forums and personal messages. This transformation is marked by an exponential expansion of the process of technological transformation, "because of its ability to create an interface between technological fields through common digital language in which information is generated, stored, retrieved, processed, and transmitted" (Castells, 2010, p. 29). This interface between different technological fields, i.e. generating, storing, retrieving, processing and publishing digital information (ibid), has made our world digital. And it is this interface which has resulted in new spheres, or new networks and communities of private individuals. Furthermore, for the first time in history, it "integrate[s] into the same system the written, oral, and audio-visual modalities of human communication" (ibid, p. 356). The interface uses a common digital language, which means that people from different countries can interact with each other, without having to change the digital information. This is an important aspect, because the common digital language offers people the potential to reach a global audience, thereby transcending geographical, political, and also linguistical borders, making the public sphere a global public sphere.

The technological changes have not only resulted in a common digital language, they "enable[s] a new level of (global) interaction with news content and the 'shape of media has shifted away from mostly passive, mass reception to more interactive, individualised modes of active engagement'" (Bruns, 2006, p. 282 cited in Heinrich, 2011, p. 2). Private individuals no longer consume information, they interact with it, process it and have the tools necessary to publish their own opinion on events. In the information age, private individuals are better capable to take part in the public sphere and together, by means of a rational-critical debate, form a public opinion. The shift from a passive to a more interactive attitude of the audience lies in the characteristics of contemporary communication, and one of the key characteristics is "dissemination rather than dialogue" (DeLuca, Sun & Peeples, 2011, p. 149). Where people used to be restricted to reply on messages, e.g. sending in letters to a newspaper, they now can publish the messages themselves. This has opened up the communication ecosystem and gives private individuals more opportunities to publish their ideas and opinions, or express themselves, which is one of the preconditions of the public sphere (Habermas, 1996). Furthermore, the information age has changed the interaction of the public with information. The first aspect of interaction with information has stayed the same, which is "the communicative processes of making sense, interpreting, and using the output" (Dahlgren, 2005, p. 149). It is the second aspect of interaction with information which has changed. Namely the interaction "between citizens themselves, which can include anything from two-person conversations to large meetings" (ibid, p. 149). This form of interaction now has an online context because of the technological changes in the information age.
Technological changes like the Internet have given the public an impetus in such a way that the spheres of each private individual can grow exponentially. Before the introduction of online communication technologies, private individuals were depending on information from their own private public spheres, e.g. friends, family, co-workers and, of course, individuals were dependent on mass media to gain access to information. The information age has changed this, giving private individuals the possibility to engage in rational-critical discourse with people outside their own direct environment. This has resulted in not only a growth of size and numbers of private public spheres, but also a diversification of them, since it brought people from different cultural backgrounds together, offering more diverse opinions on the same matter.

2.3 The public space
During the information age, the public sphere has transformed into a global ‘public space’. "The global public space forms a new transnational dimension for political communication, one that influences national/statist political spheres" (Volkmer, 2005, p. 362). Volkmer highlights here that the global public sphere is no longer bound to place and time, but space in the form of networks. Networks, which are in Habermasian terms, a "multitude of overlapping international, national, regional, local, and subcultural arena[s]" (Habermas, 1996, p. 373). Private individuals each form their own networks, or communities, of friends, colleagues, fellow enthusiast or fellow activists, both offline and online. It is in these networks where the private individuals exchange information, opinions and ideas necessary to form the public opinion. In short, all these networks, or communities, form the public space. And because the Internet makes it possible for people to communicate online over these networks, they don’t have to physically meet at a certain place at a certain time. This makes the Internet a global medium, it transcends geographical borders and time zones, transforming the public sphere in the global public space. Habermas (1996, p. 374) did write about the "abstract public sphere of isolated readers, listeners, and viewers scattered across larger geographic areas, or even around the globe, and brought together only through mass media". This abstract public sphere, however, implies a passive audience. Readers, listeners and viewers in 1996 had less to none possibilities to engage in a debate with the elite, an important aspect in the communicative world which has changed in the global public space. This has changed in such a way that "shape of media has shifted away from mostly passive, mass reception to more interactive, individualised modes of active engagement" (Bruns, 2006, p. 282) It is here, on the Internet, that the formation of public opinion takes place through the self-expression of people through "dialogic articulation of ideas and interests" (Ghanavizi, 2011, p. 260). Furthermore, information is accessible
at any time of the day and stays accessible online, so people can access the information they need at any given time, from any given place. This is of importance since the public space, just like the public sphere, "refers neither to the functions nor the contents of everyday communication but to the social space generated in communicative action" (Habermas, 1996, p. 360).


3. THE ROLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA IN ACTIVISM

With the transformation of the public sphere into the global public space, private individuals can access information, engage in debates and publish their ideas and opinions through networks. These networks transcend borders and time zones, and give activists tools which have the potential to address the elite directly and set the agenda. This is particularly useful for activists and NGOs like Greenpeace according to Laura Kenyon, online marketing and promotions specialist at Greenpeace International (Owyang, 2010):

As we face [...] climate change, civil courage and the online spaces where it is expressed will be crucial. Greenpeace will maintain a strong presence in social media, using the latest tools and communication channels where it is effective.

The definition of activism in the Oxford Dictionary (a) is "The policy or action of using vigorous campaigning to bring about political or social change". As the word 'campaigning' implies, activism is always organized, be it a single activist who plans where to demonstrate or assembling a crew of 30 people for the Arctic Sunrise to demonstrate in the Pechora Sea against oil drilling by Gazprom. This chapter will discuss the effects of the information age on activism by explaining the role of social media in activism. "[I]t is in and through communication networks and the pervasive and overlapping media ecology that oppositional currents and movements for change are principally conveyed" (Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 7). Through the debate in the public space, private individuals form an opinion and take a stance for certain causes, like Greenpeace does. In this way, communication networks can be used by people and organizations to create movements and it is communicative action like this, which generates the social space the public space encompasses. Cottle and Lesters use of the word 'conveyed' here is an interesting choice, since it can both mean to communicate, and to transport. This connects to the role that social media play in activism, which is in contrast to the phenomenon of social media itself, not a totally new one. It has converged two major roles necessary for activists to campaign. Namely the role of creating an imaginative social solidarity, or a collective identity (Anderson, 1991), through the construction of shared meanings and narratives (communicate), and the role of mobilizing that identity by condensing the discontent (Gerbaudo, 2012), and translating this into direct action (transport). This chapter will discuss social media, the changing notions of agenda-setting and gatekeeping, followed by a discussion on the creation of a collective identity, and the mobilization of such collective identity. To conclude, activism in the global public space will be explained in order to give some insight in the potential of the public space for activists.
3.1 The rise of social media

Before explaining the effects on activism in a global public space, and on the notions of agenda-setting and gatekeeping, it is important to explain what social media are and its different functions in the communication ecosystem. The *Oxford Dictionary* (b) defines social media as "[w]ebsites and applications that enable users to create and share content or to participate in social networking." Mason (2012, p. 75) divided these websites and applications, or apps, into several categories:

Facebook is used to form groups, covert and overt - in order to establish those strong but flexible connections. Twitter is used for real-time organization and news dissemination, bypassing the cumbersome ‘newsgathering’ operations of the mainstream media. YouTube and the Twitter-linked photographic sites - Yfrog, Flickr and Twitpic - are used to provide instant evidence of the claims being made. Link-shorteners like bit.ly are used to disseminate key articles via Twitter.

In short, social media are tools for private individuals to assemble themselves, access information and publish ideas and opinions, which connects directly to the preconditions of the public sphere to form a public opinion (Habermas, 1964). While the information age has taken away the power of the elite to control the rational critical debate in the public sphere by controlling the flow of information, the elite still has some power in communicating strategies of social interests, e.g. on "the arenas of communication and socialization such as education, religion and science" (Dinan & Miller, 2009, p. 255). This means that there are still aspects in society where the elite still has control over specific flows of information. As a result, the information age has opened up the communication ecosystem for a large part, but not completely, and the elite media still have some power to influence public opinion.

Social media platforms are often connected with each other by means of sharing, linking and embedding content from one platform to the other. This makes it difficult to identify specific characteristics of individual platforms. Kaplan & Haenlein (2010) categorized social media platforms in six different categories, namely collaborative projects, blogs, content communities, social networking sites, virtual game worlds and virtual social worlds. Of these categories, the latter two are restricted to a storyline, e.g. by completing quests (ibid, p. 64), but these social media platforms can still be used as means of digital communication. Larry Diamond (2010) calls the social media 'liberation technology'. This is a technology with the ability "to empower individuals, facilitate independent communication and mobilization, and strengthen an emergent civil society" (p. 70). An important part of the global civil society are NGOs like Greenpeace. Social media, alongside with
projects such as WikiLeaks, have made it more and more difficult for the elite to set the agenda and control the flow of information. The secrecy that enables abuse of power is crumbling down in an increasing rate because of the increasing level of transparency (McNair, 2012), which helps democracy in such a way that private individuals can access and publish information and opinions.

3.2 Changing the notions of gatekeeping and agenda-setting

Social media have given the formation of public opinion an impetus, in particular by changing the notions of gatekeeping. Gatekeeping, as Shoemaker, Vos & Reese explain, is "the process of selecting, writing, editing, positioning, scheduling, repeating and otherwise massaging information to become news" (2009, p. 73). It's a process where the gatekeeper decides whether or not to let information pass through the gate and disseminate it (ibid). This gate is a division between those who have access to information, and the public. Once information is let through the gate, or published, it's accessible for private individuals and can be used in debates to form a public opinion. However, not all information is accessible for private individuals because gatekeepers choose not to publish it. While the definition remains the same, access to, or power over, gatekeeping has changed in the information age. Before, the media of Habermas' public sphere were "newspapers and magazines, radio and television" (1964, p. 49). These used to be the gates, or channels, through which information would or would not be passed on to the public by publishing it. However, this formed an obstacle for the public sphere, where (political) control has to be subordinate to free and unlimited access to information for private individuals, and where those individuals should have the possibility to publish their ideas and opinions in order to form a public opinion (Habermas, 1964). This aspect is crucial to the formation of public opinion, which shows in the original term of the public sphere, namely ‘Öffentlichkeit', which is German for publicness or publicity (Outhwaite, 1996, p. 370).

The information age has set a process in motion by which now private individuals can access information and disseminate their own information. This is the result of the Internet and social media in specific, which offer the tools to bypass traditional gatekeepers. Their ability to select information in and out of the public sphere, information constructed by the press and political actors (Bennett, 2004), is being challenged. As discussed above, the power of [information] flows now takes precedence over the flows of power (Castells, 2010). The traditional gatekeepers can no longer control the information that flows freely in the public space. The number of information outlets has increased as a result of the Internet and the rise of social media, making it difficult to control the immediate flow of information. Information that is no longer only published by politicians, PR people
and media (Heinrich, 2011 p. 76), but also by private individuals in the public space. These gatekeepers are also the mediators of messages, who "play an important part within their cultural environment" (Heinrich, 2011, p. 6-7). And now that gatekeepers are being bypassed by private individuals in the public space, they also have less influence in the formation of a public opinion. In short, the changing notion of gatekeeping is promoting the subordination of political control to the democratic demand of information by private individuals. Moreover, where private individuals had the means to access information online before 2004, social media have given them the means to also disseminate information to the public sphere and other private individuals.

In addition, Heinrich (2011, p. 68) explains that "just as traditional notions of gatekeeping are under scrutiny, agenda-setting processes now increasingly follow different rules". By transcending the journalists and the elite, Internet and social media have the potential to set the agenda in the public space. "Agenda-setting is the process of the mass media presenting certain issues frequently and prominently with the result that large segments of the public come to perceive those issues as more important than others" (Coleman et al, 2009, p. 147). When private individuals hear about certain events, and keep hearing about them through information channels, they will discuss these events. This implies that information about certain events, and the lack of information about other events, can direct publics and the formation of public opinion in such a way that private individuals will form an opinion about the events they hear about, and not form an opinion about an event of which they don't know it exists. Following this concept of agenda-setting, activists strive to get media coverage on their campaign (Hutchins & Lester, 2011), so that private individuals perceive the existence of the campaign and debate about it in the public space.

However, just like the notion of gatekeeping is changing in the information age, agenda-setting is also changing. When private individuals or NGO's like Greenpeace present certain issues in the public space, they could potentially set the agenda, even if mass media don't present those issues. And with a follower base of, according to Greenpeace International (2013, p. 41), 23.6 million subscribers worldwide in 2012, the NGO can present issues to a large segment of the public. However, the direct influence of social media on setting the agenda and influencing public opinion is hard to prove, since private individuals not only access information through these interactive communication channels, but also through the mass media, physical communication and everyday life. Yet, while it is hard to measure the direct influence of social media on agenda-setting and public opinion, it is interesting to research the potentials of social media to do so. But before a public opinion can be influenced, the public first has to come together to form one.
3.3 Creating a collective identity

"[T]he process of mobilisation cannot be reduced to the material affordances of the technologies it adopts but also involves the construction of shared meanings, identities and narratives" (Johnston & Klandermands, 1995 cited in Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 9). Just like before the information age, activists have to be motivated to mobilize. Part of that motivation lies in the creation of a collective identity, or an identity which is shared by like-minded people, e.g. supporters of a sports club, people with the same profession, supporters of an environmental organization, etc. This is for two reasons. First of all, there has always been a strength in numbers, something that Greenpeace realizes:

As an organisation, the last year saw us reach 1 million supporters on Facebook alone. This kind of support empowers us, and our hope is to empower those supporters in return to have civil courage and to amplify their voices when they speak out against injustice (Laura Kenyon, cited in Owyang, 2010).

When campaigning, be it for social or political change, it is better to campaign in large groups when the goal is to get attention in the public space, because large groups of people are harder to ignore and more likely to receive coverage by the media than small groups of people. Furthermore, it makes it harder for the elite to subdue a mass protest or demonstration than it is to subdue a single activist. That being said, there are also successful cases where just a single person protested and it appears that the bigger the group of activists, the more diverse the political views and standpoints will be (Pickerill, Gillan and Webster, 2011), which makes it harder to form a collective identity. Second, when an individual which is part of a collective identity is being opposed, e.g. the crew of the Arctic Sunrise by the Russian government and Gazprom, other individuals of the same collective identity will be more likely to act in favor of said individual and mobilize. This construction of shared meanings, identities and narratives, or the construction of a collective identity is of high priority in order to mobilize private individuals, as well as "the identification of an enemy, the definition of a purpose and an object at stake in the conflict" (Melucci, 1996, p. 292).

While the construction of a collective identity through shared meanings and narratives have always been part of activism, the Internet in general and social media in particular have set a process in motion which "re-cast the organisation of the spatial and temporal scenes of social life" (Barnett, 2004, p. 59). Social life was previously organized around constrictions of time and space, like face-to-face meetings or the access of published information which you could only access at the time of publishing or at specific archives. In the information age, however, face-to-face meetings have been replaced for a large part by e.g. online forums and conference calls, and archives have been digitalized and made accessible all over the world at any time. This has resulted in "new forms of
social organization and new modes of perception" (DeLuca, Sun & Peeples, 2011, p. 145). Where in the past discontent was condensed by "spatial concentration' of people such as workers in industrial factories, which, according to Marx, formed the basis for political action" (Kohn, 2003, p. 46 cited in Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 30), there is nowadays a "spatial dispersion which characterises contemporary social space with its 'fear of crowds' (Davis, 1992) [which] makes this process of gathering particularly problematic and requires complex practices of symbolic and technological mediation" (Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 21). Private individuals don't come together physically as often as they used to before the information age, but organize themselves through networks where they form a collective identity through mediation. Here, 'mediation' can be seen as "the interpersonal process of participation or intervention in the creation and sharing of meaning" (Lievrouw, 2011, p. 4). It is through the sharing of opinions and ideas that private individuals find people with the same mindset, in the case of the Arctic Sunrise activists who are against oil drillings in the Pechora Sea by Gazprom, or, for that matter, private individuals who don't agree with the campaign of Greenpeace and who form groups on grounds of shared ideas and opinions.

Furthermore, the mediation can transcend the collective identity when people spread it throughout the global public space, thereby not only reaching people with the same mindset but also others. In other words, activists "say something that transcends their particularity and speaks to us all" (Melucci, 1996, p. 1). By doing so, many environmental movements assume, as described by Macnaghten & Urry (1998, p. 152 cited in Crouch & Damjanov, 2011, p. 191):

a concept of global citizenry, a network of cosmopolitan, eco-aware, transborder audiences, activists, and affiliates, prompting concerns about issues which are beyond the local. This global "imagined community" (Anderson, 1991) has a culture of its own and requires the same kind of myths and symbols as any national culture.

Just like a national culture, the culture of activists is created, or mediated, through mental representations and objectified representations (Bourdieu, 1991), thereby leading to believe the activists they are part of a community which only exists in its representations, thereby being an imagined community. Private individuals can show that they are part of a group of activists by saying that they are, which are Bourdieu's mental representations, or they can show it by holding up banners or wear badges, which are Bourdieu's objectified representations. Greenpeace, like many other environmental movements such as the World Wide Fund for Nature, have an international supporters base, making the network, or the imagined community, a global one. In the global public space that isn't bound to time and place, the private individuals of the imagined community don't have to be physically together in the same place. The information age has promoted the creation of
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an imagined community and the access to it, but as a result has also generated spatial dispersion between private individuals.

Some scholars, like Bauman and Ghanavizi, see spatial dispersion as a negative aspect. "Classic forms of the public space have largely been replaced by different forms of space, including media, that arguably isolate citizens from each other rather than bringing them together" (Ghanavizi, 2011, p. 260). Because of this, "contemporary hardships and sufferings are dispersed and scattered; and so is the dissent which they spawn" (Bauman, 2000, p. 54). This forms a challenge to the creation of an imagined community, since "face-to-face meetings are more conducive to the creation of trusting relationships" than meetings in the global public space, and that "[w]ithout regular meetings it seems impossible to build coalitions" (Pickerill, Gillan & Webster, 2011, p. 46-47). This follows the line of Habermas' thinking. "For Habermas the new media technology is manipulative, unable to generate new forms of social and cultural exchange" (Crouch & Damjanov, 2011, p. 193). This is a pessimistic view because it overlooks the unifying of people in the global public space, what I call 'spacial concentration' which replaces 'spatial concentration'. Thanks to the recent communication technologies, there are now multiple other forms of interaction possible in the public space in the form of digital communication. In other words, spatial concentration is supplemented with the growth of private individuals concentrating in the public space through nodes and networks online, or spacial concentration.

In the global public space, organizations such as Greenpeace form 'nodes' (Heinrich, 2011) in the networks of activists, where contemporary hardships and sufferings are transformed "into political passions driving the process of mobilisation" (Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 14). This potential of the global public space was already observed by Featherstone and Lash (1999, p. 7 cited in Crouch & Damjanov, 2011, p. 193), who "argued that the new forms of electronic communication could well provide a range of new quasi-public spaces, which encourage debate and active citizenship". It's an aspect of the information age, where people organize themselves around information and mediators of messages take the lead in cultural environments (Campbell, 2004; Heinrich, 2011). This new era gives both activists and journalists the opportunity to reposition themselves as news accelerators and navigators, and "adjusting work sets and organizational structures is a necessary part of the adoption process" (Heinrich, 2011, p. 83). Something that Chris Rose already noted after the 1992 Earth Summit, which resulted in a professional media unit within Greenpeace's organization. Salerno (1989, cited in Atton and Hamilton 2008, p. 38) already discussed the importance of communication above the importance of spatial concentration:

[The Industrial Workers of the World] helped pioneer a flexible, deterritorialized resistance [...] in the form of a variable, general community of affinity at specific sites
to be determined by choice and conditions. Such an 'organization' was actually a dispersed and mobile solidarity that aspired to novel kinds of hybrid association[...].

Because of its de-institutionalized nature, calls for specific actions spread through word of mouth, thus becoming much more difficult for foremen, managers and the state to detect, control and punish.

This counts not only for calls for specific actions, but also for the dissemination of information, and the information age has promoted 'hybrid association', which now takes place in the form of networks. Hybrid associations can be defined as communities and are typical for the public space, where people from all kinds of backgrounds come together to form an imagined community. Ideally, it doesn't matter if you're a banker, a bus driver or a farmer in the public space, since people take part in the rational-critical discourse as private individuals. It is this concentration of individuals from different backgrounds that makes the associations, or networks, hybrid.

Nodes like Greenpeace generate social space on social media platforms, through communicative action, spaces which can be seen as a new form of agora or public square. This social space is where the hybrid association takes place, and where the activists "gain visibility and voice, present alternative or marginal views, produce and share their own do-it-yourself (DIY) information sources, and resist, talk back, or otherwise confront dominant media culture, politics and power" (Lievrouw, 2011, p. 2). As Mark Poster (2001) argues, important political gathering places like the agora no longer serve as organising centres for political discussion and action. Media, and social media in particular, "have become the animating source for political discussion and action" (ibid, p. 178). It is these discursive operations of political discussion and action that used to be formed by a spatial concentration and are now increasingly formed by the spacial concentration of contemporary hardships and sufferings through social media. "The contradictions, conflicts and crises spawned by today's interconnected, globalizing late modernity, it seems, can also summon into being new social movements, coalitions of opposition and voices of dissent worldwide" (Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 3). These coalitions do not consist exclusively of private individuals who were already part of a coalition sided in this case with Greenpeace or Russia, but also of individuals who obtained information via online networked activities such as social media and forums. Information, which could help those private individuals to form an opinion about the case of the Arctic Sunrise and choose a side, or maybe choose to ignore the events and thereby joining a third coalition, opposing neither Greenpeace or the Russian government.

It is through the spacial concentration that a hybrid association is created, which can "act as a unified and delimited subject and retain control over their own action" (Melucci, 1996, p. 72). This
association, or a 'swarm' as Gerbaudo calls it, "is characterised by an irreducible multiplicity, 'nomadism' and 'determinationalising power" (Hardt & Negri, 2000, p. 61). A swarm is "a multitude which can act together without being reduced to one identity or one place" (Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 26-27). While Hardt and Negri (2000) talk about the empire and subjects to its rule, the characteristics can also be applied to Greenpeace and its supporters. In a way, Greenpeace can be seen as the center of the environmentalism swarm, as the beekeeper for all the swarming activists when compared to a swarm of bees. Without the swarm, Greenpeace is just a single voice, all be it a voice that came to be respected throughout the years by most institutions. But with the swarm, Greenpeace can grow and use the swarm for its own purpose, while giving the swarm a hive, or a place to express their feelings in the global public space. In this form, the swarm is an irreducible multiplicity because the activists can operate without Greenpeace and Greenpeace can operate without the activists.

The swarm is nomadic in two ways. On the one hand, the global public space has enabled activists to connect to other networks of activists, for example when multiple environmental organizations have the same cause and combine their resources in a campaign. When this happens, "changes occur in the political identities and political imaginaries that they express. Thus political identities are not established before they interact on the international scale, and international activism is not simply local activism 'scaled-up" (Pickerill, Gillan & Webster, 2011, p. 53). The political identity is therefore nomadic in such a way that it has to be seen in its international context and not just in the local context. "[W]e cannot define, or understand, the local without seeing its construction in relation to national and transnational acts. These are not separate scales, they are intimately interwoven. No place is simply bounded and local - it is formed in its relation to all other places" (Castree, 2004; Pickerill, Gillan & Webster, 2011, p. 54). This makes it easier for different networks of activists to work together on certain campaigns by combining resources. On the other hand, the swarm is nomadic in their identity. "Protests [...] creates communities" (Della Porta & Piazza, 2008), and "the local community remains an important site for mobilization and political opportunity that, with the right conditions, will be sustained to a greater and more effective degree than either national or global communities" (Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 289). In these communities, the swarm assumes a 'tolerant identity', based on "short-term concrete goals, on immediately gratifying action rather than old style militancy" (Della Porta, 2005 in Rojecki, 2011, p. 93). Greenpeace is an important factor in creating this tolerant identity, and can be seen as an 'empty signifier', "a leader, an image, a collective name or possibly also a place around which the unity of the people can be performatively created" (Laclau, 1996, p. 36; 2005, p. 69 cited in Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 42). This makes the collective identity of the swarm dynamic in the sense that it can adapt itself to particular
campaigns, making it easier for individuals outside the swarm to join certain campaigns while not participating in others. Furthermore, it offers a tool for Greenpeace in such a way that Greenpeace can have a more effective campaign when it involves local communities in local campaigns.

Lastly, the swarm is a deterritorialising power because it uses social media to engage its enemies, which overcomes the classic bureaucratic boundaries, thereby forming the battleground where activists show their dissent (Castells, 2008). Activists use the potential of the global public space to disrupt top-down communication flows to directly address the elite on the battleground. "[P]rotests are designed to challenge elite decision-making [e.g. by IMF, WTO and G20] and the deliberation of policies behind closed doors, policies that if implemented will have profound impacts on populations internationally or even globally" (Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 4). Information, be it text, photo's or video's, "can be circulated to émigré communities, publics and political leaders around the globe and, importantly, can also re-enter the communications environment of the country from whence they secretly came" (ibid, p. 8). By doing so, it is harder for the elite to control the flow of information and thereby controlling the public opinion of the global public space. However, swarms are not "automatically defining collective action", but are "the point of departure for a complex process of social re-composition and symbolic articulation, facilitating the 'fusion' of individuals into a new collective agent" (Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 29). In other words, swarms themselves are not automatically campaigning for certain causes. A swarm can be seen as a starting point for the creation of a collective agent, the base of a collective identity which can be mobilized for a cause by activists or NGO's who take upon themselves the role of beekeeper, like Greenpeace.

3.4 Mobilizing publics

Once the collective identity of the swarm is created, the swarm can be mobilized by Greenpeace against an enemy for a purpose or an object at stake in a conflict through "a choreography of assembly" (Gerbaudo, 2012), which is the creation of public space around a certain campaign. This space is created with the use of social media, by "directing people towards specific protests events, in providing participants with suggestions and instruction about how to act, and in the construction of an emotional narration to sustain their coming together in the public space" (ibid, p. 12). One of the arguments Bennett makes in this regard, is that campaigns become more and more difficult to control because of the openness of the public space. "[O]rganizations may face challenges to their own internal direction and goals when they employ open, collective communication processes to set agendas and organize action" (2003a, p. 145). In order to campaign for a cause, it is necessary for the those being part of the collective to agree on said campaign. It is important to note that the more
people who join in, the more opinions and ideas join in and there could be a risk of having conflicting ideas within the network, which forms an obstacle for collective action. However, as mentioned above, each campaign has its own dynamic when it comes to the formation of collective identity, consisting of private individuals who decide whether or not to participate in a campaign. Therefore, the dynamic character acts as a filter, by including private individuals who agree with the campaign, and excluding private individuals who don’t agree with the campaign. By doing so, it minimizes the possibility of conflicting ideas and opinions within a community that is characterized by a dynamic collective identity. This is where another strong suit of social media comes into play. Social media can not only be used for spacial concentration, creating a collective identity, but also to give the condensed emotions a direction. In other words, social media can be used as a tool to guide a community and insure they form a dynamic collective identity during a campaign.

The public space must "amplify the pressure of problems, that is, not only detect and identify problems but also convincingly and influentially thematize them, furnish them with possible solutions, and dramatize them in such a way that they are taken up with and dealt with by parliamentary complexes" (Habermas, 1996, p. 359). Politicians should listen to the public and handle according to how the people want them to handle, which is how the democratic power of the politicians can be legitimized. This connects to the idea that the formation of a public opinion is necessary to keep those in power in check. Seizing the Arctic Sunrise and capturing the crew, without giving a clear reason for it (Deutsche Welle, September 25, 2013), was a decision by those in power in Russia. As a result, not only Russians, but people all around the world campaigned against the Russian government to show their discontent and keep the government in check. The dramatizing of these problems is where the demonstrations and protests come into play, and another use of social media as a tool to use the potential of the global public space. Social media are not only used to create an imagined collective identity around the event, but "social media have [also] been chiefly responsible for the construction of a choreography of assembly as a process of symbolic construction of public space which facilitates and guides the physical assembling of a highly dispersed and individualised constituency" (Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 5). Dramatizing the problems in the global public space calls for the mobilization of the collective identity, or the swarm, and is where Greenpeace comes into play. Activist groups and NGOs such as Greenpeace define the collective action of the swarm, or the new collective agent. "Mass protests, coordinated and conducted simultaneously on different continents, in different countries and across major cities have proved capable of mobilizing hundreds of thousands of people, sometimes millions of people, around the globe" (Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 3). Coordination is key in mass protests, since the swarm itself is not automatically defining collective action. The dynamic collective identity of the swarm has to be created in the public space.
before and guided during the collective action. And in order to have more impact, local communities should be mobilized for local campaigns.

Before the rise of social media, "so-called 'small media' (not only photocopied leaflets and audiocassette tapes but also their grassroots composition and circulation) helped 'foster an imaginative social solidarity, often as a precursor for actual physical mobilization" (Sreberny-Mohammadi & Mohammadi, 1994, p. 24 cited in Atton & Hamilton, 2008, p. 20). What has happened since the Cold War period, has been a "proliferation and convergence of networked media and information technologies [which] have helped generate a renaissance of new genres and modes of communication and have redefined people's engagement with media" (Lievrouw, 2011, p. 1). Furthermore, these networked media and information technologies have "reduced the costs of mobilization but not necessarily participation across the categories of protest repertoire" (Diani, 2005).

"Movements such as Greenpeace now use whatever mode of collective action seems effective for a specific goal, including the same tactics used by opponents, such as institutional lobbying" (Fischer et al., 2005 cited in Rojecki, 2011, p. 93). This means that activists try to influence policymakers and politicians, something that Greenpeace successfully does since the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio (Willets, 1996 cited in Pickerill, Gillan & Webster, 2011, p. 43).

According to Arendt (1958), the political action does not disappear with the dispersal of the people, but only disappears with the disappearance or arrest of the activities themselves (cited in Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 38). If this was true for political action in 1958, it is even more so now for online activism. But what are the tools and tactics used by Greenpeace for online activism? Note here that like a beekeeper and his swarm of bees, Greenpeace does not command the swarm what to do. The relationship between Greenpeace and its followers can be understood as a dialogical relationship, which is based on consensus rather than commands. And if the NGO doesn't command the swarm what to do, it is important to come with good campaigns in order to reach consensus in the public space. This dialogical relationship, which is embodied in comment sections on social media, also reflects the identity of the swarm, which is constructed through a performative discourse. By debating, sharing ideas, opinions and symbols, the private individuals of the swarm form a dynamic collective identity in order to campaign. As a result, it is necessary to disappear or arrest the activities themselves, activities which nowadays include the use of social media. This makes it difficult to stop online activism, because in order to stop online activism, you have to stop the activities by activists in the public space. Something that has been, and still is being tried by repressive regimes around the world. They try this by deploying "sophisticated digital censorship and monitoring capabilities and engage in pernicious cyber attacks and the targeting of media activists" (Cottle, 2011b, p. 299), but never seems to work. The theory on the creation of a swarm also challenges the pessimistic view of
Bauman (2000) on the spatial dispersion, since the arrest or disappearance of activities are harder when people are already dispersed, then when people and the activities of these people are concentrated into one (physical) place and time. In other words, the shift from spatial concentration (Barnett, 2004) to spacial concentration makes it harder to stop private individuals from gathering together, sharing ideas and opinions and, in this case, protest.

3.5 Activism in the global public space

The effects of this shift from the public sphere to the global public space have been subject to research by many scholars. Research which predominantly developed theories about the effects of the shift for journalism on the one hand, and activism on the other hand. Internet and social media have not only helped create a global public space, they have also promoted further globalization which resulted in "a fusion between local and global activism as well as a fusion of local and transnational issues" (Yüksel & Yüksel, 2011, p. 244). According to Cubitt (2005 cited in Crouch & Damjanov, 2011), the global public space is necessary for the contemporary civil society, since global crises need to be discussed or reasoned not only by the elite, but in a 'rational-critical discourse' by the global civil society as well. This allows the public to form a public opinion on which governments and institutions can act together as a representative of the public. Furthermore "national elites must increasingly take world opinion into account, since their own citizens are part of those [global] networks and have easy access to coverage of major events" (Reese, 2011, p. 76). Of these issues, according to Cottle (2011):

[The] origins and outcomes are not confined behind national borders[,] In today's interdependent world, global crises cannot be regarded as exceptional or aberrant events only, erupting without rhyme or reason or dislocated from the contemporary world (dis)order. They are endemic to the contemporary global world, deeply enmeshed within it. And so too are they highly dependent on the world's media (p. ix).

The oil drillings in the Pechora Sea, for example, can be regarded as a local crisis because it affects the local ecosystem. But when placed in the broader picture, the drillings can be seen as a result of the international trade in oil, in which not only Russia partakes. But not only national elites must increasingly take the world opinion into account, corporations must also do this, since their own consumers take part in the global public space, as noted by DeLuca, Sun & Peeples (2011). Just like countries, corporations are also subjected to discussion in the public space. Corporations, of which some are being campaigned against by Greenpeace, like Gazprom. "The publicity activists
generate [...] is just as often directed toward corporations as toward governments, since even powerful corporations are vulnerable to imagefare on public screens" (ibid, p. 149).

Social media are breaking down the capability of the mass media to neutralize dissent by converting demonstrations and protests into "another set of empty signs and simulacra" (Crouch & Damjanov, 2011, p. 194). In other words, the global public space is challenging the 'protest paradigm', which means that it gets harder for the mass media as well as for elites, be it politicians or leading corporations to undermine activists by framing a protest in a certain way (Murray et al, 2011). For example, the mass media can choose to portray a group of demonstrators as peaceful, campaigning for their human rights, or as a brutal, violent group of demonstrators who try to disrupt everyday life. This portraying happens through "de-legitimisation cues" (Gitlin, 1980) in protest coverage, which are "a focus on radicalism, "extremism," strange appearance or behaviours, violence and disruption [...] coverage concentrating on elements that appear "deviant" in relation to normal or "mainstream society" (Murray et al, 2011, p. 62). In other words, by framing protest in specific ways, the mass media can, for example, undermine a protest against oil drillings by Gazprom, a protest where activists try to board an oil platform, and frame it as an act of people trying to take control over equipment of Gazprom, portraying them as thieves or pirates rather than activists.

Social media can be used to break down this power of the mass media, by "inserting a horizontal communicative network into the wider communications environment" (Archibald, 2011, p. 138), which "contains a socially activated potential to unsettle and on occasion even disrupt the vertical flows of institutionally controlled 'top-down' communications" (Cottle, 2008, p. 859 cited in Archibald, 2011). Social media can be used to bypass the traditional gatekeepers which control the vertical flow of communication into the public space, by disseminating information directly into the public space. This also makes it easier for activists to generate publicity on public screens.

However, while social media have the potential to assist activist groups or individuals to set the agenda and influence public opinion, information seekers "will most likely turn to information sources that are common knowledge" (Heinrich, 2011, p. 78). These sources which are common knowledge still comprise mostly the mass media, and as a result activists try to disseminate their message not only through social media and the Internet, but also the more traditional mass media. These mass media outlets incorporate user-generated content, such as information from social media networks (Heinrich, 2011; Cottle & Lester, 2011; Poell & Borra, 2011). Rational critical debates are substantially framed "by the inherent logic of the media system, which means that campaigns that are not covered by the mass media are thought to have no hope of attracting broad, widespread support" (Castells, 2004[b] in Hutchins & Lester, 2011, p. 162). Activists realize this and use social media to their advantage by disseminating information, trying to get their story not just out there,
but also to get their story covered by the mass media. "[N]ews coverage, accompanied by compelling images and footage, remains the key objective in attaining and maintaining widespread political and cultural legitimacy for environmental protest" (Hutchins & Lester, 2011, p. 170). When protests and demonstrations are being covered by the mass media, they are perceived by a bigger audience then would be the case when they are only mentioned on social media platforms. Without going into too much detail, the reality of the lives of most private individuals is a constructed reality, constructed by the media and information from the networks of these private individuals, consisting of other private individuals, e.g. friends, family and coworkers. This means that, in order to reach those individuals who are not partaking in the activists networks, activists aim for coverage by the mass media. They do so by using social media and the Internet to disseminate digital information in the hope that it will be picked up by the mass media, so their cause will be known by a bigger audience and therefore have a bigger chance to influence public opinion (Habermas, 1964).

One of the potentials of the global public space is promoting this exchange of information between networks of activists and the mass media in the public space. Information about campaigns of activists, be it grassroots organizations or NGOs like Greenpeace. Journalists are adapting to the changing dynamics of the global public space and journalists no longer receive news exclusive via official sources, like politicians and spokesmen, but more and more via networks in the form of user generated content (Heinrich, 2011). This implies that the "switching power", the ability to control and/or influence how networks connect and interact (Hutchins & Lester, 2011, p. 161), is being taken away from the elite, adding to the horizontal communication flows in the global public space which challenge "the vertical flows of institutionally controlled 'top-down' communications" (Cottle, 2008, p. 859 cited in Archibald, 2011). Private individuals now have the tools to not only publish their own information, but also to contribute to the information published by the mass media, be it a photo, an eye-witness account in the form of a video, or by publishing other forms of information which is incorporated by the mass media. "New digital means of recording, storing and disseminating images of protest have also eased the practical, if not ideological, cross-over of scenes of dissent into wider communication flows and mainstream media" (Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 5).

Activists realize the incorporation of user-generated content into the content of the mass media (Atton & Hamilton, 2008) all too well, and use it to their advantage to come into contact with the media, disseminating information to the media in the hope of getting coverage. One possible way of doing so, is by creating so called image events. "For decades NGOs and other protest organizations have been using shock campaigns and high levels of media visibility in order to communicate their message, applying a strategy that DeLuca (1999) calls the production of "image events" as a rhetorical tactic" (cited in Crouch & Damjanov, 2011, p. 186). The use of shocking images can move
people in such a way that they would take action, online or offline. They "are dense surfaces meant to provoke in an instant the shock of the familiar made strange .., the shock of recognition that the familiar is not necessarily innocuous, [...] it is brief, visual, dramatic, and emotional" (DeLuca, Sun & Peeples, 2011, p. 151-152). The dramatic images provoke emotions. Emotions which, in turn, can be condensed in the global public space, reinforcing the dynamic collective identity of the swarm, and used by Greenpeace for its campaign. "It tries to focus the public opinion, getting people out of "the glance of habit while immersed in a sea of imagery" (DeLuca, Sun & Peeples, 2011, p. 152).

This, however, can be complicated and "a number of critical studies examining the relationship between the media and environmental movements suggest that environmental activists must be extraordinarily media savvy in order to successfully convey their message" (Crouch & Damjanov, 2011, p. 187). But social media are not only a way of getting the attention of the mainstream media. Social media, or 'liberation technology' as Diamond (2010) calls it, tears down the walls between the elite and the public. It offers activists a 'battleground' (Castells, 2008) where they can place themselves next to the elite, be it governments or multinationals. Everyone with access to the global public space can occupy this battleground and "use it for their own purposes" (Castells & Ince, 2003, p. 58 cited in Heinrich, 2011, p. 82). Before the information age, private individuals accessed information via newspapers, magazines and radio- and TV-broadcasts, information which was constructed by gatekeepers (Bennett, 2004).

"It is in and through this fast-evolving complex of interpenetrating communication networks and media systems, then, that protests and demonstrations today principally become transacted around the world" (Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 5). As stated above, the coverage of activists in mass media gives the activists cultural and political legitimacy, reinforces the visibility in the global public space, and thereby their impact on the public opinion. In order to impact public opinion, protest seeks attention of others to make "us notice its displays of dissent but also engages us in continuing debates about its meanings, its roles and its outcomes" (Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 288). This, however, is only a small part of the potential of the global public space which is being utilized by online activists according to Cottle & Lester (2011):

[I]t is by means of contemporary communication networks and media systems that they [transnational demonstrations] effectively become coordinated, staged for wider audiences and disseminated around the world. And it is here too that they often discharge their affect and effects on supporters, wider publics and different decision makers; whether by redefining the terms of public discourse, bolstering solidarities and identities of opposition, mobilizing supporters or shifting cultural horizons as well as seeking to influence political elites and government policies (p. 4).
Social media as a tool offers the potential to activists to reach out beyond their supporters base, inform private individuals in the public space about certain campaigns. By doing so, the mental and objectified representations of the collective identity also reach a greater audience. This in turn can lead to a bigger swarm. Furthermore, social media offer the potential to activists to reach out to politicians in the public space who are otherwise out of reach because of bureaucratic obstacles, such as PR people and official letters and forms. In this lies a crucial role for social media in the contemporary world of online activism: bolstering solidarities and identities. Not necessarily of opposition, but also of the activists themselves.
4. TRACING GREENPEACE AND THE CASE OF THE ARCTIC SUNRISE

Building upon the previous chapters on globalization, social media and activism, this research will analyze the online protest repertoire of Greenpeace, which consists of tools and tactics used by the NGO. While most research regards activists as loosely organized groups of demonstrators and protestors (Bennett, 2003; DeLuca & Peeples, 2011; Gerbaudo, 2012; McNair, 2012; Valenzuela, 2012), activism by professionally organized groups and NGOs has received little scholarly attention (Reese, 2011, p. 82):

[T]he array of issues with global dimensions grows, [and] so does the importance of the layer of civil society represented by NGOs. These organizations play an important coordinating function in promoting a vigorous transnational message, but this important zone of interstitial influence between government and corporate structures has received scarcely any scholarly attention.

This research analyzes the role of social media in online activism by Greenpeace, with the Arctic Sunrise as a case study. While social media have an impact on both online and offline activism, this research only analyzes the impact of social media on online activism, thereby testing the potentials of the global public space in promoting a transnational message. According to the theory, the digital age has changed the public sphere in favor of the formation of public opinion by private individuals, by changing the notions of agenda-setting and gatekeeping. This allows private individuals to both pull information out of networks, and push information into these networks (Heinrich, 2011). Furthermore, social media, in theory, offer more potential for activists within the global public space. The aim of this research is to test these theories by researching the protest repertoire of Greenpeace and how they use it.

4.1 Research question and method

The research question (RQ), What is the protest repertoire of Greenpeace and how do they use it? will be examined by answering the following subquestions (SQ): First of all, SQ1: Which different social media platforms does Greenpeace use? The protest repertoire of Greenpeace consists of tools, like social media, and tactics, or how they use their tools in campaigns. Therefore, it is necessary to identify the tools (SQ1) to answer the RQ. To answer SQ1, mainstream social media platforms will be searched for official accounts of Greenpeace. Official accounts are accounts which can be verified as being controlled by Greenpeace, e.g. when the official website of Greenpeace refers to the account. Furthermore, the account in question has to belong to one of the Greenpeace
offices, preferably the office of Greenpeace International. Accounts from people working for Greenpeace are not regarded as official accounts, but as personal social media accounts. As stated above, only mainstream social media will be searched for verifiable accounts due to the researchers limitations in time and space. Social media platforms are considered mainstream when they are global, not local or national like the Russian VKontakte or the Chinese Qzone and RenRen.\(^a\) Furthermore, social media platforms that are limited to a single language are also not considered mainstream social media platforms. Bookmarking sites like StumbleUpon and Digg are also not considered to be part of mainstream social media, since these platforms are primarily used to bookmark digital information. While the platforms offer the possibility to share these bookmarks with other people, their primary function is not social interaction. However, in some cases it can be difficult to draw the line between the different functions. Lastly, the social media platforms have to be cross-platform, not only accessible for mobile devices like bebo, Snapchat and Tinder. For the purpose of this research, the following social media platforms are searched for verifiable accounts of Greenpeace: Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, LinkedIn, Pinterest, Google+, Tumblr, Instagram, Vimeo, Flickr, Vine, Tagged, Myspace, SoundCloud, Reddit and Storify. Each of these platforms can be placed in the following three of the six social media categories which Kaplan & Haenlein (2010) defined, namely 1) blogs (Reddit & Storify), 2) content communities (YouTube, Vimeo, Pinterest, Tumblr, Instagram, Flickr, Vine & SoundCloud) and 3) social networking sites (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Google+, Tagged & Myspace).\(^b\)

Of these tools, or the social media platforms used by Greenpeace, one platform in specific will be analyzed to answer SQ2: How does Greenpeace use Twitter to articulate protest? To answer this question, the use of Twitter by Greenpeace will be researched in depth by means of a quantitative content analysis of 453 Tweets published by the Twitter account @Greenpeace in the time span of September 18, 2013 - January 1, 2014, combined with a limited qualitative assessment of the Tweets in light of the theory. The purpose of this quantitative content analysis is to

\(^a\) VKontakte can be regarded as the Russian equivalent of Facebook, with English, Russian and Ukrainian as official languages. Qzone is a Chinese social networking site with the focus on blogging, whereas RenRen has a focus on instant messaging. Both Qzone and RenRen operate in the Chinese language.

\(^b\) The other three categories are collaborative projects, virtual game worlds and virtual social worlds. These categories are disregarded because it is difficult to measure the influence of Greenpeace in collaborative projects, since these projects are the result of more than one person or organization, and because the latter two categories are restricted to a storyline, e.g. by completing quests (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010, p. 64). However, these social media platforms can still be used as means of digital communication.

\(^c\) While some might argue this research uses a qualitative content analysis by coding for (T3) Topic, I argue that this research is conducted using a quantitative content analysis. It tests the theories outlined above by coding 453 Tweets following a deductive codebook (Bryman, 2012). This method is possible because the affordances of Twitter are known, and in combination with the tools of Greenpeace allow for a theoretical prediction of how Twitter is used, which allows for the creation of a codebook based on deduction.
derive specific information out of a large body of Tweets to get insight in how Greenpeace uses social media in its protest repertoire. The time span, consisting of 16 weeks, is chosen because it was on September 18, 2013 that the Russian Coast Guard imprisoned the crew of the *Arctic Sunrise* and towed away the ship to the harbor of Murmansk. The reason for January 1, 2014 as the end date is that in the last week of December 2013 the last crewmember who was still imprisoned made bail and the choice of January 1, 2014 makes the period exactly 16 weeks. The reason for Twitter in specific as subject to a quantitative content analysis, is that it offers the tools to: "connect with your friends - and other fascinating people. Get in-the-moment updates on the things that interest you. And watch live events unfold, in real time, from every angle" (Twitter, b). Furthermore, Twitter introduced the Hashtag, a way of adding keywords to publications on social media, which are now employed by other social media platforms. These Hashtags are keywords which are created by private individuals on social media and are used to group information on social media, making it easier to find specific information. The reason to analyze the account @Greenpeace lies in the fact that this is an account verified by Twitter. Moreover, this is also the account to which the official website of Greenpeace International refers to for people who want to be updated on events by Greenpeace via Twitter.

The tools used by Greenpeace will be identified through a quantitative content analysis of 453 Tweets from @Greenpeace. This analysis will take place by means of a codebook created for this specific research. While figure 4.1 shows the outline of the codebook, the complete codebook including coding rules and exceptions can be found in the appendix. The 453 Tweets will be dated to give insight in the articulation of the event over time, the links posted in the Tweets will be analyzed, and the number of Retweets and number of favorites will be counted per Tweet to give insight in social media as a tool to disseminate information into private online spaces. Furthermore, the links to different websites will be counted per website in order to study who Greenpeace uses as information sources or platforms for publication, and to study which other tools Greenpeace employs, i.e. other forms of social media and websites. The quantitative content analysis will also be used to see if and how Greenpeace combines tools, e.g. linking social media platforms to each other by publishing links of one platform on another. This will also answer SQ3: *Who does Greenpeace link to on Twitter?*

The quantitative content analysis of 453 Tweets from @Greenpeace, along with an analysis of the existence of other verifiable social media accounts of the NGO should give an answer to RQ: *What is the protest repertoire of Greenpeace and how do they use it?* The hypothesis is the following: Greenpeace uses the global public space as a battleground to fight for their cause, a fight in this case against the Russian government. Via social media, Greenpeace is able to overcome the problem of reaching out to the Russian government via traditional ways, and to give their subscribers
the information they want, which formed the community for this specific campaign. Furthermore, Greenpeace makes their supporters feel appreciated by thanking them, and encourages them to protest by sharing information about other supporters who protest as well. Thanks to the affordances of social media, Greenpeace is able to do this without having to rely solely on media institutions, but at the same time tries to get attention of these institutions and shares its coverage via social media to legitimize their own cause. Social media allow Greenpeace to place themselves on the same level as the Russian government. Furthermore, it allows the swarm, mobilized by Greenpeace via the media unit, to address the elite while demonstrating both online and offline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1: Tweet ID (1-453)</th>
<th>T2: Date (DD-MM-YYYY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3: Topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: on topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: related topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: unrelated topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4: Function of Tweet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Trigger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Illustration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Q&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: sharing/linking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Constructive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5: Character of Tweet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Factual: update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Factual: background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Opinion: environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Opinion: political</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Opinion: other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Directive: offline action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Directive: online action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Constructive: identity building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T6: Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: No link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Link to social media platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Link to news media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Other link</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T7: Destination of link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: No link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Greenpeace: website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Social media: publication by Greenpeace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Social media: publication by other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Official source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: News media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T8: Number of Retweets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Tweet is Retweeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Tweet is not Retweeted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T9: Number of favorites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Tweet is marked favorite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Tweet is not marked favorite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Data management

The nature of the Internet and social media makes offline storage for research purposes of information important for two reasons. First, especially in the case of social media publications such as Tweets, private individuals can access the publications and alter these in various ways. In the case of Tweets, the publisher can delete Tweets, and other individuals can Retweet or mark Tweets as favorite, long after they have been published. Second, not only the publisher of digital information can delete it, the platform itself can have a function which deletes publications after a certain time span. To prevent alterations of data or loss of data during this research, the 453 Tweets posted by @Greenpeace in the time span of September 18, 2013 - January 1, 2014 have been retrieved December 5, 2014 as PDF files and backed up on an external hard drive. In order to retrieve the Tweets from Twitter, a new Twitter account was made. This prevents Twitter from suggesting search results based on previous searches and preferences. For example, when a Twitter account is used to search for specific Tweets, Twitter comes with suggestions from other Twitter accounts that the former account has a connection with. With this new account, the search function of the social media platform was used, searching for all Tweets from @Greenpeace since: 2013-09-17 (September 17, 2013) until: 2013-10-01 (October 1, 2013), followed by the same search but with varying time spans. The reason why the time span was divided in separate months is that Twitter shows a less percentile of published Tweets when the time span gets bigger. Therefore, with the exception of the first month, each individual search has the time span of one full month. The total body of 453 Tweets is stored in 4 files, ranging from the time spans September 17, 2013 - October 1, 2013; October 1, 2013 - November 1, 2013; November 1, 2013 - December 1, 2013; and December 1, 2013 - January 1, 2014.

4.3 Limitations

First of all, the body of sampled Tweets is analyzed by only one person and an intercoder reliability test was not performed. Second, the method of data management has a few limitations. As stated above, the search method which is used does not necessarily encompass all the Tweets published by @Greenpeace during the set time span. However, all the Tweets showed by Twitter as a search result have been used, making the selection by Twitter the only selection which took place while retrieving the data. Securing this data lead to other limitations. One limitation is that the replies are not visible in the PDF files. This means that the number and the nature of these replies cannot be taken into account. Another one is that when a Tweet contains a link to another website or social media platform, such as The Guardian or a YouTube video, the PDF files show a blank square instead
of a preview of the article or video in question. Nevertheless, the blank square or the link in the PDF file does refer to the initial article or video, which means that the original information is still accessible. Lastly, 47 links were shortened using Google, and all 47 are no longer working. This means that while most links published in Tweets can be followed up, not all of them can, thereby limiting the outcome of variables T6 and T7.
5. CONSTRUCTING SOCIAL SPACE FOR CAMPAIGNS

The base for online activism is the creation of a swarm which shares a dynamic collective identity. This identity is created through a performative discourse by private individuals. But in order to have a performative discourse, there has to be room for spacial concentration where private individuals can debate, share ideas, opinions and symbols. This means that the first step for online activism is to construct social spaces in the public space, which function much like agoras or public squares used to function before the digital age, and where the base for the swarm is created by means of consensus. Social media as a tool offers private individuals the ability to create social spaces, where spacial concentration takes place through nodes and networks. The following analysis shows how Greenpeace forms one of these nodes in the networks of activists where the dynamic collective identity is created, and discontent is condensed and can be used as the motor which "driv[es] the process of mobilisation" (Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 14).

This chapter will analyze the creation of social spaces by Greenpeace, where the NGO played the role of mediator of messages and took the lead in the campaign to free the crew of the Arctic Sunrise. For this analysis, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, LinkedIn, Pinterest, Google+, Tumblr, Instagram, Vimeo, Flickr, Vine, Tagged, Myspace, SoundCloud, Reddit and Storify will be checked for official accounts by Greenpeace. Following this brief overview of the use of different social media platforms by Greenpeace, which gives insight in the toolbox of the NGO, the relation between these different platforms will be discussed in order to analyze how these tools are being used together to not only create social spaces, but also to broaden and protect these social spaces in the public space. This chapter will conclude with an analysis of the data using the codes (T6) Links, (T7) Destination of link, (T8) Number of Retweets and (T9) Number of favorites. This will show if and how the social spaces were not only created using different platforms, but also using different nodes on the same platform, in this case on Twitter, thereby answering SQ1: Which different social media platforms does Greenpeace use?

5.1 The toolbox

The global public space offers a wide arrange of tools for private individuals to organize themselves around information and it offers Greenpeace the tools to play the role of mediator of messages. This allows Greenpeace to "play an important part within their cultural environment" (Heinrich, 2011, p. 6-7). A cultural environment consisting in this case of social spaces, and functions as the hive where spacial concentration takes place and the swarm is created. These tools, which come in the form of social media, have been divided into different categories by Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) and each of
them can be used as to create social spaces. Even Instagram and Vine, of which the primary function is to share images, offer the possibility to create social spaces since images can be used as the center of debate around which a collective identity can be created (Laclau, 1996; 2005 cited in Gerbaudo, 2012).

Greenpeace International has an official Facebook account, greenpeace.international, with 2.203.571 followers and 156.051 people talking about it (Facebook). While this is not the only account by Greenpeace on Facebook, it is the only one to which the official website of Greenpeace refers to at the bottom of the site (Greenpeace International, June 23, 2015). The same website also refers to the official Twitter account @Greenpeace, which has over 1.39 million followers (Twitter), to the official YouTube channel GreenpeaceVideo, with 100.033 subscribers (YouTube), and to the official Flickr account Greenpeace International, which has 1.000 followers (Flickr). Greenpeace also refers to their Pinterest account on their website. This referral is not listed at the bottom of the page between Facebook, Flickr, Twitter and YouTube, but can be found on the right side of the page, in a box with the title 'Follow us on...' (Greenpeace International, June 23, 2015), and leads to the Pinterest account Greenpeace, with 12.508 followers (Pinterest). Besides these accounts, Greenpeace International also has an official Google+ account to which the YouTube channel GreenpeaceVideo links to. This account on Google+, Greenpeace International, has 54.654 followers (Google+).

While these accounts are directly, or in the case of Google+ indirectly named by the official website of Greenpeace International, Greenpeace also uses other social media platforms. LinkedIn shows that the organization Greenpeace has 84.528 followers and 2.988 employees on the platform (LinkedIn). The company page does link to the official website, but the website itself doesn't link to LinkedIn. Greenpeace is also active on Tumblr, amongst others with greenpeace.tumblr.com (Tumblr), which is the account of Greenpeace International. In contrary to the other social media platforms mentioned, Tumblr only allows the account in question itself to see how many people follow the account. The Instagram account of @Greenpeace has 91.500 followers (Instagram) and the Vimeo account named Greenpeace has 659 followers (Vimeo).

On Vine, a social media platform where users can post short videos, Greenpeace International doesn't have an account itself. There are however 352 hits when looking for accounts by using the word Greenpeace. Of these 352 hits there are 4 hits, or accounts, which are verified by Vine as being official. These are GreenpeaceUSA with 2.837 followers, Greenpeace France with 3.066 followers, Greenpeace UK with 2.710 followers and Greenpeace Deutschland with 1.106 followers.

* All data concerning social media accounts mentioned in this chapter has been retrieved from the respective social media platforms on June 23, 2015.
Mobilizing Publics

(Vine, a; b; c; d). Soundcloud on the other hand does have a Greenpeace International account, but this account has posted six times, of which the last one was one year ago (Soundcloud, a). However, there is also another account, called Greenpeace Podcast, which is controlled by Greenpeace Canada and has 632,347 followers (Soundcloud, b). The social media platform Storify also shows an official account by Greenpeace International, which has 1,036 followers (Storify).

Reddit is not actively being used by Greenpeace. There is an account, GreenpeaceUSA, which was created six years ago, but it hasn’t been active (Reddit, a). The social media platform Tagged is also not being used in an active way by Greenpeace and while there is an account on Myspace called gpus, which claims to be Greenpeace, it can’t be verified as being an official account from Greenpeace. Furthermore, this account shows no activities in the form of posts, other than having one image which serves as a profile picture, and being connected to 100,000 people on Myspace, and 83,668 people in return being connected to them (Myspace). However, while Tagged, Reddit and Myspace are not actively being used by Greenpeace to create social spaces, there are other users who use the platforms to create discussion groups and debate about Greenpeace. For example Tagged, which is a social networking site to meet new people, has an open group called Greenpeace Internacional, with 1,180 members (Tagged). While there is not an official Greenpeace account, the NGO is present on the platform through a performative discourse by 1,180 user accounts. Also on Reddit, a social media platform where "anyone can create a community" (Reddit, b), Greenpeace is present through private individuals. In fact, the search query 'Greenpeace' gives a total of 2,888 hits divided in 19 different categories, from environment to funny and videos (Reddit, c).

It is important to note that although Greenpeace is not actively using the social media platforms Tagged, Myspace and Reddit, this doesn’t mean that these platforms are not being used to generate social spaces. After all, the dynamic community is based on consensus and not on command, and private individuals are free to generate performative discourses on social media platforms, even when Greenpeace itself is not active on those platforms. This also shows that during the digital age, the flows of power have been replaced by the power of flows as outlined by Castells (2010). Private individuals have the ability to access and publish information and therefore no longer have to rely on the elite for information. This also counts for information about Greenpeace, since private individuals no longer have to rely on Greenpeace itself in order to access information about the Arctic Sunrise or to create a social spaces, while still being able to form a public opinion in the public space. Furthermore, it proves that protests creates online communities (Della Porta & Piazza, 2008 cited in Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 289) in a similar way as the communities of Industrial Workers of the World, which formed "a dispersed and mobile solidarity that aspired to novel kinds of hybrid association" (Salerno, 1989 cited in Atton & Hamilton, 2008). Social media allow for private
individuals to generate social spaces which are dispersed not only over different platforms, but also on the different platforms themselves, where they come together and form a mobile solidarity.

5.2 Network hopping

The creation of social spaces in the global public space is the first step towards spacial concentration and creating the swarm, since it forms the base of the dynamic collective identity. Both the official social media accounts of Greenpeace itself and the performative discourses by accounts other than Greenpeace's are Laclau's empty signifiers. These empty signifiers are in this case a leader, namely Greenpeace in the form of official social media accounts, and places in the form of performative discourses, “around which the unity of the people can be performatively created” (Laclau, 1996, p. 36; 2005, p. 69 cited in Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 42). The hybrid associations can use these empty signifiers to form a mobile solidarity. In this case the word mobile is not meant to describe a solidarity which can be mobilized, but a solidarity, that is mobile in the sense that it can hop from one network to the other. These different networks can be on one single social media platform, as well as on all the platforms described above that are being used by Greenpeace.

One of the features of social media, which gave an impetus to horizontal communication flows, is that it allows private individuals to move through different social media platforms, hopping from one platform, in this case Twitter, to another one, like YouTube. Platforms not only promote this network hopping, for example by integrated links in online publications by users, but also internalize it. To stay with the example of Twitter and YouTube, Twitter allows users to integrate YouTube video's in online publications on the social media platform (figure 5.1). This allows for Greenpeace to set up different accounts, namely one on Twitter and one on YouTube, each an empty signifier in itself around which social space is generated, and then link the different accounts together, thereby joining the social spaces for further spacial concentration. In short, Greenpeace can link social spaces together to direct users towards a specific social space, thereby promoting spacial concentration. The data from (T6) Links shows that Greenpeace uses this feature by allowing private individuals on Twitter to hop from Twitter to other social media platforms, such as Avaaz, Facebook, Flickr, List.ly, Storify and Tumblr. Furthermore, network hopping not only takes place in-between different platforms, but also on individual social media platforms themselves as (T6) Links shows. Private individuals can decide for example to assume the hybrid identity of a local leader, for example joining the network of Greenpeace Deutschland on Vine by following the account, and not joining the network of Greenpeace UK on the same platform. When the users then decide that Greenpeace Deutschland doesn't fit their own beliefs, they can join another network of Greenpeace,
such as Greenpeace UK or GreenpeaceUSA. Another example is the use of Hashtags (#), which are empty signifiers as well since they can be seen as an image or a collective name around which a dynamic collective identity can be created through a performative discourse (Laclau, 1996; 2005 cited in Gerbaudo, 2012). Private individuals can hop from Hashtag to Hashtag while looking for one which suits their own beliefs, e.g. a Hashtag which focuses the performative discourse on the Arctic Sunrise.

Network hopping is important for online activism. It allows private individuals to find a tolerant identity in the public space. An identity which people are willing to tolerate, or to accept, and which is the base of the swarm that Greenpeace can use for their campaign to have the crew of 30 activists, who were arrested by the Russian Coast Guard, set free. Hopping from one network to another is not a new feature that is brought forward by the information age, but has changed drastically during the last decades. Already before the internet, people were part of different networks which consisted of private public spheres, e.g. friends, family, co-workers and mass media,
and chose with which network they wanted to interact. However, the information age has given private individuals the possibility to engage in rational-critical discourse with people outside their own direct environment, thereby creating new social spaces which are easily accessible. Because of the common digital language which was created during the information age (Castells, 2010), such as the possibility to share an image via a link on different social media platforms instead of having to upload the same image over and over again, everyone with access to the global public space can tap into these new spheres and Greenpeace can address these directly for campaigns.

Another feature of social media, which is a result of the information age and related to network hopping, is the power of flows instead of flows of power (Castells, 2010). Nowadays, information flows freely through the public space and private individuals address the elite directly. This crumbles down the vertical communication flows and replaces it with horizontal communication flows. While the power of flows are important to create social spaces, the horizontal communication flow is important to broaden these social spaces by tapping into other social spaces, i.e. linking social spaces generated by Greenpeace itself to other social spaces. This results not only in larger social spaces, but also generates a larger hybrid identity since it links up the hybrid identities formed around these social spaces. However, it is important to note that social spaces, just like battlegrounds, can be occupied by everyone. This means that third parties, like Gazprom, can occupy a social space which is created by Greenpeace or private individuals. In order to prevent this from happening, a choreography of assembly (Gerbaudo, 2012) has to take place. In other words, Greenpeace can protect the social space through a performative discourse, identifying enemies and constructing an emotional narrative to sustain the spacial concentration as will be explained and illustrated with examples in the coming chapter. This not only offers Greenpeace the role to protect social spaces, it also offers the NGO tools to set up a dialogical relationship with its supporters.

5.3 Social spaces around the Arctic Sunrise through Twitter

As stated above, social spaces can both be created on different social media platforms, and on individual platforms themselves. Twitter is such platform, which allows users to “connect with your friends - and other fascinating people. Get in-the-moment updates on the things that interest you. And watch live events unfold, in real time, from every angle” (Twitter, b). During the event, or the imprisonment of the 30 crewmembers of the Arctic Sunrise after they protested against oil drillings by Gazprom in the Pechora Sea, Greenpeace actively used Twitter in several ways. One of the ways it uses the platform, or the tool, was to create, broaden and protect social spaces around the event of the Arctic Sunrise. It is the affordances of Twitter to get updates in real time from multiple angles
that makes Twitter an interesting platform to research, since it allows Greenpeace keep its supporters up to date while events unfold. Furthermore, it makes it more difficult for the enemy to subdue the swarm, since each form of protest is directly communicated into the public space, making it hard to silence Greenpeace and its supporters.

When looking at the data, (T6) Links shows that Greenpeace actively used Twitter to broaden the social space which was generated around the *Arctic Sunrise* by the account @Greenpeace. Of the 453 Tweets, 48 Tweets don't contain a link to another social space by means of a direct link. This means that almost 90 percent of the Tweets were used by the NGO to link between Twitter and other social spaces such as... , not only on social media (100 Tweets), but also to news sites (9 Tweets) and other websites (280 Tweets). This means that not only social media are used to broaden and protect the social space created around the empty signifier @Greenpeace, but also spaces outside of social media. However, while these social spaces outside social media also consist of official sources and news media, 55 percent of the links to other websites lead to websites by Greenpeace itself. When combined with the links to Greenpeace on social media platforms, the destination of links is almost 67 percent of the time Greenpeace itself. This is interesting because it implies that Greenpeace was more occupied with protecting the social spaces than broadening them. Note that a link by Greenpeace to Greenpeace still has the potential to broaden the social space since overlapping networks are overlapping, but not identical. This means that linking one social space created by Greenpeace to another one, e.g. from @Greenpeace to @gp_sunrise (figure 7.6), can still broaden both social spaces, attracting more private individuals than they did before. However, while linking to overlapping networks has the potential to broaden a social space, linking to a completely different network has more potential to broaden it since it taps into a space with private individuals who are not yet part of the social space around the *Arctic Sunrise*. It is important to note that while tapping into completely different networks offers more potential to broaden a social space, it also requires better mediation since these networks are not yet familiar with the symbols and meanings around the *Arctic Sunrise*.

By creating links between the Twitter account @Greenpeace and other online spaces almost 67 percent of the time to other social spaces of Greenpeace, be it on social media or their own websites, the NGO protects its social space by reinforcing the mediation. As mentioned above, the overlapping networks share for a part the same symbols and meanings through a performative discourse. And just as information can be circulated to other communities around the globe and re-enter the same communications environment from whence it came (Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 8), symbols and meanings can be circulated from one public space created by Greenpeace, to another, thereby reinforcing the mediation and emotional narration which not only sustains spacial
concentration, but also makes it harder for third parties to take over the social space in question. Twitter is a powerful tool to create, broaden and protect social spaces, not only because it allows users to publish links, but also because it has the features of Retweeting a Tweet and marking a Tweet favorite. Features of which Greenpeace is not only aware, but are actively used by Greenpeace to create a swarm. By doing so, Greenpeace gains a podium to get attention for their own cause from where the organization can voice it's message without having to rely solely on mainstream media, while being supported by millions of people.
6. CREATING THE SWARM THROUGH SOCIAL MEDIA

After, but also during the creation, broadening and protection of social spaces, Greenpeace actively uses Twitter for the choreography of assembly. The hybrid identities engage in a dialogical relationship with Greenpeace which is created through a performative discourse by sharing symbols and meanings, resulting in the creation of the swarm with a dynamic collective identity. In this chapter the creation of the swarm is analyzed using the data to see to whom Greenpeace links to within their online spaces. Note that Greenpeace, either by linking to itself or others, already directs the swarm during the creation of it, but not yet mobilizes it. The difference between directing and mobilizing is that directing is an inevitable consequence of creating the swarm, for symbols and meanings are being used to create a dynamic collective identity which includes private individuals who accept this identity, and excludes those who do not accept it. In a way, directing can be seen as shaping the swarm. Mobilizing is, in contrary to directing, not an inevitable consequence of the creation of the swarm, but it is the purpose of its creation, which is to actively campaign in this case for the release of the crew of the Arctic Sunrise and the icebreaker itself.

In order to analyze how Greenpeace created the swarm on Twitter, (T3) Topic and (T4) Function of Tweet will be analyzed in order to see how the dialogical relationship between Greenpeace and private individuals was constructed. Following the construction of this dialogical relationship, the creation of a dynamic collective identity is analyzed through the performative discourse on Twitter not only by looking at the discourse itself, but also at the different levels of engagement using (T6) Links, (T7) Destination of link, (T8) Number of Retweets and (T9) Number of favorites. This gives insight in how Greenpeace uses social media to gather the smaller communities under one umbrella, creating a collective identity. Once the swarm is formed, Greenpeace gives the swarm a hive, or a place for spacial concentration where discontent can be condensed and translated into direct action. This chapter will end with an analysis of the concept of the hive using (T3) Topic, (T4) Function of Tweet, (T5) Character of Tweet, (T6) Links and (T7) Destination of link. Note that the hive is bigger than the social spaces discussed in the previous chapter and turns the swarm into a collective agent which can be mobilized by Greenpeace. It is both an aggregation of the social spaces themselves, as well as the performative discourses found on these social spaces. Furthermore, the hive not only acts as a place for spacial concentration for the swarm itself, but also as a new form of face-to-face meetings between the swarm and Greenpeace. Meetings, which are crucial to build coalitions according to Pickerill, Gillan & Webster (2011).
6.1 Engaging dialogical relationships

First of all, it is important to note that the horizontal flow of communications, which has become inherent in the communication ecosystem, automatically defines the relationship between @Greenpeace and other Twitter accounts as a dialogical one. This means that in order to get a complete overview of the dialogical relationships on Twitter, all Tweets and other forms of activity between @Greenpeace and all other Twitter accounts should be analyzed, whether these accounts are followers or not. However, while the data does not give a complete account of the dialogical relationships, it does give insight in how @Greenpeace used Twitter to engage a relationship based on consensus with other accounts. Just like private individuals no longer need the mass media to stay updated and to form a public opinion, they also no longer need Greenpeace to stay updated and form a public opinion concerning environmental issues. This means that @Greenpeace is placed at the same level as other Twitter accounts, rather than above them. As a result, the account has to interact with these other accounts on the social spaces, of which @Greenpeace forms one on Twitter. While accounts following @Greenpeace already have a dialogical relationship of sorts with @Greenpeace, the account by Greenpeace was able to generate more followers during the event of the Arctic Sunrise, which means that it actively engaged dialogical relationships, thereby creating a bigger swarm around the event.

On September 21, 2013, @Greenpeace had 855,731 followers on September 21, 2013 (Internet Archive, a), and 936,688 followers on December 27, 2013 (Internet Archive, b)*. But how did @Greenpeace engage with these 80,957 users? Note that there is a possibility that the growing number of 80,957 means that during the event, at least 80,957 Twitter accounts started following @Greenpeace since there is a chance that during the event, accounts already following @Greenpeace decided to stop following the account, or unfollowing, thereby leaving the social space of @Greenpeace. This means that an equal amount of accounts unfollowing @Greenpeace started following @Greenpeace, plus an extra of 80,957 other Twitter accounts. Furthermore, as (T3) Topic shows, almost 67 percent of the Tweets concerned the case of the Arctic Sunrise itself, while another 27 percent of the Tweets contained a topic directly related to the case. This leads to the assumption that over 80,000 private individuals were willing to engage in a dialogical relationship with @Greenpeace based on the events around the Arctic Sunrise.

(T4) Function of Tweet shows how @Greenpeace was used on Twitter by Greenpeace itself to engage other Twitter accounts, both those already in a dialogical relationship and those who were not yet following @Greenpeace. As figure 6.1 shows, 24 percent of the Tweets functioned as a (1)*

---

*While September 21, 2013 isn’t the first day of the event, it is the closest result to the closest result to September 18, 2013, the day the event started. December 27, 2013 is chosen because it is the closest result to January 1, 2014.
trigger. This means that only 24 percent of all Tweets analyzed, Greenpeace expected some sort of action and thus can be seen as an attempt by Greenpeace to place itself above other Twitter users. By doing so, the organization accepted its position amongst all other Twitter users, thereby engaging in dialogical relationships. Note that this percentage doesn't take in account that the function (1) Trigger doesn't necessarily have to be a command from Greenpeace. Rather, as chapter 7 will show, Greenpeace almost exclusively mobilized the swarm by asking or advising it to take action, be it online or offline, rather than commanding the swarm by telling them what to do or by implying that the swarm doesn't have another option than to act. As the growing number of followers shows, it is important that Tweets by @Greenpeace keep engaging dialogical relationships, not only to engage new ones, but also to keep relationships ongoing for two reasons. First of all, it is easier for Greenpeace to get attention, both from private individuals and from the mass media and others, such as Gazprom, when it has a large supporters base, while making it at the same time harder for the enemy to subdue the swarm. Second, a large group of followers means that Greenpeace has a podium in the form of @Greenpeace, thereby not only aiming for the attention of news media which can result in coverage on the Arctic Sunrise, but actively creating their own coverage with the purpose of "attaining and maintaining widespread political and cultural legitimacy" (Hutchins & Lester, 2011, p. 170). This not only allows Greenpeace to dramatize problems (Habermas, 1996), for example by claiming Gazprom and Shell are together responsible for climate change (figure 6.5), but also helps deteriorating the protest paradigm (Murray et al, 2011). However, as figure 6.1 shows, the main function of the Tweets was not to keep the followers of @Greenpeace up to date. Instead, the main functions were to (1) trigger an action, emotion or response, to create or reinforce the swarm by (2) illustrating a situation or example, thereby adding to the performative discourse, or being (6) constructive. (T1) 149 is a good example of this, where Greenpeace published a Tweet asking the swarm for help to free the activists, who "just are just like all of us" (figure 6.4).

Figure 6.1: Ring diagram showing the percentages each category is coded for (T4) Function of Tweet.
6.2 Creating the swarm

The social space around @Greenpeace not only offers a podium that can be used for political and cultural legitimacy, it is also offers a podium where a performative discourse takes place to create the identity of the swarm out of all the hybrid identities. While smaller communities gathered around Greenpeace in the global space already show that they support the organization, this doesn't mean that they also take part in the campaign to free the crew of the *Arctic Sunrise*. Therefore it is important for Greenpeace to create a collective identity which consists not only of the hybrid identities, but also of shared meanings and narratives. These can be constructed by both Greenpeace and by other Twitter users, following the rules of a deliberative debate which is "governed by rules of equality, symmetry and civility" (Halpern & Gibbs, 2013, p. 1160) through the mediation of mental and objectified representations (Bourdieu, 1991). In total, around 70 percent of the Tweets contributed to the performative discourse, not only when looking at (T4) Function of Tweet, but also (T5) Character of Tweet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(T4) Function of Tweet</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2: Table showing the number of times a category is coded together with another category for (T4) Function of Tweet.

First of all, when looking at the data visualized in figure 6.2, it is interesting to see that (1) Trigger and (2) Illustration were not only used together in 127 Tweets, but were also combined with (6) Constructive. 242 Tweets triggered an action, emotion or a response in a constructive way, thereby actively pulling other Twitter accounts in the performative discourse 53 percent of the time. Furthermore, the 194 Tweets illustrating a situation or example in a constructive way show that almost 43 percent of all Tweets were aimed at creating or supporting shared meanings and narratives. One such way to do so is by giving the activist an identity which is shared by a large group of professionals, like electricians (figure 6.3). This means that Greenpeace acknowledges Twitter as a tool to influence public opinion in the global public space by using the two-way communication feedback loop (Tedesco, 2004) for political and cultural legitimacy based on consensus. An important
aspect of the performative discourse in which the swarm is created, is that it allows Greenpeace to not only create a dynamic collective identity, but also to already direct it by identifying enemies.

Constructive Tweets can be so by creating new objectified representations or reinforcing existing ones. This also counts for mental representations. While refraining from an extensive qualitative content analysis, it is interesting to take a quick glance at one of the methods used by Greenpeace to create or sustain these objectified representations via their Twitter account. One of these ways is the creation of Hashtags such as #Arctic30 and #FreeTheArctic30 (figure 6.4). Hashtags are effective symbols, since they can not only be used as a representation, but also serve as a link between social spaces, promoting a performative discourse and therefore promoting the formation of public opinion. Another method used by Greenpeace to turn the 30 crewmembers of the Arctic Sunrise into mental representations of the swarm. Greenpeace did so by Tweeting images of the activists, thereby not only creating visual symbols, but also generating a form of face-to-face meeting between the private individuals and the activists, which adds to the creation of trusting relationships (Pickerill, Gillan & Webster, 2011). These digital forms of face-to-face meetings not only consist of images such as photographs and video footage (figure 5.1), but also of written blogs and articles, which allows the swarm to get to know the activists. Furthermore, Greenpeace used the representations in the form of the activists as a base to create mental representations which went beyond the mere activists themselves. As figure 6.3 shows, the activists were not only portrayed as
such, but also as professionals such as web-editors, electricians, photographers, journalists, as family members, as inhabitants of specific countries and even as heroes. By doing so, the activists are no longer part of the collective identity of activists, but also of other identities. The activists are given a face, sometimes even multiple faces at the same time, thereby addressing overlapping networks. But the strongest way of portraying the activists, which acts as a mental representation, is portraying them as being “just like all of us” (figure 6.4). By doing so, Greenpeace not only appeals to the whole swarm, but also shows that the activists are part of the identity of the swarm. This personalization of the activists increases the power of the campaign.

Moreover, Greenpeace goes beyond the internalization of the activists into the swarm by fusing the whole NGO itself with the swarm. As (T1) 196 shows, Greenpeace not only offered private individuals face-to-face meetings with the activists themselves, but also with the support team which was working behind the scenes to free the activists. By doing so, Greenpeace not only creates a trusting relationship through face-to-face meetings, but also through its transparency, signalling that it has nothing to hide. This reinforces the relationship between Greenpeace and the swarm, showing that both parties are doing everything they can to release the 30 activists. Furthermore, it is a form of reciprocity, since it shares images of their own support as an answer to the sharing of images of support by the swarm, which appeals to the dialogical relationship between the swarm and Greenpeace itself.
What is interesting to mention as well, is that Twitter not only allowed Greenpeace to create the swarm itself, but also to create the enemy. Inherent to the construction of a dynamic collective identity and referring to it as 'us', is the construction of a 'them'. The Arctic Sunrise started as a conflict between 'us', which was Greenpeace and all private individuals already supporting them, and 'them', which were Gazprom in the form of the Prirazlomnaya oil rig and the Russian government in the form the Russian Coast Guard. Inherent to 'us' versus 'them' in the creation of the swarm, is that it allows Greenpeace to expand 'us' by expanding 'them'. However, while everybody can become part of 'them', it is important that Greenpeace stays in the cultural environment around which the swarm is being created. Therefore, 'them' has to be constructed based on consensus and the safest way to do so for Greenpeace, is to find enemies which can be compared to Gazprom and the Russian government, or to find issues which can be related to the event, and identify them as such (figure 6.5).

As mentioned before, Twitter as a tool offers the abilities to Retweet a Tweet and to mark a Tweet as favorite. This allows private individuals to either share a post or to show that they agree with it or think it's interesting, thereby taking the mental and symbolical representations out of the social space of @Greenpeace and publishing them in their own social spaces. By doing so, private individuals not only show the swarm itself that they are part it, but also show it to people outside the swarm, thereby reinforcing the identity of the swarm by creating a feeling of 'us' versus 'them' on
different social spaces at the same time. As (T8) Number of Retweets and (T9) Number of favorites show, all 453 Tweets except for (T1) 50 and 356 were retweeted, while all Tweets except for (T1) 356 have been marked favorite. This also reflects the dialogical relationship since it shows that private individuals are not only actively pulled into the performative discourse by Greenpeace, but that private individuals themselves also actively show towards their own private social spaces that they are part of the swarm. By doing so, the swarm is able to sustain its own growth by spreading the representations created around the Arctic Sunrise in the social space of @Greenpeace, thereby leading those outside the swarm to the swarm itself. The swarm itself can publish the message in its own private networks, which are the networks of all the private individuals. While doing so, the swarm can act as a mediator while @Greenpeace stays the leader of the cultural environment since Twitter will name @Greenpeace as the original mediator of the message. This not only makes sure that the account can take the lead over the swarm, it also leads private individuals outside the swarm directly to the social space of @Greenpeace.

Once the swarm is created, it is important to assemble it in the global public space. The spacial concentration of the swarm takes place by linking up the already existing social spaces and by creating new social spaces for the purpose of spacial concentration. New social spaces which are not only created through a performative discourse, but also technologically by creating nodes such as Hashtags, or even new platforms such as Avaaz\(^*\), which reinforce the spacial concentration and crystallizes the performative discourse into a home for the swarm in the global public space, or a hive. The creation of a hive not only structures the social spaces, it also makes it easier for Greenpeace to act as a beekeeper since it no longer has to address the individual social spaces. Instead, Greenpeace only has to focus its efforts on addressing the swarm via the hive. The ability to create hives is an interesting concept which is made possible by the information age, for this concept is the result of network hopping, dialogical relationships and the performative discourse combined. In other words, the hive is where all social spaces are integrated, e.g. by creating Hashtags which are used on the different social spaces, and not only is the result of the performative discourse based on dialogical relationships, it also has a dialogical relationship itself with the swarm. The hive and the swarm sustain each other through a performative discourse. Note that the hive is not the performative discourse itself, but also consists of the social spaces, both networks, platforms and nodes, which enable private individuals to have a performative discourse. Furthermore, the hive can be used as a catalyst for Greenpeace to condense discontent, which can then be translated it into direct action.

\(^*\) Avaaz is an online community which tries to make sure global decision-makers are aware of the public opinion, focusing on humanitarian and environmental issues.
7. MOBILIZING THE SWARM FOR THE ARCTIC SUNRISE

After successfully creating the swarm, which had a presence of almost 900.000 private individuals in the social space around @Greenpeace, the main part of the campaign started, namely translating discontent into direct action. Greenpeace can assume the position as leader of the swarm because the swarm is created on this premises. This means that those who do not accept Greenpeace as the leader, are not part of the swarm itself. As a result, the swarm can be mobilized by Greenpeace, both online and offline. During this mobilization, the campaign is divided in smaller parts, sub campaigns, thereby creating short-term concrete goals (Della Porta, 2005 cited in Rojecki, 2011) and different levels of participation, which are easier for the swarm to tolerate. This not only ensures that private individuals are willing to be part of the swarm, but also lowers the threshold of active participation during the campaign.

This chapter will give insight into how Twitter was used for both online and offline mobilization using (T4) Function of Tweet and (T5) Character of Tweet, and how the swarm participated in the campaign using the data and describing a few Tweets in particular. The first part of the chapter is an analysis of the online mobilization in which different aspects of the campaign are revealed. Following the online mobilization, offline mobilization will be analyzed. While (T5) Character of Tweet already shows that only 1 percent of all Tweets were (6) directed at offline action (figure 7.1), implying that offline action was a minor part of the campaign, it's still interesting to analyze how Greenpeace managed to have private individuals swarming the streets. After the analysis of the mobilization of the swarm by Greenpeace using Twitter, some of the different forms of protests will be discussed to give an answer to SQ2: How does Greenpeace use Twitter to articulate protest? Furthermore, this chapter will form together with chapters 5 and 6 the answer to SQ3: Who does Greenpeace link to on Twitter?

7.1 Swarming the web

After the first part of the campaign which is outlined above, Greenpeace can implement the main part of the campaign in the hive, or define collective action (Gerbaudo, 2012). As figure 7.1 shows, 31 percent of all Tweets were (7) directive: online action. These online actions vary from simply Retweeting a Tweet, to sending letters to Russian embassies (T1) 19. While it goes too far to discuss all different forms of online mobilization employed by Greenpeace, the two mentioned above will be discussed, together with addressing the enemy, in this case the Russian government in the form of embassies or politicians, and Gazprom and Shell.
As figure 7.2 shows, most of the Tweets which had a directive character for (6) offline action as well as (7) online action, were also (8) constructive. This implies that Greenpeace was not only aware of the importance of creating and sustaining the collective agent, or the swarm, but also of its own dialogical relationship with that collective agent. Furthermore, the ongoing construction and maintaining of the swarm is visible throughout the event. As noted before, the function of Retweeting a Tweet is a useful tool for this purpose and has been actively employed by @Greenpeace. Note that while all 453 Tweets except for two have been retweeted, not every Tweet was actively used to ask for a Retweet of it. Rather than asking for a Retweet with every Tweet, which is a form of minimal participation since the swarm is already on Twitter and therefore only has to click on the Retweet button in order to actively participate in the short-term goal of retweeting the Tweet, Greenpeace actively used Retweets to spread different sub campaigns, such as hanging posters, writing letters to Russian embassies and organizing small vigils, which contributed to the campaign itself while maximizing participation by the swarm by offering different levels of participation. However, while a Retweet only asks for minimal participation, the total amount of (T8) Number of Retweets of all 453 Tweets combined is 65.183, against an average of almost 900.000 followers. This is an average of almost 144 Retweets per Tweet, meaning that on average, 0.016 percent of the swarm was willing to spread the campaign into their own private networks, with a peak of 866 Retweets, or 0.096 percent for (T1) 249.
While the number of Retweets is relatively small, it could still mean that a large number of private individuals was reached by @Greenpeace through these Retweets. In fact, Greenpeace kept actively asking for Retweets throughout the event. It even started a sub campaign directly aimed at reaching a bigger audience via Retweets, not per se by getting more private individuals to Retweet the Tweets, but to get influential private individuals to retweet Tweets. As figure 7.3 shows, on October 2, 2013, Greenpeace started a sub campaign with the concrete goal to get 30 Twitter millionaires, or Twitter accounts with more than 1 million followers. This means that if one of those accounts retweets a Tweet by @Greenpeace, it will be dispersed into the social space of the account in question, reaching at least one million private individuals with just one Retweet. This means that in the worst case, being that all followers of @Greenpeace also follow the account in question, the Tweet will reach an extra 100,000 people, amplifying it by 11 percent. This shows that even by linking just a few other social spaces to the hive, Greenpeace can expand its reach exponentially. Furthermore, completely in line with social media, Greenpeace didn't approach these Twitter millionaires itself, nor did it come up with the 30 millionaires. Greenpeace asked the swarm itself to ask its favorite 'big tweeter' to support the cause (T1) 89. Furthermore, the organization kept updating the status of the sub campaign, thereby immediately gratifying action by showing the swarm the results of its efforts.

Figure 7.3: (T1) 66
As mentioned before, another form of mobilizing the swarm online employed by Greenpeace was by having them send letters to Russian embassies and address the enemy. As (T6) Links and (T7) Destination of Link show, 269 Tweets directed the swarm towards one of the websites of Greenpeace where the NGO had formulated its campaign and several sub campaigns. By doing so, Greenpeace overcame the possible challenge of third parties influencing the swarm as a result of employing open, collective communication processes (Bennett, 2003a). Greenpeace lead the swarm to a social space which was entirely controlled by the organization and where it organized the campaign. Besides leading the swarm to letters written by Greenpeace, which only had to be signed and send by supporters, @Greenpeace also lead their followers to other sub campaigns, such as a ready-to-send Tweet (T1) 18 directed towards @RussianEmbassy, an open thread where the swarm could share its own ideas to help the cause (T1) 48, a crowd source list where the swarm could suggest people who "we should be asking for help" (T1) 69, an online petition (T1) 401, and a list of 30 things private individuals could do for the cause (figure 7.4), consisting of sub campaigns for both online, such as making and sharing "social media images and memes", and offline protest. Enabling the swarm to come up with own sub campaigns is "a bold move embracing a vibrant give and take with community members" (Lawrence, 2010). It is bold because the swarm could see this as an opportunity to take over the social space and campaign itself, or even third parties. On the other hand, it's also typical for the NGO since it reflects both the horizontal structure of this collective agent and the nature of its performative identity. All these forms of online protest show that Greenpeace was able to create a supporters base with the use of social media. Supporters who not only demonstrated online, but also offline.

Figure 7.4: (T1) 160
7.2 Swarming the streets

Offline protest was divided in sub campaigns just like online protest, e.g. sending a letter to the Russian embassy, putting up posters, talking with students about the Arctic 30, or organizing small vigils in local places. These forms of offline protest were documented both supporters and Greenpeace in the form of images and published in the hive, where they served as symbols of support, making the swarm stronger in its identity. Furthermore, this means that while only 1 percent of the Tweets were directly asking the swarm to take offline action (figure 7.1), the offline protest was a bigger part of the campaign than the 1 percent implies. Besides these forms of protest, the swarm itself came up with their own sub campaigns, such as climbing the Eiffel Tower to hang a banner (T1) 158 or setting up a mock prison cell in Brussels (T1) 285, where people could show their support and identify themselves with the activists by being behind bars. However, there is one campaign in particular which is interesting to discuss, namely the 'global day of solidarity to the Arctic 30' (figure 7.5), which took place on October 5, 2013, and again on November 16, 2013.
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What makes this campaign so interesting, is that for both days it combined online resources to offer the private individuals of the swarm the opportunity to find an event in their own area. Greenpeace did so by publishing an interactive map on their own website (Greenpeace International, July 3, 2015), on which you can zoom in to see how the swarm would manifest itself on the streets, not only describing where the protest would take place, but also who organized it, from single private individuals to Greenpeace itself. Furthermore, the map was easy to share through social media via Google+, Facebook and Twitter, and the description of the protest contained a link to the social space of the organizer if the organizer had one, thereby reinforcing and possibly even expanding the hive. This not only makes it easier for private individuals to participate, but also appeals to the nomadic identity of the swarm. Local activists can swarm their own streets, thereby forming temporary communities, and combine their resources for the maximum impact. This call for global action resulted in over 10,000 people who took part in protests in over 160 cities (ibid), thereby proving that "symbolic construction of public space" can indeed facilitate and guide "the physical assembling of a highly dispersed and individualised constituency" (Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 5)
However, while @Greenpeace did call its followers to swarm the streets the first time a global day of solidarity was organized, it didn't circulate the symbols back into its own social space. Instead, @Greenpeace thanked the swarm and simply referred to @gp_sunrise for "more update & pics" (T1) 85. The fact that @Greenpeace didn't use the offline protest directly as symbols and fed them back to the swarm can be explained by a Tweet (figure 7.6) posted 17 minutes later, at 04:15 CEST on October 6, 2015. As this Tweet shows, Greenpeace used different social media accounts and relied on the willingness of the swarm to hop networks, referring the swarm to a different account rather than using one account non-stop. This shows the hive's strong suit which is that it not just combined different networks, but also allowed Greenpeace to use the different networks in an interactive way, in this case working in teams to keep the campaign going around the clock. And because Greenpeace was transparent in doing so, it maintained the trusting relationship with the swarm. Nevertheless, referring the swarm around @Greenpeace to @gp_sunrise did increase the level of participation and private individuals could choose not to take a look at the social space of @gp_sunrise, thereby missing the symbols and thus part of the dynamic collective identity. On the other hand, it was more dialogical than just showing the symbols, since private individuals now could choose to accept the symbols by going to @gp_sunrise, rather than having them published by @Greenpeace in their own private networks. Nevertheless, during the second global day of solidarity to the Arctic 30, @Greenpeace posted multiple images of people swarming the streets of 265 cities in 43 countries, and even created a new social space around these symbols by means of a photo album on Flickr (figure 7.7).

![Figure 7.6: (T1) 86](image)

### 7.3 Campaigning for the Arctic 30

All these sub campaigns, both online and offline, have four things in common. First, they were directed at the enemy and took place at symbolical sights, either because it was at popular places such as the Eiffel Tower (T1) 158 or the Sagrada Familia (T1) 239, or because the places represented the enemy, e.g. in the form of headquarters or even Facebook pages of Shell and Gazprom. This allowed the swarm to not only address the enemy directly in the global public space, but also on the streets themselves. Furthermore, it allowed Greenpeace to fully use the nomadic character of the
swarm, both by having private individuals campaigning in their own locality online and offline, and by combining resources from private individuals and other NGOs as (T1) 188 shows. Second, Greenpeace made use of overlapping networks of the swarm itself, including the Arctic 30, as well as the overlapping networks of the enemy, in order to create a bigger arena on which the NGO could fight for the cause. In some cases, the networks of the swarm were overlapping those of the enemy directly, such as the fans and even the manager of FC Schalke 04, and its sponsor Gazprom, as figure 7.8 shows. Here, supporters of the club are both cheering for a club sponsored by the enemy, as well as cheering for Greenpeace to fight for its cause. Third, the organization offered the swarm different levels of participation, from retweeting a Tweet to swarming the streets, thereby avoiding the pitfalls of activism, and online activism in particular, which are "lack of ideological clarity and coherence" (Bennett, 2005). And fourth, Greenpeace was able to orchestrate these sub campaigns at specific times and places, thereby making sure the protest landed in the right context for a maximum impact in the global public space.
These sub campaigns not only allowed Greenpeace to immediately gratify action for the swarm, they also offered Greenpeace the ability to show the private individuals in the swarm that they were not alone, thereby strengthening the dynamic collective identity of the swarm. For example, when looking at the Tweets concerning letters send by the swarm to Russian embassies, it is interesting to see that the amount of letters send surpasses the amount of private individuals following @Greenpeace, as (T1) 83 and (T1) 90 show. One Tweet even implies that the swarm consists of 4 million private individuals (figure 0.0), which shows that the swarm is bigger than just the followers of @Greenpeace on Twitter. Nevertheless, it’s still a smaller number than the 23.6 million subscribers it had worldwide in 2012 (Greenpeace International, 2013). While these numbers imply that not all supporters of Greenpeace were willing to assume the dynamic collective identity of the swarm, it shows that the organization was able to use multiple social media accounts and platforms to free the Arctic 30. Furthermore, it is important to note that while merely 1 percent of the Tweets was (6) Directive: offline action (figure 7.1), the offline protest was circulated back into the hive as symbols (figure 7.7). By doing so, the offline protest were a bigger part of the campaign than the 1 percent implies, for the offline protests were used online in a constructive way.
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Figure 7.8: (T1) 58
Inherent to these overlapping networks is that the spread the issue into the global public space, thereby making it a global issue which not only makes it easier to directly address the enemy, but also helps to reinforce the swarm by creating "coalitions of opposition and voices of dissent worldwide" (Cottle & Lester, 2011, p. 3). Greenpeace managed to form a coalition consisting of 4 million people worldwide, of which the organization was the leader, and thereby the leader of the public opinion formed by this swarm. A public opinion on which not only the Russian government, but also other governments and institutions were forced to act as a representative of the public. And while the elite used to be able to control the publishing of and access to information -and repressive regimes still try to do so, Greenpeace was able to not only circumvent the former gatekeepers, but even to have the former gatekeepers report about the event. This means that social media not only have the potential to unsettle and disrupt the vertical flows of communications (Cottle, 2008 cited in Archibald, 2011), but even can be used as a two-way communication feedback loop (Tedesco, 2004) to reverse the vertical flow of communication. Social media can be used to create events such as the global day of solidarity which are covered by the mass media, and accessed through these channels such as CNN and The Guardian by private individuals (CNN, October 5, 2013; The Guardian, October 6, 2013).

Lastly, it is interesting to see that the creation of mental and objectified representations of the swarm not only took place at the beginning of the event, but throughout the whole event. And once the event was over, the symbols were dropped almost immediately, even the Hashtag #FreeTheArctic30 (figure 7.9). This shows that the swarm was indeed a dynamic collective identity based on "short-term goals, on immediately gratifying action rather than old style militancy" (Della Porta, 2005 in Rojecki, 2011, p. 93). Furthermore, it shows that Greenpeace respected its dialogical relationship with the swarm by acknowledging that the swarm was created through a performative discourse around the imprisonment of the 30 crewmembers of the Arctic Sunrise, which means that once the campaign was finished, the swarm no longer had a legitimate reason to exist. In other words, once the Arctic 30 was released by the Russian government, the swarm was set free by Greenpeace as well.
Celebrating the retirement of a hashtag. #FreeTheArctic30

#FreeTheArctic30

...Are
CONCLUSION

Greenpeace actively uses most of the popular social media platforms, while private individuals create the presence of Greenpeace on other platforms. Just like the former gatekeepers are losing their ability to control the flow of information, Greenpeace also loses its ability to control the flow of information in the public space as a result of the power of flows. However, this case study shows that the organization is able to overcome this loss of control by engaging dialogical relationships with private individuals through a performative discourse, in which private individuals assume the dynamic collective identity of the swarm, which then accepts Greenpeace as its leader. This leadership is not only something that Greenpeace needs to obtain before the campaign really starts, but has to be protected and reinforced throughout the campaign. As a result, the technological mediation of symbols in the global public space is a dominant factor in the protest repertoire of Greenpeace.

Part of this technological mediation is linking different social spaces together to generate a hive where spatial concentration of the swarm takes place. This hive is important for Greenpeace, since it functions as a gathering space for the swarm, a space for condensing discontent, a podium to cover the event, and as a point of departure for the sub campaigns. It is the hive, rather than the individual social spaces which the hive encompasses, that allows for an effective choreography of assembly. However, this choreography is not something which can be controlled or commanded without consensus. As this case study shows, switching power has been replaced by the information age with consensus. Greenpeace realizes this and uses it to its own advantage by not only having the swarm executing sub campaigns which are planned at specific times and places to have a greater impact, but also letting the swarm participate in the creation of these campaigns. These sub campaigns reflect the identity of the swarm for two reasons. First, they allow for different levels of participation, thereby appealing to the multiple hybrid identities of which the swarm consists. Second, the sub campaigns reflect the identity of the swarm in the streets, since these campaigns allow for offline protest on different places all over the world. By doing so, Greenpeace leaves room for the nomadic character of the swarm instead of trying to force the swarm to take specific action, which is a marker of the dialogical relationship between Greenpeace and the swarm. Moreover, this also shows that the swarm indeed can "act together without being reduced to one identity or one place" (Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 26-27), which makes it hard for other parties to stop the activities.

Furthermore, as the data shows, Greenpeace not only has a dialogical relationship with the swarm, it also internalizes itself in the swarm through its articulation of protest on Twitter. The organization does so by merging the swarm and Greenpeace into one group through a performative discourse, and by making the website of Greenpeace International the centre of the hive were the
campaign is formulated. This strengthened the identity of the swarm during the event in such a way that it showed its support for the Arctic 30, which was also made part of the swarm, not only online but even offline, where small vigils were held during the event and two days of global solidarity took place under the leadership of Greenpeace itself. During these days, thousands of people all over the world swarmed the streets, asking for the release of the Arctic 30 and the ship itself. By linking to these protests in the global public space, the NGO was able to further enhance representations of the swarm in the form of images. These images turned the mental representations, the imagined community of the swarm, into objectified representations. Furthermore, these representations were directly addressed at the enemy via the hive by linking directly to Gazprom, Shell or the Russian government. Directly addressing the enemy in the global public space not only makes the protest noticeable in the private networks of the enemy, it also serves as a further reinforcement of the swarm by underlining ‘them’, thereby also underlining ‘us’, or the dynamic collective identity of the swarm.

This case study gives insight in the protest repertoire of Greenpeace in the global public space, both online and offline. Social media have become inherent in this repertoire, using the opportunities social media offer for the wider enactment and diffusion of political protest. As a result, 4 million people were voicing their support around the world, either as suggested by Greenpeace or in their own way, making the event a global issue. Influential people and governments around the world got involved too, adding their voices of support, while the mass media reported about the event. The Dutch government started an arbitration under the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea in an attempt to resolve this global issue in an according fashion, followed by the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea ruling that the Arctic 30 should be set free. However, Greenpeace kept the momentum going after this ruling and stayed on the campaign until the complete crew was released.

While it is interesting to get insights in the use of social media by one of the frontrunners of activism, it is also of importance to research the potentials of social media in the global public space for other reasons. Not only organizations such as Greenpeace, which are accepted by most people around the world and supported by millions of people, but also other organizations employ social media to promote their own cause. However, there are organizations amongst these which have other ideals than most people in the Western world. ISIS is one such organization. And it uses the same tactics Greenpeace uses to promote the creation of the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS), and is regarded by most governments as an terrorist organization. Therefore it is important carry out research such as this into the potentials of social media in the global public space for a better understanding of not only social media, but also diverse organizations around the world.
FUTURE RESEARCH

While this case study gives insight in the protest repertoire of Greenpeace, it only shows part of this repertoire. A quantitative analysis of Tweets should be supplemented with a qualitative analysis of the symbols created during this event. Moreover, in order to get a complete picture of activism in the global public space, other campaigns should be studied as well. For example Greenpeaces action against Nestlé, which is a prime example of a shock campaign. The NGO intended to influence the public opinion by raising consumer awareness. For doing so, Greenpeace used the mode of collective action of sharing a video, which the NGO had made itself. This sharing took place by publishing the video in the public space, making it accessible to private individuals who, in turn, disseminated it into their own networks via social media. Nestlé had the video removed from YouTube in an attempt to make the activities from Greenpeace disappear in the public space. However, this form of censorship made the campaign even more successful after Greenpeace published the same video again, only this time on Vimeo, a social media platform comparable to YouTube, where it generated more views than Greenpeace predicted in the planning of the campaign (Owyang, 2010).

The video, titled 'Have a break?', was posted on YouTube on March 17, 2010 by the account named 'Greenpeace UK', shows an office worker taking a quick break by opening up a KitKat wrapper, which contains the finger of an Orangutang, and then starts eating it like it's an ordinary piece of chocolate. His coworkers however, are shocked by the gruesome visuals of the worker eating the finger, with blood dripping out of his mouth. This is followed by the visuals of respectively an orang-utang in a tree and a single tree standing amongst chopped down trees, with the sound of chainsaws on the background (Greenpeace UK, March 17, 2010). This video has received 658 comments directly posted under the video on YouTube, both positive and negative. Enabling the public to comment on the video is "a bold move embracing a vibrant give and take with community members" (Lawrence, 2010) but also typical for the NGO since it reflects both the horizontal structure of this collective agent and the nature of its performative identity, much like the case study of the Arctic Sunrise shows. The video was shared through networks of social media, making it viral in the global public space, and even won the 'Viral Video Award' for 'Best Viral 2010' (Viral Video Award, 2010). Two months after publishing the video on YouTube, Greenpeace International wrote a feature story on their own homepage as means of thanking "hundreds of thousands of you who supported our two-month Kit Kat campaign by e-mailing Nestlé, calling them, or spreading the campaign message via your Facebook, Twitter and other social media profiles" (Greenpeace International, May 17, 2010). This story was accompanied with the embedded video and also embedded images of people protesting on the streets against Nestlé for the same cause. The success of this certain campaign, reaching these hundreds of thousands of supporters in merely two months,
has been made possible because of the potential of the global public space mentioned above. The Nestlé campaign is just one of many examples showing that social media can be used for far more than simply sharing your meal or a funny video. However, in order to get an idea of the full potential of social media when used strategically, it is necessary to carry out further research. Not only in the different media platforms themselves, but also in how organizations such as Greenpeace, but also others such as ISIS turn social media to their advantage.
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# Appendix 1: Codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Exception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T1) Tweet ID</td>
<td>1 - 453</td>
<td>Each Tweet will be numbered, starting from 1 - 453.</td>
<td>1.1 The numerical order follows the chronological time of posting the Tweets.</td>
<td>The Tweet in the body of collected Tweets that was posted first will get (T1) 1, the Tweet posted after that will get (T1) 2, ending with the last Tweet, or the most recently posted Tweet in the total body of Tweets, which will get (T1) 453.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2) Date</td>
<td>Date (dd-mm-yyyy) ranging from 18-9-2013 till 31-12-2013</td>
<td>Each Tweet will be dated (dd-mm-yyyy).</td>
<td>2.1 Each Tweet will be dated (dd-mm-yyyy) according to the day it was posted.</td>
<td>The first Tweet (T1) 1 in the body of sampled Tweets was posted on 13-9-2013, the last one (T1) 453 on 31-12-2013.</td>
<td>2.1 There are a few days from which the body of Tweets doesn't have a Tweet listed. If that's the case, the skipped days are not the result of the search method, but of the results Twitter gave, which still results in an objective method of collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T3) Topic</td>
<td>(1) On topic</td>
<td>The Tweet concerns the case of the <em>Arctic Sunrise</em>.</td>
<td>3.1 A Tweet can address multiple topics, e.g. activists protest against oil drillings by Gazprom to prevent climate change. The oil drillings by Gazprom are on topic and climate change is in this example a related topic.</td>
<td>(T1) 1: Activists arrested on the #Gazprom rig are now being held on the Coast Guard vessel. Our ship continues to protest #Arctic drilling.</td>
<td>3.1 The use of a Hashtag relating to the topic doesn't mean that the Tweet is (1) On topic. Therefore, the Hashtag(s) mentioned in a Tweet do not count while coding for (T3) Topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Related topic</td>
<td>The Tweet concerns a topic related to the <em>Arctic Sunrise</em>, but not the <em>Arctic Sunrise</em> itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 39: We have a choice: radical emissions cuts can avoid global warming of 2°C. <a href="http://bitly.com/howhotwillitget">http://bitly.com/howhotwillitget</a> #howhotwillitget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Unrelated topic</td>
<td>The Tweet concerns a topic unrelated to the <em>Arctic Sunrise</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 350: Ethiopia becomes part of the #EnergyRevolution: <a href="http://goo.gl/rnuf1U">http://goo.gl/rnuf1U</a>. Dirty energy is not the solution! #FreeTheArctic30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T4) Function of Tweet</td>
<td>(1) Trigger</td>
<td>The Tweet triggers an action, emotion or a response.</td>
<td>4.1 A Tweet can have multiple functions, e.g. sharing the link of a petition, which makes the function of the Tweet both (1) 'trigger' and (4) 'sharing / linking'. 4.2 A Retweet is considered (4) Sharing / linking, since it's a way of sharing an online publication.</td>
<td>(T1) 220: #Arctic30 piracy charges are STILL not dropped! Tell @VladimirMarkin to keep his promise #HeroesNotPirates</td>
<td>4.1 A Tweet only has the function of (4) Sharing / linking when it explicitly refers to a link. Just mentioning a link thereof doesn't count as having the function of (4) Sharing / linking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Illustration</td>
<td>The Tweet illustrates a situation or example.</td>
<td>(T1) 191: #Antarctica has been protected as an area of peace and science. Yet the #Arctic is still exposed to oil drilling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Question and answer</td>
<td>The Tweet is an answer to a question. This could be the answer of a question in the same Tweet.</td>
<td>(T1) 182: How to help #FreeTheArctic30 today? Make a call to the Russian ambassador in your country, and demand their release: <a href="http://free-arctic30.org/">http://free-arctic30.org/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Sharing / linking</td>
<td>The Tweet refers explicitly to another online publication by means of a link.</td>
<td>(T1) 5: If you haven’t seen it, here is a must-see video showing footage inside the oil rig we are protesting: <a href="http://youtu.be/IpUFVYjXOyw">http://youtu.be/IpUFVYjXOyw</a> #savethearctic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Update</td>
<td>The Tweet contains an update on events.</td>
<td>(T1) 417: BREAKING: Amendment to amnesty document approved by Russian parliament means #Arctic30 could come home!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Constructive</td>
<td>The Tweet helps to build or reinforce the collective identity of the swarm. This can happen e.g. by thanking supporters, or by naming places of physical protest, enabling people to join each other. This could also happen by using words such as ‘we’, ‘us’, ‘our’ etc. to suggest a collective identity.</td>
<td>(T1) 71: Climate change will affect us all: <a href="http://goo.gl/qUehDr">http://goo.gl/qUehDr</a> . Support the Arctic30 for taking a stand: <a href="http://www.greenpeace.org/freeouractivist">http://www.greenpeace.org/freeouractivist</a> s ... #FreeTheArctic30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Other</td>
<td>The Tweet has another function than above mentioned functions.</td>
<td>(T1) 369: Here’s an idea for the int’l polar bear conservation forum hosted in Moscow: Keep #oil companies out of the #Arctic! <a href="http://goo.gl/e78cY6">http://goo.gl/e78cY6</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T5) Character of Tweet</td>
<td>(1) Factual: update</td>
<td>The character of the Tweet is a factual update of events or parties involved, e.g. the activists, Gazprom or the Russian government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 A Tweet can have more than one characters, e.g. giving an opinion concerning the environment (3), based on factual background information on oil drillings (2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 417: BREAKING: Amendment to amnesty document approved by Russian parliament means #Arctic30 could come home!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 25: Not the 1st time we've had a ship seized. Here's Manuel's story of the Ship that Sailed Itself: <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YMPhWmtOqc">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YMPhWmtOqc</a> ... #FreeTheArctic30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 451: Mysterious, magnificent, magic... #SaveTheArctic! <a href="http://savethearctic.org/?twgpi30dec2">http://savethearctic.org/?twgpi30dec2</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 389: Keep the pressure up! The absurd charges against the #Arctic30 are still not dropped! <a href="http://greenpeace.org/featurearctic30?twgpi10dec2">http://greenpeace.org/featurearctic30?twgpi10dec2</a> ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 231: 50 days of detention for standing up for what's right. The #Arctic30 tell their story: <a href="http://lettersfromthearctic30.tumblr.com/">http://lettersfromthearctic30.tumblr.com/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 193: Make a call to #FreeTheArctic30! Call the Russian ambassador in your country today: <a href="http://free-arctic30.org">http://free-arctic30.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 69: Who do you think we should be asking to help #FreeTheArctic30? Add you suggestions to the crowd source list <a href="http://list.ly/list/8O6-twitter-millionaires">http://list.ly/list/8O6-twitter-millionaires</a> ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Directive: online action, the mentioning of a Hashtag doesn't count as (7) Directive: online action. Hashtags are used as keywords and don't imply that private individuals should take further action, even though they can follow the Hashtag to find relating Tweets. The mentioning of another account on Twitter (@) also doesn't count as (7) Directive: online action, unless online action regarding the account is explicitly mentioned in the same Tweet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2) Factual: background</th>
<th>The character of the Tweet gives factual information on the background of events or parties involved, e.g. the activists, Gazprom or the Russian government.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 'Parties involved' can be both groups of people such as individuals, companies, governments or NGOs, as well as property of the parties involved, such as the Arctic Sunrise or the Prirazlomnaya oil rig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 417: BREAKING: Amendment to amnesty document approved by Russian parliament means #Arctic30 could come home!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 25: Not the 1st time we've had a ship seized. Here's Manuel's story of the Ship that Sailed Itself: <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YMPhWmtOqc">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YMPhWmtOqc</a> ... #FreeTheArctic30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 451: Mysterious, magnificent, magic... #SaveTheArctic! <a href="http://savethearctic.org/?twgpi30dec2">http://savethearctic.org/?twgpi30dec2</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 389: Keep the pressure up! The absurd charges against the #Arctic30 are still not dropped! <a href="http://greenpeace.org/featurearctic30?twgpi10dec2">http://greenpeace.org/featurearctic30?twgpi10dec2</a> ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 231: 50 days of detention for standing up for what's right. The #Arctic30 tell their story: <a href="http://lettersfromthearctic30.tumblr.com/">http://lettersfromthearctic30.tumblr.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 193: Make a call to #FreeTheArctic30! Call the Russian ambassador in your country today: <a href="http://free-arctic30.org">http://free-arctic30.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T1) 69: Who do you think we should be asking to help #FreeTheArctic30? Add you suggestions to the crowd source list <a href="http://list.ly/list/8O6-twitter-millionaires">http://list.ly/list/8O6-twitter-millionaires</a> ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3) Opinion: environmental</th>
<th>The character of the Tweet is an opinion or statement concerning the environment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Directive: online action counts for all forms of online action. Even the mentioning of a link calls for online action, since it implies that private individuals should follow the link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T1) 451: Mysterious, magnificent, magic... #SaveTheArctic! <a href="http://savethearctic.org/?twgpi30dec2">http://savethearctic.org/?twgpi30dec2</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4) Opinion: political</th>
<th>The character of the Tweet is an opinion or statement concerning politics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 (6) Directive: offline action only counts when the tweet makes explicit that the action will be offline, e.g. on the streets. 'Take action' therefor will not be coded as (6) Directive: offline action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T1) 389: Keep the pressure up! The absurd charges against the #Arctic30 are still not dropped! <a href="http://greenpeace.org/featurearctic30?twgpi10dec2">http://greenpeace.org/featurearctic30?twgpi10dec2</a> ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(5) Opinion: other</th>
<th>The character of the Tweet is an opinion or statement concerning a subject other than the environment or politics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4 (6) Directive: offline action only counts when the tweet makes explicit that the action will be offline, e.g. on the streets. 'Take action' therefor will not be coded as (6) Directive: offline action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(6) Directive: offline action</th>
<th>The character of the Tweet is a call for offline action.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T1) 193: Make a call to #FreeTheArctic30! Call the Russian ambassador in your country today: <a href="http://free-arctic30.org">http://free-arctic30.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7) Directive: online action</th>
<th>The character of the Tweet is a call for online action.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T1) 69: Who do you think we should be asking to help #FreeTheArctic30? Add you suggestions to the crowd source list <a href="http://list.ly/list/8O6-twitter-millionaires">http://list.ly/list/8O6-twitter-millionaires</a> ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>(8) Constructive: identity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T1) 153</td>
<td>@JaredLeto thank you so much for all your support to #FreeTheArctic30. <a href="http://act.gp/1dryEeD">http://act.gp/1dryEeD</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>(9) Advice</th>
<th>The character of the Tweet is to give advice of any sorts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T1) 369</td>
<td>Here's an idea for the int'l polar bear conservation forum hosted in Moscow: Keep #Oil companies out of the #Arctic! <a href="http://goo.gl/e78cy6">http://goo.gl/e78cy6</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>(10) Other</th>
<th>The character of the Tweet is other than the aforementioned categories.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T1) 378</td>
<td>&quot;A winner is a dreamer who never gives up&quot;, Nelson Mandela. #Mandela's legacy will live on as an inspiration to all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>(T6) Links</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) No link</td>
<td>The Tweet does not contain a link.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>(2) Link to social media platform</th>
<th>The Tweet contains a link to a social media platform, the name of the platform has to be noted. This has to be done for each individual platform named in each individual Tweet.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T1) 4</td>
<td>FSB = Russian security services. Came to work today to protect a reckless oil company in the Russian Arctic. Full Service BodyGuard?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>(3) Link to news media</th>
<th>The Tweet contains a link to a website or publication by news media.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T1) 2</td>
<td>We found embarrassing footage from INSIDE the Arctic rig we’re protesting today <a href="http://bit.ly/1BZEvAj">http://bit.ly/1BZEvAj</a> #SaveTheArctic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>(4) Other link</th>
<th>The Tweet contains a link to other websites or publications than news media.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T1) 6</td>
<td>@KumiNaidoo on how Sini weathers the eye of the storm: <a href="http://act.gp/1aKQZzw">http://act.gp/1aKQZzw</a> (she’s still being held by the Coast Guard) #SaveTheArctic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (T7) Destination of link | (1) No link | Tweet does not contain a link. | 7.1 A Tweet can contain multiple links and therefor multiple destinations.  
7.2 Official sources comprise politicians, governments and companies other than news media companies. Note that Greenpeace is a NGO and not a company. | (T1) 4: FSB = Russian security services. Came to work today to protect a reckless oil company in the Russian Arctic. Full Service BodyGuard? | 7.1 If the Tweet is in the form of a question and the answer is not given in the same Tweet, it has a trigger function and not Q&A.  
7.2 A single link can refer to (5) social media: other and (6) Official source if the social media publication or account is that of a official source. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Greenpeace: website</td>
<td>Tweet contains a link to one of the websites of Greenpeace.</td>
<td>(T1) 6: @KumiNaidoo on how Sini weathers the eye of the storm: <a href="http://act.gp/1AKQZzw">http://act.gp/1AKQZzw</a> (she’s still being held by the Coast Guard) #SaveTheArctic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Social media: Greenpeace</td>
<td>Tweet contains a link to a publication on social media by Greenpeace itself, or to an account of Greenpeace on social media.</td>
<td>(T1) 2: We found embarrassing footage from INSIDE the Arctic rig we’re protesting today <a href="http://bit.ly/18ZEvAJ">http://bit.ly/18ZEvAJ</a> #SaveTheArctic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Social media: news media</td>
<td>Tweet contains a link to a publication on social media by news media, or to an account of news media on social media.</td>
<td>(T1) 200: READ: Australian MP asks govt: &quot;Where’s the support for the jailed #Arctic30 activist Colin Russell?&quot; <a href="http://goo.gl/KzUdER">http://goo.gl/KzUdER</a> via @guardian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Social media: other</td>
<td>Tweet contains a link to a publication on social media by others than Greenpeace or news media, or to an account of others.</td>
<td>(T1) 50: @vani_nadarajah Thank you for supporting them and spreading the word! It means a lot to us, their families &amp; them as well! #FreeTheArctic30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Official source</td>
<td>Tweet contains a link to an official source, e.g. politicians, governments or companies. This could be a publication like a document or the website of an official source.</td>
<td>(T1) 154: BREAKING: Pres. of International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea orders hearing to start on Nov 6: <a href="http://www.itlos.org/fileadmin/itlos/documents/cases/case_no.22/C22_Ord_2013-3_25Oct13_E_opening_of_hearing__2_.pdf">http://www.itlos.org/fileadmin/itlos/documents/cases/case_no.22/C22_Ord_2013-3_25Oct13_E_opening_of_hearing__2_.pdf</a> … #FreeTheArctic30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) News media</td>
<td>Tweet contains a link to a publication by news media or a website of news media.</td>
<td>(T1) 3: Russian news source: shots were fired by FSB because our activists were blocking Arctic oil destruction <a href="http://www.interfax.co.uk/russia-news/shots-at-greenpeace-icebreaker-were-caused-by-environmentalists-illegal-actions-fsb/">http://www.interfax.co.uk/russia-news/shots-at-greenpeace-icebreaker-were-caused-by-environmentalists-illegal-actions-fsb/</a> ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mobilizing Publics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(8) Other</th>
<th>Tweet contains a link to a website or publication by others than Greenpeace, news media or official sources.</th>
<th>(T1) 321: 206 oil spills across 6 oil fields where #Gazprom conducts drilling operations: <a href="http://publiceye.ch/en/case/gazprom/">http://publiceye.ch/en/case/gazprom/</a> ... #PEAwards14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(T8) Number of Retweets</th>
<th>(1) Tweet is Retweeted</th>
<th>The Tweet is Retweeted.</th>
<th>(T1) 1: Activists arrested on the #Gazprom rig are now being held on the Coast Guard vessel. Our ship continues to protest #Arctic drilling.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Tweet is not Retweeted</td>
<td>The Tweet is not Retweeted.</td>
<td>8.1 If a Tweet is Retweeted, the number of Retweets has to be noted.*</td>
<td>(T1) 50: @vani_nadarajah Thank you for supporting them and spreading the word! It means a lot to us, their families &amp; them as well! #FreeTheArctic30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(T9) Number of favorites</th>
<th>(1) Tweet is marked favorite</th>
<th>The Tweet is marked favorite.</th>
<th>(T1) 1: Activists arrested on the #Gazprom rig are now being held on the Coast Guard vessel. Our ship continues to protest #Arctic drilling.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Tweet is not marked favorite</td>
<td>The Tweet is not marked favorite.</td>
<td>9.1 If a Tweet is marked favorite, the number of times it is marked favorite has to be noted.*</td>
<td>(T1) 356: @crdeb11 Hi, we have not heard yet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of replies on a Tweet is not taken into account for two reasons:

**a** The number of replies are not visible in the documented Tweets which are backed-up for this research.

**b** This research contains a quantitative content analysis, not a discourse analysis. This means that the content, such as the discourse that forms around a Tweet, is not of interest for the research.

* The number of Retweets and marked favorite can vary over time. This research contains an analysis of Tweets stored offline on December 5, 2014.
Appendix 2: Body of sampled Tweets

The PDF file containing Tweets (T1) 1-47 from September 17, 2013 - October 1, 2013 can be retrieved from:  https://www.dropbox.com/s/48gc7gd0nvkq8r9/from_greenpeace%20since_2013-09-17%20until_2013-10-01%20-%20Twitter-zoekfunctie.pdf?dl=0

The PDF file containing Tweets (T1) 48-187 from October 1, 2013 - November 1, 2013 can be retrieved from:  https://www.dropbox.com/s/ha8f2hp0knu79j/from_greenpeace%20since_2013-10-01%20until_2013-11-01%20-%20Twitter-zoekfunctie.pdf?dl=0

The PDF file containing Tweets (T1) 188-348 from November 1, 2013 - December 1, 2013 can be retrieved from:  https://www.dropbox.com/s/h50umqd4q12dg2l/from_greenpeace%20since_2013-11-01%20until_2013-12-01%20-%20Twitter-zoekfunctie.pdf?dl=0

The PDF file containing Tweets (T1) 349-453 from December 1, 2013 - January 1, 2014 can be retrieved from:  https://www.dropbox.com/s/1c6tqzu93ak3sg2/from_greenpeace%20since_2013-12-01%20until_2014-01-01%20-%20Twitter-zoekfunctie.pdf?dl=0