

On the edge of activism or networking behind the scenes: The role of Greenpeace in Aotearoa New Zealand

Schirmer, Luca

Erstveröffentlichung / Primary Publication

Sonstiges / other

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Schirmer, L. (2020). *On the edge of activism or networking behind the scenes: The role of Greenpeace in Aotearoa New Zealand.* <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-83033-8>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-SA Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Weitergabe unter gleichen Bedingungen) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-SA Licence (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike). For more information see: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0>



Universität Hamburg

DER FORSCHUNG | DER LEHRE | DER BILDUNG

MASTERTHESIS

On the edge of activism or networking behind the scenes

The role of Greenpeace in Aotearoa New Zealand

Submitted by

Luca Schirmer

On September 22, 2020

Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences

Department of Socioeconomics

Interdisciplinary Public and Nonprofit Studies

Matriculation number: 7099057

First reviewer: Prof. Dr. Frank Adloff

Second reviewer: Prof. Dr. Stefan C. Aykut

Content

- 1. Introduction 1
- 2. Research approach..... 4
 - 2.1 The expert interview 4
 - 2.1.1 Definition of experts..... 4
 - 2.1.2 The interview guideline..... 6
 - 2.2 Participants 7
 - 2.2.1 Participants overview 7
 - 2.2.2 Access to the participants 8
 - 2.3 Data processing and analysis 9
 - 2.3.1 Transcript 9
 - 2.3.2 Analysis of the interviews 10
 - 2.4 Reflection of the approach..... 11
 - 2.4.1 Reflecting the literature and sources 11
 - 2.4.2 Reflection of the researcher’s role 12
 - 2.4.3 Attempt of a reflection on colonial history 13
- 3. Social movements studies - between organisations and networks..... 14
 - 3.1 Defining social movements 14
 - 3.2 Resource mobilisation theory 15
 - 3.3 Social movements as networks..... 16
 - 3.4 Different roles within a movement..... 17
 - 3.5 Organisations as movement actors 18
- 4. Understanding the environmental movement 20
 - 4.1 From Lake Manapōuri to School Strikes for Climate 20
 - 4.2 Why to call it a movement..... 24
 - 4.3 Structuring the movement 25
 - 4.4 Landscape of Aotearoa’s environmental organisations..... 26
 - 4.4.1 Forest & Bird..... 26
 - 4.4.2 350 Aotearoa 27

4.4.3	WWF	28
4.4.4	ECO	28
4.4.5	School Strikes for Climate (SS4C).....	29
4.4.6	Generation Zero.....	29
4.4.7	Oil Free Groups	30
4.4.8	Extinction Rebellion (XR)	31
4.4.9	Other actors	32
4.5	Māori engagement	32
5.	Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand	34
5.1	Origin and history of Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand.....	34
5.2	Effects of the Rainbow Warrior bombing	38
5.3	Nonviolent direct action for a green and peaceful future	39
5.4	Hierarchy as a recipe for success.....	40
5.5	Campaign focusses of Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand	41
5.6	An inspiration for the offices around the world	42
6.	Analysis: The role of Greenpeace within the environmental movement	43
6.1	Greenpeace’s self-assessment.....	43
6.1.1	Greenpeace’s perspective on its role in the movement	43
6.1.2	Greenpeace’s view on its relationships to other actors of the movement	46
6.1.3	Supporting others from the background.....	51
6.1.4	Internal critique of Greenpeace	53
6.2	The movement’s assessment	54
6.2.1	The movement’s assessment of Greenpeace’s role within it	54
6.2.2	The movement’s assessment of relationships with Greenpeace	56
6.2.3	Getting supported or supporting Greenpeace?	59
6.2.4	Critique about Greenpeace	60
6.3	Comparing both perspectives	61
6.3.1	Comparing the abstract view on the role.....	61
6.3.2	Comparing the assessments on relationships	63
6.3.3	Comparing the views on support.....	65

6.3.4	Comparing the critique.....	65
6.3.5	Interim conclusion.....	66
7.	Discussion of the results.....	67
8.	Conclusion.....	71
	References	73

1. Introduction

The "Clean and Green Aotearoa New Zealand" is the slogan with which the land of the kiwis - as both the flightless bird and the human inhabitants of Aotearoa (Te Reo Māori name for New Zealand)¹ are self-mockingly called - is associated throughout the world. The colonial idea of a paradise island and "the land of milk and honey" is well received by tourists. According to Tucker, it has also burned itself into the identity of its society and has become part of its self-image. But besides tourism, agriculture is a central part of the country's economy and identity as well as its biggest environmental threat (Tucker, 2017: 278–280). Unspoiled nature is what people hope for from a trip to Aotearoa, but on a journey through the country and by talking to residents suddenly a completely different image emerges. Destructive intensive forestry, agriculture that pollutes soils and waters and oil drilling along its coast. These are just some of aspects that crumble the picture that I too had, as a European before my research on and travel to Aotearoa.

For several decades, however, Aotearoa has also been a place which set an example for environmental movements from many parts of the world (mainly in the global north). Aotearoa is the country where the first Green Party was born and for many years was a focal point in the global fight against nuclear weapons and the first country in the world to become "nuclear free" (Bührs, 2013: 331). The list of pioneering developments was supplemented by the 2018 ban on new offshore oil exploration permits and the stipulation that the country should become carbon neutral by 2050. These are examples of decisions that have made Aotearoa a pioneer in environmental policy. There are other aspects of Aotearoa's history that are interpreted as progressive and internationally perceived as a role model. For example, the right to vote for women was introduced as early as 1893 (Schuster, 2017: 176), or the supposedly reflective approach to colonial history. It should be noted, however, that the story and global perception of Aotearoa's decolonialisation attempts are very different from political reality (Wynyard, 2017: 13–18). This image of a progressive state was also what attracted me to Aotearoa and awakened my interest in its politics and civil society.

¹ The name Aotearoa is used in this thesis for "Aotearoa New Zealand", because the use of Aotearoa is common in parts of society and it is not intended to reproduce the colonial narrative underlying the name New Zealand. The full name "Aotearoa New Zealand" should not be used because I consider it too bulky. However, in some contexts the name New Zealand will have to be used if there is no adequate paraphrase using the word Aotearoa. This ties in with an ongoing debate about how far the name "Aotearoa New Zealand" should be used as a whole or remain with "New Zealand".

More information: (Small (2019); *New Zealand Herald* (2019))

In 1985, a terrorist attack on a Greenpeace ship was carried out on Aotearoa's territory which made global headlines because it was executed by an ally, agents of the French secret service. This event produced great tensions, especially among the "western allies" and made the young organisation Greenpeace part of Aotearoa's history and world politics (Robie, 2016: 192).

My scientific interest in Greenpeace in Aotearoa is particularly marked by the fact that the organisation appears to have a good reputation in society that is unparalleled in almost any other country, and it is therefore exciting to investigate how exactly Greenpeace is rooted there. Due to my background in social movements, it was clear to me that this is particularly interesting in the context of the environmental movement, because Greenpeace is one of its many actors and its relevance is shown above all in how the organisation is anchored within the movement and how it is perceived there.

Looking at the existing publications that deal with social movements in Aotearoa in general and the environmental movement in particular, it becomes clear that the structure of the movement and thus the structure of the network, as well as the position of individual actors within it has, in my opinion, never been explicitly explored. In several papers, individual actors of the movement have been assigned an explicit role without being analysed. Greenpeace was assigned a role there, which can be roughly summarized as follows: Greenpeace is one of the largest environmental NGOs in the country and is very special within this group because it has a focus on direct action. However, this has never been investigated in detail (Bond et al., 2018; Bührs, 2013; O'Brien, 2013b; Thomas, 2018).

Some aspects indicate that Greenpeace is to a certain extent relevant to the political processes in Aotearoa, and especially on environmental issues Greenpeace is usually at the forefront of media coverage. But this does not tell whether it is really important for environmental policy and especially the environmental movement. Therefore, the thesis will try to answer the research question: Which role does Greenpeace play within the environmental movement of Aotearoa New Zealand?

It tries to illustrate the concrete case of Greenpeace in the environmental movement of Aotearoa, which can be seen as a particular example of a large actor within a relatively defined movement. But the central motivation of this work is to contribute to the concrete discourse on social movements in Aotearoa and to narrow the research gap on the environmental movement there.

I assumed from my everyday experience and initial research that Greenpeace would say of itself that it plays an important role in Aotearoa and that other actors in the movement would probably

also share this opinion. This pre-assumption should be made transparent at this point and will be reviewed in the discussion.

To answer the research question, 19 expert interviews were conducted with actors of the environmental movement. Among them are people who are affiliated with Greenpeace, people who are active in other organisations, and scientists who have conducted research on parts of the movement or the problems dealt with there.

The structure of this thesis is such that first, an overview of the scientific approach and all research methods for data collection and analysis will be explained and the approach will be reflected. Then the research will be embedded in the existing theoretical foundations of social movement theory and definitional bases will be made. After the theoretical roots have been clarified there, it will then be defined what is meant by the term environmental movement in this thesis and the structure and the actors of the movement will be presented. Subsequently, Greenpeace will be introduced and embedded in the social context of Aotearoa. This is followed by the empirical chapter, in which the interviews are analyzed under consideration of the research question. Finally, all chapters are summarized, and the results are discussed in the light of existing literature and theory.

2. Research approach

A qualitative approach was chosen as most suitable as it allows to capture a wide range of perspectives on the research question. For this purpose, expert interviews were conducted between May 2019 and January 2020. Most of the interviews were conducted face-to-face, although a few were held via Skype due to the physical distance. The research question implies in some way a descriptive answer. Thus, a qualitative content analysis was applied. In this chapter, the research method and the procedure for the subsequent analysis of the data will be explained in more detail. Finally, the research and the role of the researcher will be critically reflected upon.

2.1 The expert interview

The chosen method for the expert interview is a guided qualitative interview. In the literature there is a dissent about the practical design of this method. That is why it is necessary to explain how it is utilized in this research (Bogner et al., 2014; Gläser and Laudel, 2010; Helfferich, 2019; Kaiser, 2014; Kruse et al., 2015; Meuser and Nagel, 2009; Niederberger and Wassermann, 2015).

Usually it is not described as an independent research method because the distinguishing characteristic of it lies only in the target group and not in the way the interview is conducted. It is targeting experts with a specific knowledge which can be gained through different interview methods (Kruse et al., 2015: 166). The expert interview can be defined as a theory guided systematic process of generating data by consulting people with an exclusive knowledge (Kaiser, 2014: 6). It can be exploratory, which means to obtain data that is not sufficiently available yet, or it can be systematizing by specifying and classifying data that already exists but that needs to be analysed in more detail (Kruse et al., 2015: 167).

This research used an explorative approach to generate missing data. As the field is not an entire blank page, a guided interview was used to mostly ask for “hard facts” and not for overflowing narrations. The guideline is thus a hybrid of short fact-orientated questions and questions with a focus on narration (Kaiser, 2014: 35). This will be further explained in section 2.1.2.

2.1.1 Definition of experts

In this research, an expert is a person who has a specific knowledge about a societal context based on their profession, engagement, or other societal roles. It purposefully is a very vague

definition because it implies that everybody is an expert of their own societal contexts. That also shows that in this framework an expert does not have to be a scientist or a professional. So it depends on the field of interest of the research who can be seen as an expert (Gläser and Laudel, 2010: 117–119). The status of an expert is always limited to a clearly defined area of knowledge and the interviewee has to be aware of the field of which they are declared an expert (Niederberger and Wassermann, 2015: 52).

All 19 experts that participated in this research are in some way actors of the environmental movement in Aotearoa. They are representatives of groups or social movement organisations. These representatives are experts in the sense that they act within a specific context of the movement. They have among other things relevant knowledge about their own organisations, interconnections, and the perspective of the organisation on other parts of the movement. Also, four scientists have been interviewed who did research on a part of the movement or its issues. All these scientists can be considered as activist scholars because, as common in movement studies, they did research in a field that they were active in. They are experts for a scientific and an activist perspective on the topics. This will be elaborated in section 2.2 which deals with the presentation of the interview participants.

The most common way to define the different types of knowledge that an expert can be a source of is to differentiate between two categories: operational knowledge and contextual knowledge (Meuser and Nagel, 2009: 470). Operational knowledge is usually the most exclusive one. For example, it includes rules, routines and interpretations that are experienced by the interviewee during its everyday interaction in the relevant societal context. It is a rather subjective knowledge. In contrast, contextual knowledge can be characterized as a more objective category. It comprises information about institutions or actors that are more fact orientated. This information is shaped by the perspective of the interviewee, but they are not mainly about their personal views. Depending on the aim of the interview it is targeting one or the other category of knowledge and must be considered while choosing the participants, creating the guideline, during the interview process and the analysis (Niederberger and Wassermann, 2015: 57).

In this research both categories of knowledge play an important role. The interviews are used to generate hard facts amongst other things about the history of the environmental movement, organisations and structures. But they are also used to identify personal views about, e.g. relationships, opinions or the relevance of a group. That means that the guideline was created in way that the narrations can be used for answering different types questions. The interviews are

the main resources to analyse the central research question, but they are also necessary to generate missing pieces of information about the societal context in Aotearoa and the movement which are not accessible in any other way.

2.1.2 The interview guideline

The guideline of a guided expert interview is the basis of obtaining adequate data from the expert. Therefore, it is important to be conscious about its relevance. It is utilized because the research interest is focussing on specific questions instead of an extensive narration. Therefore, the guideline has to reflect the research interest (Kruse et al., 2015: 209). However, in contrast to a standardized questionnaire it is just a framework in which the interviewer has a high degree of latitude during the communication. The interviewer can for example adjust the structure depending on the course of the conversation (Gläser and Laudel, 2010: 142).

Creating an interview guideline requires a balance between openness and structuredness. There is the principle of being “as open as possible and as structured as necessary” (Helfferich, 2019: 670). That is why this research used both narration stimulating questions as well as questions that aim at shorter answers. This gives the interviewee the opportunity to set their own priorities while still following the research interest.

Because the interviews are not only used to compare the views of each other but to gain information about each societal context it was required to personalize the guideline. Thus, it has been modified for every expert. There was a pool of questions that have been used most of the time but there have also been questions that only fitted to the societal context of a single expert.

All guidelines are following a similar structure. It starts with an introduction by the interviewer with a short overview of the research and an explanation of the context that the interviewee is considered an expert in. The first questions are dealing with personal information about the interviewee to understand the person’s role within the relevant societal context. The responses to these questions are not used for the analysis to guarantee anonymity.

The main part starts with questions about the organisation that the interviewee represents. This includes some questions to fill in certain knowledge gaps but do not require long answers.

The following sections depend on the role of the interviewee. They include for example questions about the environmental movement in general, its history, the issues of the movement,

civil society, media, and lobbying. These questions are also mostly used to gain information and facts about each of these contexts.

All guidelines included a section concentrates on Greenpeace. Depending on which relationship an interviewee has with Greenpeace the questions varied. For all the interviewees who represented Greenpeace this was the substantial part of the interview. With all the others this section mostly focusses on the personal perspective of the expert. The responses are very subjective statements and not used as facts in this research but as the part of the reality that is represented by the interviewee. It is necessary to analyse these and compare them with each other. The interview always ended with asking the interviewee if there is something more, they would like to add and offer some open space.

2.2 Participants

The databases of this research are 19 interviews with different experts. This section will give an overview of the participants, but it will not go into detail of why every single person was chosen to guarantee their anonymity. The other part of this section will make it transparent how I got access to all the participants and how I got into contact with them.

2.2.1 Participants overview

The participants of the research are assigned to three different categories. These are representatives of Greenpeace, representatives of other civil society organisations and third scientists. They have been categorised in these groups to be able to classify their statements with the specific background. These categories have been developed during the process of recruiting interviewees. Most of the interviewees are professionals or voluntary activists in the field they are declared experts in. Whether they are paid staff or not, does not make a relevant difference for the research.

With Greenpeace five of the seven interviewees are paid staff members. They are campaigners or former campaigners. There is also one voluntary board member and an activist that has been with Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand since its beginning. Each of them has an individual personal view of the organisation and its role and the movement. The process of interviewing has shown that every single participant added new information and personal assessments to the research.

With the other groups and organisations there is great variation of the roles of the interviewees. They are for example, long term activists, founders, campaigners or regional leaders. There are some groups with paid staff where it was best to talk to one of their employees whereas there are others who are voluntary driven and can be represented best by voluntary activists. In total eight people counted to this category. They were representatives of the School Strikes for Climate (SS4C), 350 Aotearoa; Generation Zero; WWF; ECO; Extinction Rebellion (XR), one of the Oil Free groups and Forest & Bird. Therefore, people from most of the organisations and groups that I have identified as relevant in the movement as it is written in section 4.4. participated in this research. It will be elaborated later in this thesis who can be considered as a part of the movement. This high number of participants has been chosen to get a holistic overview from nearly the whole movement. It is necessary to not only get the perspective and knowledge of Greenpeace itself but to show the view of all the different actors.

All the participants in the category of scientists can be declared as engaged within the movement or how one of them called himself an “activist scholar”. This group consists of four interviewees. They have done research on a part of the environmental movement or an issue of the movement, but they also are or have been engaged in this political context. For example, they did research on the climate movement of Aotearoa, the anti-genetic engineering movement and on freshwater issues. Their inseparable knowledge from a scientific and an activist point of view is very valuable for the research. They added many information for all the relevant topics, but they also helped to get an overview of the whole context to classify all the other statements.

Most of the interviewees are either Pākehā² or were born in Europe or the USA. This will be discussed critically in the section 2.4.3 on reflection of colonial history. Among the interviewees there was an imbalance in context of gender. According to the assumption of the author eight of the 19 participants have been female³.

2.2.2 Access to the participants

To select participants a snowball method was used. Interviewees were asked if they can recommend someone to talk to. Afterwards I did research on the recommended person and if it seemed to fit, I got in contact with the person via email or phone. The decision of interviewing someone

² “New Zealander of European descent - probably originally applied to English-speaking Europeans living in Aotearoa/New Zealand”. In Aotearoa it is common to use the term. (Moorfield (n.d.b))

³ Gender was not surveyed or a topic of the interviews. Therefore, it is not possible to make correct specifications.

was made dependent on which context this person is representing, which role this person has and how the person assesses their own competencies.

Another way of finding participants was through research. The scientists were discovered by reading their papers and while searching for literature. Later some of them were also mentioned in interviews as well. To ensure that actors with different levels of closeness to Greenpeace are interviewed, some organisations were contacted directly via email although no one recommended a specific person.

As an intern with Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand I had an easy access to representatives of this organisation. The role as a researcher and intern will be reflected in section 2.4.2. I started with interviewing a campaigner of Greenpeace. This person provided many contacts which led to a few interviews. Afterwards the snowball method ensured further ones. Within Greenpeace as well mostly people have been interviewed that have been recommended.

Almost all the people the author got in contact with have been interested in giving an interview. That is why it was not too hard to find enough participants. Some declined because they were worried an analysis of the movement may cause negative effects or because of a post-colonial criticism on social sciences.

2.3 Data processing and analysis

Obtaining the data is only one part of the necessary work. For the data to be of use to a scientist, it must be processed, in this case it must be converted into written text so that it can be analysed afterwards. The process, as it was implemented in the present thesis is explained in this chapter.

2.3.1 Transcript

All the interviews have been recorded with a voice recorder with consent of the participants. This was necessary to ensure that all the statements are captured unadulterated. Every other way of saving the content of the interview is associated with the loss of information (Gläser and Laudel, 2010: 157).

For utilizing and analysing the content of interviews, it is necessary to transfer the recorded audio file into a written text. For this reason, all the interviews have been transcribed. Depending on how the content of the interviews is to be processed, there are different transcription scopes. For this research it was considered appropriate to use a less complex type. The text does

not capture every single sound, emphasis or intermission and the statements have been written down in standard orthography instead of the exact way they have been said. This ensured clean sentences without research-irrelevant data. Still, the content of the statements has not been changed or adulterated. The whole interviews have been transcribed in that way without missing any parts of them (Gläser and Laudel, 2010: 193–195).

All interviews have been anonymised afterwards. The names of the participants that represented a group or an organisation have been changed to the name of this organisation. The interviewees that represent Greenpeace are named “GP” and each of them was assigned an individual number. All the scientists are called “Scientist” with a number, too. It is necessary to keep the information for which context a person is expert, that is why these names have been chosen. All the other information that easily can be used to identify the participant have been removed from the transcript. No details have been changed (Reichertz, 2016: 159–174).

2.3.2 Analysis of the interviews

To utilize the transcribed content, it is important to process the data systematically. Therefore, a simplified approach based on Kuckartz’s “structuring qualitative content analysis” has been chosen for this research. A content structuring approach is in general used to filter different topics out of the material and to summarize all the related statements within a topic (Mayring, 2010: 98). It is the aim of the analysis to extract and classify the information from the interviews. This was done with the following procedure:

1. **Reading the transcripts:** The analysis starts with reading all the transcripts and making notes. This step gives the researcher an overview of the existing data.
2. **Building categories:** The material is structured in different categories. These so-called codes are mainly generated in a deductive way. They are shaped by the research question which also affected the guideline and the interview process. So, I created main categories related to the research interest. But also, some categories that came up by reading the transcripts can be added. Afterwards, more detailed subcategories are added to some of them.
3. **Coding test run:** With the so-called code book, which includes all these categories and rules for coding, the process of coding the material starts. While reading the transcripts sentence by sentence all the paragraphs or sentences that fit a category are marked with the affiliated code or sub code. This is done using the software MAXQDA. A section

can have multiple codes if it fits all of them. The coding process starts with a test run of 10% to 25% of the entire material. After this test run all the codes must be checked and modified so that they suit to the material well. In this research it happened after the fourth transcript. Some codes have been changed and some new ones have been added.

4. **Coding the whole material:** Afterwards all material, including the first four transcripts, will be coded with the existing codes. When this is finished all relevant segments of the data are assigned to one or multiple categories. And the whole content is structured related to topics.
5. **Summarize the categories:** The last part of the analysis is to summarize the content of each category. This summary can be seen in the related chapter 6. (Kuckartz, 2016: 97–120).

It was consciously decided to use this procedure and not to paraphrase the text passages, since it makes sense for the research project to be able to depict not only the meaning of a statement, but also its exact formulation. It is therefore clear that the main purpose of this method is to arrange the text passages in order to place them in context with one another throughout the interviews.

2.4 Reflection of the approach

This section takes a critical look at the research approach. First, a critical look is taken at the sources used in this thesis. Afterwards critical thoughts are made about the role of the researcher. In the last part, an attempt is made to critically reflect on the colonial context in which this research is embedded.

2.4.1 Reflecting the literature and sources

Some of the used scientific literature was published in German language. That may cause confusion by readers of the thesis for multiple reasons. One aspect is that readers may possibly not be able to read and check the quotations, therefore it seems like a lack of transparency. But the official auditors of the thesis understand and read German texts therefore I assumed that the supposed lack of transparency is not relevant in this case. Another cause for concern may be that the use of this literature is reproducing German discourses and approaches to social sciences even if the thesis shall place in the discourse of Aotearoa. The decision to use this literature and the methodical approaches was made because I was scientifically educated in Germany

and will not be able to wipe the associated views of. Therefore, it seemed to be dishonest or non-transparent to claim to totally adopt Aotearoa's social science practices.

Apart from the interviews and scientific literature other sources of knowledge are used in this thesis. This for example includes self-presentations on websites of organisations, their reports, or journalistic texts. This is necessary to gain information that is not scientifically captured so far. Because of the non-scientific character of these sources it always is necessary to frame it in an appropriate way and not using it as a matter of fact. It was tried to implement this in this thesis.

2.4.2 Reflection of the researcher's role

The role of the researcher in the present thesis can be problematic in two contexts and should therefore be reflected upon. On the one hand, as a person socialized in Germany, I travelled to Aotearoa for five months and can thus be considered an external person who previously had no connection to the country and society. This aspect possibly plays a role for the interview partners and may have had an impact on their behaviour in the interview situation. The effect was tried to be compensated for by the fact that I prepared intensively for the interviews and hopefully the participants noticed that although I am not from Aotearoa, I am very familiar with the topic and the social context. It was made transparent to the interviewees that I am from Germany. Even though attempts were made to counteract this effect, it cannot be ruled out that the results were influenced by this.

A second reason why the role as external might be problematic is that I will not be able to grasp the social context to such an extent that all relevant aspects will be considered. This is also referred to in section 2.4.3. At the same time, however, an external view can have the advantage of not being restricted to existing views.

The second potentially problematic aspect that needs consideration is that I was doing an internship with Greenpeace in Aotearoa and have previously worked for Greenpeace in Germany. This could have affected both the behaviour of the participants and the framing in the thesis. Since the role I played at Greenpeace had little to do with the content of the thesis, I assess the view as an internal as positive. I rather suspect that this makes me even more critical of the research topic. It does not seem to have had a strong impact on the interview situation, since the participants, according to their own statements, perceived me more as a researcher and less as a Greenpeace employee. However, it cannot be ruled out that the role nevertheless had an

impact on the results. But in general, being a part of the group, which is done research on is common in the social movement studies and therefore this challenge does exist within the whole discipline (Ullrich, 2019: 30–33).

2.4.3 Attempt of a reflection on colonial history

Traveling to Aotearoa as a white European to research an organisation that was founded by white people in a European influenced country and that has spread throughout the world should not be done in isolation from the reflection of Aotearoa's colonial history. This is particularly difficult because when dealing with colonial history and indigenous consideration of the social sciences, it becomes clear that this thesis is fundamentally part of the tradition of European scholarship that is to be criticized. The term "research is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism. The word itself [...] is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world's vocabulary" (Smith, 2012: 1). This quote makes the degree of difficulty of such a project clear and as a researcher one must be aware of this. It was tried to include this knowledge in all parts of the thesis. At the same time, I had the plan to let indigenous voices have their say so that they are represented in the thesis and their important perspective is reflected. After receiving critical feedback from one group, I took a closer look at the topic and reflected whether my interest in explicitly letting indigenous people have their say is not unfortunately reproducing exactly that colonial practice, because as Smith says many indigenous groups see themselves as "the most researched people in the world" (Smith, 2012: 3). Therefore, no matter what the intentions are I assumed it as inappropriate to try to explicitly encourage indigenous people to participate. That is why to the best of my knowledge no indigenous people of Aotearoa participated and that their view is not reflected in the interviews. However, this may also be an indication that indigenous people are underrepresented within the movement, or that my approach may not have been inclusive enough, as indigenous people may well have been representatives of environmental organisations other than just explicit iwi⁴ organisations. But just because this was reflected on does not change the reality that this thesis nevertheless primarily reproduces white knowledge and is to be seen as part of the Eurocentric scientific discourse.

⁴ Iwi is the Te Reo Māori equivalent to the English term tribe (Moorfield (n.d.a)).

3. Social movements studies - between organisations and networks

In order to understand the role of Greenpeace in the environmental movement, it is necessary to incorporate the theoretical foundations of social movement theory. The field of social movement theory includes all scientific considerations that have social movements as their object of investigation. It is an interdisciplinary direction of the social sciences and, according to Rucht, has its roots in the 19th century. For today's social movement theory, the so-called "new social movements", whose emergence dates back to the 1970s, are particularly formative. A still central approach of social movement theory, which originates from a psychological approach, is the collective behaviour theory. It is used to explain the functioning of movements. With the arrival of the new social movements, two major strands were added. The first is the political opportunity or political process approach, which considers social movements in the context of their environment and the political landscape (Rucht, 2020: 282–284). The central approach for this thesis is the resource mobilisation theory discussed in section 3.2.

First, it is made clear what is meant by the term "social movement" in this thesis and then it is shown that the understanding used is based on a network structure. Afterwards it is displayed how roles within a movement can be defined, whereby the limits of the theoretical basis become clear. Finally, it is pointed out that in this thesis actors within a movement are understood as organisations.

3.1 Defining social movements

As usual in social sciences there is a long and ongoing theoretical debate on how to define the term „social movements” depending on different theory traditions (Saunders, 2013: 6). This section shall give a basic insight into how this pivotal term is used in this research.

On a structural level, social movements can be seen as networks of individuals, groups and organisations which build up “complex social entities with vague and shifting boundaries” (Rucht, 2011: 197). Snow identifies five axes of which a minimum of three are usually used for defining social movements. These are: “collective or joint action; change-oriented goals or claims; some extra- or non-institutional collective action; some degree of Organisation; and some degree of temporal continuity” (Snow et al., 2011: 6). This way of identifying social movements has heavily influenced the understanding thereof in the context of this research. However, the definition chosen was social movements are “networks of informal interactions,

between a plurality of individuals, groups or associations, engaged in a political or cultural conflict, on the basis of a shared collective identity“ (Diani, 2009c: 301).

This is a broad definition that marks the boundaries of what is covered by this term. It does not seem necessary or adequate to give a more precise definition that excludes some forms of engagement or organisations because movements can be very diverse systems. In this research the defining element of the network structure is important because this is its focus.

3.2 Resource mobilisation theory

This thesis looks at organisations as actors at the centre of the study of social movements rather than capturing the movement in its entirety. This is common practice in the field of resource mobilisation theory. Through such a simplification it is made possible to understand the movement itself (Bakker et al., 2017: 204).

The resource mobilisation theory is based on the assumption that the ability to mobilise the resources necessary for a social movement is of crucial relevance for its emergence and success. These resources include on an abstract level: moral, cultural, social-organisational, human, and material resources. In practice, this means for example, money, employees, strategy, knowledge and support within the society (Edwards and McCarthy, 2011: 125–128). At the centre of this research are organisations for which, according to this theory, it is necessary to mobilise such resources. In contrast to earlier approaches, this theory is assessed by its representatives as being based on rationality. There is, however, also a strand of criticism. This is based to a large extent on the approach, which tangentially follows an economic approach. Some resource mobilization theorists assume that actors in the movement are entrepreneurial. This is criticized for missing the reality of social movements. The theory is also criticized for ignoring the societal environment too much (Della Porta and Diani, 2020: 16). Therefore, I am partly critical of the theory, but also see its advantages. Hence, this thesis does not use the theory as a whole to answer the research question, but again refers to the aspect of making resources available as a central aspect for the attribution of a role within the movement.

Since it became clear during the course of the research that resources were the central characteristic for the majority of those involved in the interviews in order to define the role of Greenpeace, this approach seems adequate and the presentation of resources will play a decisive role in the empirical chapter.

3.3 Social movements as networks

To analyse the role that an actor has within a movement it is necessary to understand the structure of a movement. As mentioned before, they are seen as networks of a range of different actors. There are multiple ways of conceptualizing networks in the context of social movements. Considering movements as networks is a step towards understanding their complexity and not seeing them as a single organisation as was originally the case in resource mobilisation theory (Diani, 2009b: 303–304). It also allows to look behind the official story and to observe what the practice really looks like (Krinsky and Crossley, 2014: 1).

A wide range of individuals, groups and organisations can be identified as part of a movement. They can have informal or legally formalized structures and they can have slightly differing targets within the movement. But all members have a shared collective identity which connects them. Each of them is taking its own unique role in this network. Scholars often explore the qualitative differences of network structures as well as the specific position of one actor within a movement. This thesis contributes to the last mentioned approach (Oliver and Myers, 2009: 173–176).

Analysing networks usually goes along with studying relationships and interactions to assess the composition of a movement. A common example of relationships in movements are alliances. These are close partnerships of actors that want to remain independent but give mutual support to each other (Rucht, 2011: 203). But this term can be interpreted just as widely as the term coalition, which often implies a more formalized relationship (Krinsky and Crossley, 2014: 8). It is also important to remember that not every element of a network must be connected to each actor of the movement.

The structures for example differ depending on whether they are centralized or totally decentralized, the number of ties, in how far they are segmented and how the power is distributed within the network (Diani, 2009b: 306). Diani identifies four main network structures:

1. “Movement Cliques” are groups of movement actors who all have a relationship with each other. On an abstract level, that means that they are decentralized networks where all nodes are connected to each other which requires a low number of actors (Diani, 2009b: 307). In later research this structure was rather identified as a subgroup of an entire network (Krinsky and Crossley, 2014: 14).

2. “Centralized Nonsegmented Networks” are illustrated as wheels with one actor in the centre that is connected to every other actor. This structure has a low degree of segmentation. The elements in the circle are only related to the actor in the middle and do not have any interconnections with each other. It is a very centralized network structure where the actor in the middle is responsible for holding the network together (Diani, 2009b: 310).
3. “Policephalous Movements” are networks with multiple centres. There is no single centralized actor and it is possible that all the different parts of the network have interconnections. There is a variety of different relationships within this structure. But there are still some elements which are better connected and more centralized than others which are more in the periphery of the network. This structure has a higher degree of segmentation (Diani, 2009b: 308–309).
4. “Segmented Decentralized Networks” – as the term says – are highly segmented structures without any centralization. Some actors are connected to others working together on a specific issue but are not connected to the other actors who focus on other issues. It is open to debate whether these can be seen as networks at all (Diani, 2009b: 311).

These patterns are useful to understand the complexity of a movement and the characteristics of a specific network. But in reality there is not one of these examples but networks that are somewhat defined in between all or a few of them (Oliver and Myers, 2009: 190–193). Moreover, none of these network structures is generally better than the others. It depends on different aspects which kind of structure works the best for a specific movement (Rucht, 2011: 204).

3.4 Different roles within a movement

Different actors of a movement have different roles within the network. As seen in the previous chapter they may be in the centre where they are playing a very prominent role or in the periphery where they are barely having an influence on the movement at all. Detached from the theoretical network structure, actors fulfil tasks in the movement which shape their individual role. Some of these tasks are mobilising, creating certain frames⁵, offering tactics and doing media communication. In general it is not possible to assign an actor to exactly one role, since they

⁵ In the context of social movements, frames usually refer to the definition and interpretation of social facts in the sense of the movement's objective. It is thus the narration of a issue from the perspective of the movement.

usually perform several roles simultaneously or at different times (Morris and Staggenborg, 2011: 180).

Movements of the left spectrum are often critical about leaderships structures. Nevertheless, movement theory assumes that also in these movements there are actors who take on a central leading role (Krinsky and Crossley, 2014: 5). But it is not clear whether it is always adequate to call them leaders. Out of the discussion around the term of leadership the concept of “social brokers” emerged which describes an actor who is connecting “other actors who are not directly related to each other” (Diani, 2009a: 107). This is a term for an actor who is playing a central role in a network. Even if the theoretical roles are ideal types and actors in reality never completely fulfil one role or several roles at the same time (Almeida, 2019: 74), it is necessary to deal with them in order to sensibly embed the role of Greenpeace in the context of Aotearoa.

In general, big well-resourced organisations like Greenpeace are attributed to fulfil many important tasks and playing an influential central role within a movement. The resource mobilisation theory sees them as provider for all relevant resources which an influential movement requires (Diani, 2009a: 107). But this does not necessarily mean that they actually have a relevant role within a movement. Which role an individual organisation plays depends on the interaction with all the actors within a movement and cannot be assessed by just looking at a single actor (Krinsky and Crossley, 2014: 4–5). Therefore, the voices of different groups of the environmental movement are relevant for this thesis to get a holistic image of Greenpeace’s role.

3.5 Organisations as movement actors

Looking at organisations while studying social movements is ambivalent. In principle, movements have the reputation of being non-institutionalized units that tend to be unorganized, which is why it initially seems unusual to conceive of their fragments as organisations. However, considering organisations as parts of social movements is very central to social movement research. Many of the formative actors that are identified as being a part of a social movement network can usually be considered as organisations (Saunders, 2007: 229). This is also the case in the environmental movement of Aotearoa. In this thesis different kinds of institutionalized and non-institutionalized organisations are identified as members of the environmental movement. But no distinction is made between different types of organisations. They all are groups that have an organisational structure without the necessity of being formally institutionalized. Thus, both large NGOs and non-formalized grassroots groups are considered organisations

(Saunders, 2013: 6). In my opinion, it is not necessary for the thesis to make a further distinction between them as it would be analysed in a more differentiated manner in other research contexts. It would create an unnecessary subdivision.

4. Understanding the environmental movement

Making the environmental movement in Aotearoa tangible is a challenge, as differences become apparent when looking at the existing limited literature. Since there is no uniform narrative about the nature of the movement, the following chapter explains in detail what is meant by the term environmental movement in this thesis. It begins with a rough outline of the history of the movement. By comparing it to the history of Greenpeace that follows later in section 5.1, some parallels become clear. With the help of theory, an attempt is then made to understand the structure of the movement and then the term of the "environmental movement" chosen in this thesis is deepened and compared with the self-conception of the actors. Subsequently, short introductions are given to all organisations that were involved in this thesis to better classify the actors involved. Finally, Māori engagement in the environmental context is discussed.

4.1 From Lake Manapōuri to School Strikes for Climate

Regarding to the literature about the history of the environmental movement of Aotearoa and the participants of this research it is conspicuous that there is wide consensus on the basic development of the movement. The emergence of the contemporary movement is unanimously determined in the 1960th with the campaign against raising the level of Lake Manapōuri (Bond et al., 2015: 1170; Bührs, 2013: 342; O'Brien, 2012: 642). In contrast to that some interviewees see the origins noticeably earlier in the times of colonialization. The fight for Māori land rights that started with colonialization and is still ongoing is viewed as the first movement that had to deal with environmental issues (GP6; Scientist4; Scientist1)⁶. It is clear that these fights are part of the roots of today's movement and for a holistic understanding, necessary to consider this but with a narrower definition the emergence of a movement with today's type of activism lies in the Lake Manapōuri campaign.

The government's plan for raising the water level of Lake Manapōuri in the Fjordland National Park on the South Island to optimize the efficiency of the new hydroelectric power station led to a large scale mobilisation (Bond et al., 2015: 1170). The "Save Manapōuri" campaign started in 1969 and gained local branches all over the country. It launched a petition which was signed by more than 260.000 people (Nathan, 2015). That were more than 9 percent of the whole population of Aotearoa during that time which was around 2.8 Million (Stats NZ, 2020). The campaign made the Labour Party to announce in 1972 that the level of the lake will not be

⁶ The interviews conducted as part of the research are quoted in this thesis in such a way that the name of the transcript is given without stating a year.

changed. Therefore this campaign was the first successful opposition against an environmental destructive infrastructure project in Aotearoa's history (O'Brien, 2016a: 12).

A huge part of the environmental movement's history does not solely base on environmental concerns. It is the fight for a nuclear free Aotearoa which always was partly an environmental issue but also a fight for peace. This fight, which already started in the 1960th and finally lead to the declaration of Aotearoa as a nuclear free zone in 1987 is important for the movement's identity. This is also the part of the history where Greenpeace emerged as a part of the movement as will be written in Chapter 5 (Scientist3; Scientist2; GP5; GP2; Priestley, 2010: 3).

Nuclear power became a big critical issue in Aotearoa's public when the first tests of atomic weapons happened on the French Polynesian Moruroa Atoll in 1966. From that point on a strong opposition grew in Aotearoa which was not only supported by traditionally leftist, peace or environmentally engaged parts of the society but also by conservatives because the tests endanger the whole country and the agriculture. Since this movement was not against Aotearoa's government but against the French government it also got some support by formal politics. The movement did not only protest with marches and a petition, but in 1972 they were sailing to the French test zone with a vessel called "Vega" that was renamed "Greenpeace III". This was when Greenpeace appeared in Aotearoa's public (Priestley, 2010: 257–262).

In 1973 the Labour government decided to send two frigates to Moruroa, to join a group of yachts that went there to protest testing. The government wanted to ensure that there is global attention on this protest. This plan was successful and led to the development, that the protesters have been the last people who witnessed any atmospheric nuclear bomb tests in the Pacific. But in 1975 France started underground testing. Even if these tests were often going along with protests of large scale in Aotearoa they got on until 1996 (Szollosi-Cira, 2020: 117–127).

A change in nuclear politics was when the new National government decided in 1976, that nuclear powered ships could come to Aotearoa once again after more than ten years of ban. In response to these visits a big heterogeneous opposition raised in the 70th and 80th which was called "Peace Squadron" and did use different forms of protest. Particularly important were the flotillas where a high number of boats did protest directly on the water. This vehicle is similar to the protest against the nuclear testing and it is a tool which is specific for Aotearoa and is associated with successful protest there (O'Brien, 2013a: 222). With a growing anti-nuclear movement many regions of Aotearoa declared themselves nuclear free. They include about 65 percent of the population (Priestley, 2010: 276).

The turning point in formal politics which was the basis for declaring Aotearoa a nuclear free zone was the bombing of the Greenpeace ship “Rainbow Warrior” in Auckland harbour by French agents in 1985. This incident will be explicated in chapter 5 because it is not only a relevant part of Aotearoa’s and the environmental movements history but also a major part of Greenpeace’s history and its identity. In response to this attack and the whole development that happened before the “New Zealand Nuclear Free Zone, Disarmament and Arms Control Act” came into effect in 1987 (Priestley, 2010: 284). This decision was the proof for the success of the movement for a nuclear free Aotearoa on a national level.

From the 1970s until the 2000s another issue mobilised activist on a large scale which shapes the today’s environmental movement. It was the protection of native forests on the west coast of the South Island from logging. A group called “Native Forest Action” (NFA) played a pivotal role within this protest. A few people who later became Greenpeace staff have been active there. Their activism was based on direct action and they tended to be quite radical. But they also got support by more moderate organisations like Forest & Bird (O’Brien, 2012: 652). NFA’s largest action was the 1997 occupation of Charleston forest, which was accompanied by protests elsewhere in the country. NFA’s high-profile actions, such as blocking a helicopter, made it possible for the group to appear frequently in the media, and the change of government to a labour government in 1999 ended the logging of native forests (Bensemman, 2018: 11–19).

The issue of genetically modified food, or genetic engineering (GE) became a major topic of the environmental movement from the 1990s onwards. In Aotearoa, concerns about GE were first addressed by six iwi at the Waitangi Tribunal⁷, where they warned about the danger for “flora and fauna and cultural intellectual property”. During the 1990s, several laws were passed relatively unnoticed by the public to enable the production of GE food. When a labour government with Green Party participation took office after the 1999 election, the movement against GE, which had already existed before reached its peak. So that in the year 2000 a moratorium on commercial GE was passed and in 2003 the “New Organism and Other Matters” bill has been adopted which marked the end point of the peak of activism on GE in Aotearoa. The movement against GE consisted on the one hand of many smaller groups that were firmly committed to and highly specialized in the fight against GE, as well as larger actors such as the Green Party and Greenpeace (Tucker, 2011: 19–23).

⁷ “The Waitangi Tribunal is a standing commission of inquiry. It makes recommendations on claims brought by Māori relating to legislation, policies, actions or omissions of the Crown that are alleged to breach the promises made in the Treaty of Waitangi” (Ministry of Justice (2020)).

Another formative struggle was the "Save Happy Valley" campaign. In 2005, the state corporation Solid Energy was granted permission to mine coal in the area known as Happy Valley which is on the South Island's west coast, where there was a deposit of kiwis and an endangered snail species. The protection of endangered species was used to strengthen the legitimacy of the protest against the mine, but the main purpose of the protest was to prevent coal production and thus protect the climate (Mitchell, 2018). A protest camp was set up on the site and remained there for 3 years. But in 2009, however, according to an article, mine work began in Happy Valley. In 2013 an organisation filed a case with the Environmental Court because they were of the opinion that the permit was no longer valid (Berry, 2013). It is difficult to find information about the current status.

The topic of offshore oil exploration became more and more present in the environmental movement from 2010 onwards and was fuelled by three key events. On the one hand, the BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico played a crucial role in raising awareness of the issue. In 2011 Aotearoa was directly affected when a container ship off the coast of Tauranga crashed and large quantities of oil formed an oil spill and were washed up on the beach. The third influential event was when the Brazilian company Petrobras obtained a permit for oil and gas exploration in the Raukumara Basin in 2011. This happened without the approval of the local iwi Te Whānau-ā-Apanu, who feared an event such as the oil spill from the Deepwater Horizon. To express their protest against the exploration work beginning there, Te Whānau-ā-Apanu, with support from Greenpeace, used a vessel to prevent the seismic survey ship from working. The skipper of this vessel was arrested and subsequently faced a court case where he was sentenced to community service. But Petrobras announced in 2012 that they will withdraw from the region, officially because of the low production expected there (Bond et al., 2018: 3).

In response to the protest, laws were enacted that explicitly punish such protest in the future and should make public participation in oil exploration impossible. In the period between 2011 and 2012, groups have been formed in several places across the country to work for an Oil Free Aotearoa (Diprose et al., 2016: 164–166). In the years that followed, numerous protests took place across the country, for example with rallies involving several thousand people. A special focus was on the annual Petroleum Summit. Despite the new law, a Greenpeace boat approached a seismic blasting ship in 2017 and activists went into the water in front of the ship to protest. Several other protests ended with the parliament passing a law in 2018 that stipulated that no new permits for offshore oil exploration would be issued (Bond et al., 2019: 534). This was hailed as a great success, but in 2019 it became clear that this did not mean that all permits

would be withdrawn. An oil rig arrived on the coast of Aotearoa to drill test wells for the company OMV. However, after protests and blockade actions by Extinction Rebellion and Greenpeace, among others, OMV announced that the test wells were not successful, and the oil rig disappeared again. However, it is possible that this was not the last attempt (*New Zealand Herald*, 2019; Kenny and Watson, 2020).

A strong development within the environmental movement was initiated when a group called School Strikes for Climate (SS4C), which is part of the global Fridays for Future movement, came together in January 2019. This movement also experienced rapid growth in Aotearoa and is now represented in many cities across the country. More details can be found in section 4.4.5. But for the environmental movement, this development was particularly relevant, as the issue of climate justice could now be openly addressed. Previously, for example, oil had been a public issue, especially about the protection of habitats and biodiversity. Now it has become possible for the movement to focus on the climate catastrophe and the goal of climate justice. This development was also supported by the founding of various Extinction Rebellion (XR) groups throughout Aotearoa, which had been formed a few months earlier. The year 2019 can therefore be considered a special moment within the movement, when climate justice became more in focus.

4.2 Why to call it a movement

This research assumes that the environmental network in Aotearoa is a social movement. Operating with the definition from Diani given earlier it seems obvious that it is a social movement and previous scholars did confirm this presumption. Comparing different authors which wrote about the environmental related movements shows that they are using different names for it. These terms can describe a specific fraction of the environmental movement like for example the Anti GE Movement or the Climate Movement (Alakavuklar and Dickson, 2016; Cretney et al., 2016; O'Brien, 2016b; Oosterman, 2018; Thomas, 2018; Tucker, 2013). This research uses the broader term of environmental movement because many of the relevant actors including Greenpeace operate in different fields of action which could not be captured in its complex extent when only focussing on one fraction. In addition, the history has shown that the fractions of the movement are related to each other. Therefore, in the context of this thesis all partial movements are summarized under the roof of the environmental movement.

Independently of scientific definitions it is interesting how the actors themselves name the network because social movement research often tries to emphasize the emic point of view which shows a wide diversity within the self-image. Many interviewees voiced detailed views regarding to this.

It appears very striking that people are not sure about whether it can be seen as a movement or not and that the term movement is seemingly not very common to use within the environmental activism or the public. The main reason for not calling it a movement seems to be the scale of the network and protest. Some interviewees compare it with what they see as movements overseas and see the activism in Aotearoa as too small (XR; GP3; GP4). Another interviewee just does not see the need to give it a specific name because it is not necessary to “define it against something else” (Forest & Bird).

Some others did define themselves as a part of a movement even if they usually do not call it like this. They gave differing answers how to call the movement each of them does act in. That could also point out that it is not very common to name it as a movement. If it would be the case, there may be a consent on how to call a fraction of it. Within the climate action there is already a range from “climate action movement” (Generation Zero), “climate justice movement” (Oil Free; SS4C), “climate movement” (GP3) to “climate change movement” (GP7).

Participants also did point out that people do use the term environmental movement, but they did emphasize that they personally do not use it (Scientist4; Scientist3; XR).

The wish to call it a movement and to give it a precise name may be a very scientific one so that there is a category in which the object of investigation may fit no matter if the actors in the field do identify with it. The comparison to movements in other countries that came up may also show the Eurocentric genesis of this term which may not necessarily fit to all activism networks around the world. But this research still uses the term because it is the one that the local scholars in Aotearoa use as well.

4.3 Structuring the movement

To understand the structure of the environmental movement, the models of network structures of social movements presented in chapter 3 are used. It becomes clear that none of the models alone is applicable to the environmental movement of Aotearoa. It is a hybrid. In the statements of many interviewees it becomes clear that to a certain extent there is something like a “movement clique”. One interviewee summarizes it as “everyone knows everyone” (Scientist4). The

representative of ECO tried to explain it in the following way: “It's partly because New Zealand is such a small place. The population is small, so the movement tends to know each other or at least elements of each other” (ECO). But there are also others who had a similar view (Scientist1; GP1). This corresponds very much to the given definition of a movement clique, which is to be regarded here as part of the entire network, but which cannot be used to describe the whole structure.

All in all, the network can be understood as a "policephalous movement". Looking at the interviews, it becomes clear that there is not a single organisation at the centre that holds all the others together, but that there are many relationships between the individual actors that do not seem to follow any great lawfulness. Some organisations, however, present themselves as more active and better networked than others, so that it can possibly be assumed that they occupy several central positions in the network, while others on the periphery have rather few relationships.

In summary, the environmental movement can be seen as a policephalous movement, in which there is a subnetwork of a movement clique.

4.4 Landscape of Aotearoa’s environmental organisations

This section gives a rundown on the relevant organisations within the environmental movement of Aotearoa. This selection was made on the basis of the interviews and reflects which actors the interviewees named as part of the environmental movement. Most of the named organisations did participate in the research with a representative. This chapter lists the majority of all groups and organisations which have been named in the interviews because it was striking that there was nearly a consent on who does take part in the movement.

Each organisation will be introduced mainly based on interview material and self-presentation for two reasons. First there is little scientific literature dealing with these groups which made it necessary to use other data and second the knowledge that shall be displayed here is on the individual role of the organisations and its perception in the movement which is represented best in this material.

4.4.1 Forest & Bird

The “Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand”, also known as “Forest & Bird” was founded in 1923 and is specialised on conservation of native species in Aotearoa. They are

one of the biggest environmental organisations in the country and have 80.000 Supporters around Aotearoa. A special feature of Forest & Bird is that they are very much focused on practical conservation work on the ground, much of which is done by their members in the 47 branches over the country (Forest & Bird, n.d.). But they do not only rely on voluntary supporters, they also have professional paid staff. Although the organisation is very much focused on conservation, both literature and interviews often state that it is also politically active in the context of the environmental politics and the organisation's representative themselves⁸ said in the interview that it is part of the environmental movement (Forest & Bird). Other interviewees also considered it to be part of the movement, which is seen as valuable especially because they are very professional in the field of political lobbying and have many volunteer supporters. And as a conservation organisation, they address a part of the population that would not be accessible to others (WWF; 350 Aotearoa; Scientist2; Scientist4; GP1; GP3; GP5; GP7).

4.4.2 350 Aotearoa

350 Aotearoa is defining itself as the “New Zealand arm of the international climate movement 350.org, which aims to unite the world around climate change solutions”. Their “mission is to strengthen and grow climate action in communities across New Zealand” (350 Aotearoa, 2020). The name comes from the safe amount of carbo dioxide in the air which is 350 parts per million. Together with Australia 350 Aotearoa is the only independent national branch which is officially no part of the global organisation 350.org (350 Aotearoa).

Their medium of climate action is divestment. They are urging banks to divest money from climate effecting investments. 350 is very specialised in this field and they see themselves as quite successful. It has a small office in Auckland with 3 employees and is also dependent on the nationwide commitment of volunteers. These volunteers organise many protests at banks, for example (350 Aotearoa).

There seems to be much agreement that 350 Aotearoa can be considered part of the environmental movement. More specifically, it is often referred to as part of the climate movement,

⁸ In this thesis, instead of gender-specific pronouns such as she/he, her/his the singular "they" is used. It is possible to use this if “the gender of the antecedent [...] is unknown, irrelevant, or nonbinary, or where gender needs to be concealed”. This fulfils two goals in this thesis. First, it helps to preserve the anonymity of the interviewees, since no reference to their gender is given. At the same time, it helps to ensure that readers do not automatically form a picture of the person quoted simply because of their assumed gender. Lee (2019).

which in the context of this thesis is considered as a part of the environmental movement (SS4C; XR; 350 Aotearoa; Scientist3).

4.4.3 WWF

The World Wide Fund For Nature (WWF) is one of the largest conservation organisations in the world. They are especially known for their work in the field of species protection. The branch in Aotearoa describes its mission as follows:

"Looking after the oceans and the animals that live there is one of WWF's top global priorities, and because New Zealand has stunning and unique sea life, our focus here is on looking after our marine animals [...]. We also work with local communities to protect our endangered species, and look after the beautiful native bush and amazing landscapes [...]. We are here to help look after the planet as a whole and are committed to inspiring people to take action on climate change to help move New Zealand and the world to a clean, green energy future" (WWF New Zealand, n.d.).

They have an office in Wellington which is the centre of their work in Aotearoa and they also have voluntary supporters. What makes it special is that they consider partnerships, even with those actors who tend to cause ecological problems, to be valuable in order to work on solutions together with them (WWF New Zealand, 2019: 3–4). This is also one of the aspects for which they are repeatedly criticized in the context of the environmental activism. When asked whether it is part of the movement, the WWF representative had a differentiated answer. On the one hand, they believe that the organisation is a part of the movement, as it runs and promotes environmental action in Aotearoa. But on the other hand, they have a special role and are also very cautious in their behaviour towards whom they would communicate to that they see themselves as part of the movement, because companies, for example, or conservative politicians, with whom they tend to enter into partnerships, might be deterred by this. And their approach is not always in the way that the interviewee sees it as normal in the movement (WWF). However, other interviewees as well believe that WWF is part of the environmental movement (350 Aotearoa; GP1; GP3; GP7).

4.4.4 ECO

The name ECO is short for "Environment and Conservation Organisations of Aotearoa New Zealand" which is a 1971 formed umbrella of 50 organisations which are working in the field of conservation or other environmental issues. Greenpeace is the only organisation covered in this thesis that is currently a member. ECO describes itself as being at "forefront of

environmental campaigns on fisheries, transport and environmental management". They have a small office in Wellington and claim to have about 500 "Friends of ECO" distributed throughout the country (ECO, n.d.).

The organisation has a special status as an umbrella, but according to the statements of the interviewees it is seen as an independent actor in the environmental movement. Because it has so many members, the representative of ECO describes it as having a good network within the environmental activism (ECO). There are other interviewees who confirm this view (GP7; Scientist1; WWF).

4.4.5 School Strikes for Climate (SS4C)

The "School Strikes for Climate" (SS4C) are the offshoot in Aotearoa of the global "Fridays for Future" movement. In Aotearoa, the movement was launched in January 2019 and experienced energetic growth in February, with the first global climate strike in March already attracting thousands of people at 30 events and in September 2019 there have been around 170.000 people participating in more than 40 events across the country (Matthews, 2020: 604).

The SS4C are organised by students who, according to SS4C; are between 8 and 18 years old. According to the interviewee, at the time of data collection, all these age groups were also represented at the national organisational level. The movement is coordinated completely voluntarily. At the time of data collection, the approximately 30 local groups act largely independently and are networked at the state level (SS4C).

By mobilising the masses, the aim of the movement is to persuade political decision-makers to act on the climate crisis and to understand science as the benchmark in the fight against the crisis. SS4C has a huge impact on the environmental movement in Aotearoa because it brings the climate crisis into focus as an omnipresent issue and it is something new that such a large number of young people become very active on an environmental issue. There seems to be a consensus that SS4C is seen as part of the movement (Generation Zero; WWF; Oil Free; 350 Aotearoa; SS4C; GP5).

4.4.6 Generation Zero

Generation Zero is another important, young people-led organisation that aims for a "carbon neutral Aotearoa". Generation Zero was founded after the 2010 UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, where young people from Aotearoa were present at the climate negotiations

and were more than disappointed by the results of the conference. But they realized that it is the young generation that will be affected by the consequences of the climate catastrophe and that young people have an important role to play in finding solutions to the climate crisis. That is why, according to their own story, they founded Generation Zero after their return from Cancun (Generation Zero, n.d.).

From a very early stage, their goal was to transform Aotearoa into a zero carbon country. They understood this not only as a stand-alone goal, but also so that Aotearoa could serve as a model for other countries. In a very long process, which according to Generation Zero included consulting with scientists and farmers and other important actors, a draft for the Zero Carbon Act was developed. After intensive campaign work, in cooperation with other environmental organisations, this draft was also taken up by political parties for the election campaign. Supported by further developments within the movement, the Zero Carbon Act was passed by parliament in November 2019. Thus, a big step was taken in the sense of Generation Zero, but they say that they will continue to be active because they are not satisfied with the outcome of the law (Generation Zero, n.d.).

Even if the participant of Generation Zero said that it is from their perspective not entirely clear whether they are a part of a social movement or not, other actors of the movement name Generation Zero as a part of it. It seems to be a matter of definition, but they are a relevant linked organisation (350 Aotearoa; GP1; GP3; GP5; GP6).

4.4.7 Oil Free Groups

In 2011 and 2012, independent groups specializing in the problem of oil production in Aotearoa were established throughout the country. These groups for example include Oil Free Wellington, Oil Free Otago and Oil Free Auckland. These groups had different backgrounds and personnel compositions, but all of them are united in their fight against deep sea oil drilling. The groups also agreed that they view the issue of oil production primarily from a climate justice perspective. According to Diprose et al. Oil Free Auckland had a strong association with Greenpeace, whereas Oil Free Wellington was initiated more autonomously (Diprose et al., 2016: 164–166). The groups have tried to generate awareness for the topic of deep-sea oil drilling on a local level. The groups have developed differing structures and are very much focused on the local level and have no official cooperation at the state level. They all are autonomous (Oil Free). According to Bond, their own approach made them more inclusive and disruptive than most other groups at the same time (Bond et al., 2015: 1177).

The interviewee with the background of an Oil Free group said that they hope they helped to grow a movement which nowadays is much more focused on climate justice than it has been to the time of their emerging (Oil Free). Even though some of the groups are no longer as active today as they were in the past, the interviewees explicitly perceive them as part of the environmental movement (Scientist4; GP7).

4.4.8 Extinction Rebellion (XR)

According to the affiliated interviewee Extinction Rebellion (XR) was launched in Aotearoa in October 2018, immediately following to the first major action that took place in the UK. According to the XR interviewee, there were people who felt that 350 Aotearoa and Greenpeace, for example, were not going far enough with their positions and actions on climate crisis and these people came together at XR. The name comes from the fact that the organisation follows a narrative that assumes that environmental destruction and climate catastrophe will lead to the extinction of countless species and, ultimately, humans. With nonviolent civil disobedience XR tries to get the government to act and sees this as one of the last possibilities because time is running out (Matthews, 2020: 591–592).

In Aotearoa, the aspect of civil disobedience was initially secondary. XR did lobby to a large extent for the fact that gradually more and more communities declared climate emergency. But other groups were also involved. However, there were also several accompanying protest actions, which were initially presented in the media as not really disturbing. The first really eye-catching action was when two activists from XR boarded a moving oil rig to protest against offshore oil exploration at the coast of Aotearoa (Kenny and Watson, 2020).

In other countries, such as Germany, at the time of data collection, there was already remarkable criticism of certain aspects of XR within the environmental movement there (Thorwarth, 2019). In Aotearoa, no such fundamental criticism was heard from any of the actors interviewed. This may be due, among other things, to the very own and specific orientation of XR in Aotearoa, which differs from the European groups, for example, in that it has a relatively high average age according to the interviewee of XR and does not consider arrests by the police as a standalone success, as in other countries. Although the interviewee of XR fundamentally questions whether, given the size of Aotearoa, one can speak of social movements at all, it is clear that XR is part of what is defined in this thesis as the environmental movement (XR). Many interviewees are also of the opinion that XR is part of it in Aotearoa (Scientist3; Generation Zero; 350 Aotearoa; ECO; GP6; GP1; GP5).

4.4.9 Other actors

In the research process a large part of the organisations that are considered relevant in the context were included and interviewed. However, it was not possible to cover every single group. From the interviews and research, a few more organisations were identified as actors in the movement.

These include the “Coal Action Network”, where I first had an interview appointment, which unfortunately had to be cancelled due to changing circumstances, so that the organisation could not be represented. According to own information, the Coal Action Network Aotearoa was created 2007 by activists, who were among other things already active with the Save Happy Valley campaign and specialized in the range of the coal mining. They understand "coal as the primary threat to Earth's climate system" and fight for climate justice (Coal Action Network Aotearoa, n.d.). They were seen by participants as part of the environmental movement (WWF; GP1).

Another organisation that is not represented in the thesis is the Environmental Defence Society (EDS). EDS describes itself as a professionally managed non-profit Organisation with the goal of “improving environmental outcomes for all New Zealanders”. It calls itself a think tank (Environmental Defence Society, 2015). It was also identified as part of the movement (WWF; GP7).

The group "Climate Justice Taranaki" can be regarded as related to the Oil Free groups, because at a similar point in time, in 2010, a similar theme was formed. They are also specialized in the work against oil and gas production and have the goal of climate justice, which they already have in their name. They are “educating the public about the adverse effects of the massive oil and gas expansion in Taranaki” (Climate Justice Taranaki, n.d.). Climate Justice Taranaki was once again named separately as an actor by the interviewees (Scientist4; GP5).

The other remaining organisations, such as trade unions or other local grassroot groups, were mentioned only once and therefore it was decided not to explicitly introduce them here.

4.5 Māori engagement

As already described in section 2.4.3 there are reasons why there are no explicit Māori voices represented in the thesis. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned here what role Māori play within environmental engagement in Aotearoa. The above-mentioned organisations are for the most part very strongly dominated by Pākehā. Even the statements of many interviewees regarding

who is considered part of the environmental movement show that explicit Māori groups are rarely mentioned.

Apart from Te Ara Whatu and the iwi Te Whānau-ā-Apanui already mentioned in the history section, no Māori groups were named as part of the movement (Generation Zero; SS4C Oil Free; 350 Aotearoa; Scientist4). Te Ara Whatu describes itself as "a group of young Māori and Pasifika", who "step up in solidarity with indigenous communities from around the world" because "Māori and Pasifika communities are at the frontlines of climate change" (Te Ara Whatu, n.d.).

Therefore, it seems to be that from the point of view of the interviewees Māori groups are not primarily part of the environmental movement. Bond describes a similar observation and states that "Even when iwi are working towards similar goals they are often framed as exterior to the post-colonial environmental imaginary" (Bond et al., 2015: 1175). According to Thomas, environmental activism in Aotearoa has often been based on colonial thought patterns and have also denied Māori land rights and their sovereignty (Thomas, 2018: 2). Under this assumption it may well be that networking between Māori and the environmental movement is difficult.

Many interviewees were asked at a later point in the interview, why in their opinion Māori groups are rarely talked about as part of the environmental movement and they seemed to agree that there are many very active iwi who take action against environmental destruction and the climate catastrophe, but in the opinion of the interviewees they are not linked to what has been outlined here as an environmental movement and there is a different mindset among Māori in terms of environmental problems. Therefore, according to this view Māori environmental engagement is a separate social sphere. According to several interviewees, one central difference is that for Māori, nature and the environment cannot be viewed in isolation from the human world. Therefore, this view is much more comprehensive than just what Pākehā understand by environment, but many things are thought of together. For example, the fight for Māori land rights, cannot be considered detached from the environment. It was also emphasized that there is frequently temporary cooperation and that there is mutual solidarity between some iwi and environmental groups (Forest & Bird; XR; Oil Free; 350 Aotearoa; Scientist1; Scientist2; Scientist4; GP1; GP3). At this point it must be explicitly emphasized that the assumptions described are based exclusively on the perspective of the interviewees and cannot be clearly stated what iwi's perspective on this question would be.

5. Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand

In order to understand how Greenpeace operates in Aotearoa, what role the organisation plays in the environmental movement, and how it is fundamentally embedded in the country, it is necessary to look at the general background of it. Especially in the context of history it becomes clear that Greenpeace has been closely connected with Aotearoa from almost the beginning and plays a special role within the country.

For this reason, the organisation is presented in detail in this chapter, with a special focus on the history and especially the history of the bombing of the Rainbow Warrior. It will then attempt to discuss the strategy and mission underlying the work of Greenpeace, and its structure will then be presented, as well as the issues it is dealing with in Aotearoa. Finally, the chapter will outline the role of Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand in the Greenpeace world.

5.1 Origin and history of Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand

This chapter provides an overview of the origins and history of Greenpeace in Aotearoa, which is closely linked to the history of Greenpeace International. It can only be roughly outlined, so it was tried to present the central milestones.

The history of Greenpeace began in Vancouver in the early 1970s. A mixture of hippies, US conscientious objectors, Quakers and other parts of counterculture were committed to opposing US nuclear testing on the island Amchitka. Thousands of people protested at the time, partly because they feared that testing a bomb would trigger a tsunami. This is why the group from which Greenpeace was later to emerge was named the "Don't make a wave Committee" (DMWC). The DMWC planned to sail from Vancouver to Amchitka to protest and prevent a testing. A benefit concert raised the money necessary for the DMWC to charter a ship in the fall of 1971 to travel to Amchitka. This ship was named "Greenpeace" for the trip (Susanto, 2007: 192). On their journey to Amchitka they were prevented from reaching their destination by the US Coast Guard and had to turn back, but their attempt had had a great impact. In response to the protest, the test was postponed to a later date, whereupon the DMWC tried again to get close to the test area with another ship, the Greenpeace II, and failed again. However, no further nuclear tests were carried out on Amchitka afterwards as a result of the protest (Zelko, 2017: 318–320).

The DMWC was renamed into "Greenpeace Foundation" in 1971 (Eden, 2004: 595). As a result of the publicity generated by the sensational protest, the first group outside Canada to call itself

Greenpeace was formed in London in 1972 (Zelko, 2017: 325). Greenpeace's second major campaign was the protest against French nuclear tests on the Pacific atoll Mururoa. The organisation sought support in Aotearoa, whereupon the "Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament" (CND) published an appeal for sailors in the "New Zealand Herald", the largest daily newspaper in Aotearoa, to join their protest and received support from Canadian David McTaggart, who lived in Aotearoa. He was ready to take his ship the "Vega" to Mururoa to protest (Zelko and Brandau, 2014: 105–108). For this purpose, an office was set up at Auckland University to organise the protest. This campaign was Greenpeace's first reference to Aotearoa. So, Greenpeace was already associated with Aotearoa at an early stage. McTaggart steered his ship, which was renamed into "Greenpeace III" for the journey, with a small crew in 1972 near Mururoa. They played a game of cat and mouse with the French Navy there for several weeks and made sure that no tests could be carried out in the entire time. Only after a ship of the French Navy had rammed the Vega, they had to abort the protest. But their trip managed to attract attention for the nuclear tests in many countries of the world. But the journey was not the only reason for publicity. Other Greenpeace activists and other peace and environmental activist around the world were involved in organising marches or trying to reach out to raise awareness at UN headquarter (Szabo, 1991: 5–17).

In the following year, there were two major protests in the test zones. First, the ship Fri, also supported by Greenpeace, was in the test zone for 53 days, thus preventing the planned tests on Mururoa. Then the Vega also returned to the area. During this protest, members of the French military came on board the Vega and beat up McTaggart. The resulting footage caused a world-wide stir and together with the disruption caused by the Fri, forced the French government to react, so that they announced that they would no longer conduct atmospheric tests from 1975 on (Zelko, 2017: 327–328). Although this was a success, it did not mean that there would be no more testing, but rather that it would be done underground, which was still very problematic for the activists. This resulted in the claim to continue campaigning for a nuclear-free Pacific. The campaign lasted for many years and later included the banning of nuclear-powered ships from the ports of Aotearoa and ultimately led to Aotearoa being declared a nuclear-free state (Szollosi-Cira, 2020: 117–127).

The official founding of Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand took place in 1974. As a joint project of the Fri, Peace Media and supporters, the first official Greenpeace national office was established outside Canada. The "Pacific Peace Odyssey" of the Fri was the first major project of the newly founded organisation, a journey of 25.000 miles through the Pacific to spread the

peace message. This journey started in 1974 and ended in India in 1977. Among other places, they stopped at the Marshall Islands, which were heavily affected by US nuclear tests (Szabo, 1991: 36–39). According to a Greenpeace representative Aotearoa was always important to Greenpeace internationally because of its geographical position because it was “the last harbour before you go to Antarctica or to Mururoa to protest” (GP6).

What Greenpeace is associated with by many people is its campaign to save the whales, which has its roots in 1974 when the organisation in Canada began to take an increasing interest in the issue of whaling. The first protest action, in which activists got close to a Soviet whaling fleet on inflatable boats, creating dramatic images, took place in 1975 (Zelko, 2017: 328–331). Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand first came into contact with whales in 1978, when more than 250 whales died in Waiau Pa near Auckland because they stranded there. At that time there was no elaborated policy on how to deal with stranded whales and Greenpeace as well as other organisations was asked to comment regarding this on the Marine Protection Bill. The 1979 meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) in London was one of the first international political meetings where environmental organisations played an important role. Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand decided to send an activist to the meeting to raise awareness and to keep the New Zealanders informed. As a response to public pressure back in Aotearoa the government delegation changed their voting from traditionally pro-whaling to a whaling critical policy. The issue of whale protection is still a very central one today. However, prompted by the whale campaign, the organisation expanded its work to include a wide variety of multi-species protection, such as the Māui dolphins in Aotearoa (Szabo, 1991: 57–64).

Another campaign that Greenpeace, but not explicitly Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand has conducted since 1975, with fatal consequences for the indigenous peoples of the Arctic, was the "Save the Seals" campaign. This followed on from a political struggle by various environmental groups that had been going on since the 1950s to oppose the industrial slaughter of seal pups for fur production (Harter, 2004: 93–103). The campaign led to the apparent success that in 1983 the European Economic Community adopted a ban on seal pup skin, with the exception of fur produced by indigenous people for their livelihood. But the market for fur collapsed completely, so the direct consequence of the campaign was the loss of livelihood for the indigenous people. This is a very dark part of Greenpeace's history, since this very same campaign has contributed greatly to Greenpeace's growth. It is also known in the literature as an example for "environmental colonialism". The very distinction between indigenous and industrial hunting implies that the indigenous people are not allowed to make their living in an almost

industrial way. The disastrous consequences of this campaign were long concealed by Greenpeace. According to an paper by Rodgers and Ingram, Greenpeace is now systematically trying to come to terms with the consequences of their colonial approach and to improve relations with the indigenous peoples of the Arctic, especially in view of the expected consequences of the climate crisis for them: This, however, is a great challenge (Rodgers and Ingram, 2019: 18–29). In a statement from a campaigner of Greenpeace Canada in 2016, they emphasize that Greenpeace continues to reject Seal Slaughter. So, it seems to be a long way (Greenpeace Canada, 2016).

In 1979 the foundation of "Greenpeace International" took place. The many independent regional groups that had already been founded up to that point were now brought together under the umbrella of one organisation, which has its headquarter in Amsterdam. Until then, any group could use the name Greenpeace without adhering to standards, but this was to change with the foundation. Greenpeace International was founded by McTaggart and other activists, some of whom were already involved in the founding of the organisation in Vancouver (Eden, 2004: 596). McTaggart was Chairman of Greenpeace International until 1991. So, Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand had an influence on the founding and the management of Greenpeace International.

In the year 1985 the Greenpeace ship Rainbow Warrior came to Auckland harbour to go on a protest at Mururoa. What than happened in Auckland harbour and the consequences of it will be elucidated in the section 5.2.

In 1987, Greenpeace established a permanent base in the Antarctic and used Aotearoa to go there regularly. Thus, Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand was closely linked to the Antarctic campaign. This is also because the idea for an Antarctic campaign was presented by the representative of Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand at a meeting of Greenpeace International in 1980 and at that time met with little interest. Because of its geographical proximity and historical ties to the Antarctic, Greenpeace in Aotearoa has been intensively involved in protecting the Antarctic since the early 1980s (Szabo, 1991: 179–180).

Until 1990, when the existing scientific literature on the history of the organisation in Aotearoa ended, it went through an enormous growth, so that in that year there were 100.000 donors, which enabled the work of 59 staff members (Szabo, 1991: 106).

What has been considered a particularly noteworthy event since then, even by interviewees, is the campaign against offshore oil explorations. Which in the end led to an apparently great

political success. For Greenpeace, the campaign against deep sea oil exploration was particularly relevant in several respects. A part of it is that the cooperation with the local iwi "Te Whānau-ā-Apanui" was something very special. Greenpeace was able to support the struggle of the iwi, for whom it was a matter of very existential questions (Diprose et al., 2016: 164).

5.2 Effects of the Rainbow Warrior bombing

A secession in the history of Greenpeace as well as for the state of Aotearoa New Zealand was the bombing of the Greenpeace International ship "Rainbow Warrior" already mentioned previously. The ship arrived in the port of Auckland in July 1985 to lead a protest flotilla of many yachts to Mururoa, where the French government continued to carry out atomic bomb tests. In the port of Auckland there was an explosion on the ship, which caused the crew member Fernando Pereira to run into the ship to save his camera equipment. While he was on the boat there was a second explosion which led to his death and the ship sank with him. The French government was quick to announce publicly that it had no connection with the incident, but when the police in Aotearoa arrested two French agents shortly thereafter, the statement became unreliable. Within a very short time it became clear that it was an attack planned by France with the aim of preventing the "Rainbow Warrior" from making its way to Mururoa (Robie, 2016: 192-193).

This was particularly problematic for the government of Aotearoa, among other things because France was officially an ally that had now officially committed an assassination on the territory of Aotearoa. This developed into a global political tension. After the French agents were convicted and sentenced in Aotearoa, France tried to blackmail the government by boycotting products from Aotearoa and forcing it to hand over the agents (Wilson, 2010: 58–61). In the end, the perpetrators returned to France and Aotearoa received an official apology and a compensation payment of NZ\$13 million from France. In addition, Greenpeace received more than NZ\$8 million and the victim's relatives received a compensation payment from France as well. With this money Greenpeace was able to purchase the "Rainbow Warrior 2" to continue the mission (Greenpeace Aotearoa NZ, n.d.c).

The attack was perceived by Aotearoa as a terrorist act by an ally and is considered an important milestone in the practical independence of the state (Robie, 2006; Wilson, 2010). To be able to grasp the social relevance and the effects of this event on Greenpeace, the interviewees were asked about their views on the event.

Before the 2019 attack in Christchurch, the bombing of the Rainbow Warrior was considered the only terrorist act on Aotearoa soil and is therefore an important part of schoolbooks and history lessons (GP7; GP3; GP2). One of the consequences was that political pressure increased for Aotearoa to become nuclear-free, and far beyond the previous circles of support, conservative farmers, for example, tended to oppose the nuclear weapons tests (GP6). However, it also seems to be controversial, as one interviewee remarked that although it was a very problematic situation, it was perceived in Aotearoa more as a foreign ship that happened to be attacked in Aotearoa and not as an attack on the country (Scientist1).

According to most interviewees it indeed had a significant influence on the future of Greenpeace in Aotearoa as well as internationally. Contrary to the actual intention of France, instead of the Rainbow Warrior the Vega then set off again from Auckland in the direction of Mururoa and Greenpeace received more financial and, in the opinion of the interviewees, ideological support than ever before. From one day to the next, Greenpeace became part of the big world politics. In Aotearoa Greenpeace became according to one interviewee “mainstream” (GP2). According to several statements, the population in Aotearoa, especially because of this event, is much more Greenpeace-oriented than it is the case in other parts of the world. This perception is difficult to substantiate with quantitative data, but it seems to be very important for many Greenpeace actors (GP6; GP5; GP4; Forest & Bird). Some even go so far as to suggest that Greenpeace is because of the incident part of the "national psyche" of Aotearoa (GP5; Scientist2). This incident also fits perfectly into the image that Greenpeace has always tried to create of David against Goliath, the powerful state of France attacking the small, insignificant civil society organisation (GP4).

The incident has been seen as ensuring that Greenpeace has become an integral part of Aotearoa’s history, although the extent of social integration of the Organisation can certainly be discussed.

5.3 Nonviolent direct action for a green and peaceful future

To be able to classify the further execution reasonably, a representation of the mission and the values of Greenpeace is necessary. According to the mission statement of Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand it is:

“an independent campaigning organisation, which uses non-violent, creative confrontation to expose global environmental problems, and to force the solutions which are essential to a green and peaceful future. Greenpeace’s goal is to ensure the ability of the

earth to nurture life in all its diversity. Therefore Greenpeace seeks to:- protect biodiversity in all its forms, – prevent pollution and abuse of the earth’s ocean, land, air and fresh water, – end all nuclear threats, promote peace, global disarmament and non-violence” (Greenpeace Aotearoa NZ, n.d.b).

The core values, which are "Personal responsibility and nonviolence", "Independence", "Greenpeace has no permanent friends or foes" and "Promoting solutions" serve as the basis for their campaigns and actions. All activities are based on these values and have already been met by the first actions, such as the protest against the nuclear weapon tests on Amchitka. From the beginning, Greenpeace framed the problems it was dealing with as global environmental issues, and from the outset its international claim distinguished it from other organisations (Timmer, 2007: 269). Looking at the means Greenpeace uses to pursue its goals, it is clear that there is a wide range. All these measures aim to influence public opinion. The organisation has evolved from a pioneer of radical direct-action environmental activism to a professional, highly strategic organisation (Eden, 2004: 604). However, direct action remains central to the organisation's identity and political praxis. These actions usually have two objectives. On the one hand, in the concrete situation in which, for example, something is blocked, it is a political act of resistance to the problem at hand. But what is particularly decisive for Greenpeace’s reputation is public communication in relation to such an event. Spectacular images are placed in the public domain to trigger emotions and influence public opinion. It has a very professional communication strategy and tries to draw a good picture in public with very concrete guidelines. Therefore, actions are always filmed to bring them into the public domain (Timmer, 2007: 271–282).

A part of Greenpeace’s strategy is also to generate knowledge. For example, its ships are also on their way to conduct research. After all, research results are an important basis for credible political argumentation (Eden, 2004: 603). At the same time, the organisation also tries to demonstrate what is possible by means of self-developed innovations. For example, its development of the first refrigerator without chemicals that affect the ozone layer has now become standard (Timmer, 2007: 288).

5.4 Hierarchy as a recipe for success

Greenpeace has a complex organisational structure that can be divided globally into two levels. Greenpeace International and the National and Regional Offices (NRO). Greenpeace International officially grants permission to NROs to use the name "Greenpeace" subject to certain criteria. They must be based on the international framework. Among other things, the

framework defines the topics on which the NROs can campaign. Greenpeace International is also responsible for maintaining the fleet of three ships, distributing money among the NROs and for global organisational development. NROs can therefore act autonomously to a certain extent, but degrees of freedom are limited. This is one of the reasons why it is seen as hierarchical (Luxon and Wong, 2017: 490–491).

The NROs act independently within the framework. Some allocate funds on the basis of a fixed key in order to finance other financially less well-off NROs (Greenpeace International, o.d.b). They also finance the work of Greenpeace International. There is a total of 27 NROs operating in 55 countries. How the NROs operate in their respective regions depends very much on the remaining local regulations (Greenpeace International, o.d.a).

Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand has a voting assembly consisting of 50 people from a variety of backgrounds, such as Greenpeace supporters or former employees and staff members of other NROs. This group elects the board, which is elected for 3 years and is responsible to ensure that the organisation is managed efficiently and ethically and for appointing the Executive Director, who is currently the former Green Party MP Russel Norman (Greenpeace Aotearoa NZ, o.d.). As will be shown later, this structure is sometimes seen as critical because it allows little co-determination of the organisations base and is considered hierarchical. But it gives the organisation the ability to act quickly when needed (GP6). In contrast to other NRO, such as Germany there are no largely independent local groups in Aotearoa (Rucht, 1993: 287). To my knowledge, Greenpeace has approximately 60 employees in Aotearoa, about half of them are working in fundraising.

In order to guarantee Greenpeace's political independence, the organisation does not accept donations from companies or governmental institutions, only private individuals may donate to Greenpeace. According to the 2018 "Annual Impact Report" these have been 43.611 people in Aotearoa which donated a total of NZ\$9,5 million (Norman, 2019).

5.5 Campaign focusses of Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand

As described above, the international framework determines which topics an NRO can focus on and these can decide on the basis of this framework what their priorities are. The campaigns of Greenpeace in Aotearoa change from time to time and also the focus within a campaign. It had at the time of data collection three campaigns, to which the other issues the organisation deals with are subordinate. These campaigns are "Oceans", "Agriculture" and "Climate" (GP4).

The Oceans campaign includes plastic and overfishing, for example. The Agriculture campaign is concerned with the pollution of fresh water caused by agriculture and its impact on the climate. The Climate campaign has a focus on the oil industry and sustainable energy production (GP4).

According to interviewees of Greenpeace, these priorities were set because of the specific problems existing in Aotearoa. It has as an island state a close connection to the sea and therefore this is a locally very relevant issue (GP7). The agricultural campaign was chosen because agriculture, especially dairy farming, is an important industry in Aotearoa and the consequences of agriculture have serious effects on the local environment (GP3). The area of climate protection seems to be an integral part of environmental engagement nowadays but is particularly relevant in Aotearoa because large quantities of oil are produced there (GP7).

5.6 An inspiration for the offices around the world

To find out about the position the Aotearoa NRO has within Greenpeace International the interviewees who are affiliated with it have been asked what from their point of view the specifics of Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand are within the Greenpeace world and what it is known for.

Several participants agree that, in their opinion, there is hardly another NRO that is as socially recognized within their country as in Aotearoa. Which in their opinion also has to do with the history of the Rainbow Warrior (GP3; GP4; GP5; GP7).

They also consider it an advantage that Aotearoa is relatively small and globally supposedly insignificant. This enables Greenpeace to have more freedom there and to be relatively influential on the international level in relation to the size of the country (GP2; GP5).

Finally, the interviewees are of the opinion that the NRO is in many respects an inspiration for many other NROs, because they have repeatedly been relatively successful and in some cases have tried out forms of action that have been copied in other parts of the world (GP2; GP5; GP7).

To what extent these assessments are true is difficult to verify, but it does give an insight into how Greenpeace in Aotearoa sees itself in relation to other NROs and Greenpeace International.

6. Analysis: The role of Greenpeace within the environmental movement

In this chapter, the interviews with the representatives of Greenpeace and with the other organisations of the movement, in total 15 are analysed to find out how Greenpeace assesses its own role in the environmental movement and how other actors in this movement perceive it. In the end, both perspectives will be compared to get a better understanding of this role. Both sections follow a similar structure: an abstract assessment of the role of Greenpeace, a closer look at this role in a specific context of direct relations and cooperation between them and other actors, and critiques of the organisation. As the research process has shown that being a supporter seems to be an important part of Greenpeace's identity, special attention is put on to which extent Greenpeace is an active supporter of other groups and organisations.

Because the position of Greenpeace within the environmental movement also depends on their critiques, they are a necessary part of this research. However, for ethical reasons this will not be discussed in detail as it can be assumed that it may become a hazard to the involved groups and organisations. Nonetheless, an abstract overview of the statements will be given.

6.1 Greenpeace's self-assessment

This chapter displays the self-assessment of representatives of Greenpeace of its role within the environmental movement of Aotearoa. As representatives of Greenpeace all of these interviewees are considered to be insiders of this organisation. Additionally, the employee of WWF is considered to be an insider as well due to their significant voluntary engagement with Greenpeace.

6.1.1 Greenpeace's perspective on its role in the movement

During the analysis of the interviews it appeared that four themes were mentioned most. These themes are summarized as seeing Greenpeace as “a network builder”, “leading the movement”, being “one of the biggest players” and characterized by “direct action and radicalism”.

Building networks

Most of the representatives placed Greenpeace's activities in the context of building networks. One perspective is that Greenpeace “acts as a network builder” (WWF). That means that they actively bring people and groups together to work on a specific topic. This happens in different ways. One side of it is that Greenpeace initiates coalitions, like around the country's offshore oil issue (WWF). In the past, Greenpeace supported local groups working on oil issues around

the country. These are the “Oil Free” groups mentioned in chapter 4 which emerged from 2011 onwards. Greenpeace provided a space which enabled engagement on oil issues and let them work until they got independent. So, Greenpeace was involved in making the network grow, even if the separation may not have been intended in the first place (GP1). Interestingly, this description does not agree with the literature, which states that only one of the groups had an explicit Greenpeace reference. Nor did the interviewee of an Oil Free group connect their group to having been founded in the context of a Greenpeace local group. It is possible that there was a wrong assessment at Greenpeace which cannot be clarified at this point. However, this statement suits to the group Oil Free Auckland. Moreover, there is dissent between the interviewees on whether being an ally and working together in a coalition happens with a tangible plan or that is just “how it happens” (GP4).

Some interviewees identified Greenpeace not only as a network builder but as being in the centre of networks. This includes for example communicating with all actors and keeping the network together (WWF; GP1) and puts Greenpeace in a position of power. It is important to keep in mind that being in this position also gives them the opportunity to destroy networks, which mostly happens because an organisation is not aware of its role and the associated power. When the organisation decides to no longer work on a certain issue or to reduce its efforts everything that was based on Greenpeace’s work within the network is missing and makes it a lot harder for all the remaining actors to still work on the issue (GP3).

All in all, the representatives agree that Greenpeace is having a big influence on the environmental network. But it is noticeable that this influence is viewed differently. It does have positive aspects, but it can also be dangerous; that is if Greenpeace is not careful, they may jeopardise the cohesion of the network.

Leading the movement

As it was mentioned in section 3.4 it is controversial in how far one actor can lead a movement and if the term leading does actually fit in this context. Different passages of participants are dealing with the question of whether Greenpeace has a leading role within the movement, regardless of them using the term “leading”.

According to the interviewees, Greenpeace is sometimes leading the discourse within the movement by highlighting an issue which was not problematized by the movement before. With a combination of picking up new topics and being able to provide expertise they see themselves as pushing other parts of the movement to work on this topic. An example for this is publishing

footage of a problematic situation, like the arrival of an oil rig (GP 4). One representative summarized it as, “In a way we influence and lead the movement on what to focus on” (GP 5).

It was highlighted multiple times, that Greenpeace is powerful and influential. One interviewee argued, “Greenpeace is powerful. They have lots of connections. They have lots of money. They have lots of knowledge. They're almost always going to be in a position of power” (GP3). But being powerful is not exclusively perceived as something positive by the participants. In particular if the organisation is not mindful about its position it already happened according to the interviewees, that it outdid other members of the movement. For example, by not giving enough space to other points of view (GP3; GP4).

This shows that the representatives of Greenpeace see their organisation in a role of power which leads the movement in some ways. But the statements are very much focussed on influence rather than seeing this organisation as the leader of the whole movement.

One of the biggest players

Another category that came up in the interviews is the size of Greenpeace. This is not only a standalone theme, because it influences the other ones that have been and will be mentioned. When the topic of Greenpeace’s role was discussed it came up multiple times because it seems to have such a formative impact.

Whether it is the empirical truth or not, many people did name Greenpeace as “probably one of the” (GP3) or “the biggest” (GP1) environmental organisations in the country. This is explained by having “more staff, mor resources, more history” than any other organisation within the environmental movement of Aotearoa (WWF). The size of it is discussed as a unique selling point.

This reputation is not only seen as an advantage as other groups may make a claim on Greenpeace to act in a certain way and expect to support everything because it seems like they have infinite means. But Greenpeace cannot do justice to all this (GP5).

In general, it can be assumed that the reputation of being one of the biggest environmental organisations is important for the self-image of the representatives of Greenpeace.

Direct action and radicalism

What strongly shapes Greenpeace’s image within the movement from the perspective of its representatives is its affinity for more radical approaches and direct action. One interviewee

says that “traditionally, we have been making that [claim], which is considered radical, but within five or 10 years becomes mainstream” (GP4). For the interviewees, the more radical approach seems to be related to the practice of direct action, as they connect it with each other (WWF; GP4). Another interviewee stressed that “Greenpeace is willing to do nonviolent direct action in an iconic way [...] apart from small groups like 350 Aotearoa no one can do in a scale and the braver Greenpeace can do” (WWF). Yet another person said that Greenpeace is “meant to be a direct-action lead” (GP5).

Further aspects shaping Greenpeace’s role

A few other aspects which are relevant for Greenpeace’s role within the movement but have not been discussed extensively during the interviews are analysed in this part.

First, Greenpeace is working on a national and an international level simultaneously. Being international means they are working on issues with an international dimension and that they are one of the only organisations which have an international structure and can work together with branches around the world (GP1).

Second, it has a special role within the environmental movement because it is not only working on environmental issues but also having a focus on social justice (WWF; GP1). This may be linked to the view that Greenpeace sees itself as a “powerful ally to indigenous people” in Aotearoa (WWF).

Third, GP5 sees Greenpeace in comparison to others as a constant in the environmental field. “I think we are one of the more constant climate groups [...] over the last 15 years. We’ve had a constant engagement on climate issues”.

6.1.2 Greenpeace’s view on its relationships to other actors of the movement

This section summarizes the view of Greenpeace’s representatives on its relationships with other actors of the environmental movement.

Reasons to work together with others

According to the interviewees, there are two main reasons for collaborations. First of all, the “relationships with grassroots groups or anyone outside the organisation are really important and we’re not going to be able to change the world or stop climate change without people bringing people along” (GP3). This means that Greenpeace cannot win these struggles alone and that it can only fight some of the issues and is glad that there are other groups that are fighting other

conflicts (GP7). This shows that there is a consensus about the value and necessity of the existence of diverse environmental groups for achieving Greenpeace's goals (GP2; GP3; GP7).

The second reason to collaborate with others is that Greenpeace sees itself in a privileged situation where they have enough resources to do a wide range of activities. This brings moral responsibilities which they respond to in sharing some of them with other actors. This reasoning seems to be the basis for what will be discussed in section 6.1.3 (GP7).

Basically, whether and how intensively Greenpeace cooperates with others depends very much on the issue at hand. This changes from time to time. It also depends on whether there is a common ground on which to work together (GP3).

Examples of working together

The main type of collaboration with others is a nonformalized irregular interaction which comes up when there is a specific reason to interact. This is because close cooperation requires a lot of resources (GP5). The most common interaction are phone calls on a specific topic when the need arises (GP5). Such an interaction can also just be about whether it is okay for another actor if Greenpeace brings its own banners to a protest event or not. If something like this is not discussed it can lead to tension between the actors (GP3). The interactions with local groups, like Oil Free Otago is often just about offering support. Even though these connections are rated as good by the interviewees there is no communication on a regular basis (GP3; GP7).

There are also some cases in which Greenpeace did work closely with others but this was limited to a certain timeframe (GP4; GP5; GP7). The term coalition seems to be interpreted differently but participants argued that there have been some more formalized coalitions in which Greenpeace was involved such as joint campaigns in context of elections (GP5).

A common, more concrete way of working together is to publish joint statements or press releases which during elections or, e.g. for the plastics campaign where interestingly even the supermarkets sided with Greenpeace (GP4; GP7).

In the context of political lobbying, Greenpeace cooperates with other organisations such as Forest & Bird to discuss a joint tactic or a bill. Additionally, they have joint meetings with politicians (GP5).

Close partnerships

Greenpeace's relationships with other actors of the movement have a variety of characteristics. There are continuous close collaborations as well as one-time cooperation or some that are revived when it is adequate (GP3). One participant said that in terms of close partnerships they tend to work with "small grassroots groups that have a very similar mission and campaign focus" (GP7).

The close partnerships between the organisations or groups are often accompanied by personal relationships between the acting people. According to GP1, they in general have personal relationships to "a lot of the people who have been involved in direct action" in Aotearoa. And if there are not only personal relationships but also personnel overlap between groups, a relationship is seen to be much stronger (GP7).

When it comes to examples for close relationships the interviewees were hesitant. Nonetheless, some named Oil Free Otago as well as Climate Justice Taranaki (GP5; GP7). Moreover, 350 Aotearoa is defined as a close partner for Greenpeace (GP7). Overall, it seemed as if the interviewees tried not to highlight a specific organisation.

General challenges

Maintaining relationships can be resource-intensive because it is necessary to reduce the danger of challenges and tension that may come up between different players (GP5). An interviewee made clear that from her point of view, their relationships today are in general "pretty good" and that there is no noticeable "tension" between partners (GP5). But what can cause problems is for example that "different groups have different expectations, different ways of working, different resources available [and] different ways of making decisions" (GP1). This summarizes the main reasons for challenges between actors. An appealing example is if a coalition of different groups wants to publish a joint press release, a high number of people from different backgrounds must give their input and must be represented in the release. If everybody shall be satisfied the paper may from the perspective of Greenpeace "lose any teeth" (GP4). However, this perception could also reflect the privileged position of Greenpeace, since it might be much easier for them to be represented, while marginalized groups, for example, would then receive less attention in the context of such a paper.

Different resources

An omnipresent difference between Greenpeace and other groups seems to be the availability of resources. Different interviewees named the fact that Greenpeace is one of the best-resourced environmental organisations in Aotearoa as a reason for challenges in relationships (GP5; GP7).

The fact that Greenpeace has got paid staff is something only a few environmental organisations like 350 Aotearoa; Forest & Bird and WWF have in common with them. Their staff can work much quicker than voluntary people ever could (GP1). That makes it a lot harder to work together because Greenpeace is able to publish a press release and give an interview in one hour if an issue is urgent while a volunteer may not. In a collaboration with a voluntary group this could cause a lot tension. If Greenpeace wants to publish something quickly and ignores the central democratic structures of a partner, it is highly problematic, or on the other hand, if it respects them and waits for a consensus to be reached, Greenpeace must adapt its working methods to the partner (GP1). One interviewee also pointed out that there are two other problems appearing when the movement believes they have a lot of staff members to work on the issues. According to the interviewee, it sometimes is assumed that all Greenpeace employees would work directly on the campaigns and thus have much more capacity at their disposal, while, in fact, the majority of employees are primarily responsible for enabling the framework conditions, such as fundraising or administrative activities. Only one part of the staff is really working on the mission the other ones are working for them to be able to do that (GP5). Furthermore, from the point of view of Greenpeace, other actors find it difficult to imagine why it, with its many resources and employees, is not able to work on even more environmental problems. From the point of view of Greenpeace, this can also lead to problems, i.e. if others have expectations of Greenpeace that the organisation cannot meet (GP5).

Hierarchies

From Greenpeace point of view, having different resources is causing hierarchies between them and other actors (GP3; GP1). An interviewee summarized this in the following way: “Greenpeace is relatively [...] big and powerful and it's easy to have a lot of influence or it's easy to push around smaller groups if we're not careful” (GP1). This shows that Greenpeace sees itself in a position of power in specific relationship as well as in the movement as a whole and the society (GP3). This power imbalance and the hierarchies can be challenging for a relationship, especially within a progressive social movement (GP3). This assessment agrees with the theory of section 3.4. According to interviewees these hierarchies can be broken down by having

personal relationships (GP1) and by sharing power and resources with other groups instead of only focussing on own campaign goals. That may have a better long-term impact (GP3).

Action consensus

In the context of a protest action there may be a variety of views of what kind of action is appropriate. This makes it important to have a shared action consensus on which all participating groups must agree (GP3; GP5). An example of problems related to this will be discussed later in this section. The main reason for tension related to this is that different groups have a different theory of change and a different understanding of the term “non-violence” (GP3). For Greenpeace it is necessary that everybody agrees on an appearance that suits the values and strategy of Greenpeace. The organisation wants to produce a certain story for the media and the police is engaging in a certain way if they can trust on not being attacked for example (GP5). Therefore, Greenpeace is strict on their principles and definition of non-violence and only want to engage publicly with groups that have the same view (GP5).

When the interviewees were confronted with the question of a concrete example of a challenging relationship to other movement actors, they all came up with the same example. For ethical reasons and to not cause any trouble for the researched groups, it was decided not to go into detail about this event but explain the general struggle.

From Greenpeace’s point of view there was a struggle about the action consensus on a particular event and the question of what non-violence means. All participating groups agreed on non-violence but at the event it appeared that Greenpeace has a much stricter definition than other groups. These groups for example, found shouting and pushing the police as acceptable which are red lines for Greenpeace. This was seen as problematic because the representation in the media was focused on what Greenpeace identifies as violence. The framings of the statements related to this event are different but what all agreed on is that Greenpeace has learned from this and that it is necessary to communicate more before a joint protest and to have consensus on how the action and especially non-violent direct action should look like (GP1; GP3; GP5; GP7).

Need for awareness

To address the challenges and hierarchies that come up in interactions with other actors, the representatives identified that Greenpeace has to be aware of its position and the potential effects associated with it (GP1; GP3; GP5). If they strengthen the work of other groups, the whole

movement will be stronger. This may happen by sharing resources and reducing hierarchies (GP1). Nonetheless, a participant said that even if Greenpeace is cautious about its position and the needs of other groups, they may always get criticised for its action. However, there is less critique and tension if there was a conversation about it before (GP3). Another person highlighted the difficulty to understand how much more challenging the work for small groups is compared to Greenpeace. But because most relevant staff from Greenpeace originally come from smaller groups and know their struggles, they can usually empathize with it and see themselves as aware about that (GP5).

It is not only about being aware of the needs of other groups but it is also about being aware if it actually makes sense to collaborate or if their values are so far from their own that it is not worth trying (GP3).

6.1.3 Supporting others from the background

During the interviews it appeared that many interviewees framed relationships with other organisations as if Greenpeace mainly supports the others with expertise, resources and space and does not expect anything in return. Because this was mentioned from the majority of the participants it seems like it is important for Greenpeace's self-image on relationships and its role within the movement. Therefore, this specific aspect will be further discussed in this chapter.

First, this section will have a look at what the interviewees mean by supporting other groups. They pointed out different forms of support. One part of it is to provide capacity building like for example nonviolent direct-action or strategy training (GP5). Another one is to provide a venue such as the warehouse of Greenpeace. At times, they draft a press release for others, teach them how to act during an interview or give general advice when needed (GP7).

Interesting about this is that Greenpeace representatives pointed out that this happens without any compensation. They see themselves as stepping back and leaving the stage to the others. For example, there were some protest events where Greenpeace was involved in organising and supporting but did not appear with its brand during the protest. (GP6). But that does not happen with a plan they just provide what is possible and needed if someone asks for help (GP4). It should be noted that this is based on experience so far, which as a whole accounts for only a relatively small proportion of Greenpeace's total available resources. Not only to environmental groups but groups with a similar mission in general, e.g. previous groups that received support were animal rights organisations as well as the organisers of a teacher strike (GP1; GP7). They

may support “anything that [they] perceive to be for the public good” (GP7). That is also what the platform TOKO is made for. It is provided by Greenpeace, but anybody can use it to start a petition and Greenpeace supports them no matter if it is an environmental issue or something else (GP3; GP7), as long as it complies with the standards of the platform and, in the broadest sense, aims for a “more fair, just and sustainable world” (Greenpeace Aotearoa NZ, n.d.a)

When interviewees were talking about examples of supporting other groups within the environmental movement they mainly mentioned SS4C; XR and Oil Free groups (GP3; GP5; GP7). It is not clear in how far there are other examples, but what these groups have in common is that they are relatively new and informally organised grassroots organisations which tend to have a lack of resources.

Most participants seemed to agree on the reasons why Greenpeace is supporting other groups: it “can’t win these fights on [its] own” (GP7). They think that they are “not going to be able to change the world or stop climate change without people bringing people along” (GP3). Therefore, it makes sense that they believe it is necessary to enable engagement whether it is for Greenpeace or other groups. For example, Greenpeace is in Aotearoa not working intensively on anti-coal but there are other groups doing this and as this is in the interest of Greenpeace’s greater goal it can be helpful that Greenpeace supports them in their own fight (GP7). One interviewee summarized this with the following statement: “It makes us all stronger. We can all talk to different audiences [...] The stronger all of the groups are, the stronger the movement is. So, we all benefit by bringing each other up” (GP1).

That makes it open to debate whether their support is actually given without the wish for any benefits in return as interviewees have argued. It appeared that there are different views on this. Someone said on the one hand, “not everyone is supportive of when we give a group support without knowing what we’re going to get back from it” (GP3), but on the other hand, an interviewee said that “there’s definitely lots of [folks] on our team that will work to support other organisations and their work even if it doesn’t necessarily benefit Greenpeace campaigns” (GP1). Another interviewee doubts that there is a strategic plan in supporting others. “I think that it might be how it happens” (GP4).

All in all, Greenpeace hopes to benefit from supporting others, albeit not directly. This does not lie in a direct return, but above all in the fact that others are also working towards the same mission as Greenpeace and others have some capabilities that Greenpeace itself does not have and thus can support them. In general, it seems to be a matter of consensus that Greenpeace

should support others because they have the knowledge, experiences and resources to do so from which large parts of the movement can benefit (GP3).

6.1.4 Internal critique of Greenpeace

This section summarises the representatives' critiques of Greenpeace. The first aspect which was criticised was the way in which Greenpeace fundraises and that it sometimes focuses too much on the fundraising success instead the mission of the organisation. This is perceived as a dilemma since its strength depends on fundraising success (GP3; GP6). This criticism is also based on a public discourse in which Greenpeace was criticized for its fundraising practices (Hunt, 2013).

At the same time, however, there is criticism that it too often focuses only on campaign output instead of considering the needs of other actors and generally does not regard relationships with others as valuable per se (GP3). It was also explained that Greenpeace is not always aware of the negative implications it may have for other groups. If they change their priorities at that it not always is mindful about its position and power (GP3). What is also highlighted as problematic is that it sees itself as a great mobiliser, although other organisations have proven to be more successful (GP1; GP2).

Also, the way how Greenpeace communicates publicly is criticized because the focus of most issues is domestically although they are international topics like climate (GP2). The other critique about storytelling of Greenpeace is that the stories can be "boring", so not exciting or motivating and they too often do not tell proactive stories but react on the media discourse (GP2; GP4).

Additionally, they identified a lack of diversity within the staff and that they see themselves as being an "elitist" organisation (GP3; GP4; GP7).

One criticism that does not concern the Aotearoa context, but rather Greenpeace International, is that Greenpeace does not admit to major past mistakes and tends to keep quiet rather than openly address them. As an example of this, protests were mentioned that had very negative consequences for indigenous people (GP5).

6.2 The movement's assessment

This chapter will reflect the views of other actors in the environmental movement on the role of Greenpeace. For this chapter, the interviews with the representatives of other environmental organisations, including SS4C; Forest & Bird; 350 Aotearoa; Generation Zero; XR; Oil Free and ECO were analysed. The interviews with the scientists were not used for this purpose, as they served rather to gain background information.

6.2.1 The movement's assessment of Greenpeace's role within it

At first all the quotations that deal with the role of Greenpeace on an abstract level will be discussed. In general, this part is a lot shorter than in section 6.1 because not as many statements were made. The participants have identified Greenpeace as a major player, an ally to other groups, a mobiliser, who takes direct action and had to change its role.

Major player

Interviewees argued that Greenpeace is a “major player” who holds a key role in the movement (XR; 350 Aotearoa). Strikingly, these statements were made without a more detailed explanation, but the participants agreed on Greenpeace having an important role. This general view may be reflected in the following categories.

Ally to other groups

A role that came up multiple times can be summarized as being an “ally” to other environmental groups (Generation Zero).

In the context of the SS4C, different groups identified Greenpeace providing support through resources and space for the school strikers (Generation Zero; Oil Free). Not only in this case but in general, interviewees describe Greenpeace as being supportive by providing resources and helping to “make things bigger” (350 Aotearoa; XR). Another participant called it a “facilitative role” (Oil Free). This view is supported by the statement that Greenpeace hosts “networking opportunities” especially by organising meetings on a regular basis (Oil Free). Because the topic of support came up often this will be further discussed in chapter 6.2.3.

Mobiliser

Another aspect which came up multiple times is their ability of mobilising people. The representative of 350 Aotearoa summarizes this in the following way: “In terms of mobilisation I

think that Greenpeace is good at getting a core group of really well-trained activists to go and be part of civil disobedience but are [less] good at getting crowds of people that they might not know [...] to come and be part of something new” . So, it is part of Greenpeace’s role to mobilise people for a protest event, but from this point of view it is not so easy for Greenpeace to activate new people.

Direct action

In general, Greenpeace’s style of protest was named multiple times as being important for its role within the movement. “Greenpeace has been [...] the master of doing things which are spectacular, unusual and media engaging” (ECO). They are “doing something that no one else is able to do. Some of it is time and resource, but some of that is their history of nonviolent direct action and continuing to deploy that” (350 Aotearoa). These two statements summarize well that from their point of view the kind of protest Greenpeace is doing is what they are known for within the movement. The representative of Forest & Bird describes the interplay as “Greenpeace breaks down the door and Forest & Bird occupies the room”. That shows Forest & Bird sees the advantages of working together at the same topic so that everybody can make use of its specific role and Greenpeace is the one who creates attention with action.

Change of the role

Two participants argued that with the explained recent developments within the environmental movement, the role of Greenpeace has changed (Generation Zero; XR). The different upcoming climate initiatives seem to oust Greenpeace from its role that “spearheaded” the movement in the past (Generation Zero). But the interpretation of this development differs between the participants. The Generation Zero representative sees it as a “challenge” for the organisation, while the participant of XR is highlighting the positive aspects which is from their point of view that the change “helps provide a space for Greenpeace to be more radical too” (XR). According to this assessment, the scope for Greenpeace would thus be expanded since it would no longer be perceived publicly as a particularly radical pioneer. But it could also be the other way round, that Greenpeace, because there are apparently more radical organisations, could present itself as even more trustworthy and established while maintaining its practice.

Further aspects shaping Greenpeace’s role

From the perspective of Forest & Bird; Greenpeace is more uncompromising than others. When the environmental NGOs for example have a meeting with politicians each organisation has its

own role. “WWF will be good cop and Greenpeace will be bad cop and Forest & Bird will be somewhere in the middle” (Forest & Bird).

Another thing that shapes Greenpeace’s role is its international network. It is seen as something special that “they've got, and they can [act] with the groups globally” (ECO).

6.2.2 The movement’s assessment of relationships with Greenpeace

Among the representatives of other actors of the environmental movement many talked about what the interactions with Greenpeace look like in practice. Four of them do have one specific contact person within Greenpeace. The representative of ECO pointed out that the level of the relationship with Greenpeace as an organisation depends on the individual counterpart. Communication between Greenpeace and the interviewed groups works in different ways. For some it consists of staying in contact via messenger from time to time (Generation Zero), while for others it is having a phone call almost every week because there is always something to talk about (350 Aotearoa). What all have in common is that there is no fixed regularity. They just get in touch if there is something to communicate on (SS4C; Generation Zero; 350 Aotearoa). One participant pointed out that Greenpeace hosted regular Skype calls for all the groups who were working against deep sea oil drilling. This is where they regularly got in contact with Greenpeace but not in a one on one situation. Overall, it was considered more of an opportunity to network with the movement (Oil Free).

The representative of Forest & Bird summarized different ways of interaction between them and Greenpeace. This perspective differs from the previous ones which may be influenced by the fact that Forest & Bird is a large NGO in contrast to the more grassroots organisations previously named or simply because they collaborate more. It appeared that there are a number of gatherings in which NGOs get together formally or semi-formally (Forest & Bird). In the context of political lobbying in particular the two organisations work together on a more formalized basis. This can be for example, having a “regular catch-up” with a party and an included discussion among the NGOs before the meeting. The interviewee also pointed out that there are some instances in which Greenpeace and Forest & Bird are doing “joint campaigns” but did not go into further detail. There is also a formal meeting between the “leaders of NGOs” where both organisations take part. But in general, they also have informal conversations in “any areas where [their] work overlaps (Forest & Bird).

For Generation Zero communication with Greenpeace mainly happens if there is anything to discuss regarding to lobbying and contact to politicians. But the interviewee also describes the relationship as being a “critical friend”. They for example let Greenpeace know when they feel “that the other is too [coy] in [the] lobbying relationship with government” (Generation Zero). This presentation suggests that Generation Zero would communicate criticism openly with Greenpeace, but the presentation makes it seem as if this would only work in one direction.

Quality of the relationship

It appeared that three interviewees were looking at the organisation’s relationship with Greenpeace in the context of interpersonal relationships between them and people working with Greenpeace (Forest & Bird; XR; 350 Aotearoa). For example, the representative of XR pointed out that some of the Greenpeace staff are their friends and that some of them are activists of XR as well. Another person pointed out that having interpersonal relationships is helping to have less tension between Greenpeace and 350 Aotearoa (350 Aotearoa).

The interpersonal relationships are also one of the reasons why the representative of 350 Aotearoa rates the organisational relationship to Greenpeace as “very good”. They say that “they’re definitely the group we’d be closest to”. That may also be influenced by the fact that they are “geographically close” to each other (350 Aotearoa). ECO is also rating the relationship as “very good” but it also can vary depending on the people within Greenpeace and how committed they are to this relationship.

In comparison to the School Strikes representative who says that they are “super satisfied” by their relationship with Greenpeace, Generation Zero is “not entirely” satisfied. According to the interviewee, this is mainly caused by differing values. The interviewee of the Oil Free group pointed out that they had both positive and negative experiences with Greenpeace over the years.

So, in general, there is a relatively high level of satisfaction with the relationship with Greenpeace, which seems to be strongly influenced by the personal relationships between them. However, this does not apply to all actors, because there are also some problems in the interaction.

Challenges

When it comes to challenges in the relationship with Greenpeace, the interviewees named multiple reasons for causing them. For example, changes in the internal priorities of Greenpeace may affect others unintended. Always when something changes in a field where someone else

is also working and Greenpeace is seen as a key role changes affect the position of the other actor. The representatives of ECO and Forest & Bird explained how this can cause challenges between them and Greenpeace. From the perspective of ECO;

“Greenpeace can be involved in a campaign for a number of years and then decide that that's not their priority, and they'll go and they'll do something else. You've sort of geared up and you've done a lot of lobbying and policy work and [...] Greenpeace is off somewhere else, and that can really be frustrating in terms of making progress on issues” (ECO).

In contrast to that, the representative of Forest & Bird explained that it can be problematic when an organisation starts working in a field where someone else is already working in. The person explained it in the way that “whenever you got more than one organisation operating in the same kind of space, there's a chance to turn over each other. [...] When one organisation feels it has done the work and think the other organisation is kind of like claiming credit for it” (Forest & Bird). An example for this was given where Greenpeace did a fundraising for its own funding campaign based on a court case in which Forest & Bird was involved and that caused tension between them (Forest & Bird)

Another problem could arise when one organisation is publicly criticising the other. For example, this happened when the chief executive of Forest & Bird tweeted his critique on a protest action that Greenpeace did at the parliament which caused conflict between the organisations (Forest & Bird).

Another reason for challenges in the relationship is different ways of communication. From the perspective of the Oil Free group the “communication process [of Greenpeace] can be lot quicker than” theirs. Their group is “consensus-driven” therefore it takes time to come to a decision and to reply. That can make collaborations problematic as the following example will show.

Example of a problematic event

Just like in the section on Greenpeace’s view on a remarkable challenging event, the following narration will be abstracted for ethical reasons. Interestingly, the event that was brought up here was the same example that the Greenpeace staff used: a protest in which the understanding of non-violence differed among the participants.

The view of the Oil Free group is that they thought until the night before the event during which a nonviolent direct action training happened, that they had an action consensus among all the

groups within the coalition organising the protest but during the training it appeared that Greenpeace had a different understanding of it. “Some people at Greenpeace had a strong idea about the way that the event should look” (Oil Free). And there was no space or time to find a consensus on this. The understanding of the Oil Free group and some other groups was to make it “harder and longer for the police” to enable the implementation of the event they were protesting. They wanted to be a bit more active in the frame of what they see as nonviolent. The interviewee summarized it in the following way:

“That was quite hurtful in a lot of ways and I think people probably worked through a lot of that stuff now, but it was just different underpinning beliefs about how a blockade should be organised, and how people should comport themselves I suppose there was two different philosophical strains running through that” (Oil Free).

6.2.3 Getting supported or supporting Greenpeace?

Many interviewees talked about a context in which they or another group received support from Greenpeace. Therefore, these perspectives shall be shown in this section. Between all the people who referenced to this there seems to be a consensus that Greenpeace is frequently the supporter, particularly of smaller groups of the environmental movement. They all did experience this themselves. And a few of them especially highlighted that Greenpeace did support the SS4C (XR; Oil Free; 350 Aotearoa; Generation Zero; SS4C).

The interviewees identified different ways of receiving support. What came up multiple times was offering the warehouse of Greenpeace for painting banners and preparing for a protest. This, however, is only possible for groups in Auckland (SS4C; XR). Another way how these groups see themselves supported is by Greenpeace’s expertise. That may be checking a media release or getting an assessment on a bill (SS4C). In the context of a protest event, it also can be that Greenpeace promotes an event or that they support it by having staff members as wardens at the protest (350 Aotearoa; XR). A different example was a camp for the School Strikes that was initiated and facilitated by Greenpeace in various countries across the globe. The representative of the School Strikes said that Greenpeace’s offered to support them with “anything [they] need” (SS4C). The 350 Aotearoa interviewee summarized their view on Greenpeace’s support for others as “they’re good at finding opportunities to support the movement by developing activists”.

What is recognizable about this is that the interviewees say that Greenpeace’s actions are rather invisible or in the background, and that not even the financial supporters but only the movement

knows about these kinds of interactions (350 Aotearoa; SS4C). It is interesting that they do not take advantage of this to improve their reputation. That was meant with the following quote: “They're really good at being supportive behind the scenes” (350 Aotearoa)

A different perspective is that there is a mutuality in the relationships between Greenpeace and other actors. That means that Greenpeace gives as well as receives support from others (Forest & Bird; Generation Zero; 350 Aotearoa). So, the organisations who have this view see themselves as also giving support to Greenpeace, e.g. by running workshops or sharing their content on social media (350 Aotearoa). The representative of Forest & Bird pointed out that if there is a campaign in which a number of organisations are involved, they can maximize the strengths of each of them by working together and having a combined strategy. Therefore, they support each other.

6.2.4 Critique about Greenpeace

What was remarkable in the research was that hardly anyone was talking about critique until the interviewer explicitly asked for it and that some people had to think about it for a while before they gave an answer. Nonetheless, a range of different critiques came up. One part of it is that Greenpeace has a hierarchical structure which is generally seen as problematic and assessed as undemocratic by parts of the movement especially if they have grassroots democracy and consensus at the heart of their work (Generation Zero; XR).

This goes hand in hand with the perception that Greenpeace is not inclusive, and that people therefore find it difficult to join the movement while Greenpeace is in the focus. One person summarized that they have a lack of an intersectional justice lens⁹ (350 Aotearoa).

The relationship of Greenpeace with parties, especially the Green Party was assessed as problematic because Greenpeace communicates that it is independent from government but a part of the movement does not think that it is entirely true because of interconnections between them (Generation Zero).

Another critique is that Greenpeace is only interested in producing images for the media instead of being disruptive which is therefore identified as a problem by groups who believe it is necessary to disrupt the system (XR). This goes hand in hand with the perception that Greenpeace is often reluctant to make donors angry (XR). An aspect that already came up in the previous

⁹ “Intersectionality related to the way in which different types of discrimination (= unfair treatment because of a person's sex, race, etc.) are linked to and affect each other” (Cambridge University Press (n.d.)).

sections is that other parts of the movements are sometimes dissatisfied with the way that Greenpeace sets and changes its priorities because it can have a negative affect on them (ECO; Forest & Bird).

Finally, claiming credit for something that others have achieved was stressed once more (XR; Forest & Bird).

6.3 Comparing both perspectives

In this part, the two perspectives which were presented in the first two sections will be compared. While much of the information presented so far is relevant to understand the context in a holistic way, it is not necessary to discuss further because it does not lead to the answer of the research question: “Which role does Greenpeace play within the environmental movement of Aotearoa New Zealand?” Thus, rather than going into every detail, the focus will be on those aspects that seem particularly relevant in this context. In order to make this as clear as possible, the structure follows the same pattern as the previous sections.

6.3.1 Comparing the abstract view on the role

When comparing the two abstract assessments of the role of Greenpeace in general, it is noticeable that the opinions of the interviewees of Greenpeace are much more differentiated and comprehensive than those of the other organisations. This may be related to the fact that employees of an organisation are generally better informed about the work of the organisation and how it is perceived by the public, and may therefore, for example, have more knowledge about what might be considered problematic than outsiders. The scope of section 6.2.1 is smaller because less information was available from the interviews. It may be possible that the questions during the interviews did not stimulate as many statements related to this. But it could also indicate that they generally do not think about the position of Greenpeace that much and therefore do not have a fine-tuned assessment or do not want to talk about it. Nevertheless, it is possible to compare the views.

First, it is noticeable that although the other organisations believe that Greenpeace plays a central role in the movement, there is no explicit mention of it having a leadership function. This aspect, however, is much discussed among Greenpeace interviewees especially within the context of leading the discourse. Even if this is implicit in some of the statements, there was no explicit statement that identifies Greenpeace as the central general leader. So there seems to be

a dissent between the two positions in the matter of leading the movement in somehow. However, they both agree that Greenpeace as one of the biggest environmental organisations in Aotearoa, has a generally important and influential position.

Another aspect where the framing of both groups differs is what Greenpeace participants called “building networks”. While they were arguing that Greenpeace is making an effort to bring groups together and create networks, it was on the other side not perceived as building networks. The statements that came closest were those relating to being an ally to other groups within the movement. However, this aspect was not presented as part of a network but rather as a one-to-one relationship between Greenpeace and the other actor. Although it has been said that Greenpeace plays a “facilitative role” and that it hosts “networking opportunities”. The function of Greenpeace in this context seems to be assessed less centrally than among the Greenpeace representatives. But these are only gradual differences.

What both sides agree on is the assumption that Greenpeace has a special role through its affinity for direct action. Greenpeace is not the only organisation that uses this means, but it is the only large one. In comparison to other NGOs, they shine not only through their actions, but according to both sides, also through their public communication, which tends to be more radical than that of others. What was also highlighted by both is that Greenpeace has a special position because of its internationality which no other organisation in Aotearoa has to that extent.

What was not addressed at all among the Greenpeace interviewees was what was previously referred to as a shift of the role, meaning that Greenpeace, according to the other actors, finds itself in a situation where its role within the movement is changing dramatically. This is justified by the fact that other actors, such as SS4C or XR; may now take on the role of pioneers within the movement. And according to this view Greenpeace must now respond to the fact that it is less represented in the discourse than before.

The aspect of not only having an environmental, but also a social justice focus was interestingly not addressed by participants of other organisations but by Greenpeace representatives. On the contrary, it was even mentioned by the others that Greenpeace lacked an understanding for intersectionality.

6.3.2 Comparing the assessments on relationships

Both sides share the view that interactions between Greenpeace and other organisations do not usually take place on a regular basis, but only when it seems necessary. For the most part, these are not formal interactions but primarily informal exchanges. They also agree that they are usually not close partnerships. Interactions among them are always depended on whether there is a necessity to do so.

However, both sides have also spoken of the fact that from time to time there were close formalized coalitions geared to a specific protest event and thus limited to a certain time frame. In the lobbying context in particular, there seemed to be a consensus that close cooperation is more frequent.

Moreover, both sides also agree that there are personal relationships and personnel overlaps between Greenpeace and other groups. Thus, the relationship between the organisations cannot be viewed in isolation from personal relationships. For those that have a personal relationship, it was identified as having a fundamentally positive effect on the relationship between the organisations.

When it comes to a general rating of Greenpeace's relationship with other organisations, most people agree that it can largely be rated as good. However, it was also said on both sides that this is fundamentally dependent on the efforts of individuals within Greenpeace. Even if many people have expressed themselves positively there are also voices on both sides that make it clear that challenges arise at times. Overall, most conflicts arise due to the different ways in which decision-making works and different speeds of communication. The very ability to act quickly puts Greenpeace in a situation where they can easily outdo other actors, which can be problematic according to both sides.

They also agreed that when Greenpeace withdraws from a specific political debate, this could potentially have negative consequences for the groups that remain. This reflects the fact that Greenpeace often plays an apparently important role in these debates because otherwise its withdrawal would not be perceived as so dramatic. Interestingly, no Greenpeace interviewee mentioned the problem described by Forest & Bird, namely that even the entry of Greenpeace into a particular issue can lead to difficulties with those who are already working on it because they could possibly push themselves into the foreground.

What Greenpeace saw as problematic was that it is possible that other actors place too high expectations on Greenpeace that they cannot meet. This aspect was not mentioned by other participants. But this could be because they perceive this problem differently. For if what Greenpeace says is true, it is the other actors who have expectations and do not necessarily realize that Greenpeace's assumes them as too high. On the other hand, it could also be an indicator that Greenpeace itself may set too high standards for itself that it may not be able to meet while others do not have these expectations.

What may have been implied, but not explicitly stated in the interviews with the other organisations, is that there is always an asymmetry in interaction with Greenpeace in terms of power. In Greenpeace's view, this is generated by the fact that they have more resources to fall back on. This asymmetry seems to be much more present for Greenpeace than for the other actors because it was explicitly addressed. They are also the reason why Greenpeace participants explain that Greenpeace must be aware of its position and power in order not to unintentionally harm others. This view is also not explicitly addressed by the other organisations, but it is very well implicit to conclude from several statements.

With the example of a problematic incident where there was disagreement about the action consensus and the understanding of nonviolence it is interesting that both sides have chosen the same event and that the representation of the event and the different positions are very similar. The fundamental difference lies in the fact that the purpose of the protest is assessed differently and thus a different understanding of the term nonviolent arises. Greenpeace's statements suggest that the protest is primarily about creating images for the media that are intended to influence public opinion in a specific way and that require images that are perceived as positive. The other actors, however, were primarily concerned with disturbing the event against which the protest was being held and preventing those people involved from attending it. Both sides accused each other of wanting to gain control of the discourse about the action through their own approach. What on the one hand means that the organisations that are more active in protesting are able to influence the images shown, on the other hand means that they are forced to sacrifice their goal at this event for good images and for the greater good. It seems difficult to find a compromise between these two positions. Interestingly, in this context Greenpeace did not mention the previously described need for awareness of its role and power.

6.3.3 Comparing the views on support

When it comes to specifying how cooperation between Greenpeace and other actors takes place, participants on both sides pointed out that it is primarily a matter of support. For this reason, this will be explained in more detail below.

Supporting others is primarily a matter of providing resources, such as expertise, venues, or training. This is especially important for smaller organisations. They also agree that this support comes in various forms and that Greenpeace does many things in this regard that are not publicly communicated.

So, the question arises whether Greenpeace is acting in a selfless manner or if they are still benefiting themselves from supporting others. Both sides agree at first that Greenpeace in most cases provides support without asking for anything in return. However, it can be assumed that they do benefit from it. For example, as the participant from XR says, that from their view Greenpeace gets open space to become more radical because XR extends the possibilities. As explained above, this is not necessarily the case.

The Greenpeace interviewees are also of the opinion that support for others can very well have a positive effect for Greenpeace, because it alone cannot win the political battles and save the planet. However, in their view, support is not given on the premise that it will have a positive effect on the struggles in which Greenpeace is involved, otherwise they would not, for example, also provide support to non-environmental organisations. One reason for this could be that Greenpeace's reputation within civil society can be improved in this way and its position of power strengthened.

What the representatives of Greenpeace did not mention is that according to interviewees of the other organisations, it does indeed receive support from other actors and that this often results in mutual support, with resources being made available in both directions.

6.3.4 Comparing the critique

When comparing the criticism of Greenpeace, it becomes clear that these differ in some points, but that there is criticism on both sides.

One criticism voiced by both sides is that Greenpeace is perceived as an elite and exclusive organisation that is not open to many people and lacks diversity. What was also criticized by both sides is the hierarchical structure of Greenpeace.

What was criticized only by the group of other organisations is Greenpeace's relationship with parties and, in their view, a lack of distance. This is particularly interesting because Greenpeace actually sees itself as independent of political parties. It is possible that the actors' assessments of which relationships with political actors are already problematic may differ in this respect.

Greenpeace interviewees said that they sometimes find their own storytelling less motivating and more boring, while interviewees from other organisations emphasized that Greenpeace is very good at motivating people through exciting storytelling. So there seems to be a differing perception here.

What both sides agreed on is that the way Greenpeace fundraises, and the value placed on it can be problematic. This is an ambivalent view as fundraising is seen by Greenpeace as necessary to continue their work and support.

6.3.5 Interim conclusion

The basic assessment with regard to the role of Greenpeace is very similar: Greenpeace generally plays an important role in the movement because they make necessary resources available to other actors. Greenpeace is assigned a position of power that has both influence on the movement and society. While all of the organisations that participated in the interviews have some kind of an organisational relationship with Greenpeace, there is no regular interaction and both sides also see potential problems in direct cooperation between Greenpeace and other actors due to power differences, communication challenges and differing values. The criticism voiced against Greenpeace relates primarily to the fact that the organisation is considered to be non-inclusive, too hierarchical and that many problems relate to fundraising.

7. Discussion of the results

At this point an attempt will be made to discuss all previous chapters of this thesis in the context of the research question: Which role does Greenpeace play within the environmental movement of Aotearoa New Zealand? In particular when considering the results of the interviews it becomes clear that there is no simple answer. The vague assumption that Greenpeace can be perceived as important by most actors was confirmed. But this was not always seen as positive.

If one would only try to apply the theory described in chapter 3 to the reality in Aotearoa, one would come to the conclusion that Greenpeace has in a certain way the characteristics of a "social broker", because in many cases it is perceived as a facilitator for networking. The organisation is thus one of the central nodes within the structure of the policephalous movement. It is clear from the empirical part that Greenpeace maintains relations with many actors, albeit not on a regular basis, but it is in any case an organisation that is well connected and from time to time, connects other actors with each other. Greenpeace's role is not such that the movement could not operate without Greenpeace, and there are certainly other actors who play a similar role. There is no dependence on Greenpeace to have the possibility of interacting with other actors, since the actors to a large extent know each other, even far away from the central nodes within the network. And the personal relationships within the movement that run through a wide range of organisations, what I have identified as the movement clique, may also contribute to the fact that the role of the organisation as a whole is different, because it is not the organisation that interacts with others, but always people within it and how the cooperation works depends on them. However, the finding that Greenpeace can be considered a social broker only covers part of the reality.

In general, it should be noted that Aotearoa, with currently about 5 million inhabitants, has about as many inhabitants as Berlin and Munich combined. This particularity in terms of size is one of the factors that allows Aotearoa to be perceived as progressive in the world and is also one of the reasons why Greenpeace, with an annual budget of NZ\$9 million can achieve a lot there.

The chapter on support makes it clear that the ability and willingness to make resources available to other actors is an essential factor in the perception of Greenpeace by the other actors in the movement and by Greenpeace itself. This reflects the underlying understanding of the resource mobilisation theory that the success of movements depends on the ability to mobilise resources. Following the findings of these chapters, Greenpeace's role in the movement as a

resource-rich actor is to redistribute a small part of this. In this way, they manage to encourage smaller actors and thus, according to the statements, promote the movement as a whole. But what goes hand in hand with this, as reflected in most of the interviews, is an improvement of the reputation of Greenpeace within the movement. This role, which Greenpeace plays here by supporting other organisations away from the public and encouraging them to work towards a common or similar goal, was not something I was aware of as a person who had been involved in Greenpeace in Germany before, but it was immediately apparent to me when I started working with the organisation in Aotearoa. So, either I was not aware of this position, or things are very different in Germany.

What has become clear in the empirical part is that many participants see a lot of power in the role Greenpeace plays, which it uses on the one hand vis-à-vis politics and the economy, and to a large extent in the interest of many actors in the movement, but at the same time also has vis-à-vis the movement. This power within the network is problematic not only because power within the movement may be seen as something critical, but also because it affects the practice of the movement. And it is possible that this may also have had an impact on the results of the research, because even if the interviews were made anonymous, the statements of the participants may have been influenced in the sense of social desirability, since they may unconsciously see a danger of being too critical about Greenpeace. Moreover, the statements could also be influenced by the fact that the interviewees do not want the movement or their organisation to be cast in a bad light. Although this is not verifiable, it should be taken into consideration when reading the results.

A particularly problematic aspect of this power is that relationships of dependency arise and Greenpeace not only takes on certain tasks, but also that other actors in a collaboration, or in the case of separate work on the same issue, want to prevent Greenpeace from withdrawing from this issue. It can have fatal consequences for a struggle if Greenpeace decides to withdraw from it and, in the worst case, it can also set back or make impossible the work of others, even if they do not interact with Greenpeace at all. It has been described that there have been such cases in the past, which is a sign that Greenpeace has probably not acted with awareness in this context, although it is claimed that there has been a development in the organisation regarding awareness.

As the result of the above-mentioned problematic example of cooperation with regard to a protest event, the Greenpeace interviewees have drawn the conclusion that they will have to

consider more carefully with whom they cooperate in the future. Being able to make such a decision in the first place underlines their privileged position. They have the possibility to select with whom and how they cooperate, since they have the possibility to manage their work on their own and do not have to rely on others. So, they are able to stick to their principles, while for others it may be necessary to cooperate with big organisation such as Greenpeace and therefore have to deviate from their views.

A look at the history of the environmental movement and Greenpeace shows that there is a strong overlap. Greenpeace was already a relevant part of what is presented in this thesis as the environmental movement from an early stage. However, it should not be forgotten, that the history presented is only an excerpt of reality and that the history presented in the thesis may also differ from how it would be presented by other people. While researching and writing this chapter, I found it very difficult to identify which aspects are relevant for the history. But especially the sinking of the Rainbow Warrior is in my opinion an integral part of every story and shows a connection of Greenpeace to Aotearoa and the environmental movement as it is nowhere else in the world. Even if the perception of the relevance of the event and the connection that Kiwis have supposedly made with Greenpeace differ greatly, this case is unique. However, it is also clear that Aotearoa and this specific event, as well as the entire nuclear free campaign, is very important to Greenpeace at the international level and therefore it is closely linked to Aotearoa. What should not remain unmentioned when looking at history is that it may as well be that my perception and definition of the environmental movement that is very much influenced by Greenpeace and that it is also possible that the practice of the movement is strongly influenced by Greenpeace. Nonetheless, it is possible that Greenpeace has had a great influence on the way activism is manifested in Aotearoa.

What was an interesting aspect of the interviews was that participants of Greenpeace sometimes attribute their organisation a leading role, which from their point of view consists mainly of steering the course and focus, thereby drawing attention to certain issues. On the other hand, this function has not been mentioned by any other interviewee, so that the question arises whether Greenpeace has a leading function that is not perceived as such by the others, or whether the representatives of Greenpeace overestimate their influence.

In general, there is criticism of Greenpeace's actions and structure on all sides, but interestingly, it is less pronounced than I would have expected. From this it can either be concluded that the

participants have consciously tried to avoid criticism, or that this criticism may not be as much in focus as in other countries environmental movements.

There were several factors in the research process that limited the possibility of a holistic perspective. On the one hand, it was possible to integrate large parts of the environmental movement into the work because of the many interviews that were conducted, but the perspective of Māori and Pasifika communities, which I consider very important for societal contexts in Aotearoa, was deliberately left out. Since the existing scientific literature was relatively limited, in order to answer the research question, some partial aspects had to be underpinned with interviews and non-scientific sources. Only through the qualitative approach was it possible to draw such a comprehensive picture of Greenpeace's perception in the movement, but at the same time it also limits the possibility of making more concrete statements on a measurable influence, or on a quantity of Greenpeace's networking.

For future research projects I would therefore recommend to closely examine the network structure of the environmental movement, so that it can be determined more concretely how the movement functions as a whole. It would also be interesting to take a closer look at how far Greenpeace is anchored in the society, especially through the bombing of the Rainbow Warrior. The perception expressed by several participants that Greenpeace is part of Aotearoa's identity seems somewhat exaggerated, but attention should be paid to the organisation's special relationship to society, nonetheless. Finally, the work suggests that social movement studies should take a closer look at the dangers involved when too much power accumulates in an organisation within a movement network and possible dependencies and unintended influence arise.

8. Conclusion

The goal of this thesis was to understand the role of Greenpeace in Aotearoa's environmental movement. Overall, the research showed that Greenpeace is generally considered as an important part and a central node within the environmental movement. In terms of its structure, this movement can be regarded as a policephalous movement, in which Greenpeace occupies one of the multiple central points. Its role within the movement can also be described as a social broker. This is expressed by the fact that it has many connections with the actors within the environmental movement throughout the network. Greenpeace's position in the movement and society has also been shaped by Aotearoa's history and especially the bombing of the Rainbow Warrior. Greenpeace often makes resources available to other actors in order to support them in their work towards the common goal. This also results in a potentially more positive reputation within the movement. However, its role as a central actor with many resources also brings with it aspects that can be seen as problematic. The emerging power within the movement can lead to dependency on Greenpeace and risks for other actors and makes awareness on the part of Greenpeace necessary.

These results agree to a large extent with the previous non-analytical presentation of Greenpeace in the social movement studies of Aotearoa but show much more facets of how relationships and interactions with Greenpeace can be assessed. In the context of social movement theory, there has been made clear that the existing explanatory patterns for roles within a movement are not necessarily applicable in practice, or that roles are defined too simply, and facets are lost. Greenpeace Aotearoa New Zealand fits very well into the concept of a social broker, but this does not describe everything that Greenpeace's role is about. When looking into this specific topic as part of the environmental movement of Aotearoa, it became clear that although there are indeed scientists who conduct research on the movement, many questions, for example about its composition and structure, have not yet been addressed.

The findings thus make it clear that Greenpeace is seen as a central actor in the environmental movement of Aotearoa, which, intentionally or unintentionally, has a great deal of influence on the movement and is generally perceived by most actors as allied. Although it is only one actor, if it would suddenly disappear from one day to the next it would have fatal consequences for all actors involved in Aotearoa's environmental movement.

Based on the analysis, I recommend that Greenpeace, even more than it already does, should reflect on its own role in the movement and the consequences of its own actions. And not just

think about it but include the reflection in its work. The impact of Greenpeace's actions can go far beyond anything the organisation is able to imagine. Therefore, not only awareness, but above all open communication with all allied actors is necessary. I think it is a good step to strengthen the movement as a whole and possibly to reduce hierarchies within the movement, by making resources available to other actors without branding it with the Greenpeace logo. This is a step to show that the mission of a planet worth living on is indeed paramount, and that the movement can come a step closer to this by fighting together.

References

- 350 Aotearoa (2020) About. Available at: <https://350.org.nz/about-2/>.
- Alakavuklar ON and Dickson A (2016) Social movements, resistance and social change in Aotearoa/New Zealand: an intervention for dialogue, collaboration and synergy. *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online* 11(2): 83–88.
- Almeida PD (2019) *Social movements: The structure of collective mobilization*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.
- Bakker FGA de, Den Hond F and Laamanen M (2017) Social Movements: Organizations and Organizing. In: Roggeband C and Klandermans B (eds) *Handbook of social movements across disciplines*: Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 203–231.
- Bensemam P (2018) *Fight for the forests: The pivotal campaigns that saved New Zealand's native forests*. Nelson, New Zealand: Pottan & Burton.
- Berry M (2013) Cypress mine consent challenged. *stuff*, 12 June.
- Bogner A, Littig B and Menz W (2014) *Experteninterviews: Eine Einführung in Theorie und Praxis einer Forschungsmethode*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH.
- Bond S, Diprose G and McGregor A (2015) 2Precious2Mine: Post-politics, Colonial Imaginary, or Hopeful Political Moment? *Antipode* 47(5): 1161–1183.
- Bond S, Diprose G and Thomas AC (2018) *Seeking Climate Justice. Findings Report on Oil Free Activism and Oil and Gas Development 2013-2016*. Dunedin and Wellington.
- Bond S, Diprose G and Thomas AC (2019) Contesting deep sea oil: Politicisation–depoliticisation–repoliticisation. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 37(3): 519–538.
- Bührs T (2013) Environmentalism in New Zealand. In: Doyle T (ed.) *Environmental Movements Around the World [2 Volumes]*: Westport: PRAEGER Publishers INC, pp. 331–358.
- Cambridge University Press (n.d.) Cambridge Dictionary: Intersectional. Available at: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/de/worterbuch/englisch/intersectional> (accessed 10 June 2020).
- Climate Justice Taranaki (n.d.) About. Available at: <https://climatejusticetaranaki.wordpress.com/about/> (accessed 10 June 2020).

- Coal Action Network Aotearoa (n.d.) About. Available at: <https://coalaction.org.nz/about> (accessed 10 March 2020).
- Cretney RM, Thomas AC and Bond S (2016) Maintaining grassroots activism: Transition Towns in Aotearoa New Zealand. *New Zealand Geographer* 72(2): 81–91.
- Della Porta D and Diani M (2020) *Social movements: An introduction*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Diani M (2009a) ‘Leaders’ Or Brokers? Positions and Influence in Social Movement Networks. In: Diani M (ed.) *Social movements and networks: Relational approaches to collective action*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, pp. 105–121.
- Diani M (2009b) Networks and Social Movements: A Research Programme. In: Diani M (ed.) *Social movements and networks: Relational approaches to collective action*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, pp. 299–318.
- Diani M (ed) (2009c) *Social movements and networks: Relational approaches to collective action*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Diprose G, Thomas AC and Bond S (2016) ‘It’s who we are’: eco-nationalism and place in contesting deep-sea oil in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online* 11(2): 159–173.
- ECO (n.d.) About Us. Available at: <http://www.eco.org.nz/about.html> (accessed 3 April 2020).
- Eden S (2004) Greenpeace. *New Political Economy* 9(4): 595–610.
- Edwards B and McCarthy JD (2011) Resources and Social Movement Mobilization. In: Snow DA (ed.) *The Blackwell companion to social movements*: Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, pp. 116–152.
- Environmental Defence Society (2015) Approach. Available at: <https://www.eds.org.nz/our-story/approach/> (accessed 15 May 2020).
- Forest & Bird (n.d.) About Forest & Bird. Available at: <https://www.forestand-bird.org.nz/about-us> (accessed 10 August 2020).
- Generation Zero (n.d.) Our Story. Available at: https://www.generationzero.org/our_story (accessed 10 June 2020).

- Gläser J and Laudel G (2010) *Experteninterviews und qualitative Inhaltsanalyse als Instrumente rekonstruierender Untersuchungen*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- New Zealand Herald* (2019) Greenpeace anti-oil protesters scaling Wellington's tallest building, 23 July.
- Greenpeace Aotearoa NZ (n.d.a) About TOKO: What is TOKO? Available at: https://www.toko.org.nz/about_us (accessed 15 September 2020).
- Greenpeace Aotearoa NZ (o.d.) How we work. Available at: <https://www.greenpeace.org/new-zealand/about/our-values/how-we-work/> (accessed 20 April 2020).
- Greenpeace Aotearoa NZ (n.d.b) Our values: Greenpeace exists to give this fragile Earth a voice. Available at: <https://www.greenpeace.org/new-zealand/about/our-values/#:~:text=Our%20mission&text=Therefore%20Greenpeace%20seeks%20to%3A%2D,global%20disarmament%20and%20non%2Dviolence.> (accessed 1 February 2020).
- Greenpeace Aotearoa NZ (n.d.c) Rainbow Warrior educational resources. Available at: <https://www.greenpeace.org/new-zealand/about/our-history/bombing-of-the-rainbow-warrior/the-bombing-of-the-rainbow-warrior-fact-file/> (accessed 5 March 2020).
- Greenpeace Canada (2016) Where Does Greenpeace Stand on Seal Hunting? Available at: <https://www.greenpeace.org/canada/en/story/424/where-does-greenpeace-stand-on-seal-hunting/> (accessed 5 April 2020).
- Greenpeace International (o.d.a) Our offices. Available at: <https://www.greenpeace.org/international/explore/about/worldwide/> (accessed 10 March 2020).
- Greenpeace International (o.d.b) Structure: How is Greenpeace structured? Available at: [https://www.greenpeace.org/international/explore/about/structure/#:~:text=Greenpeace%20National%20and%20Regional%20Organisations%20\(NROs\)&text=Each%20NRO%20consists%20of%20one,within%20the%20local%20environmental%20communities.](https://www.greenpeace.org/international/explore/about/structure/#:~:text=Greenpeace%20National%20and%20Regional%20Organisations%20(NROs)&text=Each%20NRO%20consists%20of%20one,within%20the%20local%20environmental%20communities.) (accessed 17 March 2020).
- Harter J-H (2004) Environmental Justice for Whom? Class, New Social Movements, and the Environment: A Case Study of Greenpeace Canada, 1971-2000. *Labour / Le Travail* 54: 83–119.

- Helfferrich C (2019) Leitfaden- und Experteninterviews. In: Baur N and Blasius J (eds) *Handbuch Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung*: Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, pp. 669–687.
- Hunt T (2013) Greenpeace defends fundraising strategy. Available at: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/9492084/Greenpeace-defends-fundraising-strategy> (accessed 18 September 2020).
- Kaiser R (2014) *Qualitative Experteninterviews: Konzeptionelle Grundlagen und praktische Durchführung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Kenny L and Watson M (2020) Extinction Rebellion campaigners' daring oil rig protest thwarted after 14 hours. *stuff*, 4 March.
- Krinsky J and Crossley N (2014) Social Movements and Social Networks: Introduction. *Social Movement Studies* 13(1): 1–21.
- Kruse J, Schmieder C, Weber KM, et al. (2015) *Qualitative Interviewforschung: Ein integrativer Ansatz*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Juventa.
- Kuckartz U (2016) *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Methoden, Praxis, Computerunterstützung*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Juventa.
- Lee C (2019) Welcome, singular “they”. Available at: <https://apastyle.apa.org/blog/singular-they> (accessed 10 September 2020).
- Luxon EM and Wong WH (2017) Agenda-Setting in Greenpeace and Amnesty: The Limits of Centralisation in International NGOs. *Global Society* 31(4): 479–509.
- Matthews K (2020) Social movements and the (mis)use of research: Extinction Rebellion and the 3.5% rule. *Interface: a journal for and about social movements* 12(1): 591–615.
- Mayring P (2010) *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken*. s.l.: Beltz Verlagsguppe.
- Meuser M and Nagel U (2009) Das Experteninterview: Konzeptionelle Grundlagen und methodische Anlage. In: Pickel S, Jahn D, Lauth H-J and Pickel G (eds) *Methoden der vergleichenden Politik- und Sozialwissenschaft: Neue Entwicklungen und Anwendungen*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften / GWV Fachverlage GmbH Wiesbaden, pp. 465–479.

- Ministry of Justice (2020) About the Waitangi Tribunal. Available at: <https://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/about-waitangi-tribunal/> (accessed 5 April 2020).
- Mitchell C (2018) THE UNHAPPY VALLEY: Three years of continuous protest. Available at: <https://interactives.stuff.co.nz/2018/10/what-happened-here/#section-MYNPEix0Ou>.
- Moorfield JC (n.d.a) Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index: iwi. Available at: <https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?keywords=iwi> (accessed 7 February 2020).
- Moorfield JC (n.d.b) Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index: Pākehā. Available at: <https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?keywords=pakeha> (accessed 7 February 2020).
- Morris AD and Staggenborg S (2011) Leadership in Social Movements. In: Snow DA (ed.) *The Blackwell companion to social movements*: Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, pp. 171–196.
- Nathan S (2015) Conservation: A history - Environmental activism, 1966-1987. Available at: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/conservation-a-history/page-8> (accessed 21 May 2020).
- Niederberger M and Wassermann S (eds) (2015) *Methoden der Experten- und Stakeholdereinbindung in der sozialwissenschaftlichen Forschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Norman R (2019) 2018 Greenpeace NZ Annual Impact Report. Available at: <https://www.greenpeace.org/new-zealand/publication/annual-impact-report-2018/> (accessed 1 May 2020).
- O'Brien T (2012) Environmental protest in New Zealand (1997-2010). *The British Journal of Sociology* 63(4): 641–661.
- O'Brien T (2013a) Fires and Flotillas: Opposition to Offshore Oil Exploration in New Zealand. *Social Movement Studies* 12(2): 221–226.
- O'Brien T (2013b) Fragmentation or Evolution? Understanding Change Within the New Zealand Environmental Movement. *Journal of Civil Society* 9(3): 287–299.
- O'Brien T (2016a) Camping, climbing trees and marching to Parliament: spatial dimensions of environmental protest in New Zealand. *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online* 11(1): 11–22.
- O'Brien T (2016b) Social control and trust in the New Zealand environmental movement. *Journal of Sociology* 51(4): 785–798.

- Oliver P and Myers D (2009) Networks, Diffusion, and Cycles of Collective Action. In: Diani M (ed.) *Social movements and networks: Relational approaches to collective action*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, pp. 173–202.
- Oosterman J (2018) Communicating for systemic change: Perspectives from the New Zealand climate movement. *Counterfutures* 5: 79–107.
- Priestley R (2010) *Nuclear New Zealand: New Zealand's nuclear and radiation history to 1987*.
- Reichertz J (2016) *Qualitative und interpretative Sozialforschung: Eine Einladung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Robie D (2006) Revisiting French Terrorism in the Pacific: Rainbow Warrior bombing. *Pacific Ecologist*: 26–29.
- Robie D (2016) The Rainbow Warrior, secrecy and state terrorism: A Pacific journalism case study. *Pacific Journalism Review* 22(1): 187-213.
- Rodgers K and Ingram D (2019) Decolonizing environmentalism in Arctic? Greenpeace, complicity and negotiating the contradictions of solidarity in the Inuit Nunangat. *Interface: a journal for and about social movements* 11(2): 11–34.
- Rucht D (1993) Ökologischer Protest als kalkulierte Rechtsverletzung: Struktur, Aktionen und Wirkungen von Greenpeace and Earth First! In: Narr W-D (ed.) *Ziviler Ungehorsam: Traditionen, Konzepte, Erfahrungen, Perspektiven*. Sensbachtal: Komitee für Grundrechte und Demokratie, pp. 283–304.
- Rucht D (2011) Movement Allies, Adversaries, and Third Parties. In: Snow DA (ed.) *The Blackwell companion to social movements*: Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 197-216.
- Rucht D (2020) Social Movements. In: Caramani D (ed.) *Comparative Politics*: Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 282–296.
- Saunders C (2007) Using Social Network Analysis to Explore Social Movements: A Relational Approach. *Social Movement Studies* 6(3): 227–243.
- Saunders CB (2013) *Environmental Networks and Social Movement Theory*. [London]: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Schuster J (2017) We Still Need Feminism in Aotearoa: The Achievements and Unfinished Tasks of the Women's Movement. In: Bell A, Elizabeth V, McIntosh T and Wynyard M

- (eds) *A land of milk and honey? Making sense of Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland: University Press, pp. 173–185.
- New Zealand Herald* (2019) Should New Zealand also be called Aotearoa? Petition launched to add to country's official name, 29 September.
- Small Z (2019) Using 'Aotearoa' and 'New Zealand' together 'as it should be'. *Newshub*, 17 December.
- Smith LT (2012) *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London & New, Dunedin: Zed Books; Otago University Press.
- Snow DA, Soul SA and Kriesi H (2011) Mapping the Terrain. In: Snow DA (ed.) *The Blackwell companion to social movements*: Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, pp. 1–16.
- Stats NZ (2020) Historical population estimates tables. Available at: http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/estimates_and_projections/historical-population-tables.aspx (accessed 21 May 2020).
- Susanto SR (2007) The transformation of Greenpeace strategy in the 1990s: From civil disobedience to moderate movement. *Global & Strategic* 1(2): 186–205.
- Szabo M (1991) *Making waves: The Greenpeace New Zealand Story*. Auckland: Reed.
- Szollosi-Cira L (2020) *Normative foreign policy - the Kiwi way: To what extent has New Zealand been acting as norm entrepreneur in the areas of nuclear free policy and promoting free trade?* Dunedin.
- Te Ara Whatu (n.d.) KO WAI MĀTOU? WHO ARE WE? Available at: <https://teara-whatu.org/who-are-we> (accessed 5 June 2020).
- Thomas AC (2018) Political Organisation and the Environment. *Economic and Social Research Aotearoa*.
- Thorwarth K (2019) Jutta Ditzfurth: „Extinction Rebellion ist eine Weltuntergangssekte“. *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 3 December.
- Timmer V (2007) *Agility and Resilience: The Adaptive Capacity of Friends of the Earth International and Greenpeace*.
- Tucker C (2011) *Making Resistance Politics: the Opposition to Genetic Engineering in Aotearoa New Zealand*.

- Tucker C (2013) Using Social Network Analysis and Framing to Assess Collective Identity in the Genetic Engineering Resistance Movement of Aotearoa New Zealand. *Social Movement Studies* 12(1): 81–95.
- Tucker C (2017) Clean, Green Aotearoa New Zealand? In: Bell A, Elizabeth V, McIntosh T and Wynyard M (eds) *A land of milk and honey? Making sense of Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland: University Press, pp. 278–289.
- Ullrich P (2019) Protestforschung zwischen den Stühlen: Ein Versuch über die Sozialfigur des "Protestforschers". *FORSCHUNGSJOURNAL SOZIALE BEWEGUNGEN* 32(1): 29–39.
- Wilson J (2010) The sinking of the rainbow warrior: Responses to an international act of terrorism. *Journal of Postcolonial Cultures and Societies* 1(1): 58–70.
- WWF New Zealand (n.d.) Who we are. Available at: https://www.wwf.org.nz/about_us/who_we_are2 (accessed 15 July 2020).
- WWF New Zealand (2019) Financial-Statement. Available at: https://wwfnz.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/fy19_wwf_nz__audited_financial_statements.pdf (accessed 15 July 2020).
- Wynyard M (2017) Plunder in the Promised Land: Māori Land Alienation and the Genesis of Capitalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. In: Bell A, Elizabeth V, McIntosh T and Wynyard M (eds) *A land of milk and honey? Making sense of Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland: University Press, pp. 13–25.
- Zelko F (2017) Scaling Greenpeace: From Local Activism to Global Governance. *Historical Social Research* 42(2): 318–342.
- Zelko F and Brandau B (2014) *Greenpeace: Von der Hippiebewegung zum Ökokonzern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.