



**Universiteit Utrecht**

**“Against this nuclear madness!” West German anti-nuclear  
power campaigns as Industrial Transition Movements**

**Nikolett Szolnoki**

**6750788**

**MA International Relations in Historical Perspective**

**Word count: 14,955**



Abstract:

This thesis examines the early stages of the anti-nuclear power movement in West Germany, focusing on the first phases of protesting in Brokdorf (1976) and Gorleben (1977-1979), to find out how the actors organising these campaigns conceptualised their goals, and the type of Industrial Transition Movement (ITM) they advocated for alongside their numerous supporters. By analysing their texts addressing the public, including flyers and pamphlets, this thesis investigates the frames utilised in them, to discover the ideas and objectives that resonated with the public and the kind of industrial transition they envisioned. Additionally, this paper considers the multiplicity of actors organising the demonstrations and explores the differences in their intentions and strategies.

This research places the grassroots nature of the movement to the forefront to find answers, and briefly considers the movement's emergence as a national phenomenon. The findings in this paper reveal the grievances that lay at the core of the movement, and the nature of the change the protesters were seeking. This thesis argues that the popularity of the movement boils down to the treatment the citizens received from the state. Although environmental and security concerns were present, the persistent use of the democracy frame highlights a bigger issue the participants intended to address: the goal of these anti-nuclear campaigns was industrial democratization.

Key words: Industrial Transition Movements; anti-nuclear movement; West Germany; democracy; collective action frames.

Table of Contents:

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Introduction-----  | 3 -  |
| Historiography and academic debates -----                    | 7 -  |
| Methodology-----   | 11 - |
| Chapter 1. Theoretical Framework-----                        | 14 - |
| 1.1. Industrial Transition Movements-----                    | 14 - |
| 1.2. Framing Theory-----                                     | 16 - |
| 1.3. Frames in Industrial Transition Movements -----         | 19 - |
| Chapter 2. Brokdorf – 1976 -----                             | 22 - |
| 2.1. When right becomes wrong, resistance becomes duty!----- | 23 - |
| 2.2. Down with imperialism!-----                             | 28 - |
| 2.3. The Campaign as an Industrial Transition Movement ----- | 31 - |
| Chapter 3. Gorleben – 1977-1979-----                         | 34 - |
| 3.1. Gorleben Shall Live!-----                               | 36 - |
| 3.2. Mein lieber Herr Albrecht!-----                         | 38 - |
| 3.3. The Campaign as an Industrial Transition Movement ----- | 42 - |
| Conclusion-----  | 46 - |
| Bibliography-----  | 50 - |

## Introduction

Just north of Hamburg, Germany, the construction of the Brokdorf nuclear power plant (NPP) began in the 1970s, and although violent protests erupted against it, the plant was connected to the grid in the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster.<sup>1</sup> Although the protests waned in the wake of this defeat, they did not stop: mostly in the form of blockade actions, they carried into the next decade.<sup>2</sup> Today, as part of Germany's ambitious commitment to the phasing out of all nuclear power by 2022, the Brokdorf NPP is finally set to close at the end of 2021 – a long overdue verdict.

In the early 2000s, the re-framing of nuclear energy as a way to combat climate change was well underway, which the leading German parties – CDU/CSU/FDP with the CDU at the helm – who did not want to say farewell to atomic power, welcomed with open arms.<sup>3</sup> However, after the Fukushima nuclear disaster in 2011, the previously staunchly pro-nuclear government rapidly began the process to eliminate atomic energy. This became the most ambitious but also a quite controversial part of Germany's energy strategy, the *Energiewende*, particularly in international circles: many argue that nuclear energy should be used to reach our climate targets, and once decarbonization has been achieved, its phasing out shall begin.<sup>4</sup> This, however, does not mean that nuclear energy is good for the environment: although nuclear power does not emit carbon dioxide, the entire nuclear fuel cycle does at various stages, starting with uranium mining.<sup>5</sup> Additionally, radioactive waste is a huge concern as it can remain active and harmful for thousands of years.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, although the *Energiewende* strategy is meant as a tool for climate change mitigation, the elimination of fossil fuels, which present more immediate

---

<sup>1</sup> LAKA Foundation, "Responses after Chernobyl and Fukushima – Comparative Analysis of Germany and the Netherlands as Amplified Examples," *Nuclear Monitor* 743 (March 2012), pp. 3-4.

<sup>2</sup> Roger Karapin, *Protest Politics in Germany: Movements on the Left and Right since the 1960s* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007), p. 121.

<sup>3</sup> Jürgen-Friedrich Hake et al., "The German Energiewende – History and status quo," *Energy* 92 (2015), p. 541.

<sup>4</sup> Chris Bryant, "Germany is Wrong about Nuclear Power," *Bloomberg*, June 4, 2019 Available at <<https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-06-04/climate-emergency-germany-is-wrong-about-nuclear-power>> (Accessed on 5 March 2020); Scott Carpenter, "As the Costs of Germany's Nuclear Phase Out Mount, Little Appetite for a Rethink," *Forbes*, January 11, 2020 Available at <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/scottcarpenter/2020/01/11/costs-of-germanys-nuclear-phase-out-are-substantial-new-paper-finds-but-there-is-little-appetite-for-a-rethink>> (Accessed on 5 March 2020)

<sup>5</sup> Unknown author, "Nuclear explained," *U.S. Energy Information Administration*, January 15, 2020 Available at <<https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/nuclear/nuclear-power-and-the-environment.php>> (Accessed on 3 April 2020)

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

dangers to our climate, does not appear prominently.<sup>7</sup> This calls Germany's priorities into question, but their history of nuclear energy might provide an answer. This paper aims to unearth how nuclear energy became such a dominant issue and what ideas surrounded it through examining the period when it became a contentious but integral topic in the public discourse: the early stages of the anti-nuclear power movement in Germany.

The decision to eliminate nuclear energy was not made merely due to risks and dangers, but rather as a reaction to public demonstrations which broke out after the 2011 disaster. The nuclear exit was not a newfound concept in the German public discourse, and the public's response to the disaster – calling for a nuclear phase-out – was certainly not an impulsive, thoughtless retort: rather, it was a reflex, stemming from Germany's long history of zealous anti-nuclear sentiments.<sup>8</sup> In fact, although nuclear disasters, such as the Fukushima disaster, or the nowadays seldom mentioned Three Mile Island accident in the United States in 1979, or Chernobyl in 1986, were arguably influential, the German public has been a significant source of criticism towards nuclear energy even independently of these disasters, and these feelings manifested in the anti-nuclear power movement which began in the 1970s.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the roots of the German nuclear debate, this research focuses on the reasons anti-nuclear sentiments resonated with the public in the early stages of the movement, and thus, the connotations nuclear energy represents to the German public.

Nuclear energy was considered to be a popular, modern technology in Germany in the 1950-60s. The Atomic Energy Act was introduced in 1960 to promote nuclear energy in the country, which especially in the face of the failing German coal industry – due to increased imports – was embraced by politicians and citizens.<sup>10</sup> Its use was further encouraged by the 1973 oil crisis, but members of the public began to question it. The anti-nuclear movement began worldwide in the 1950-60s, when concerns about nuclear weapons, and not nuclear energy, rose, but as

---

<sup>7</sup> Darren McCauley et al., "Energy justice and policy change: An historical policy analysis of the German nuclear phase-out," *Applied Energy* 228, (2018), p. 320.

<sup>8</sup> Bernd Grässler, David Levitz, Ben Knight, "Tens of thousands of Germans take to the streets in anti-nuclear protest," *Deutsche Welle*, March 13, 2011 Available at <<https://p.dw.com/p/10YDL>> (Accessed on March 5, 2020)

<sup>9</sup> Andrew S. Tompkins, *Better Active than Radioactive! Anti-Nuclear Protest in 1970s France and West Germany*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 29.

<sup>10</sup> Hake et al. "The German Energiewende," p. 534.

nuclear facilities increased, the focus shifted to nuclear energy and the movement began to transform.<sup>11</sup> This transformation was solidified in West Germany in the 1970s.<sup>12</sup>

The most defining, formative time period for the movement was the 1970s and early 1980s, as it slowly became one of the most significant “New Social Movements.”<sup>13</sup> New Social Movements, first emerging in the 1960s, can be distinguished from other movements because of their focus on quality of life and human rights.<sup>14</sup> In West Germany, environmental awareness increased, aided by the publication of books such as “The Limits to Growth” by the Club of Rome, a book on the finite supply of resources published in 1972, and citizens’ initiatives and associations with an environmental focus were established, learning from the practices of the 1968 generation.<sup>15</sup> Against this backdrop the first large-scale protest against the construction of an NPP at Wyhl took place in 1975, which acted as a catalyst for the West German anti-nuclear power movement. The Wyhl campaign, which included clashes with the police and a nine-month occupation of the site ending in November 1975, was only the beginning and subsequent campaigns were organised. Protests against nuclear facilities reached many parts of the country throughout the decade, such as Brokdorf, Grohnde, Gorleben, and Kalkar.<sup>16</sup> These campaigns were more or less independent at the beginning, targeting local issues, although the anti-nuclear power sentiments were elevated to the national level over the course of a decade as an infrastructure of anti-nuclear organisations was established. Additionally, the Wyhl protests inspired demonstrations abroad, such as at Seabrook, New Hampshire, which began a domino effect in the United States.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> That is not to say that the public cared less about nuclear weapons than before, as demonstrated by the protests organised against the NATO decision to deploy American missiles in Western Europe. In 1981, 300,000 people gathered in Bonn to show their disapproval. Andrei S. Markovits, “On Anti-Americanism in West Germany,” *New German Critique* 34 (Winter 1985), p. 8.; Peter E. Quint, *Civil Disobedience and the German Courts: The Pershing Missile Protests in Comparative Perspective*, (Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge-Cavendish, 2008), p. 24.

<sup>12</sup> Dolores L. Augustine, *Taking on Technocracy: Nuclear Power in Germany, 1945 to Present* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2018) p. 7.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. For additional details on New Social Movements, see for example: Hanspeter Kriesi, *New Social Movements in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1995)

<sup>15</sup> Hake et al. “The German Energiewende,” p. 535.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> In fact, the Clamshell Alliance, a coalition of activists and organisations opposing nuclear power, began “the occupation of Seabrook,” inspired by the Wyhl occupation. The Clamshell Alliance motivated Californians to fight against the Diablo Canyon NPP, and thus the US movement began. Robert Gottlieb, *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*, (Washington DC, Island Press, 2005) p. 238.

The movement's influence cannot be understated in West Germany either, as re-examining the importance of nuclear energy rapidly reached increasingly higher echelons. American scientist Amory Lovins popularised the concepts of 'soft' and 'hard' paths: whereas the hard path is based on fossil fuels and nuclear power, the soft path is a much more diverse and simpler strategy that relies on renewable energy sources.<sup>18</sup> In 1979-1982, the Bundestag authorised an Enquete Commission – i.e. a group established by the government with the aim to debate and provide information on a topical issue – on future nuclear energy policy, which contributed to the recognition of the possibility of a nuclear-free future.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, the term *Energiewende* was introduced in this period: although some suggest it was used by protesters as early as in the 1970s, the word certainly entered the public discourse in 1980, when the Öko-Institut, an environmental research institute that grew out of the movement, published their book, titled *Energiewende: Wachstum und Wohlstand ohne Erdöl und Uran*, or *Energy transition: growth and prosperity without petroleum and uranium*.<sup>20</sup> This influential piece of writing suggested that there was a way to eliminate nuclear energy without compromising economic growth. As scientists introduced valuable concepts which breached the walls of the Bundestag as well, some of the activists in the movement took their participation a step further by establishing the Green Party, which entered the Bundestag in 1983.<sup>21</sup>

Therefore, a local protest at Wyhl inspired demonstrations across the country and internationally, and scientific researchers to contribute to the cause, and it also led to the emergence of a party and its entrance in the Bundestag within a decade. The grassroots groups organising the protests grasped onto something that reached an unexpected number and variety of people. The events that took place in the 1970-80s became a defining feature of activism and politics in Germany. The objectives of a movement that rapidly developed within a decade are being fully realized today, and this research aims to understand how this movement could be so influential by examining the ideas surrounding it. Via analysing events that occurred in the first decade of the movement before it became an all-encompassing national phenomenon, this

---

<sup>18</sup> Amory Lovins, *Soft Energy Paths: Towards a Durable Peace*, (New York: Harper Collins, 1979)

<sup>19</sup> Stefan C. Aykut, "Energy futures from the social market economy to the Energiewende: The politicization of West German energy debates, 1950-1990," in: *The Struggle for the Long Term in Transnational Science and Politics: Forging the Future*, eds. Jenny Andersson, Egle Rindzevičiūtė, (New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 95.

<sup>20</sup> Hake et al. "The German Energiewende," p. 537.; Craig Morris and Arne Jungjohann, *Energy Democracy: Germany's Energiewende to Renewables*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), p. 4.; Krause Florentin, Hartmut Bossel, and Karl F. Müller-Reißmann. *Energie-Wende: Wachstum und Wohlstand ohne Erdöl und Uran; ein Alternativ-Bericht des Öko-Instituts*, (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1981)

<sup>21</sup> Sarah Elise Wiliarty, "Nuclear Power in Germany and France" *Polity* 45, no. 2 (April 2013), pp. 283-284.; Gerd Winter, "The Rise and Fall of Nuclear Energy Use in Germany: Processes, Explanations and the Role of Law," *Journal of Environmental Law* 25, no. 1 (January 2013), p. 98.

study intends to find out how the actors of the campaigns conceptualised their goals, what values propelled them, what injustices motivated the participants.

### Historiography and academic debates

This research is connected to a vast catalogue of literature on the German anti-nuclear movement, and several debates and themes run through it. Whilst these are quite varied, certain questions stand out, such as the question of democratization and environmental protection, and the role of these concerns in the movement. Although some protests may be isolated, taking place sometimes years apart and across the country, the grassroots political and civil society actors were united in fervour. These organisations stirred the public, and their methods, their arguments to entice the people to join the struggle need to be more thoroughly examined.

Democracy, in fact, has become a focal point of previous research. The focus of the early protests against the construction of NPPs – such as the Wyhl occupation – has been contested: while environmental groups did participate,<sup>22</sup> Glaser and Morris contend that the emphasis was not on the environmental dangers of nuclear power, but the lack of transparency in the projects, and the government’s authoritarian style.<sup>23</sup> Milder also suggests that nuclear reactors threatened citizens’ livelihoods, which is why they spoke up in the first place.<sup>24</sup> Thus, it is possible that the public outrage followed a sense of injustice, that they were mainly motivated by suspecting damage to their democratic rights as opposed to fear for the environment.

On the other hand, Rüdig argues that the anti-nuclear opposition placed emphasis on the question of nuclear waste, and Beveridge and Kern contend that nuclear waste was a central problem, which was an environmental and health issue first and foremost.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, they argue that the anti-nuclear movement was a building block of the environmental movement

---

<sup>22</sup> Such as the Freiburg Working Group for Environmental Protection in Wyhl, and the Lower Elbe Citizens’ Initiative for Environmental Protection in Brokdorf. Stephen Milder, *Greening Democracy: The Anti-Nuclear Movement and Political Environmentalism in West Germany and Beyond, 1968-1983*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 135.; Karapin, *Protest Politics*, p. 131.

<sup>23</sup> Alexander Glaser, “From Brokdorf to Fukushima: The long journey to nuclear phase-out,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 68, no. 2. (2012), p. 12.; Craig Morris, “Germany’s Energiewende: Community-Driven since the 1970s,” in *Global Sustainable Communities: Green Design Technologies and Economics*, ed. Woodrow W. Clark, II, (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2014), p. 107.

<sup>24</sup> Stephen Milder, *Greening Democracy*, p. 15.

<sup>25</sup> Wolfgang Rüdig, “Phasing out Nuclear Energy in Germany,” *German Politics* 9, no. 3, (December 2000), p. 50.; Ross Beveridge and Kristine Kern, “The ‘Energiewende’ in Germany: Background, Development and Future Challenges,” *Renewable Energy Law and Policy Review* 4, no. 1 (January 2013), p. 5.

itself, and that it should be noted that at the same time, environmental organizations were formed, the Green party was founded as an environmentalist alternative, and there was a growing demand for a coherent environmental policy in the 1980s.<sup>26</sup> Interestingly, pro-environment protests also occurred in the 1970s, and these generally attracted more protesters than the purely anti-nuclear demonstrations at first – nevertheless, the anti-nuclear movement was often thought of as a part of the environmental movement.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, Kalb in his research found the importance of *Heimat* (homeland) in the protests at Wyhl – the first, highly influential campaign – which, according to his understanding, points to a close connection to nature, an inherent link to the environment.<sup>28</sup>

Of course, a movement's concerns can surround both the environment and democracy, and the scholarship has explored the relationship of both to the movement. For instance, Milder assesses the effects of environmentalism on democracy in his book on West Germany, and argues that the activists participating in the movement, contributed to the “greening of democracy,” and that environmentalism itself resulted in the “renewal of democracy.”<sup>29</sup> Nevertheless, finding out where the focus lay can provide a better understanding of the way the movement operated and the nature of the change they were seeking; finding the primary argument of the leading activists can also point to the values of the population who listened to them.

A seminal scholar in the academic literature on energy and social movements is David Hess. His work on Industrial Transition Movements (ITM) is a focal point of this research – much of which will be elaborated in the first chapter on theoretical concepts, particularly the various types of ITMs. An ITM is a struggle for a systemic change: energy transition movements can be organised, for instance, with the aim to increase the use of renewable energy sources in order to protect the environment, or to allow the public to be a part of the dialogue over energy production.<sup>30</sup> An industrial transition movement is a push and pull kind of process between “challengers” and “incumbents.”<sup>31</sup> Coalitions are formed amongst “challengers,” and the

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 5.; Joachim Radkau, “The Anti-nuclear Movement in Germany,” *Polygraph* 22, (2010), p. 169.

<sup>27</sup> Dieter Rucht and Jochen Roose, “The German Environmental Movement at a Crossroads,” *Environmental Politics* 8, no. 1. (1999) p. 13; p.35; William T. Markham, *Environmental Organizations in Modern Germany: Hardy Survivors in the Twentieth Century and Beyond*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), p. 107.

<sup>28</sup> Martin Kalb, “Rather Active Today than Radioactive Tomorrow!” Environmental Justice and the Anti-Nuclear Movement in 1970s Wyhl, West Germany,” *Global Environment* 5, no. 10, (2012)

<sup>29</sup> Milder, *Greening Democracy*, p. 6.; p. 239.

<sup>30</sup> David J. Hess, “Energy Democracy and Social Movements: A multi-coalition perspective on the politics of sustainability transitions,” *Energy Research & Social Science* 40 (2018), p. 179.

<sup>31</sup> David J. Hess, “Social Movements and Energy Democracy: Types and Processes of Mobilization,” *Frontiers in Energy Research* 6, no. 135 (December 2018), p. 1.

stronger the coalition, the higher the chances for success.<sup>32</sup> Based on the literature on the West German movements, the coalitions were mostly limited to citizens' initiatives, or Bürgerinitiativen, minor and nascent political groups, for example Communist<sup>33</sup> or green organisations, scientists – e.g. the Öko-Institut – and the occasional, already established, politician. The specific actors in the coalitions were flexible, they could change over the years and based on the campaign, especially the citizens' initiatives, as these were often formed on a local basis, but national or even transnational organisations were established as well.

This paper focuses on the actors who addressed the public, with the aim to explore what lay behind the transformation they were striving for and how they presented the main focus of the struggle to the general public in order to convince them to join the protests. Whilst there has been a considerable amount of research done on the movement, especially post-Fukushima, scholars tend to focus on the instruments the movement used to achieve success – namely the role of the courts and the electoral system as used by Wiliarty and Renn and Marshall for instance – rather than the multiplicity of actors organising a campaign.<sup>34</sup> McCauley et al. did utilize various categories of actors – state, business, civil society – but they analysed their role in the evolution of nuclear policy.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, much of the scholarship focuses on the post-Fukushima era, even if there is a minimal description of the roots of the movement, such as Rehner and McCauley or Borden and Stonington.<sup>36</sup>

Thus, we have a vast scholarship, but unanswered questions can still be found: there has been a lack of emphasis on the movement coalitions in the West German anti-nuclear movement, and the way they conceptualized their campaigns. By examining the way these actors appealed to the public, it is possible to find out the main themes they and their supporters who listened to them found vital, and the deep-seated issues that propelled the movement. This not only provides an insight into the way these coalitions operated and described the main issue, but this study aims to find out the type of industrial transition the movement coalitions and their

---

<sup>32</sup> Hess, "Energy Democracy," p. 177.

<sup>33</sup> In fact, leftist radicals became interested in the movement in the second half of the 1970s as they realised the movement was an opportunity to voice their opinions on the evils of capitalism. Rucht and Roose, "The German Environmental Movement at a Crossroads," *Environmental Politics* 8, no. 1. (1999), p. 4.

<sup>34</sup> Wiliarty, "Nuclear Power in Germany and France;" Ortwin Renn, Jonathan Paul Marshall, "Coal, nuclear and renewable energy policies in Germany: From the 1950s to the Energiewende," *Energy Policy* 99, (2016)

<sup>35</sup> McCauley et al., "Energy justice and policy change"

<sup>36</sup> Robert Rehner and Darren McCauley, "Security, justice and the energy crossroads: Assessing the implications of the nuclear phase-out in Germany," *Energy Policy* 88, (2016); Eric Borden and Joel Stonington, "Germany's Energiewende," in *Global Sustainable Communities: Green Design Technologies and Economics*, ed. Woodrow W. Clark, II, (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2014)

supporters envisioned. Whether they rejected nuclear power plants for the sake of it, or if they had greater grievances. For this reason, the research places more emphasis on what has been communicated towards the participants by the movement coalition, although this distinction is most evident in the sources of choice.

The research is done through the identification of frames often used by the main actors of the movement. Essentially, the way an issue is framed can point to the type of industrial transition the participants were striving for – and thus a picture of the core of the movement emerges. Chapter 1 discusses frames and the ITM types according to Hess.

The movement began in 1975 with the Wyhl protests, and the Green Party entered the Bundestag in 1983, which provides a lively decade for the research to focus on and examine the movement's formative years. Additionally, it is important to keep in mind that even though these protests make up *the* anti-nuclear movement, many of these were more localized campaigns, somewhat independent from each other, especially at the beginning. Therefore, it is practical to select campaigns to focus on, which is not a simple task due to the volume and longevity of the anti-nuclear campaigns in West Germany. While choosing case studies, the two most important factors were that these occurred somewhat at the same time so that outside influences are minimized, and that the coalitions achieved something significant that demonstrates that the movement was led successfully and that the frames utilized resonated with the public. In a similar vein, choosing case studies from before the political wing of the movement, Die Grünen, became a part of the (federal) political life of Germany is beneficial as these campaigns were not influenced by the actions of a group whose target demography was considerably broader, which assists in exploring the core ideas of the early stages of the movement.

The choice fell on the Brokdorf and the Gorleben campaigns. Analysing the campaigns in their entirety would be beyond the scope of this paper and thus lively slivers of time periods were carefully chosen. The selected periods – 1976 in Brokdorf, 1977-1979 in Gorleben – are the first stages of regular protesting, and thus the formative years, but these also ended with minor accomplishments to be discussed in the coming chapters. This period, particularly the year 1977, has been described as the “heyday of antinuclear mobilization.”<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, these case

---

<sup>37</sup> Christian Joppke, *Mobilizing Against Nuclear Energy: A Comparison of Germany and the United States*, (California: University of California Press, 1993), p. 107.

studies should illustrate the diversity of the campaigns: whilst the Brokdorf campaign was against an NPP, the target of the Gorleben protests was a nuclear waste reprocessing plant.

In order to find out what these campaigns were striving for beyond surface-level ideas and what propelled the great level of mobilization, the research question is:

***What type of Industrial Transition Movement did the actors in the movement coalitions convey through the frames employed in their discourse in the early stages of the anti-nuclear campaigns in Brokdorf (1976) and Gorleben (1977-1979)?***

In order to answer the main research question, certain sub-questions are needed. First of all, it is important to establish who the members of the movement coalitions were. These were the main actors who motivated the public and unified them through their grievances. Establishing who they were is important to account for differences between their strategies, their main audiences and their goals as the various organisations were not necessarily acting in the same capacity. This means that there may have been differences in the industrial transition they fought for, and over time they may have aligned their primary aims with other actors, shifting the type of transition they envisioned. Therefore, distinguishing between them adds to the value of the research and uncovers the layers of the movement. Additionally, the study will be guided by the frames the actors used to address the public, which reveal the ideas and objectives they highlighted. These will then uncover the kind of industrial transition the campaigns and their supporters intended to bring about. Thus, the sub-questions are: *Who were the members of the movement coalitions? What frames did they use to communicate their goals?*

This study provides insight into the historical context of the German nuclear phase-out, with particular attention to the ideas surrounding the early stages of the anti-nuclear movement. The West German movement has inspired a transformation in the worldwide anti-nuclear movement, therefore the findings in this research also contribute to understanding the fundamentals of the international movement. Furthermore, this research aims to contribute to the scholarship on Industrial Transition Movements, a fairly new concept that has seldom been utilized as an analytical concept, as well as the notion of framing in social movements.

## Methodology

In order to answer the research question, an array of primary sources is needed. Using the concept of framing, the aim is to identify the key phrases and concepts in these sources that

defined the purposes and goals of the struggle and mobilized the public. Frame analysis is focused on how mobilisation is affected by the slogans, speeches, and the key texts distributed, more specifically, how the frames in these sources can reveal why a cause gains support.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, we can determine what sort of Industrial Transition Movement the selected anti-nuclear campaigns were by examining the way they were framed, as the frames carrying the main beliefs point to the agenda of the organisers and the supporters. Thus, the research goes beyond framing, in fact, the frames used in the movement are merely the conduit of the research – much like they are the conduit of mobilisation. As the movements were more or less successful, the way these actors framed the issue will reveal what moved the participants, and what goals and values were important for them.

Analysing frames can be done effectively in several ways. Analysing by creating a coding system and quantifying the findings is often done using large samples collected from the media, but this has its pitfalls. It can skew the intentions of a text, the embedded, implied meanings.<sup>39</sup> But through close textual analysis, the researcher can discover interpretations evident to those who read the text carefully, and avoid factual errors (e.g. missing the context).<sup>40</sup> The nature and the relatively low number of the texts analysed in this research makes it possible to use this type of textual analysis.

The sources used will be inevitably varied in nature – including pamphlets and flyers which addressed the public, and slogans which encapsulated the sentiments of the protests. Magazine articles are used as well, including pieces written by the movement coalition. Newspapers are also valuable as they can provide context. In fact, context is not negligible when analysing these sources as several factors determine the way they were written, including external events, reactions from the state, and their target audience, all of which is considered during the course of analysis. Sources are found in online archives, including the ‘Archiv der Sozialen Bewegungen,’ and the ‘Materialien zur Analyse von Opposition.’<sup>41</sup> The objectives that attracted the public, the arguments that truly defined the campaigns were transmitted through the sources addressing the public, therefore certain otherwise valuable sources, such as testimonials in front

---

<sup>38</sup> Lasse Lindekilde, "Discourse and Frame Analysis, In-Depth Analysis of Qualitative Data in Social Movement Research," in *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*, ed. Donatella della Porta, (Oxford Scholarship Online, 2014), p. 226.

<sup>39</sup> Hank Johnston, and John A. Noakes, *Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective*, (Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005), pp. 246-249.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid. p. 249.

<sup>41</sup> Archiv der Sozialen Bewegungen. Available at <<https://asb.nadir.org/>> (Accessed on 22 April 2020); Materialien zur Analyse von Opposition. Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on 22 April 2020)

of government bodies or court records were omitted. The selected primary sources will be analysed first by looking at the themes expressed in them and examining the ways in which the themes were conveyed. A frame shows an interpretation of the theme, and this frame is relayed by key words, phrases and concepts. Chapter one details the concept of frames in social movements.

The paper is divided into two analytical chapters, examining the chosen periods of the Brokdorf and the Gorleben campaigns. Each chapter introduces the selected primary sources and analyses them in terms of themes, key words and phrases that reveal the frames utilised by the actors, which in turn will uncover the type of industrial transition the actors were striving for.

# Chapter 1. Theoretical Framework

## 1.1. Industrial Transition Movements

In terms of theoretical framework, the abovementioned concept of Industrial Transition Movements (ITMs), based on social movement theories, by David Hess is pivotal as it serves as an overarching framework upon which the study is built. Little research has been done on this concept, however as Kallman and Frickel state in their research on ITMs, as science and technology become more incorporated in politics and the economy, ITMs will presumably become more significant “as forces of social change around the world,” therefore it is imperative to continue analysing them.<sup>42</sup>

Broken down to its bare essentials, an Industrial Transition Movement is a struggle between ‘challengers’ who aim to bring about a systemic change in an industry (e.g. food, transportation, or, in the case of this study, energy), and ‘incumbent actors’ whose goal is to preserve the status quo.<sup>43</sup> Coalitions are formed on both sides: incumbent actors, such as industry actors often partner up with political parties who support the idea of maintaining the current state of affairs, whilst the base of the challengers, that is, the movement coalition, is civil society organisations who may be supported by other actors such as political organisations, state and industry actors.<sup>44</sup> Usually a campaign in West Germany is led by a Bürgerinitiative, or citizens’ initiative as it tends to be a local establishment founded by citizens in the area, but as more and more nuclear facilities were proposed, an infrastructure of umbrella organisations emerged ensuring cooperation between local initiatives.

This paper analyses the challengers, the movement coalitions of the selected campaigns. The main organisations set the tone of the movement, they determine the strategies and the focus of the campaign. According to Hess, strong coalitions are necessary to face the incumbent actors, and he adds that these coalitions often become stronger when traditional actors, such as environmental organisations, work alongside non-traditional actors.<sup>45</sup> Hess also applied a multi-coalition perspective on ITMs to uncover whether the coalitions are splintered along their

---

<sup>42</sup> Meghan Elizabeth Kallman and Scott Frickel, “Power to the people: industrial transition movements and energy populism,” *Environmental Sociology* (2018), pp. 1-2.

<sup>43</sup> Hess, “Social Movements,” pp. 1-2.

<sup>44</sup> Hess, “Social Movements,” p. 1.; Hess, “Energy Democracy,” p. 177.

<sup>45</sup> Hess, “Energy Democracy,” pp. 177-178.

goals.<sup>46</sup> This perspective makes analysing an ITM more comprehensive as it allows for deviations to be discovered amongst actors.<sup>47</sup> This means that the broader movement may have multiple coalitions co-existing with different sets of goals, for instance, within the same movement, one coalition may have sunsetting goals (e.g. ending the use of nuclear energy), and another might be focusing on the sunrising of other technologies (e.g. advocating for solar power).<sup>48</sup> Ultimately this leads to a better understanding of the way the movement operated, particularly in terms of its evolution and the compromises made during the process. It is also a useful way of analysing the first decade of the West German anti-nuclear movement when campaigns were less coordinated across the country, and the national infrastructure for the movement was only being constructed.

Through analysing several movements, Hess has identified various types of ITMs based on the main goals of the movement. He divided the goals into two categories: goals related to a transition of the sociotechnical system, and industry-related societal change.

Within the first subcategory, Hess offers the alternative industry type, which aims to support progress and transition in the industry, and the industrial opposition type, which has a sunsetting goal and intends to end (part of) the existing system.<sup>49</sup> The first one can be a movement that primarily calls for the use of renewable energy sources, whilst Hess himself explicitly classifies anti-nuclear movements as an industrial opposition type.<sup>50</sup> The case studies in this paper will certainly include this type, but Hess warns that an ITM can have multiple goals, therefore one type should not be dismissed in favour of another so early on.<sup>51</sup> It also follows, that these types are mere guidelines, or “ideal types,” although they serve as useful analytical concepts, but this means that a movement can be an amalgam of ITM types.<sup>52</sup>

Hess identified a further two types of ITMs based on the second main goal – industry-related societal change. He makes a distinction between the industry and governance restructuring type (or, industrial democratization), which aims for democratizing the energy sector, and the access or equity type (or, industrial access), which has economic objectives to support “low-income

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., p. 178.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 177

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., p. 178.

<sup>49</sup> Hess, “Social Movements,” p. 2.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Hess, “Social Movements,” p. 2.; Hess, “Energy Democracy,” p. 178.

<sup>52</sup> Hess, “Social Movements,” p. 2.; Hess, “Energy Democracy,” p. 178.

customers and working-class employees in the energy industries.”<sup>53</sup> The goal to democratize the sector can manifest in different ways: it can include support for “local renewable energy generation,” or favouring nationalizing (part of) the energy sector as opposed to keeping it entirely in private hands.<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, these movements may address a lack of public participation or transparency in decision-making.<sup>55</sup> The access or equity type may be focusing on the price of energy or tax increases, and it can advocate for government assistance for those on low-income, or for the creation of green jobs, for instance.<sup>56</sup>

This typology is useful in precisely tracking the objectives of a movement, which can change and evolve. Adding to the precision of this is considering possible differences between the objectives of the main actors. The strength of a coalition can also be connected to its success in adjusting the goals, in making compromises – this can follow the decision to target a larger or a different audience and/or the expansion of a coalition.<sup>57</sup> The objectives of an ITM are communicated through frames, thus, in order to examine the type of industrial change the movement coalitions were striving for, the introduction of framing is necessary.

## 1.2. Framing Theory

The notion of framing in the context of social movements is a crucial part of this paper as well. In short, framing presents and organises an issue in a particular way, it emphasises certain aspects of the problem and conceals others, it makes sense of events and points out what is under threat.<sup>58</sup> Movement coalitions use frames to appeal to the public, the policymakers, the media, and the industry – however, this paper places emphasis on the ability of a frame to address the public through choosing certain types of sources.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Hess, “Social Movements,” p. 2.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> Hess, “Social Movements,” p. 3.; Hess, “Energy Democracy,” p. 179.

<sup>57</sup> David J. Hess, “Cooler coalitions for a warmer planet: A review of political strategies for accelerating energy transitions,” *Energy Research & Social Science* 57 (2019), p. 8.

<sup>58</sup> Axel Goodbody, “Framing in Literary Energy Narratives,” in *Framing the Environmental Humanities*, eds. Hannes Bergthaller, Peter Mortensen, (Brill | Rodopi, Leiden, Boston, 2018), p. 6.

<sup>59</sup> Hess, “Energy Democracy,” p. 178.

Following Goffman's influential work, frames are used to help individuals "locate, perceive, identify, and label" events and phenomena: in short, frames give events meaning.<sup>60</sup> Framing is a great tool for individuals or groups to disseminate their message, therefore the concept has been quite popular in the social sciences, and it has particular value in analysing social movements as frames are constructed by the actors to carry the primary beliefs and values of a movement, and essentially give meaning to the struggle.<sup>61</sup> Therefore, frames reveal a lot about the core of the movement. By locating the popular frames in the anti-nuclear movement, the research can reveal the reasons that lay behind the protests, the concerns that served as motives. The term 'framing' inherently evokes a process, an on-going, dynamic construction, rather than a static concept, which requires agents – organizations and activists – to carry out the process and construct the frames.<sup>62</sup> The frames that are then brought about are 'collective action frames.'<sup>63</sup> As Snow and Benford identified, the actors involved in the process "frame, or assign meaning to and interpret relevant events and conditions," but in the case of a social movement, they construct collective action frames that would mobilize the public, "garner bystander support, and ... demobilize antagonists."<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, collective action frames provide answers to what is and what should be going on.<sup>65</sup> According to Gamson et al., so-called 'injustice frames' are an important component to collective action frames – Gamson even believes that collective action frames are always injustice frames, although this has been contested.<sup>66</sup> To construct an 'injustice frame,' the identification of an unjust authority is the first step, then with the use of specific words for instance, a sense of injustice can be stirred up.<sup>67</sup>

Frames operate through 'core framing tasks,' which describe their duties. The 'core framing tasks' cultivate agreement ('consensus mobilization') and promote action ('action mobilization').<sup>68</sup> Frames do not only make sense of the events, they also identify the source of

---

<sup>60</sup> Erving Goffman, *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of the Experience*. (New York: Harper Colophon, 1974), p. 21.

<sup>61</sup> Robert D. Benford, and David A. Snow, "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment," *Annual Review of Sociology* 26. (2000), pp. 613-614.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 614.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup> David A. Snow, and Robert D. Benford, "Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization." *International Social Movement Research* 1, no. 1. (1988), p. 198.

<sup>65</sup> William A. Gamson., "The social psychology of collective action," in *Frontiers in social movement theory*, eds A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992) p. 111; Benford and Snow, "Framing Processes and Social Movements," p. 4.

<sup>66</sup> Gamson, "The social psychology of collective action," p. 68; Gamson et al. *Encounters with Unjust Authority*. (Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1982)

<sup>67</sup> Benford and Snow, "Framing Processes and Social Movements," p. 616.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 615.

the problem (diagnostic framing), motivate the public (motivational framing), and provide solutions, or at least a plan or strategy (prognostic framing).<sup>69</sup> These ‘tasks’ are fundamental for this paper, with the caveat that the main issue identified will be the construction of nuclear facilities in both cases. Nevertheless, the analysis of the texts in this research uncovers the frames that were used, and the identification of them, via their motivational and prognostic duties, will reveal more about the nature of the industrial transition movement.

Additionally, scholars have identified the variable features of collective action frames, which include frame resonance.<sup>70</sup> Frame resonance is a fundamental part of forging a collective action frame for a movement, and it is a characteristic emphasised by Hess himself in his work on ITMs, as it points to the ability of the frame to reach a wide range of people who may join the movement.<sup>71</sup> In other words, a frame must be forged in a way that it resonates with a large audience. The frame must be credible, the actions of the movement must be consistent with its message, and the beliefs and values it conveys must be salient and relatable.<sup>72</sup> This is what makes utilising frames in this research possible: the frames to be uncovered spoke to the public and encouraged them to support the movement because the grievances and objectives the frames pointed out resonated with them.

To sum it up, framing theory allows the researcher to discover the beliefs and values that attracted the public and motivated the participants and, closely connected to it, the objectives of the campaign. This is essential as the frames are used to entice and convince people. The aim is to find the most prominent frame(s) employed by the movement coalitions. Ultimately, finding the primary frame(s) has a dual purpose in this research: first, the frame can reveal the ideas and issues that attracted the public, and second, it may also point toward the solutions, the outcome the participants advocated for. Furthermore, this research may also show the way the frames evolved, and how the coalitions became more integrated over time by adjusting the goals of the movement and constructing new frames that resonated with a broader audience.<sup>73</sup> Thus considering the differences between organisations will contribute to the deeper understanding of the framing process within the movement.

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> Other features include problem identification and direction or locus of attribution; flexibility and rigidity, inclusivity and exclusivity; interpretive scope and influence; degree of resonance. For additional details, see: Benford and Snow, “Framing Processes and Social Movements”

<sup>71</sup> Hess, “Energy democracy,” p. 179.; Benford and Snow, “Framing Processes and Social Movements,” p. 619.

<sup>72</sup> Benford and Snow, “Framing Processes and Social Movements,” pp. 619-621.

<sup>73</sup> Hess, “Energy Democracy,” p. 179.

As the case studies selected accomplished a (minor) goal and attracted tens of thousands of people, this means that the frames resonated with them, which means the objectives conveyed through the frame corresponded with the sort of industrial change they envisioned. Thus, the identification of the popular frame(s) in the movement will reveal one, more, or an amalgam of an ITM type that the actors were striving for.

### 1.3. Frames in Industrial Transition Movements

Based on the existing scholarship, the identification of the ‘democracy’ and ‘environment’ frames is expected, the former characterized by a demand for public participation and respect for democratic rights, the latter by ecological demands and conserving nature. Nevertheless, other frames should not be discarded either. Previous research on framing and energy transition movements has identified a variety of frames. This paper is only concerned with those that may have been used by the movement coalitions, that is, frames that could be used to oppose nuclear energy and offer alternatives.<sup>74</sup> This includes the ‘soft path’ frame, a term introduced by Amory Lovins in the 1970s. The ‘soft path’ frame refers to an understanding of nuclear power as “the wrong kind of technology,” instead of which an ecologically safe, alternative energy source should be used.<sup>75</sup> The ‘green jobs’ frame is straightforward: this frame points towards the creation of jobs in green sectors, a popular argument to invest in alternative energy sources as opposed to nuclear power.<sup>76</sup> The ‘security’ frame is also often used, which points out the risks of nuclear facilities, whilst the ‘runaway science’ frame warns against the dangers of technology itself.<sup>77</sup> These frames correspond with certain Industrial Transition Movement types as they communicate different kinds of motives and desired outcomes.

There are four ITM categories that Hess identified, and the classification shown in Table 1.1. is easily derived from Hess’ explanation of the different types of ITMs. The alternative industry

---

<sup>74</sup> Further frames have been identified in energy transition movements, but those are promoting or at least accepting the use of nuclear energy, therefore these are not relevant for this research. For further details, see William A. Gamson, Andre Modigliani. “Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach.” *American Journal of Sociology* 95, no. 1. (1989); Goodbody, “Framing in Literary Energy Narratives.”

<sup>75</sup> William A. Gamson, *Talking Politics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) p. 152.

<sup>76</sup> David J. Hess “Energy Politics in the Public Sphere: Frames, Values, and Symbolic Power,” in *Energy Justices Across Borders* eds. Gunter Bombaerts, Kirsten Jenkins, Yekeen A. Sanusi, Wang Guoyu, (Berlin: Springer Nature, 2019) p. 37.

<sup>77</sup> Goodbody, “Framing in Literary Energy Narratives,” p. 19.

type can be fought for through a soft path frame, as the promotion of alternative energy sources is included in this category. The industrial opposition type can be described by a “simple” sunseting goal, therefore the environment frame, which does not, in itself, offer a solution, the security frame and the runaway science frame, which merely urge for the sunseting of the technology, point to this type. Industrial democratization is easily promoted through a democracy frame, whilst the industrial access type can include the creation of green jobs, therefore a green jobs frame can be employed.<sup>78</sup>

| <b>Industrial Transition Movement type</b> | <b>Frames</b>  |
|--|--|
| Alternative industry development           | soft path frame  |
| Industrial opposition                      | environment frame; runaway science frame; security frame |
| Industrial democratization                 | democracy frame  |
| Industrial access                          | green jobs frame   |

Table 1.1.

The following chapters analyse sources distributed by the movement coalitions to find the recurring frames that resonated with the public. Based on Table 1.1., the discovery of the prominent frames will reveal the type of industrial transition they advocated for, broken down by the actors who utilised them to account for deviations that may occur in the framing strategies.

---

<sup>78</sup> Hess, “Energy Democracy,” p. 179.



Figure 1. Map. (own; based on template at <<https://d-maps.com/>>)

## Chapter 2. Brokdorf – 1976

By the time the construction of the Brokdorf NPP began, both the state and the activists had learnt from the Wyhl protests, they were more prepared and the campaign they engaged in became one of the most defining campaigns of the German movement, despite its few achievements until recently. This chapter focuses on the first months of the campaign, which began violently and attracted large crowds in numbers never seen before.

The municipality of Brokdorf is located in Schleswig-Holstein along the Elbe river (Fig 1.). Although the vague plans of the state to commission a nuclear power plant in Brokdorf had been known since around 1971, the construction of the NPP was only announced in 1973 by the utility company Nordwestdeutsche Kraftwerke AG (NWK).<sup>79</sup> Although the nuclear facilities were developed by private companies such as this, the German government was a major shareholder in utilities in general, therefore the state and the industry joined forces to develop nuclear facilities in West Germany.<sup>80</sup> In fact, a leaflet from December 1976, circulated among the protesters, discloses the fact that HEW, an electricity company in Hamburg became the main shareholder in the Brokdorf NPP, adding that “75% of HEW belongs to the city of Hamburg,” as state councillors and a senator in the Hamburg Ministry of Finance sat on the supervisory board.<sup>81</sup> On the opposition side, an umbrella organisation encompassing several local citizens’ initiatives, the Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe (BUU) was established in 1973, although their activity was minimal until the construction of the plant commenced in 1976, when they began to organise the campaign in earnest and were joined by other organisations in the process.

The construction of the Brokdorf plant was authorised to begin on 25 October 1976, albeit only in a limited capacity. A day later a barbed wire fence was erected around the site in order to block the protesters’ path and hinder them from flocking in.<sup>82</sup> These two days acted as the catalyst for the campaign to take to the streets – or, rather, the construction site. The first demonstration took place on 30 October, with over five thousand participants. Although already a violent protest with demonstrators clashing with the police, the subsequent protest in

---

<sup>79</sup> Joppke, *Mobilizing Against Nuclear Energy*, p. 101.

<sup>80</sup> Wiliarty, “Nuclear Power in Germany and France,” p. 283.

<sup>81</sup> Harburger Initiative gegen Atomanlagen (BUU), “Wußten sie das schon? HEW ist Hauptaktionär beim KKW Brokdorf“ (11.12.1976) Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>82</sup> Augustine, *Taking on Technocracy*, p. 131.

November was even more vicious. On 13 November, upon the call of the BUU, thirty thousand protesters showed up at the site, and 1300 police units were present, more than ever before.<sup>83</sup>

The struggle was not only fought at the building site. The activists also turned to the courts, who temporarily suspended the construction at Brokdorf in December 1976, arguing that continuing with the construction was not in the public interest, and throughout 1977 the courts extended the suspension and certain conditions were added to the granting of the permit, primarily focusing on the creation of a nuclear waste storage facility.<sup>84</sup> Although the construction freeze was lifted in 1981 and the plant began to operate in 1986, the Brokdorf campaign attracted a larger number of protesters than ever before.

This chapter deals with the first phase of the Brokdorf protests in 1976. This was a formative, active period which lay the foundation for the rest of the campaign by carving out their place in the movement and devising their platform in a very short amount of time. The activists had already learnt from the Wyhl occupation, and the broader anti-nuclear movement continued in Schleswig-Holstein. The movement coalition was mostly limited to the Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe (sub-chapter 2.1.) and various Communist organisations (sub-chapter 2.2.), but they were particularly prolific and left behind a large range of literature including pamphlets, flyers and press releases which address the public and provide explanations, many of which are available on the ‘Materialien zur Analyse von Opposition’ archive. The selected sources were either circulated in large numbers amongst the public or act as an example of the organisations’ strategy.

## 2.1. When right becomes wrong, resistance becomes duty!

Two days after the partial permit for the construction of the site was granted, on 27 October 1976, the Elmshorn branch of the BUU called for a protest at the construction site for 30 October. Their flyer communicates the main reason why rapid action is needed: the police units guarding the site and the fence meant to keep demonstrators out angered them.<sup>85</sup> By the same token, they highlighted one sentence: “When right becomes wrong, resistance becomes duty!” – a popular motto that has been used in various struggles, a catchy but compelling slogan

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., p. 134.

<sup>84</sup> Joppke, *Mobilizing Against Nuclear Energy*, p. 123.; Michael T. Hatch, *Politics and Nuclear Power: Energy Policy in Western Europe*, (Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 2014), p. 80.

<sup>85</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe Elmshorn, “Atom Alarm no. 3.,” (27.10.1976) Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

motivating the citizens to act instead of enduring injustice, while reminding those elected that they should serve the public interest.

The granting of the permit itself would have been enough for a protest to take place, but the involvement of the police and the erection of the fence clearly angered the local activists who had been paying attention to the construction plans in Brokdorf. Furthermore, the permission was granted just after the Federal Minister of the Interior, Werner Maihofer promised that no more nuclear plant would be built until a nuclear waste storage facility was secured.<sup>86</sup> The initial call to action of the Bürgerinitiative does not, however, go beyond mere anger and perhaps experiencing betrayal. It fails to detail the nature of the threat the NPP represents, although they do mention that 12,000 scientists have argued for the halting of construction.<sup>87</sup> This refers to the solar energy expo held in Freiburg earlier that year. This fair was hosted by local activists, academics and scientists, and the total number of people attending it was 12,000, although that does not mean they all opposed nuclear energy.<sup>88</sup> The event confirms that interest in alternative energy sources existed, primarily encouraged by scientists, but the flyer fails to mention this. Instead they claim that the scientists do not support nuclear energy due to safety concerns.<sup>89</sup>

The activists were aware of the violence that sporadically erupted in Wyhl, they were angered by the fence at Brokdorf, preparing for similar aggression, and the first flyer – introducing the campaign – is written in a tone that suggests this was a continuation of the Wyhl demonstrations and chances for peaceful protests were slim. But the misrepresentation of the Freiburg expo suggests that they were looking for alternative arguments to support their cause: the safety concerns imply a security frame, and the flyer also suggests security concerns regarding nuclear waste, but they fail to connect it to environmental concerns, despite being an environmental organisation. The central BUU, however, took a step closer to doing so. The leaflet, titled “Citizens prevent nuclear facilities,” briefly mentions how detrimental nuclear energy is to the environment, but the emphasis in the flyer is placed on the supposed blackmailing of the citizens by the state and industry with claims that “the lights will go out” unless nuclear energy is used.<sup>90</sup> Moreover, they highlighted two sentences, independent from each other. The first one states:

---

<sup>86</sup> Stephen Milder, “Today the Fish, Tomorrow Us: Anti-Nuclear Activism in the Rhine Valley and Beyond, 1970-1979,” PhD diss., (University of North Carolina, 2012), p. 288.

<sup>87</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe Elmshorn, “Atom Alarm no. 3.,” (27.10.1976.)

<sup>88</sup> Joanna Williams, “Can low carbon city experiments transform the development regime?,” *Futures* 77, (March 2016), p. 14.

<sup>89</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe Elmshorn, “Atom Alarm 3.,” (27.10.1976.)

<sup>90</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Bürger Verhindern Atoanlagen,” (28.10.1976.) Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

“We defend our right to health and a healthy environment,” using a partially environmental argument, which ultimately addresses their inherent right to a good quality of life.<sup>91</sup> The second one was the slogan “No nuclear power plant in Brokdorf or elsewhere,” which was also used in Wyhl, but the Brokdorf campaign sometimes included their rejection of a nuclear reprocessing plant for the spent fuel as well.<sup>92</sup> This slogan, much like the most popular motto “Nuclear power? No, thanks!” reveals an intense rejection of nuclear facilities – they do not, however, offer an alternative or even disclose their main issue with nuclear power. The promotion of the first demonstration reveals the BUU trying to find their main arguments: their documents contained residual anger from Wyhl, and a mixture of environmental, security, but especially democratic concerns.

On 30 October 1976, the protesters and the police clashed for the first time, albeit this was a rather tame event. In their speech, the BUU took a radical stance against the “irresponsible” authorities and politicians and demanded the end of nuclear facilities in the Federal Republic.<sup>93</sup> Their press release after the protest details the tactics of the police – chemical mace, teargas and water cannons – which the protesters bravely faced. Throughout the statement, they refer to the demonstrators as “environmentalists,” who were non-violent protesters, which stands in stark contrast with their subsequent demand for a prison sentence for a number of people, such as the police officers who sprayed mace on vulnerable protesters, and the managers of HEW and NWK.<sup>94</sup> Thus, the October protest was a robust beginning of a defining campaign. Its status can be illustrated by the sheer number of protesters the event inspired: the October protest was attended by around 5000 people according to modest estimates, and two weeks later six times as many people showed up at the site.

The protest on 13 November 1976 was a significant event, which truly gave the campaign legitimacy and popularity. In their flyer promoting the November protest, the BUU lists a set of demands, which included halting the construction, the withdrawal of the police, and that “The building site must become a meadow again!”<sup>95</sup> The latter was intended as a motto,

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.

<sup>92</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Bürger Verhindern Atoanlagen,“ (28.10.1976.); Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Presseerklärung,“ (03.12.1976.) Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>93</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Macht den Bauplatz zur Wiese!“ (Wewelsfleth, 1976.), p. 2. Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>94</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Presseerklärung der Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz Unterelbe Brokdorf,“ (30.10.1976.) Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>95</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Aufruf der Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz Unterelbe,“ (08.11.1976.) Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

although its popularity was largely overshadowed by slogans on the harsher side, suggesting that sentiments opposing police presence and, as an extension, the state's conduct were more important for the participants. The CDU's environmental spokesperson and staunch opponent of nuclear energy, Herbert Gruhl<sup>96</sup> did a speech at the rally, in which he referred to Brokdorf as one of the "last intact vestiges of our homeland," which presumably further galvanized the public, or at least illuminated the gravity of the situation.<sup>97</sup> The organisers of the protest, the BUU intended it to be a peaceful demonstration, however a few thousand participants began using more militant means to block the construction, to which the police responded in a similar fashion – dozens, maybe hundreds were injured as a result.<sup>98</sup> A doctor at a nearby hospital said that the eye injuries the demonstrators suffered were "terrifying."<sup>99</sup> Speaking to the *Hamburger Morgenpost*, he claimed that the police had asked him for the names of the injured activists, which he called a "danger to our constitution."<sup>100</sup> The force with which the state intended to stifle the protesters astounded the public.

A press release by the BUU, printed in December, details the events that had taken place at Brokdorf since the granting of the permit, providing information on the protests and the threatening police presence, and more explicitly uses the democracy frame than previous communications. They state that they have a right to stop the construction and that their enemy is not the police, but those who make the decisions in Kiel – the state capital – and Bonn – where the Bundestag was – and the industry they operate.<sup>101</sup> At the very end of this press release is their demands, which now included an appeal for *public* negotiations that should take place once construction has halted.<sup>102</sup> This was added due to ineffective talks with politicians and panel discussions that took place, and interestingly, this demand in itself does not exclude the possibility that the NPP could be built after thorough negotiations.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Within the Bundestag, Herbert Gruhl was a prominent opponent of nuclear energy. He was a member of the CDU/CSU, he co-founded an environmental organisation, the Bund für Umwelt und Naturschutz Deutschland (BUND) in 1975, and later a small green party, the Grüne Aktion Zukunft (GAZ) in July 1978.

<sup>97</sup> Augustine, *Taking on Technocracy*, p. 135.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.

<sup>99</sup> Unknown author, "Brokdorf: Chefarzt von Kripo bedrängt," *Hamburger Morgenpost*, November 22, 1976. p. 15. Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Untereibe, "Presseerklärung," (03.12.1976.) p. 8

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

Disillusionment with the state and outrage due to not being taken seriously was becoming the norm, which the BUU's press release from 20 November 1976 can illustrate.<sup>104</sup> The BUU condemns the use of chemical mace, teargas, and the aggressive conduct of the police. The organisation believes that they have gotten closer to shutting the construction down, although the phrasing of this implies a need to convince their supporters that they are on the right track. The three-point justification contains references to the large number of participants at the site and those who support the cause from elsewhere, even abroad. They mention that the protesters are bravely "defending their legitimate right to life and a healthy habitat," even if it means "confrontation with the state power."<sup>105</sup> Furthermore, the BUU reiterated that the governments in Kiel and Bonn are going "against the declared will of the population," demonstrated by the attacks by the police, once again appealing to democratic sensibilities.<sup>106</sup>

In December 1976, the BUU published a pamphlet, entitled "Turn the site into a meadow!" but despite its name, environmentalism was barely present in it. It included a list of "the citizens' arguments" against the construction of the site: the first argument cites the government's "unlawful" issuing of the permit in October despite a lack of public interest in the construction, and the rest claim the plant is simply not needed for the local energy supply, it would not create but destroy jobs, and that the radioactivity of the NPP would be that of "over one thousand Hiroshima bombs."<sup>107</sup> The pamphlet also discusses the lack of nuclear waste disposal centres, an issue that has become more pressing, appearing in several of their statements.<sup>108</sup>

After the November protest, the BUU began to more explicitly attack the state, security concerns were only implied and the *environmental protection* in their name has been all but forgotten, excluding a few references. The state wilfully ignored them, and this injustice was more serious than other grievances: they were explicitly using the democracy frame to carry their message. But the BUU did not have to fight alone as their concerns were shared by other organisations as well who decided to act: K-groups, that is, Communist organisations.

---

<sup>104</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, "Presseerklärung der Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe betreffend verletzte KKW-Gegner vom 13. Nov. 1976," (20.11.1976) Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>105</sup> Ibid.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid.

<sup>107</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, "Macht den Bauplatz zur Wiese!" p. 5.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., p. 30.

## 2.2. Down with imperialism!

The militant and the political dimensions of the Wyhl campaign were supported by active Communist groups, and this practice continued at Brokdorf, starting with the first protest in October 1976, but K-groups became particularly active after the first demonstration. One of the first groups was the Kommunistischer Bund Westdeutschland (KBW). In a leaflet circulated on the day of the first demonstration, entitled “The masses cannot be defeated in the blitzkrieg!,” they state that only “the representatives of the bourgeois class ... support this construction. The people are against it.”<sup>109</sup> The four pages long leaflet calls the struggle a fight against the bourgeois state and maintains that the nuclear plant “serves imperialist politics and the exploitation of the working population.”<sup>110</sup> In addition, they draw attention to the NPP’s negative effects on nature, particularly pollution.<sup>111</sup> Therefore, they cast a wider net, bringing up environmental arguments that could appeal to the people, whilst ensuring that they are aware that the real enemy committing injustices is the state. As Communists, the identification of the state as their enemy and the ardent use of the democracy frame are not surprising, but the softening of their accusations with environmental arguments is. In fact, the use of environmental arguments could have been a prelude to dealing with the question of nuclear waste – an issue inherently connected to a healthy environment – which has become quite pronounced by 1976.

After the first protest, an array of K-groups eagerly took part in the campaign. The Communist League, KB, joined the struggle at the beginning of November when they published a pamphlet entitled “Why we are fighting against nuclear power plants.” Although the pamphlet is not centred around Brokdorf, they declare that the state is deliberately ignoring the protesters, and several pages are dedicated to photographs from the demonstrations (e.g. Fig. 2.) which show the police units and the protesters clashing.<sup>112</sup> They also explicitly condemn the “brutal behaviour” of the state.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> Kommunistischer Bund Westdeutschland – Hamburg-Untereibe, “Die Volksmassen lassen sich nicht im Blitzkrieg besiegen!” (30.10.1976.) p. 1. Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid.

<sup>112</sup> Kommunistischer Bund, *Warum kämpfen wir gegen Atomkraftwerke*, (Hamburg, Arbeiterkampf Verlag J. Reents, 1976) p. 4. Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., p. 5.



Figure 2 Brokdorf 30.10.1976. (Kommunistischer Bund, *Warum kämpfen wir gegen Atomkraftwerke*, 1976, p. 14.)

A working group of the German Communist Party, the Deutsche Kommunistische Partei (DKP) in the Port of Hamburg was also active in the struggle. In a November 1976 article in the paper, *Kiek ut*, they detail their disapproval of politicians making decisions without input from the public, that it is only once pressure has been applied on the government do they begin to “apply the rules of democracy,” and they also harshly criticize the government for caring more about the industry than the population.<sup>114</sup> Similarly, the KPD, which was more of a shadow of the original Communist Party of Germany, went after the state. Their leaflet promoting the November protest, deals with the lies the “energy capitalists, the governments and the bourgeois parties” have been spreading, such as nuclear facilities creating more jobs or that they are safe.<sup>115</sup> The KPD also believes that capitalism is unable to deal with the energy question and environmentalism altogether, a nod to the environmentalist argument whilst maintaining that

<sup>114</sup> G. H., “Kein Atomkraftwerk in Brokdorf,” *Kiek ut*, November, 1976, p. 5. Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>115</sup> Kommunistischer Partei Deutschlands, “Das Atomkraftwerk in Brokdorf muss verhindert werden!,” (November, 1976.) Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

the central problem is with the system.<sup>116</sup> The K-groups were fragmented but they were united in their criticism towards the state, enthusiastically employing the democracy frame, and they made sure that all Communists in West Germany were aware of the injustices by relentlessly promoting the campaign.

Although the protests were organised by the BUU, K-groups became their “driving force.”<sup>117</sup> Instead of condemning each other, there was striking support and cooperation between them throughout the campaign. During the November protest, where the militant faction who provoked the police into further violence largely belonged to K-groups, the BUU, the unofficial leader of the campaign did not denounce them and their actions – instead, they “declared solidarity” with them.<sup>118</sup> Furthermore, their support for each other can be demonstrated by the same set of demands at the end of a flyer or a press release – e.g. by the DKP who even state that the demands originate from the Bürgerinitiative – or the appeal from the BUU published in *Rote Hilfe*, the paper of a left-wing group by the same name and affiliate of the KPD, in which they ask those who can testify against the police or have photographs to contact them, because they have a duty to “document the government’s civil war approach.”<sup>119</sup> In fact, the likening of the struggle to a civil war was also made in a pamphlet published by the KPD and Rote Hilfe, in which they also claim that the government is busy trying to “get every movement of the population under their control” – a scathing critique.<sup>120</sup>

Although both were eager to appeal to the public through discussing democratic injustices, using the democracy frame, the Communists were conjuring up more threatening and vivid images, connecting the construction of NPPs to imperialism, and pitting the hardworking farmer and the bourgeois state against each other, for instance in the December 1979 pamphlet of the KBW, which even had the phrase “down with imperialism” in its title.<sup>121</sup> Despite differences in militancy, the police did not make a distinction between the BUU and the Communists,

---

<sup>116</sup> Ibid.

<sup>117</sup> Augustine, *Taking on Technocracy*, p. 137.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> G. H., “Kein Atomkraftwerk in Brokdorf;” BUU, “Aufruf der Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz Unterelbe,” *Rote Hilfe*, no. 11/12, 26 November 1976 Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>120</sup> KPD, and Rote Hilfe, *Kein Atomkraftwerk in Brokdorf und auch nicht anderswo!* (Hamburg, 1976), p. 24. Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

<sup>121</sup> Kommunistischer Bund Westdeutschland, *Nieder mit Imperialismus und Reaktion. Kein Kernkraftwerk in Brokdorf*, (Hanover: KBW, 1976) Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on May 9, 2020)

claiming that K-groups were “disguised as citizens’ initiatives,” although it is true that some participants were members of both.<sup>122</sup>

On 17 December 1976, the courts ordered a construction stop in Brokdorf – but not everyone was satisfied, particularly the most militant faction of the Communists.<sup>123</sup> Further protests were planned because of the widespread belief that the state intended to carry on with the construction by deploying more police units.<sup>124</sup> Nevertheless, the accomplishments of the first phase of the campaign should not be understated: the injustices became common knowledge, the number of supporters increased, and the courts began to listen.

### 2.3. The Campaign as an Industrial Transition Movement

The movement coalition in the first phase of the Brokdorf campaign was quite spread out and not localized, especially when it came to the Communist groups – KBW, KB, DKP, KPD, Rote Hilfe – but even the BUU, the main leader of the campaign was technically an umbrella organisation with branches in the area, such as Elmshorn. There was a general sense of support and solidarity between the two types of organisations in the coalition – BUU members and K-groups – evident in their framing strategies. Essentially, whilst an environmental argument cropped up every now and again and security concerns were implied at times, as Table 2.1. shows, the democracy frame was utilized constantly and vigorously by both kinds of organisations. This is interesting particularly because the BUU was originally an environmental group, but the events made it impossible for them to rely on an environmental frame.

---

<sup>122</sup> Augustine, *Taking on Technocracy*, p. 137.

<sup>123</sup> Joppke, *Mobilizing Against Nuclear Energy*, p. 105.

<sup>124</sup> Elim Papadakis, *The Green Movement in West Germany (RLE: German Politics)*, (London: Routledge, 1984.), p. 69.

| <b>Coalition partners</b>                     | <b>Prominent frames</b> | <b>Industrial transition movement types</b> |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe (BUU) | democracy frame         | Industrial democratization                  |
| Deutsche Kommunistische Partei (DKP)          | democracy frame         | Industrial democratization                  |
| Kommunistischer Bund (KB)                     | democracy frame         | Industrial democratization                  |
| Kommunistischer Bund Westdeutschland (KBW)    | democracy frame         | Industrial democratization                  |
| Kommunistischer Partei Deutschlands (KPD)     | democracy frame         | Industrial democratization                  |
| Rote Hilfe                                    | democracy frame         | Industrial democratization                  |

Table 2.1.

The experiences at the Wyhl occupation, where the police used violence to forcibly remove activists from the area, has certainly influenced the Brokdorf campaign. The state’s immediate request for police forces to be deployed and a fence to be erected undoubtedly added to the sense that the campaign would be similar but probably more vicious than the Wyhl occupation. Although the BUU had been criticising the government, the active presence of K-groups certainly aided their usage of this argument, and thus aligned their frames, exemplified by the use of the vivid image of a “civil war.” Thus, the movement coalition began to cooperate immediately, coordinating their arguments, targeting an issue that would attract thousands of angry citizens: democratic injustices.

Using sources aimed at the public, the research reveals that the lack of public participation and respect for democratic rights became a great issue for those concerned about nuclear facilities in Brokdorf. The movement realised that the main problem lay in the state ignoring them, and not the environmental costs or the safety issues stemming from nuclear energy, that is, the real problem was the decisionmakers who controlled Germany’s energy future without input from the citizens. This is particularly interesting if we consider the fact that Brokdorf was a fishing village, and yet the organisations leading the campaign were not interested in utilising an environmental argument, which may have only motivated the locals. Instead, they opted for a coordinated use of the democracy frame – which could mobilise both the locals and those further away. The public agreed, the citizens demanded respect from the state, and thus the number of supporters jumped. This chapter analysed sources that addressed the public, but

further analysis of sources targeting a different audience would be beneficial to examine, and possibly discover discrepancies.

These findings mean that whilst the movement had a clear sunset goal regarding nuclear energy, that is, it was an industrial opposition movement, the democratic deficit felt by the participants pushed them to ask for more respect by the state and the industry, and thus the movement's objective was more focused on creating a democratic environment. This means that the movement coalition working tirelessly at Brokdorf and their supporters enticed by their messages transformed the movement into an industrial democratization movement, which includes "advocacy for improved democratic decision-making processes."<sup>125</sup> This result corresponds with scholars who claimed that the early stage of the movement was largely concerned with democratic injustices. Further research could determine whether this concern stayed in focus for the duration of the campaign, particularly when the NPP was connected to the grid after Chernobyl.

In addition, an important issue was raised in the pamphlets and statements throughout the first months of the Brokdorf campaign: nuclear waste. The participants were aware that the government had not dealt with the question of nuclear waste, and although many arguments could have been used in the debate, the government's inactivity on the matter was highlighted. Nevertheless, in 1977, the quest to find a place for nuclear waste seemed to have been solved. The next chapter deals with the campaign against the Gorleben site, the site of a proposed nuclear waste reprocessing and final repository centre.

---

<sup>125</sup> Hess, "Energy Democracy," p. 179.

## Chapter 3. Gorleben – 1977-1979

As West Germany increased its investments in nuclear power plants, the need for a nuclear waste reprocessing plant and storage facility grew. The 1974 *Entsorgungskonzept* (concept for radioactive waste disposal) guaranteed that the government would ensure that nuclear waste is taken care of in Germany.<sup>126</sup> Although Gorleben, a small municipality in the Lüchow-Dannenberg district of Lower Saxony (Fig.1.), was not the most suitable location for a reprocessing centre – it was, for instance, a level one earthquake zone – it was chosen because it was a less densely populated area than other options. Ernst Albrecht, the Minister President of Lower Saxony, even stated in his draft bill that he expected demonstrations therefore choosing the sparsely populated Gorleben would lower the risk of another major anti-nuclear campaign. Needless to say, this was not the case – in fact, Gorleben is still a contentious site today as nuclear waste storage facilities remain necessary. Furthermore, Albrecht was adamant on building the facility in Gorleben, because it would give the county leverage and perhaps popularity, as the site would directly contribute to Germany’s energy future.<sup>127</sup>

The decision to build the reprocessing centre was announced by Albrecht in early 1977, and the first demonstration was organised in March 1977, and protesters flocked to Gorleben for several years to come. The site was to be built by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Wiederaufarbeitung von Kernbrennstoffen (DWK), a private nuclear fuel reprocessing company who used controversial tactics to prove that Gorleben was an appropriate area to build the new reprocessing plant, and to intimidate and pressure the locals into giving them their land. Much like in Brokdorf, the industry and the state joined hands in constructing a reprocessing plant, and Albrecht happily granted the DWK the license needed.<sup>128</sup>

The focus of this chapter is on the first phase of the campaign – a lively, eventful period, that ended with Albrecht announcing in May 1979 that due to public dismay it was not “politically feasible” to construct the nuclear waste management centre, but efforts to create an interim storage facility continued, which included numerous harmful drillings – surface explorations –

---

<sup>126</sup> Hake et al., “The German Energiewende,” p. 534.

<sup>127</sup> Astrid M. Eckert, *West Germany and the Iron Curtain: Environment, Economy, and Culture in the Borderlands*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 225.

<sup>128</sup> David E. Deese, “A Cross-National Perspective on the Politics of Nuclear Waste,” in *The Politics of Nuclear Waste: Pergamon Policy Studies on Energy* ed. E. William Colglazier. (New York: Pergamon Press, 1982), p. 79.

in the area.<sup>129</sup> The first phase of this campaign was much slower than that of the Brokdorf campaign, therefore a longer period can be examined. It must be noted that the Three Mile Island accident occurred two years into the Gorleben campaign, and the number of protesters in Gorleben understandably jumped for a short period. The disaster happened on the first day of a symposium where influential, German and foreign experts debated the future of Gorleben,<sup>130</sup> and three days into the march from the Wendland, the area surrounding Gorleben, to the state capital, Hanover, also known as the Gorleben Trek. This is where the largest protest in the history of West Germany thus far took place as around one hundred thousand people gathered in Hanover at the end of the march.<sup>131</sup> The influence of the Harrisburg accident must be considered, as it shows an anomaly in the Gorleben campaign regarding the number of supporters, without neglecting the fact that the infrastructure for large-scale, coordinated protests had already been laid down. Moreover, lines were often blurred within the anti-nuclear movement between those who focused on local campaigns and those attending to the broader implications, particularly by 1979.

This chapter introduces the slogans of the Gorleben campaign, which were either created or popularised by the movement coalition, and they show creativity that was missing from the Brokdorf campaign. In fact, it is evident that the way in which the Gorleben movement coalition wished to communicate with the public was more evolved and sophisticated than at Brokdorf, where they mainly relied on flyers and pamphlets. In Gorleben, grassroots magazines published by the coalition were circulated. Although there are fewer sources available concerning Gorleben, the sources on the 'Archiv der Sozialen Bewegungen' reflect the maturity of the campaign.

For instance, the *Gorleben Aktuell*, which was edited by the Arbeitsgruppe Wiederaufbereitungsanlage (Reprocessing plant working group), whose members also belonged to various initiatives and associations: such as the Grüne Liste Umweltschutz (GLU) and the Aktionsgemeinschaft Unabhängiger Deutscher (AUD), both of which were the precursors of the Green Party, and Bürgerinitiativen in the local area, primarily the Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg. Besides original pieces, this paper also highlights articles from other magazines, which shows how the organisations intended to

---

<sup>129</sup> Peter Hocke and Ortwin Renn, "Concerned public and the paralysis of decision-making: nuclear waste management policy in Germany," *Journal of Risk Research* 12, no. 7-8, (2009), p. 8.

<sup>130</sup> The symposium was hosted by Ernst Albrecht, and as its full name "Symposium of the government of Lower Saxony on the basic safety-related feasibility of an integrated nuclear waste disposal centre" implies, the focal point of the debates was safety and security.

<sup>131</sup> Hatch, *Politics and Nuclear Power*, p. 114.

present the issues by picking certain articles to print. The Lüchow-Dannenberg Initiative was the most active in Gorleben. They also published the *Gorleben Informiert*, another magazine focusing on the struggle. Furthermore, this chapter considers the political wing of the movement, whose activity accelerated after the Brokdorf campaign began. Various green political organisations were established, some of which entered the 1979 European election under the name ‘Die Grünen,’ inspired by the Gorleben Trek.<sup>132</sup> Analysing their manifesto showcases the evolution of the broader movement and the influence of the Gorleben campaign.

### 3.1. Gorleben Shall Live!

Several slogans were used in the Gorleben campaign, which were created or popularised by the movement coalition. These slogans were meant to encapsulate the outrage the activists felt and communicate this to the decisionmakers, the state and the industry, in a concise manner. As the campaigns became more connected, more built upon each other, the slogans were often borrowed. Besides the existing slogan “Nuclear energy? No, thanks!” the Gorleben campaign introduced a new one in early 1977: “Gorleben shall live!” The original German slogan – “*Gorleben soll leben!*” – was a play on words which also showed a change in the tone of the movement.<sup>133</sup> This motto added a new dimension to the struggle in Lower Saxony, where nuclear energy equals the end of something significant, but the protesters are going to be triumphant and the area will “live” again. The popularity of this slogan is exemplified by the song entitled “*Gorleben soll leben!*” written for the protests to incentivise the participants to stand up “against this nuclear madness.”<sup>134</sup> Another popular slogan specific to the Gorleben campaign was “Reforestation instead of reprocessing,” a slogan that did not only roll off the tongue (“Wiederaufforstung statt Wiederaufarbeitung”) but it also offered a suggestion, to do something positive, as opposed to simply rejecting nuclear power.<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> Paul Laufs, *Reaktorsicherheit für Leistungskernkraftwerke 2: Die Entwicklung im politischen und technischen Umfeld der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2018), p. 453.; Unknown author, “Gorleben-Treck 1979: Demokratischer Widerstand In Einer Neuen Dimension,” *Grüne Niedersachsen* (29 March 2019) <<https://www.gruene-niedersachsen.de/gorleben-treck-1979-demokratischer-widerstand-in-einer-neuen-dimension/>> (Accessed on 7 June 2020)

<sup>133</sup> “Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg,” *Gorleben Aktuell*, 28 July 1978, p. 10. Available at <<https://asb.nadir.org/tp1.php?urlpara=3123>> (Accessed on 20 April)

<sup>134</sup> Jost Schneider, *Sozialgeschichte des Lesens: Zur historischen Entwicklung und sozialen Differenzierung der literarischen Kommunikation in Deutschland*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), p. 413.

<sup>135</sup> “Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg,” *Gorleben Aktuell*, 28 July 1978, p. 10.

These two slogans were the most salient at demonstrations, and whilst the first one is up to interpretation, the second one clearly utilized an environmental frame. However, familiarity with the history of the area may reveal something more sinister behind the slogan: reforestation became an issue after a forest fire in the area in 1975, a fire that the Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg called arson. In fact, in an interview for *Gorleben Aktuell*, Martin Mombaur, introduced as the top candidate of the Grüne Liste Umweltschutz in the upcoming elections in Lower Saxony, contributed to the theory with a hint of conspiracy. He pointed out the peculiarity of the fire taking place in the same area where the plans to construct the facilities were, adding that the public is “convinced that the operators could be behind it.”<sup>136</sup> Although the fires happened two years prior to choosing the site, Mombaur, an influential participant and organiser of the campaign, attempted to steer the discourse towards disapproval of the industry and the state, calling them “undemocratic.”<sup>137</sup> Nevertheless, the slogan in and of itself is created from an environmental perspective, but it must be noted that it also had a different connotation. In fact, what this interview proves is that although the environment was central to the campaign at the time, democratic injustices were also being felt.

Other common slogans included “Gorleben is everywhere” and “Albrecht, we are coming,” popularised during the Gorleben Trek.<sup>138</sup> The former is supposed to show that events such as this do not only occur in isolated areas, but it neither suggests a solution nor does it clearly state what the issue is. It was, however, a slogan used in other campaigns, starting with Wyhl, therefore this slogan also communicates that the public will not back down until the state agrees not to invest in nuclear energy anywhere. The latter slogan, however, clearly shows dissatisfaction with the system, although it does not really offer a solution either and remains more of a promise, or a threat.

This struggle was different than the Brokdorf protests: there was a lack of violence, a more environmental view, the quality of the slogans shows a more mature campaign. The abovementioned Bürgerinitiative Lüchow-Dannenberg was one of the main civil society organisations during the Gorleben campaign, and they eagerly utilised these mottos.

---

<sup>136</sup> “Interview mit Martin Mombaur, Wolf Römmig, Otto Klaucke,“ *Gorleben Aktuell*, 28. July 1978, pp. 14-15. Available at <<https://asb.nadir.org/tp1.php?urlpara=3123>> (Accessed on 20 April)

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.

<sup>138</sup> Bettina Meier, “Albrecht wir kommen! Gorleben-Protest in Hannover,” *NDR*, (25 March 2009) <<https://www.ndr.de/geschichte/chronologie/Albrecht-wir-kommen-Gorleben-Protest-in-Hannover,gorleben240.html>> (Accessed on 7 June 2020)

### 3.2. Mein lieber Herr Albrecht!

A few years before Gorleben, a group of local citizens under the unofficial leadership of Joachim and Marianne Fritzen protested a planned NPP in Langendorf,<sup>139</sup> but the official Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg was only founded in 1977 when they turned their focus to Gorleben.<sup>140</sup> This initiative spearheaded the Gorleben campaign, and they offered a new understanding of the fight – at least initially. Much like other citizens' initiatives within the broader movement, they rejected nuclear energy and any facility that supported the use of nuclear energy, but unlike them, the Lüchow-Dannenberg Initiative worked on not only being *against* something but offering an alternative as well. The full name of the initiative was Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg, and with the term 'environmental protection' in the middle, the organisation immediately distinguished themselves. This addition was not common, although as the previous chapter discussed, the main initiative at the Brokdorf campaign was also founded in this ethos – but the circumstances did not allow the fulfilment of this focus.

The dubious conduct of the DWK was a critical topic in the campaign. In order to construct the plant, the company had to obtain land from numerous farmers, many of whom did not want to sell.<sup>141</sup> The DWK began using unethical tactics to coerce farmers to sell their land – e.g. they would only be compensated reasonably if they sell their land immediately, and they were followed by unknown people hired by the company – and many gave in.<sup>142</sup> *Gorleben Aktuell* dedicated much of their second issue, published in July 1978, to the DWK's dealings. They highlighted a transparency issue but there are several instances where they explicitly draw attention to environmental issues surrounding the construction of the Gorleben nuclear facilities. For instance, the cover page depicts a board with the text: "Those who prefer to deal

---

<sup>139</sup> Langendorf is not far from Gorleben, also in the Wendland region of Lower Saxony. The announcement to construct an NPP there was made in 1973, and Joachim and Marianne Fritzen instantly stood up against it. Their primary argument against the construction was about the destruction radioactivity can cause. The plant was never built. Eckert, *West Germany*, p. 232.

<sup>140</sup> Lilo Wollny, *Es wird wie ein Kartenhaus zusammenbrechen - 20 Jahre Lügen, Tricks und Größenwahn. Der Atommüllskandal von Gorleben*, (1998) p. 6.

<sup>141</sup> This included the Earl of Bernstorff, who owned 50% of the land in question, and who has been a keen opponent of nuclear energy ever since. Wollny, "*Es wird wie ein Kartenhaus zusammenbrechen*," p. 6.

<sup>142</sup> Wollny, "*Es wird wie ein Kartenhaus zusammenbrechen*," pp. 6-7.

with trees rather than nuclear facilities can now lease a piece of land here and reforest it. You are actively opposing nuclear power plants and protecting nature and the environment.”<sup>143</sup> This refers to the grassroots fundraising project, organised by the Lüchow-Dannenberg Initiative, dedicated to preserving the land and preventing the DWK from acquiring it. The July issue of *Gorleben Informiert* also begins with a two-and-a-half-page long report on the DWK’s dealings, detailing the fundraiser and a story of how the DWK forced someone to sell the night before the initiative was ready to buy the land themselves.<sup>144</sup>

This was an enraging chain of events, where the activists learnt that the industry, and by extension the state which lets it operate in such a way, are not there to listen to them. Nevertheless, at this point, there are numerous references to environmental protection in both publications, primarily by the citizens’ initiative: the harmfulness of nuclear power plants is implied, and nature conservation is promoted, primarily through advocating for reforestation. In fact, a press release by the Lüchow-Dannenberg Initiative confirms this as they reiterate the need for reforestation and that their organisation works “precisely to preserve the natural characteristics of the landscape.”<sup>145</sup>

In December 1978, *Gorleben Aktuell* published previously unseen documents from the DWK which show that from the very beginning, the state and the DWK were aware of the unrest that would follow: they planned to use military force to intimidate the protesters and keep organising groups apart.<sup>146</sup> The editorial team dedicated seven pages to present and analyse the documents, and they also added proof that the public was being misled: public statements by government officials contradicted the findings in the documents. They published a short reaction to the documents in which they detail their disapproval of the state’s lack of dialogue with the public, and even declare their resistance to the system, mentioning the threat of inching toward a “nuclear state,” a term alluding to the oppression of a totalitarian state.<sup>147</sup>

All in all, this issue was more dedicated to grievances that arise from a government and industry that do not listen to the public, for instance, they also printed a call from the GLU to conduct a

---

<sup>143</sup> *Gorleben Aktuell*, 28 July 1978, p. 1. Available at <<https://asb.nadir.org/tp1.php?urlpara=3123>> (Accessed on 20 April 2020)

<sup>144</sup> *Gorleben Informiert*, July 1978, pp. 1-3. Available at <<https://asb.nadir.org/tp1.php?urlpara=3124>> (Accessed on 20 April 2020)

<sup>145</sup> “Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg,” *Gorleben Aktuell*, 28 July 1978, p. 10.

<sup>146</sup> *Gorleben Aktuell*, December 1978, pp. 3-9. Available at <https://asb.nadir.org/tp1.php?urlpara=3123> (Accessed on 20 April 2020)

<sup>147</sup> “Anmerkung der “Gorleben Aktuell”-Redaktion,” *Gorleben Aktuell*, December 1978, p. 7.

popular survey on the future of Gorleben, eager to involve the public, and the Lüchow-Dannenberg initiative explicitly warned the public to be careful with the DWK.<sup>148</sup> Nevertheless, a short report was also included, in which the ominous words of a forestry expert warn that the “nature and landscape of the Lüchow-Dannenberg district ... is threatened to collapse” due to the nuclear industry’s activities in Gorleben. He also called the area “one of the last paradises” of the “*Urstromtal*,” a sort of glacial valley.<sup>149</sup> Despite this warning, the December 1978 issue of the paper shows an increased use of the democracy frame – both by the Lüchow-Dannenberg initiative and the editorial team. The DWK’s conduct ostensibly contributed to the change in the hierarchy of frames.



Figure 3 Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg, *Marianne Fritzen*, March 1979.

By 1979, the Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg increased their use of the democracy frame, presumably elevated by the democratic injustices the participants experienced. Nothing illustrates this better than a photograph of their chairwoman, Marianne Fritzen surrounded by border guards, which they circulated with the text “All state power comes

<sup>148</sup> “GLU will Volksbefragung,” *Gorleben Aktuell*, December 1978, p. 20.; “Dringende Warnung,” *Gorleben Aktuell*, December 1978, p. 13.

<sup>149</sup> “Eines der letzten Paradiese ist vom Kollaps bedroht,” *Gorleben Aktuell*, December 1978, p. 20.

from the people” (Fig. 3.).<sup>150</sup> This passage was lifted from Article 20 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany. The picture was taken in March 1979 when the first mass arrest occurred after a roadblock, and the poster also reveals that Fritzen herself was arrested shortly after the photo was taken. This, coupled with the DWK’s behaviour, understandably pushed the initiative to take the argument for democracy more seriously, and it was also an effective way to stir the public and compel them to listen.

As tensions rose, the level of mobilisation rose as well, and the plans for a large-scale march and protest in Hanover were in the making. With the primary motto “Albrecht, we are coming,” the Gorleben Trek to Hanover began on 25 March 1979.<sup>151</sup> The demonstrators, including about 500 tractors, arrived in Hanover on 31 March 1979, where the speech of a young farmer encapsulated the sentiments of the march. Addressing Albrecht – “Mein lieber Herr Albrecht“ – he stated that this was a fight for their district and their lives, and they want Albrecht to listen to them and stop the construction.<sup>152</sup> The main message of the campaign has truly shifted as demands for respect of democratic rights increased.

Inspired by the Gorleben Trek, several green political groups and novice parties ran jointly in the 1979 European Parliament election under the name ‘Die Grünen’.<sup>153</sup> The organisations included the Aktionsgemeinschaft Unabhängiger Deutscher (AUD), Grüne Aktion Zukunft (GAZ), spearheaded by Herbert Gruhl, Grüne Liste Umweltschutz (GLU), and citizens’ initiatives, such as the Bundesverband Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz (BBU). Generally speaking, these associations worked within the framework of the broader anti-nuclear movement, that is, they did not put all their efforts into one campaign, but they were sympathetic to all anti-nuclear causes and promoted the campaigns, including Gorleben. Their election programme explains that the current energy policy is not sustainable on the long term, as it damages the climate, and they also underline the fact that it “threatens democracy.”<sup>154</sup> Interestingly, their argument against the construction of specific nuclear facilities is the risk of

---

<sup>150</sup> Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg, “Marianne Fritzen vor Polizeikette,“ (March 1979) Available at <[https://ku-ni.de/record\\_kuniweb\\_948096](https://ku-ni.de/record_kuniweb_948096)> (Accessed on 8 May 2020)

<sup>151</sup> Laufs, *Reaktorsicherheit für Leistungskernkraftwerke* 2, p. 450.

<sup>152</sup> Dietrich Mohaupt, “Politik reagiert nur, wenn Druck ausgeübt wird,“ *Deutschlandfunk Kultur* (21 March 2019) <[https://www.deutschlandfunkkultur.de/widerstand-gegen-atommuell-politik-reagiert-nur-wenn-druck.1001.de.html?dram:article\\_id=444175](https://www.deutschlandfunkkultur.de/widerstand-gegen-atommuell-politik-reagiert-nur-wenn-druck.1001.de.html?dram:article_id=444175)> (Accessed on 7 June 2020)

<sup>153</sup> Paul Laufs, *Reaktorsicherheit für Leistungskernkraftwerke*, p. 453.; Unknown author, “Gorleben-Treck 1979: Demokratischer Widerstand In Einer Neuen Dimension,“ *Grüne Niedersachsen* (29 March 2019) <<https://www.gruene-niedersachsen.de/gorleben-treck-1979-demokratischer-widerstand-in-einer-neuen-dimension/>> (Accessed on 7 June 2020)

<sup>154</sup> Die Grünen, *Wahlprogramm*, (1979), Available at <<https://www.boell.de/de/navigation/archiv-4289.html>> (Accessed on 9 May 2020)

an accident, which could “amount to genocide.”<sup>155</sup> They emphasised the sites in Gorleben and Kalkar – where the construction of a fast breeder was proposed – in Germany, but also Creys-Malville and La Hague in France, proving that the question of nuclear energy was an international problem.<sup>156</sup> In fact, the anti-nuclear movement transcended borders, and especially the French case was pertinent for the West Germans. The two states had signed an agreement to construct a fast-breeder in Creys-Malville, whilst La Hague was the reprocessing plant West Germany could use until they build their own.<sup>157</sup> Within this programme that is presumably representative of their beliefs, Die Grünen did not commit to using the democracy or the environment frame, and especially when mentioning the Gorleben issue, their main argument was the physical danger the production of nuclear power poses. Thus, they used a security frame, which points to vehement opposition of nuclear energy, although they do also offer democratic and environmental concerns to be considered.

At the height of mobilization, a few weeks after the Trek which saw 100,000 protesters, Albrecht maintained that Gorleben would be an excellent location for the plant, but announced that the construction in its current form would not go ahead as it was not “politically feasible” and he did not want “a civil war” in the state.<sup>158</sup>

### 3.3. The Campaign as an Industrial Transition Movement

The movement coalition in the first two years of the Gorleben campaign was mostly limited to the Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg, the Arbeitsgruppe Wiederaufbereitungsanlage, and green political organisations, particularly the Grüne Liste Umweltschutz. In fact, most active participants were often members of multiple organisations – e.g. members of the Arbeitsgruppe Wiederaufbereitungsanlage were members of the main organisations. Nevertheless, the movement coalition at the beginning of the Gorleben campaign is barely comparable to that of the Brokdorf movement, where K-groups adopted the nuclear debate: most of the organisations at Gorleben were established precisely to tackle this and

---

<sup>155</sup> Ibid.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> D. W. Pearce, Lynne Edwards, Geoff Beuret, *Decision Making for Energy Futures: A Case Study of the Windscale Inquiry*, (New York: Springer, 1979) p. 281.; Eckert, *West Germany*, p. 221.

<sup>158</sup> Hocke and Renn, “Concerned public and the paralysis of decision-making,” p. 8.; Frank Uekötter, *The Greenest Nation?: A New History of German Environmentalism*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2014) p. 97.

similar issues. Although the groups and organisations were new, the idea to organise protests and the practice of establishing these groups was not. In fact, without the previous campaigns, the organisations at Gorleben would not have been so prepared. The available sources also demonstrate an evolution in the communication of the movement coalition: the grassroots magazines distributed allowed the research to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the messages of the campaigns as these can showcase a wider set of ideas and additional details. The available sources neatly present a transformation in the Gorleben campaign. Whilst the Brokdorf campaign was clearly organised around the idea that the lack of democracy is hurting the citizens, the Gorleben campaign had more of an environmental element at the beginning, possibly due to the nature of the question of nuclear waste. With time, however, this changed.

| <b>Coalition partners</b>                       | <b>Prominent frames</b>                           | <b>Industrial transition movement types</b>       |
|---|---|---|
| Arbeitsgruppe Wiederaufbereitungsanlage         | environment frame at first; democracy frame later | Industrial opposition; Industrial democratization |
| Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg | environment frame at first; democracy frame later | Industrial opposition; Industrial democratization |
| Die Grünen (1979 form)                          | security frame*                                   | Industrial opposition                             |
| Grüne Liste Umweltschutz (GLU)                  | democracy frame                                   | Industrial democratization                        |

\* regarding Gorleben

Table 3.1.

As Table 3.1. shows both the Bürgerinitiative and the Arbeitsgruppe relied on the environment frame at first, but by the end of 1978 and certainly the beginning of 1979, the democracy frame was utilised, and the environmental aspects were neglected. This is especially telling in the case of the Lüchow-Dannenberg Initiative, as they put *Umweltschutz* in their name, specifically to show they value the environment. It could be argued that due to the nature of the site – nuclear waste has a much more evident effect on the environment than an NPP – the citizens were more concerned about the environmental consequences, therefore beginning the campaign with this focus made sense.

The gradual shift towards the democracy frame is not surprising, however, once it is put into context. First of all, the protests were met with a lack of reaction from the state – except for

attempts to stop them – which naturally angered the participants. Second, the DWK’s dubious activity infuriated the activists who wished the state would not allow this to happen. Moreover, the movement was breaching the political sphere through the green political organisations that began to run in local elections – for instance, GLU ran in Lower Saxony in 1978, where they received a surprising 3.9% of the votes.<sup>159</sup> This added a new dimension to the anti-nuclear movement, a dimension that meant a role in the existing political structures.<sup>160</sup> Although there were disagreements between those who wanted a national political party, and those who preferred working in a more grassroots capacity, the more political wing of the movement began to dip their toes in politics around the time the shift towards a democracy frame was observed.<sup>161</sup> This included members of the Bürgerinitiative, such as the abovementioned Mombaur, who ran on the GLU’s platform in the elections in Lower Saxony. This shift demonstrates the increased seriousness of the broader movement, and the lack of respect the participants received, to which the panacea could be entering politics and giving people back their voice. Finally, this shift could have been enhanced by the treatment the activists received at the March 1979 protest where demonstrators were arrested, including the chairwoman of the Bürgerinitiative. The change in framing shows that whilst at the beginning, the Initiative and the Arbeitsgruppe merely had a sunsetting goal, that is, an industrial opposition movement, the next year they began to advocate for a more complex change in the system, thus their campaign became an industrial democratization movement. Further research could determine whether this trajectory was followed in the subsequent years.

Die Grünen, encompassing several green associations was clearly reaching for a larger audience with their party manifesto. The document shared a lot of details of their thoughts on nuclear energy, utilised a security frame in relation to Gorleben, which points to a simple, sunsetting goal, that is, an industrial opposition movement, but they also used the environment and democracy frames in this document, which point to the possibility of advocating for industrial democratization as well. Research into Die Grünen’s further activity could uncover the full extent of their goals.

As expected, the environment and democracy frames were almost in a battle, vying for prominence, but the most pronounced frame overall was the democracy frame. Although the Lüchow-Dannenberg initiative tried to retain their environmental focus, achieving more

---

<sup>159</sup> Although this was a significant achievement, unfortunately they would have needed at least 5% to enter the State Parliament.

<sup>160</sup> Milder, “Today the Fish, Tomorrow Us,” p. 339.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

transparency and greater public participation in decision making processes became more pressing, and the movement was mostly focused on democratizing the energy sector. As the campaign's focus shifted, the movement also gained a national dimension as the political wing began to run in elections, which presumably contributed to this shift. Of course, the baseline of the campaign remained an industrial opposition movement, but ITMs often do not follow the rigid classification – even in Hess' own research – and thus the Gorleben campaign became an industrial democratization movement, a campaign to fix the lack of public participation the citizens were experiencing.

## Conclusion

At the root of the anti-nuclear power movement in West Germany was a struggle for public participation and respect for the citizens' democratic rights. Even though the movement inspired Green organisations and citizens' initiatives with an environmental focus, and the environmentalist movement gained momentum as a result, the emphasis was rarely on environmental concerns in the texts circulated by the movement coalitions at Brokdorf and Gorleben, addressing the public and communicating their arguments and objectives. In fact, the struggle was only about nuclear energy on the surface – the real fight was against the lack of democracy the citizens experienced.

The aim of this paper was to examine the formative years of two seminal but somewhat different campaigns to find out what type of industrial transition the activists envisioned, based on David Hess' concept of Industrial Transition Movements. This concept is an excellent way of describing and unearthing what lies beneath the surface of a movement. At the core of an ITM are the people who participate in the protests and actively seek change, and it is the movement coalitions' job to convey the message of the movement, which ideally motivates the public as it reveals why their cause should be supported and what outcome to fight for. They communicate these ideas and objectives through so-called collective action frames.

Framing analysis is often used in research concerning the media, but it has value in examining other forms of communications in social movements. A coding system is often used in this type of analysis but opting against it proved to be beneficial: the context provided by reading the texts in their entirety allowed for a deeper understanding of the circumstances and intentions of the authors. This research was guided through the frames the movement coalitions employed to address the public. There is, of course, significant overlap between what the organisers communicate towards the public and towards the decisionmakers, but oftentimes one argument, one frame is better suited for one audience than another. This paper focused on the messages communicated towards the public to find out their objectives and what resonated with the citizens, however, further research could determine whether similar frames were used towards the decisionmakers during the occasional public hearing or governmental testimonies – these were mostly done by scientists and politicians, therefore future research could delve into this, focusing on different actors.

This thesis analysed the frames utilized by the movement coalitions at the beginning of the Brokdorf (1976) and the Gorleben (1977-1979) campaigns in order to find an answer to the main research question: what type of industrial transition movement were these campaigns embodying? Although the availability of sources constricted the research, the difference in the types of sources intended to address the public found in the two archives (flyers, press releases and pamphlets in Brokdorf; magazines in Gorleben) reflect the evolution of the campaigns in terms of their methods of communication. By analysing these sources, a quite straightforward picture emerged: the issues that truly resonated with the citizens centred around democracy. Despite inspiring the environmentalist movement, the anti-nuclear power campaigns were striving for an industrial democratization process, whereby the industry and the state allow the public to take part in the decision-making process.

The movement coalitions were led by Bürgerinitiativen with an environmental focus in name (the Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Untereifel in Brokdorf, the Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg in Gorleben) alongside Communist groups (KBW, KB, DKP, KPD, Rote Hilfe) in Brokdorf and green associations (Grüne Liste Umweltschutz, Die Grünen) in Gorleben. These actors heavily relied on the democracy frame, particularly in Brokdorf, where heavy police presence immediately showed the state's true colours. In Gorleben, despite efforts to steer the focus towards more environmental concerns – e.g. they passionately advocated for reforestation – the democracy frame proved to be more efficient. The public was more motivated by this argument, and the experiences in Wyhl and Brokdorf certainly contributed to it. Fundamentally, although environmental and even security frames were not neglected, they were marginalised in favour of the democracy frame in both cases, which pointed out deeper injustices and resonated with a larger audience.

This research also considered the political wing of the movement, which revealed the power of framing an issue for a different audience. Whilst Communist groups adopted the movement's concerns, political organisations were also established as a reaction to these injustices, which became the precursors of the Green Party. Inspired by the Gorleben Trek and proving its influence, some of these grassroots organisations joined hands to run in the European Parliament election in 1979, under the new name, Die Grünen. Their manifesto demonstrates the use of a variety of strategies to target a larger audience. The security frame was utilised in connection with specific nuclear facilities, but their ideas for reforming the energy policy of West Germany included arguments for environmental concerns and democracy.

The sum of these findings ultimately leads to this result: the coalitions could effectively galvanize support by using arguments for a more democratic system as the participants were seeking a systemic change – industrial democratization. The results show that it's worth challenging pre-conceived notions, such as declaring the anti-nuclear campaigns as purely industrial opposition movements. Nevertheless, as Hess explained, ITMs are often a mixture of different types, therefore the industrial opposition type shall not be neglected: the movement demanded democratization through opposition to the nuclear energy programme of the country. Thus, its sunsetting goal coupled with energetic demands for transparency, public participation and respect for rights inferring both an industrial opposition and an industrial democratization movement. This result ultimately corresponds with scholars' claim that the movement in the 1970s was about democracy, specifically in Brokdorf. Furthermore, Hess states that industry and state actors often work together, which was demonstrated in both campaigns, therefore the democracy frame not only included a demand for respect for rights but also for increased transparency which not only the state, but private companies should adhere to. Although in Gorleben, there was an attempt to create an environmental campaign, which means that scholars who claim there was more emphasis on the environment are also not necessarily wrong: the movement was diverse, and the focus changed based on the place and the date. Nevertheless, even this campaign went through a transformation, the Bürgerinitiative made compromises and focused on democratic injustices.

The movement rapidly became a national phenomenon because the democratic injustices suffered by the locals resonated with citizens around the country. Nuclear energy became associated with a lack of democracy, a connotation that is not easily forgotten. Half a century later, although the fight is not over – demonstrations continue to take place, particularly against the dangerous transportation of nuclear waste – nuclear energy is being phased out in Germany.

Whilst previous research has examined the accomplishments of the movement or the ways in which the participants attempted to reach and convince the decisionmakers to act on their behalf, this paper was interested in the participants' intentions in terms of intended outcomes. Unfortunately analysing whether transformations or anomalies occurred later in the movement was beyond the scope of this paper, nevertheless the results from two defining campaigns in the first decade of the movement point in the same direction. Furthermore, as mentioned, the West German movement inspired campaigns abroad, starting in the United States. Further research could examine to what extent the idea of democratization was exported to these campaigns, and whether there was continued influence on movements abroad.

By analysing the frames utilised by the movement coalition, this paper aimed to shed light on the driving force of the West German movement, the reason why people supported it, as opposed to examining documents which addressed the decisionmakers. This was done because the West German anti-nuclear power movement was a grassroots movement and the spotlight should be on the people who drove the campaigns, who strove for change, and who, through demands to stop constructing nuclear facilities, conveyed a larger idea: a plea for democracy.

## Bibliography

### *Primary Sources:*

- Archiv der Sozialen Bewegungen. Available at <<https://asb.nadir.org/>> (Accessed on 20 April 2020)
  - Sources from 1977-1979 regarding Gorleben
- Materialien zur Analyse von Opposition. Available at <<https://mao-projekt.de/>> (Accessed on 9 May 2020)
  - Sources from 1976 regarding Brokdorf

### Archiv der Sozialen Bewegungen

- Gorleben Informiert, July 1978, pp. 1-3. Available at <<https://asb.nadir.org/tp1.php?urlpara=3124>>
- Gorleben Aktuell. Available at <<https://asb.nadir.org/tp1.php?urlpara=3123>>
  - “Anmerkung der “Gorleben Aktuell”-Redaktion,” December 1978, p. 7.
  - “Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg,” 28 July 1978, p. 10.
  - “Dringende Warnung,” December 1978, p. 13.
  - “Eines der letzten Paradiese ist vom Kollaps bedroht,” December 1978, p. 20.
  - “GLU will Volksbefragung,” December 1978, p. 20.
  - “Interview mit Martin Mombaur, Wolf Römmig, Otto Klaucke,” 28 July 1978, pp. 14-15.

### Materialen zur Analyse von Opposition

- Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Aufruf der Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz Unterelbe,” (08.11.1976.)
- BUU “Aufruf der Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz Unterelbe,” *Rote Hilfe*, no. 11/12, 26 November 1976
- Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Bürger Verhindern Atomanlagen,” (28.10.1976.)
- Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Macht den Bauplatz zur Wiese!” (Wewelsfleth, 1976.)
- Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Presseerklärung,” (03.12.1976.)
- Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Presseerklärung der Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe betreffend verletzte KKW-Gegner vom 13. Nov. 1976,” (20.11.1976)
- Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe, “Presseerklärung der Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz Unterelbe Brokdorf,” (30.10.1976.)
- Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Unterelbe Elmshorn, “Atom Alarm no. 3.,” (27.10.1976)
- G. H., “Kein Atomkraftwerk in Brokdorf,” *Kiek ut*, November, 1976.
- Harburger Initiative gegen Atomanlagen (BUU), “Wußten sie das schon? HEW ist Hauptaktionär beim KKW Brokdorf“ (11.12.1976)

- Kommunistischer Bund, *Warum kämpfen wir gegen Atomkraftwerke*, (Hamburg, Arbeiterkampf Verlag J. Reents, 1976)
- Kommunistischer Bund Westdeutschland, *Nieder mit Imperialismus und Reaktion. Kein Kernkraftwerk in Brokdorf*, (Hannover: KBW, 1976)
- Kommunistischer Bund Westdeutschland – Hamburg-Untereifel, “Die Volksmassen lassen sich nicht im Blitzkrieg besiegen!” (30.10.1976.)
- Kommunistischer Partei Deutschlands, “Das Atomkraftwerk in Brokdorf muss verhindert werden!,” (November, 1976.)
- KPD, and Rote Hilfe, *Kein Atomkraftwerk in Brokdorf und auch nicht anderswo!* (Hamburg, 1976)
- Unknown author, “Brokdorf: Chefarzt von Kripo bedrängt,” *Hamburger Morgenpost*, November 22, 1976

#### Other primary sources

- Bürgerinitiative Umweltschutz Lüchow-Dannenberg. “Marianne Fritzen vor Polizeikette.” (March 1979) Available at <[https://ku-ni.de/record\\_kuniweb\\_948096](https://ku-ni.de/record_kuniweb_948096)> (Accessed on 8 May 2020)
- Die Grünen, *Wahlprogramm*, (1979), Available at <<https://www.boell.de/de/navigation/archiv-4289.html>> (Accessed on 9 May 2020)

#### *Secondary Sources:*

Augustine, Dolores L. *Taking on Technocracy: Nuclear Power in Germany, 1945 to Present*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2018.

Aykut, Stefan C. “Energy futures from the social market economy to the Energiewende: The politicization of West German energy debates, 1950-1990.” In *The Struggle for the Long Term in Transnational Science and Politics: Forging the Future*, edited by Jenny Andersson and Egle Rindzevičiūtė, 93-144. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow, “Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 26. (2000): 611-39.

Beveridge, Ross, and Kristine Kern. “The ‘Energiewende’ in Germany: Background, Development and Future Challenges.” *Renewable Energy Law and Policy Review* 4, no. 1 (January 2013): 3-12.

Borden, Eric, and Joel Stonington. “Germany’s Energiewende.” In *Global Sustainable Communities: Green Design Technologies and Economics*, edited by Woodrow W. Clark, II, 369-386. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2014.

Bösch, Frank. “Taming Nuclear Power: The Accident near Harrisburg and the Change in West German and International Nuclear policy in the 1970s and the early 1980s.” *German History* 35, no. 1.

- Bryant, Chris. "Germany is Wrong about Nuclear Power." *Bloomberg*, June 4, 2019. Available at <<https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-06-04/climate-emergency-germany-is-wrong-about-nuclear-power>> (Accessed on 5 March 2020)
- Burns, Rob and Wilfried van der Will. *Protests and Democracy in West Germany: Extra-Parliamentary Opposition and the Democratic Agenda*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988.
- Carpenter, Scott. "As the Costs of Germany's Nuclear Phase Out Mount, Little Appetite for a Rethink." January 11, 2020. Available at <https://www.forbes.com/sites/scottcarpenter/2020/01/11/costs-of-germanys-nuclear-phase-out-are-substantial-new-paper-finds-but-there-is-little-appetite-for-a-rethink> (Accessed on 5 March 2020)
- Deese, David E. "A Cross-National Perspective on the Politics of Nuclear Waste." In *The Politics of Nuclear Waste: Pergamon Policy Studies on Energy*. edited by E. William Colglazier. 63-97. New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.
- Eckert, Astrid M. *West Germany and the Iron Curtain: Environment, Economy, and Culture in the Borderlands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Gamson, William A., *Talking Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Gamson, William A., "The social psychology of collective action." in *Frontiers in social movement theory*. edited by A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller. 53–76. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Gamson, William A., Bruce Fireman, Steven Rytina. *Encounters with Unjust Authority*. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1982.
- Gamson, William A., Andre Modigliani. "Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 95, no. 1. (1989): 1-37.
- Glaser, Alexander. "From Brokdorf to Fukushima: The long journey to nuclear phase-out." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 68, no. 6. (2012): 10-21.
- Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of the Experience*. New York: Harper Colophon, 1974.
- Goodbody, Axel. "Framing in Literary Energy Narratives." in *Framing the Environmental Humanities*. edited by Hannes Bergthaller, Peter Mortensen. 15-33. Brill | Rodopi, Leiden, Boston, 2018.
- Gottlieb, Robert. *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*. Washington DC, Island Press, 2005.
- Grässler, Bernd, David Levitz, Ben Knight. "Tens of thousands of Germans take to the streets in anti-nuclear protest." *Deutsche Welle*, March, 13 2011. Available at <<https://p.dw.com/p/10YDL>> (Accessed on 5 March 2020)

- Hake, Jürgen-Friedrich, Wolfgang Fischer, Sandra Venghaus, Christoph Weckenbrock. "The German Energiewende – History and status quo." *Energy* 92, (2015): 532-546.
- Hatch, Michael T. *Politics and Nuclear Power: Energy Policy in Western Europe*. Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 2014.
- Hess, David J. "Cooler coalitions for a warmer planet: A review of political strategies for accelerating energy transitions." *Energy Research & Social Science* 57 (2019): 1-12.
- Hess, David J. "Energy Democracy and Social Movements: A multi-coalition perspective on the politics of sustainability transitions." *Energy Research & Social Science* 40 (2018): 177-189
- Hess, David J. "Energy Politics in the Public Sphere: Frames, Values, and Symbolic Power." In *Energy Justices Across Borders* edited by Gunter Bombaerts, Kirsten Jenkins, Yekeen A. Sanusi, Wang Guoyu. 23-44. Berlin: Springer Nature, 2019.
- Hess, David J. "Social Movements and Energy Democracy: Types and Processes of Mobilization." *Frontiers in Energy Research* 6, no. 135 (December 2018): 1-4.
- Hocke, Peter, and Ortwin Renn, "Concerned public and the paralysis of decision-making: nuclear waste management policy in Germany," *Journal of Risk Research* 12 no. 7-8, (2009): 921-940.
- Johnston, Hank, and John A. Noakes. *Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective*. Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005.
- Joppke, Christian. *Mobilizing Against Nuclear Energy: A Comparison of Germany and the United States*. California: University of California Press, 1993.
- Kalb, Martin. "Rather Active Today than Radioactive Tomorrow!" Environmental Justice and the Anti-Nuclear Movement in 1970s Wyhl, West Germany." *Global Environment* 5, no. 10 (2012): 156-183.
- Kallman, Meghan Elizabeth and Scott Frickel. "Power to the people: industrial transition movements and energy populism." *Environmental Sociology* (2018):1-14.
- Karapin, Roger. *Protest Politics in Germany: Movements on the Left and Right since the 1960s*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007.
- Krause, Florentin, Hartmut Bossel, and Karl F. Müller-Reißmann. *Energie-Wende: Wachstum und Wohlstand ohne Erdöl und Uran; ein Alternativ-Bericht des Öko-Instituts*. (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1981)
- Kriesi, Hanspeter. *New Social Movements in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.

LAKA Foundation. "Responses after Chernobyl and Fukushima – Comparative Analysis of Germany and the Netherlands as Amplified Examples." *Nuclear Monitor* 743 (March 2012)

Laufs, Paul. *Reaktorsicherheit für Leistungskernkraftwerke 2: Die Entwicklung im politischen und technischen Umfeld der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2018.

Lindekilde, Lasse. "Discourse and Frame Analysis, In-Depth Analysis of Qualitative Data in Social Movement Research." In *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*, edited by Donatella della Porta. 195-227. Oxford Scholarship Online, 2014.

Lovins, Amory. *Soft Energy Paths: Towards a Durable Peace*. New York: Harper Collins, 1979.

Markham, William T. *Environmental Organizations in Modern Germany: Hardy Survivors in the Twentieth Century and Beyond*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2008.

Markovits, Andrei S. "On Anti-Americanism in West Germany." *New German Critique* 34 (Winter, 1984): 3-27.

McCauley, Darren, Antje Brown, Robert Rehner, Raphael Heffron, Shashi van de Graaft. "Energy Justice and Policy Change: An Historical Political Analysis of the German Nuclear Phase-Out." *Applied Energy* 228 (2018): 317-323.

Meier, Bettina. "Albrecht wir kommen! Gorleben-Protest in Hannover." *NDR* (25 March 2009) <<https://www.ndr.de/geschichte/chronologie/Albrecht-wir-kommen-Gorleben-Protest-in-Hannover,gorleben240.html>> (Accessed on 7 June 2020)

Milder, Stephen. *Greening Democracy: The Anti-Nuclear Movement and Political Environmentalism in West Germany and Beyond, 1968-1983*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Milder, Stephen. "Today the Fish, Tomorrow Us: Anti-Nuclear Activism in the Rhine Valley and Beyond, 1970-1979," PhD diss. University of North Carolina, 2012.

Mohaupt, Dietrich. "Politik reagiert nur, wenn Druck ausgeübt wird," *Deutschlandfunk Kultur* (21 March 2019) Available at <[https://www.deutschlandfunkkultur.de/widerstand-gegen-atommuell-politik-reagiert-nur-wenn-druck.1001.de.html?dram:article\\_id=444175](https://www.deutschlandfunkkultur.de/widerstand-gegen-atommuell-politik-reagiert-nur-wenn-druck.1001.de.html?dram:article_id=444175)> (Accessed on 7 June 2020)

Morris, Craig. "Germany's Energiewende: Community-Driven since the 1970s." In *Global Sustainable Communities: Green Design Technologies and Economics*, edited by Woodrow W. Clark, II, 105-113. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2014.

Morris, Craig, and Arne Jungjohann. *Energy Democracy: Germany's Energiewende to Renewables*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

- Papadakis, Elim. *The Green Movement in West Germany (RLE: German Politics)*. London: Routledge, 1984.
- Pearce, D. W., Lynne Edwards, Geoff Beuret. *Decision Making for Energy Futures: A Case Study of the Windscale Inquiry*. New York: Springer, 1979.
- Quint, Peter E. *Civil Disobedience and the German Courts: The Pershing Missile Protests in Comparative Perspective*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge-Cavendish, 2008.
- Radkau, Joachim. "The Anti-nuclear Movement in Germany," *Polygraph* 22, (2010): 167-182.
- Rehner, Robert and Darren McCauley. "Security, justice and the energy crossroads: Assessing the implications of the nuclear phase-out in Germany," *Energy Policy* 88, (2016): 289-298.
- Renn, Ortwin and Jonathan Paul Marshall. "Coal, nuclear and renewable energy policies in Germany: From the 1950s to the Energiewende," *Energy Policy* 99, (2016): 224-232.
- Rucht, Dieter, and Jochen Roose, "The German Environmental Movement at a Crossroads," *Environmental Politics* 8, no. 1. (1999): 59-80.
- Rüdiger, Wolfgang. "Phasing out Nuclear Energy in Germany," *German Politics* 9, no. 3, (December, 2000): 43-80.
- Schneider, Jost. *Sozialgeschichte des Lesens: Zur historischen Entwicklung und sozialen Differenzierung der literarischen Kommunikation in Deutschland*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
- Snow, David A., and Robert D. Benford, "Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization." *International Social Movement Research* 1, no. 1. (1988)
- Tompkins, Andrew S. *Better Active than Radioactive! Anti-Nuclear Protest in 1970s France and West Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Uekötter, Frank. *The Greenest Nation?: A New History of German Environmentalism*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2014.
- Unknown author. "Gorleben-Treck 1979: Demokratischer Widerstand In Einer Neuen Dimension." *Grüne Niedersachsen* (29 March 2019) Available at <https://www.gruene-niedersachsen.de/gorleben-treck-1979-demokratischer-widerstand-in-einer-neuen-dimension/> (Accessed on 7 June 2020)
- Unknown author. "Nuclear explained," U.S. Energy Information Administration, January 15, 2020, Available at <https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/nuclear/nuclear-power-and-the-environment.php> (Accessed on 3 April 2020)

Williams, Joanna. "Can low carbon city experiments transform the development regime?" *Futures* 77, (March 2016): 80-96.

Rüdiger, Wolfgang. "Phasing out Nuclear Energy in Germany." *German Politics* 9, no. 3, (September 2007): 43-80.

Wollny, Lilo. *Es wird wie ein Kartenhaus zusammenbrechen - 20 Jahre Lügen, Tricks und Größenwahn. Der Atommüllskandal von Gorleben.* (1998)

Wiliarty, Sarah Elise. "Nuclear Power in Germany and France." *Polity* 45, no. 2 (April 2013): 281-296.

Winter, Gerd. "The Rise and Fall of Nuclear Energy Use in Germany: Processes, Explanations and the Role of Law." *Journal of Environmental Law* 25, no. 1 (January 2013): 95-124.



## PLAGIARISM RULES AWARENESS STATEMENT

### **Fraud and Plagiarism**

Scientific integrity is the foundation of academic life. Utrecht University considers any form of scientific deception to be an extremely serious infraction. Utrecht University therefore expects every student to be aware of, and to abide by, the norms and values regarding scientific integrity.

The most important forms of deception that affect this integrity are fraud and plagiarism. Plagiarism is the copying of another person's work without proper acknowledgement, and it is a form of fraud. The following is a detailed explanation of what is considered to be fraud and plagiarism, with a few concrete examples. Please note that this is not a comprehensive list!

If fraud or plagiarism is detected, the study programme's Examination Committee may decide to impose sanctions. The most serious sanction that the committee can impose is to submit a request to the Executive Board of the University to expel the student from the study programme.

### **Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is the copying of another person's documents, ideas or lines of thought and presenting it as one's own work. You must always accurately indicate from whom you obtained ideas and insights, and you must constantly be aware of the difference between citing, paraphrasing and plagiarising. Students and staff must be very careful in citing sources; this concerns not only printed sources, but also information obtained from the Internet.

The following issues will always be considered to be plagiarism:

- cutting and pasting text from digital sources, such as an encyclopaedia or digital periodicals, without quotation marks and footnotes;
- cutting and pasting text from the Internet without quotation marks and footnotes;
- copying printed materials, such as books, magazines or encyclopaedias, without quotation marks or footnotes;
- including a translation of one of the sources named above without quotation marks or footnotes;
- paraphrasing (parts of) the texts listed above without proper references: paraphrasing must be marked as such, by expressly mentioning the original author in the text or in a footnote, so that you do not give the impression that it is your own idea;
- copying sound, video or test materials from others without references, and presenting it as one's own work;
- submitting work done previously by the student without reference to the original paper, and presenting it as original work done in the context of the course, without the express permission of the course lecturer;
- copying the work of another student and presenting it as one's own work. If this is done with the consent of the other student, then he or she is also complicit in the plagiarism;
- when one of the authors of a group paper commits plagiarism, then the other co-authors are also complicit in plagiarism if they could or should have known that the person was committing plagiarism;
- submitting papers acquired from a commercial institution, such as an Internet site with summaries or papers, that were written by another person, whether or not that other person received payment for the work.

The rules for plagiarism also apply to rough drafts of papers or (parts of) theses sent to a lecturer for feedback, to the extent that submitting rough drafts for feedback is mentioned in the course handbook or the thesis regulations.

The Education and Examination Regulations (Article 5.15) describe the formal procedure in case of suspicion of fraud and/or plagiarism, and the sanctions that can be imposed.

Ignorance of these rules is not an excuse. Each individual is responsible for their own behaviour. Utrecht University assumes that each student or staff member knows what fraud and plagiarism



entail. For its part, Utrecht University works to ensure that students are informed of the principles of scientific practice, which are taught as early as possible in the curriculum, and that students are informed of the institution's criteria for fraud and plagiarism, so that every student knows which norms they must abide by.

I hereby declare that I have read and understood the above.

Name: **Nikolett Szolnoki**

Student number: **6750788**

Date and signature: **05/06/2020**

*Nikolett Szolnoki*

Submit this form to your supervisor when you begin writing your Bachelor's final paper or your Master's thesis.

Failure to submit or sign this form does not mean that no sanctions can be imposed if it appears that plagiarism has been committed in the paper.