

Caretakers of the Mountain: Understanding the Burnaby Mountain Pipeline Blockade

by

Stephanie Shea

B.A. (Hons.), Simon Fraser University, 2013

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

in the

School of Criminology

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

© **Stephanie Shea 2016**

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Spring 2016

All rights reserved.

However, in accordance with the *Copyright Act of Canada*, this work may be reproduced, without authorization, under the conditions for Fair Dealing. Therefore, limited reproduction of this work for the purposes of private study, research, education, satire, parody, criticism, review and news reporting is likely to be in accordance with the law, particularly if cited appropriately.

Approval

Name: Stephanie Shea
Degree: Master of Arts
Title: *Caretakers of the Mountain:
Understanding the Burnaby Mountain Pipeline
Blockade*

Examining Committee: **Chair:** Brian Burtch
Professor Emeritus

Ted Palys
Senior Supervisor
Professor

Sheri Fabian
Supervisor
Senior Lecturer

annie ross
External Examiner
Associate Professor
Department of First Nations Studies

Date Defended/Approved: April 13, 2016

Ethics Statement



The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

- a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

- b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

- c. as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

Abstract

In the Fall of 2014, citizens of Vancouver, Burnaby and members of the Tsleil-Waututh Nation took part in a blockade in an attempt to prevent company Kinder Morgan from conducting survey work in Burnaby Mountain Park. The surveyors were met with intense local resistance by local long time protesters, as well as members of the community newly galvanized to environmental activism. A participant observation was conducted of the resistance to the pipeline development efforts. Field observations began during the initial monitoring of the site, and continued through the growing mobilization of the resistance, culminating with the mass arrests of protesters in November of that year. The ongoing analysis explores the philosophy of protest and 'radicalism,' as well as the role of consensus and conflict frameworks in the language of protesters and their use of various tactics of resistance.

Keywords: political protest; environmentalism; social resistance; activism; blockades

Dedication

To my family, who hung in there.

To all Land Defenders, everywhere.

To Tashanna, who I wish I could have known better.

Acknowledgements

This project would not have been possible without the immediate support of my supervisor Dr Palys. I also was helped immeasurably by my secondary supervisor, the professor for the methods class where the work took place, Dr Fabian. Both of them have continued to encourage and enable my contrariness and anti-authoritarianism with gracious good humour and infinite patience. I owe a separate and tremendous debt to my classmates, who talked me through the whole research process, and to Russel Ogden, who provided sound advice and kind counselling. Last, and certainly most importantly, to my research participants, who will change the world in a way that I can only dream of.

Table of Contents

Approval.....	ii
Ethics Statement.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Figures.....	ix
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2. Literature Review.....	5
Academia and Protest.....	6
Liberals and Radicals.....	7
Emotional Engagement.....	9
Protest Tactics.....	10
Media.....	13
Ideological Leanings and Tactic Adoption.....	15
Chapter 3. Methods.....	17
Evolution of the Project.....	17
Interviews.....	18
Ethics Issues.....	19
Chapter 4. Results.....	22
The Setting.....	22
Timeline.....	26
People.....	36
Meaning Makers.....	37
Caretakers.....	37
Chapparahl.....	40
Sut'lut.....	41
George and Anne.....	42
Non-Members.....	43
Veteran Environmentalists.....	44
Novice Environmentalists.....	44
Facebook.....	46
Observers.....	47
The Enemy(?).....	48
Kinder Morgan.....	49
Police and Courts.....	49
The Court.....	53
Strategy.....	54
Showing that we care.....	54
Getting enough people together.....	56

Concrete Intervention	58
Symbolic Arrest	59
Chapter 5. Discussion	62
Hierarchy.....	63
Ownership and Voice.....	64
Core Conflict	68
How far must we push?	71
Role of the Researcher	74
So how did it all end?	76
Chapter 6. Conclusion.....	81
Diversity of Tactics	81
Conflict and Consensus	83
References	87

List of Figures

Figure 4-1: A map of the area.....	23
------------------------------------	----

Chapter 1.

Introduction

In the Fall of 2014, the city of Burnaby, British Columbia played host to an anti-pipeline blockade. U.S. based company Kinder-Morgan had begun conducting survey work in Burnaby Mountain Park in order to investigate the feasibility of a transmountain pipeline¹. The company was met with intense local resistance. This was partially due to an existing network of environmental protesters in the area who mobilized early against the development, as well as to the company's decision to continue the project against the wishes of the municipal government itself. Kinder Morgan's work was inconsistent with local bylaws protecting the park, a registered conservation area², and the perceived egregiousness of their being allowed to continue it galvanized new and first time protesters to participate in the demonstrations against the work. This conflict began an ongoing legal battle as to a municipality's right to control energy development. This study is a multi-method exploration of the resistance to these surveying efforts.

The Burnaby Mountain Pipeline Blockade took place from September through December of 2014. That summer previous, many locals in the City of Burnaby were already aware that energy company Kinder Morgan was going to attempt to develop pipelines in their city. Having already been impacted in 2007 by one downtown Burnaby oil spill due to a Kinder Morgan pipeline rupture, resistance to the new development formed quickly. The group 'Burnaby Residents Oppose Kinder-Morgan Expansion' (BROKE) began leaflet campaigns as early as July 2014, going from door to door and raising awareness about the proposed pipeline corridor and possible environmental

¹ A pipeline development project that would involve drilling and laying pipe directly through and under Burnaby Mountain.

² A space protected from development by bylaws, devoted to protecting local green space and natural habitats. Burnaby Mountain Park is a conservation area large enough that it supports a rich and diverse wildlife, including thirteen black bears

impacts. September 2014 marked the beginning of a concentrated effort to physically hold the space clear of workers, news of the issue had been spreading for some time. On September 2nd, it was discovered that contractors had cut down trees in Burnaby Mountain Park. In a deep part of the woods on the mountainside, at GPS coordinates that would become known as 'Borehole One,' the company and cut down a thirteen red alders, in preparation for being able to lower heavy equipment into the dense woods by helicopter. Though the city attempted to have the work stopped, the National Energy Board³ (NEB) ruled Burnaby's bylaws "inoperative or inapplicable." The board alleged that although the city might have a say in whether the pipeline eventually went through, it should be as an intervenor during an official board hearing, where Kinder Morgan would also have the right to make their case, and therefore should be allowed to present surveying data as to the feasibility of their pipeline plan; municipal bylaws could not interfere with the federal energy development process. While the city took the issue to court, during the progression of that case potentially environmentally harmful work was still continuing on the mountain. Grassroots mobilization began to occur within the local Burnaby, Vancouver, and Tsleil-Waututh communities to stop the work.

The mobilization that took place around the Kinder Morgan pipeline expansion occurred in the context of a rich tradition of environmentalist protest in British Columbia⁴, and was a part of a growing opposition to the energy industry in Canada and worldwide. It also took place in the context of ongoing debate around Bill C51, a bill that would expand police and government powers to take anti-terrorism measures, and that many concerned Canadians believed might be used by police to target environmental activists.

This thesis explores the developing protests, the establishment of the mountainside camp, and the decision to remain on the mountainside in defiance of a court order, leading to the mass arrests during the pipeline blockade in November of 2014. Primarily I explore the ideological conflicts between protesters, as a negotiation that provides insight into how protesters perceived their own actions, particularly how their

³ An independent economic regulatory agency created by the Government of Canada to control and oversee international and inter-provincial energy industry concerns.

⁴ The province is sometimes known as 'green BC,' referring to massive historical efforts and campaigns to prevent logging and deforestation, as well as to ongoing struggles by Land Defenders regarding pipeline and mining development in the north of the province.

protests might provoke change. Two core research methods were employed. The first was a participant observation of the pipeline blockade that occurred on Burnaby Mountain. My field observations began during the initial monitoring of the site, and continued through the growing mobilization of the resistance, to the point of the mass arrests of protesters in November of that year. The second research method was a short series interviews following the end of the blockade, in March through July of 2015. Participants were activists associated with the environmental protest movement in Vancouver and involved with the Caretaker⁵ specifically. They supplied context for the events that had occurred, and protesters from other Canadian cities supplied insight into protest in general, and points of comparison for the events in Burnaby.

Through a diverse selection of participants and field sites, using a participant- led approach in terms of where to turn next, I strove to explore the events on Burnaby Mountain. Although I was able to witness the development of this blockade from nearly beginning to end, I also consider these events to be one chapter in the history of political resistance in British Columbia, in particular in the complex history of Land Defence and the environmentalism tied to anti-colonialism that exists when blockades like this one take place on unceded territory. My analysis explores philosophies of the protesters, focusing on interpersonal relations between activists to understand the role of consensus and conflict frameworks in the language of protesters and their use of various tactics of resistance, and explored the interpersonal frictions when two groups holding such different perspectives worked together to try to accomplish the same task.

I begin in Chapter 2 with an exploration of some of the literature associated with social movement studies, globalization and securitization, and transmission of tactics within activist networks. This brief exploration of my theoretical standpoint and the major work that influences mine is followed in Chapter 3 with a discussion of the research methods used. I discuss the specifics of my period of field observations, the protocols for conducting the participant-guided interviews, and the ethics concerns involved in this kind of criminological research. Results are reported in Chapter 4, which focuses on providing a concise summary of the events I witnessed on the mountain and the fallout that was

⁵ The name of the unofficial group of people involved in spending time on the mountain to hold surveyors back.

described to me during interviews. This involves some of the effort that was needed to physically mount a camp, and my first descriptions of the source of conflict between the local activists. In Chapter 5, this is expanded upon by a more thorough discussion of the themes that emerged throughout the study, grounding the facts that I observed in theory. I unpack some of the theoretical underpinnings of the perspectives of my participants, distinguishing between activists who believe that public perception matters and needs to be won over to their side, from activists who believe in a level of systemic corruption that means that only direct action can protect our environment at this point. In my conclusion, I briefly return to the current Canadian political context, and discuss my work in terms of implication for future research.

Chapter 2.

Literature Review

Protest is a visible form of a broader resistance that exists in iceberg-like proportion to the greater hotbed of general activism and resistance, according to authors Dauvergne and LeBaron, who explore the recent history of activism in North America (2014, p. 9). There is a common tradition in more purely academic circles to refer to protests, rallies, social gatherings, and other public group gatherings in support of a political idea as 'events' in order to analyze them all together (Earl, McCarthy, & Soule, 2004). This is because these activities represent organized and public forms of social resistance. In keeping with this tradition, this thesis analyzes the events leading up to the mass arrests on Burnaby Mountain, from small group meetings to large scale marches and rallies.

The academic study of political protest, particularly in the field of criminology, has several epistemological splits that characterize major differences in perspective on protests. While all crowd unrest was previously generally characterized as mob behaviour, the rise of protest culture⁶ on campuses and critical scholarship added more nuance to that understanding. Although political action is still sometimes explored in the context of being an emotional reaction to injustice, there is also an understanding that it can be an effective strategy for social change, and a growing body of work that explores the nuanced space between these two poles.

One phenomenon frequently studied in association with political protest is the process by which activists adopt tactics for resistance. There is a tension in the literature around this question, between conceiving of protest as an irrational or rational activity. Theories that are a part of social movement studies often allow for political protest to exist as a sophisticated form of resistance that activists may choose to engage with in a tactical and deliberate way; advocates of this approach typically employ theories of social movements, as well as subculture studies. This perspective stands in contrast to a more

⁶ A tendency towards a politically active student body, a critical and sometimes left-leaning faculty, the image of marches and rallies on university campuses becoming commonplace.

classical framework, often reinterpreted from more of a policing perspective, which focuses on crowd activities as a product of collective anger and frustration, with any resulting actions seen as a product of mob mentality encouraged by a handful of leaders. A common criticism of this kind of writing is that it is dismissive of the real concerns that activists may have. Both these frameworks for conceptualizing the structures of activist activities are useful when paired with diffusion theories to analyze how tactics for protest transmit themselves through organization structures as well as make the leap from network to network.

Because of the proliferation and variety of anti-oppression movements, there are myriad ideologies associated with protest movements and resistance. The ones most relevant to this research are liberalism and radicalism. I discuss how these theoretical orientations influence the way protesters perceive their relationship with authority and with the media, as well as the tactics that activists use. I discuss the transmission and spread of tactics in general, particularly when the distinction between radical and liberal protesters is not entirely clear, while both participate in the same movements.

Academia and Protest

Campuses are not only a location where academic theories about protest are generated. They are frequently the location of rallies, marches, and other demonstrations. The research that takes place around protest in many cases arises from a culture that is heavily involved with activism, particularly the body of work on the topic published in the 1970s. It is not surprising that the students involved in incidents like Kent State, for example, where four unarmed students were shot and killed by the Ohio National Guard (Michener, 1971), would produce a growing collective body of anti-establishmentarian theory. Simon Fraser University, where this research was conducted, has a long and rich history as a hotbed of activism and demonstrations (Johnston, 2005). SFU personnel were involved in the Burnaby Mountain protests as well; many of the key participants in this research were SFU students, and oftentimes staff and professors were protesting between classes and receiving delivery of legal documents to their department offices. In one memorable case, I came upon a professor sitting in her car, giving a graduate student's thesis a rapid read-over before stepping back out to return to a rally. The

distinction between academia as the lens through which protest is examined and the source of said protest seemed to become more blurred as the research went on.

Protests and critical criminologies⁷ are inherently linked because they spring from the same source. The ideological principles behind critical criminology are, for the most part, the same ones that contributed to social movements and political protests around social justice issues involving, for example, inequalities in race and gender. The main contribution of critical criminology to the study of political protest is the new understanding of the power of the state in the construction of crime, the process of criminalization, and conflict theories in general. By understanding the social world to have systems of domination, inequality, alienation and injustice inherent in our countries and political entities, we understand the role that political protest can play in addressing those issues.

The growing role of activism in academic spaces brought with it a new attitude towards protest in academic writing. Sociological work such as McDougall's 1939 *the Group Mind* described crowd violence as being caused primarily by mob mentality. Later perspectives expanded to include a variety of approaches informed by a growing acceptance of conflict models of society. While protest had previously been seen as an emotional response to frustration at the injustice that results from friction between social groups, post-1960s critical theorists are more likely to view activism as a tool to be rationally used by those groups in power negotiations with one another.

Liberals and Radicals

There are many ideological approaches to protest activity, of which two broad categories are of particular relevance to the current study. The first, liberal protest, is political protest that has the goal of stimulating change from within the system. The second, radical protest, aims to disrupt existing structures of power. An example of a common form of liberal protest is the mainstream feminist movement. First and second wave feminist involvement in political protest characterized by massive engagement

⁷ Criminological theory centered around critiques of power; feminist, Marxist, anti-racist criminological theory, among others.

through political demonstrations, disobediences, and other activities that fall under the umbrella of protest (Raeburn, 1973; Rebick, 2005; Steinem, 1983).

Contrasted with liberalism, radicalism is the philosophy that the same battles must be fought, but can only be won by replacing the existing power structure. A woman elected prime minister, for example, would be simultaneously hampered by the power structures she moves within, such as the personal ideological compromises she might have to make to ensure her election. Her success, understood through the lens of intersectionality, would be of limited use to women who face other forms of oppression. Militantism is a philosophy that involves armed, active political resistance. Not all militants are opposed to all forms of governance.

Associated with the feminist movement is a breaking down of hitherto rigid gender structures, as women historically begin to 'force' their way into new realms of life in greater numbers, sometimes including the criminal aspects of protest (Einstadter & Henry, 2006, p. 276). In terms of political protest, this included being put in harm's way, engaging in acts of violence, and in the notable case of one London suffragette, facing death by throwing herself onto the horse track during the middle of a race (Raeburn, 1973). Militant suffragette work in the early feminist movement was crucial to successfully challenging stereotypes about women and femininity, but still associated with the efforts and philosophies of liberalism, and particularly the increased representation of women in government and in the judiciary.

Anarchists, by contrast, see all hierarchies as inherently negative and want to abolish them (Gordon, 2007). The degree to which they advocate for this disruption of power may in some cases fall into militantism, but anarchists specifically resist hierarchy and authority, where some militants do not. They have been associated with some of the most aggressive innovations in protest tactics in the last few decades⁸. It is most commonly understood that militantism is about the means, and anarchism is about the ends, and from a purely philosophical perspective this is true. However, at Burnaby Mountain, there were many anarchist protesters who align themselves with that outlook and yet only propose or hope for partial measures, seeking a reduction in social control,

⁸ See in particular the Black Bloc tactics of new anarchist movements.

or admiring and using 'anarchist tactics' rather than pushing for the erasure of all social order.

These are complex and evolving terminologies, with different nuances and implications across disciplines. As I engage with them in my work, as a feminist criminologist, both militantism and anarchism can be forms of radicalism (Gordon, 2007). Like anarchism, in many respects, the members of a 'radical' political movement might want to see partial to total dismantling of a current political system, but unlike an anarchist they may be content to see it replaced with some sort of structure or organization; radical feminists, for example, are not exclusively anarchists, though the two philosophies are linked that they frequently work in solidarity with one another and oftentimes go hand in hand.

Emotional Engagement

Although I use a framework that presupposes that many activists are rational, there are many meritorious theories that analyze the role that emotional engagement and activism play in affecting the decision of an individual to participate in protest activities. Alain Touraine, who coined the term 'new social movements' to refer to the upsurge of post-industrialization protests centered around gender, class, and race (Touraine, 1965), furthered the analysis of protest by ascribing certain personal characteristics to protesters. For Touraine, modern protest originated as organized sabotage committed by skilled workers. Workers whose trades afforded them a high level of autonomy in the workforce found their freedom threatened by the advent of Fordism⁹, and responded by engaging in a series of attacks and vandalism at factories. Touraine's (2002) point is that there must be personal conditions (temperament, political allegiance or inclination) in the participants that prime them to engage (p. 89).

Some writers describe protest as a sort of prisoners' dilemma, where if all members of the community participate then the rewards will be high and the punishment lower, and

⁹ Mechanized production via assembly line, and the drastic changes it meant in social and working life.

if only a few members of the community participate the punishment will be higher, thus necessitating a certain amount of trust between community members in order to risk social engagement (Jung, 2003). However, Muller and Opp (1986) postulate that this level of trust cannot possibly occur, which leads them to expand their rational choice theory of political protest beyond a strict private-interest model and accept the hypothesis that the psychological benefits of acting for the public good might also motivate political participation. This conclusion is echoed in research on 'therapeutic civil disobedience,' disobedience for ones' own happiness (Smith, 1994). Both frameworks create space for an activism that is not necessarily motivated by any belief in the likelihood of provoking quick or immediate change, or even necessarily immediate material or political benefit for the protesters, rather, that resistance can be an activity that has intrinsic personal value.

Jung's (2003) case study of a South African social protest in the post-apartheid reorganization of the country emphasized that it is possible for protest to occur in the absence of communal trust. It had previously been hypothesized that trust was an essential component of an effective social movement, but the community that organized to protest was one where neighbours were isolated from one another, and social ties were weak. However, despite the neighbourhood Jung studied not having a network of people who knew one another well, the protests manifested spontaneously, and were well attended and very effective. Participants in Jung's study ascribed their attendance to a strong sense that the resistance (blockading, in this case) would be effective, and described trust as forming spontaneously at the protest itself (p 147). A case can be made that strong and durable relationships, tight knit communities, and high levels of trust can lead to more rapid diffusion and an easier mobilization to participation- e.g., when Black church communities served as points of mobilization for civil rights activism (Strang & Soule, 1998) but trust is not an absolutely necessary precursor to engagement.

Protest Tactics

Diffusion theory provides a useful framework for describing how activists learn tactics from one another. Classical diffusion theory tracks any changes in behaviour as transmitted from one person or organization to another (Strang & Soule, 1998), but can also track the spread of anything "from the use of prescription drugs to hybrid corn" (p

267). In the context of social movement theory, it describes the transmission of tactics of resistance from one activist or activist network to another. Its three stages, awareness, persuasion, and adoption, explain how activist networks may adopt tactics from one another (Rogers, 2003). Historically protest was understood to be diffused through irrational contagion (McDougall, 1939). However, as of the 1960s and the advent of critical theory in academia, there has been a shift to a much more sympathetic perspective in social movement studies (Strang & Soule, 1998, p. 268).

Tactics are likely to transmit along multiple pathways. They may jump easily along close ties, between friends and family (Knowles, 2011), or may travel longer distances along weak social ties, travelling from one distant acquaintance to infect an adjacent, dense social group. Analysis of diffusion of tactics among militant suffragettes explores the additional characteristic of structural equivalence (Edwards, 2013), i.e., that activists are likely to adopt a tactic if they see it modeled by someone they see as socially equivalent to themselves. This is one reason why we witness tactics jumping from university campus to university campus, for example, but not generally from corrupt dictatorship to student rally to picket line. Edwards also expands on the idea that activists must have the framework in place to perceive a militant tactic as justified before adopting it.

One factor that diffusion theorists explain can influence the perceived legitimacy of a tactic is who models the behaviour. Lower ranking community members aspiring to be like prodigious others will mimic tactics and actions more readily if they hold their models in high esteem (Strang & Soule, 1998, p. 275). This is because the leaders of social movements are able to produce meanings, and play a significant role in developing the meaning structure of a network of activists.

Protest is sometimes understood to operate as cyclical periods of heightened conflict associated with rapid diffusion of philosophies and tactics. Tarrow (1994) cites the civil rights and antiwar cycle of the 1960s as a key example of a window of intense assimilation of tactics from one network of activists to the next. It was a period in history where many people were very politically active, and where that energy spread ideas and strategies very quickly across the country, moreso than at other moments in history. These

networks of activists share both tactics, such as sit-ins, as well as frames of meanings, such as the rubric of rights spreading between the civil rights and women's movement.

The concept of a 'meaning structure' (Fuhse, 2009) is an intersubjective network of interpersonally constructed meanings, discourses and expectations from which individuals within the network have to draw (Bottero & Crossley, 2011). Thus, the shared definitions and philosophical leanings of a social network, if closely aligned, will more easily result in the transmission of tactics of resistance between activists, particularly if those tactics fit within the meaning structure adopted by a network of activists. The structures of diffusion¹⁰ are the very things that create our social meanings (Edwards, 2013, p. 63). Other approaches track activism generationally, as a set of values transmitted from parent to child, particularly feminism as an intergenerational construct (Knowles, 2011), linking this learned meaning structure to family background as well as peer social interaction.

The spread of tactics between groups may depend on this mirroring, but the spread of tactics within small group memberships is almost instantaneous. Social networks also have a tendency to become more radical overall over time. The phenomenon of group belief-change explains how members who join a group will become more committed to their cause through socialization with other group members (Sunstein, 2008). Groups that socialize together gradually become ideologically more homogenous in their beliefs, and extreme sentiment within-group runs stronger when a group has identifying characteristics that allow them to form a more homogenous group (p. 15). In particular, this in-group socialization amplifies outrage, which can prime activists towards a more radical stance.

One of the frequently studied factors of political and crowd violence¹¹ is crowd homogeneity; the historical perspective has been that crowds comprised of people who possess the same characteristics and comparable levels of resentment and aggression are the most likely to become violent (Bekhterev, 1994). Bekhterev specifically writes

¹⁰ Tarrow (1994) incidentally points out that police networks have cycles and diffusion processes that are almost identical to those of protesters, sharing scripts justifying the need for social control and the tactics for how to disrupt protest.

¹¹ Research that focuses on dangerous demonstrations, particularly violence during anti-state demonstrations.

about demographic factors in this analysis, but measures these factors as likely to create a sense of closeness in the crowd members, which could also be created by Sunstein's aforementioned socialization process of groups becoming more politically committed together, resulting in the same effect.

Sometimes, protest behaviours are also in and of themselves pathways for dissemination for new ideas and tactics. 'Convergence' protests are defined by Esparza and Price as occurring when, "(1) activists with an ideologically anti-capitalist orientation; (2) engage in property destruction; (3) travel from outside of the site of the protest event; and (4) solicit a determinable police response" (Esparza & Price, 2015, p. 22). These import activists stay briefly and share new strategies with their local counterparts. Because the activists who tend to be willing to travel for a cause are frequently fervently committed, they are likely to introduce the locals they visit to the most disruptive or assertive tactics from their area.

Media

Media scrutiny is also a major influence on most protest tactics. Though media is an important pathway through which protest tactics can be diffused, it is also the battleground on which political protests fight to frame their actions in the public eye. Social movement theorists credit the media as being almost singlehandedly responsible for diffusing the 'sit in' tactic across the US (Edwards, 2013). However, media can also serve as a tool for reproducing and reinforcing dominant ideologies and can be quite hostile to political dissent (Hall, 1978). The fear of media scrutiny can also impact the decision to engage in protest activities. Jung found that protesters with jobs modulated their activities for fear of being caught on the evening news and facing repercussions at work (Jung, 2003, p. 158).

Protesters can and do incite social disorder to put pressure on politicians to resolve situations, either by raising awareness about an issue and turning public opinion against politicians, or by producing enough social disorder to embarrass politicians into making concessions. To accomplish either of these ends, protesters need to have significant engagement with the media and to be portrayed in a relatively sympathetic light. Whether

or not the media sides with protesters frequently also depends on whether the police response was deemed overly forceful (Waddington, 2007).

When the government succeeds in framing activists' tactics as unethical, overly violent, criminal or egregious, they justify harsher policing and more aggressive suppression of crowds and public assembly, constructing a public emergency that needs to be addressed (Hall, 1978). This process of social construction extends beyond the government and the media to all those invested in reproducing and naturalizing the current social hierarchies. Thus, it behooves strategic activists to confine their levels of violence and destruction of property to the realm of what will be sympathetic, so that an overly harsh police response may be perceived as oppressive rather than justified.

Strategically, this tactic can be constructed as a variant of game theory, a series of measures and countermeasures taken between protesters and police officers, where protesters try to attract as much sympathetic public attention as possible, and police officers try to justify suppressing this expression in as un-newsworthy a way as possible (Meyer, 2004).

Of course, some activists, particularly radicals, simply write the media off as a lost cause, or a tool of the dominant power structure. Activists who are not concerned with media consequences thus have a broader spectrum of potential tactics at their disposal. Many of the more radical movements are unconcerned with media portrayals of their activities and instead focus on aggressive disruption and blockading. Some networks choose to adopt shock tactics to attract media attention, good or bad. For example, the French branch of FEMEN's¹² bare breasted invasion of the Notre-Dame cathedral in 2013 protested the Pope's opposition to gay marriage (Economist, 2013). Although such tactics are constructed as provocative and sometimes unethical in broader society, they are adopted by activists when they believe the ends justify the means. Some academics agree; some legal scholars even go so far as to suggest that it should be a mitigating factor at sentencing, proposing a verdict along the lines of 'guilty but civilly disobedient,' (Hall, 2007) on the grounds that crimes committed to strengthen a democracy should be

¹² Not an acronym. A Ukrainian (Фемен) feminist protest group notorious for aggressive and topless demonstrations in support of feminism.

seen as more morally worthy and less meriting punishment. FEMEN were fined for the Notre-Dame protest, but strictly on the grounds that they did some property damage while ringing one of the bells to attract attention.

Ideological Leanings and Tactic Adoption

The selective adoption of tactics in different organizations is especially relevant in the context of the ongoing struggle to frame political resistance, which frequently takes place in the media. Because of the role media can play in translating protest action into pressure against political leaders, some protesters engage in tactics very aware of how they will be framed in print. Tactic assessment occurs in response to a new and growing tendency for the government and police forces to use the language of securitization to justify tightening social controls.

Some protest organizations have a strictly nonviolent philosophical outlook, adopting the tactics and theories associated with purely pacifist, nonviolent resistance movements. They may share the Black Bloc's ideological stance on state control as a form of violence, but instead choose to meet it by modelling pacifist philosophies and creating activist subcultures where new and peaceful means of social relation are privileged. The Occupy movement, for example, was almost entirely nonviolent and did considerable work to remain leaderless and to ensure the voices of all participants were honoured, despite fraught relationships with law enforcement in many cities (Van Gelder, 2012). Specific networks of activists, though they sometimes share members and attend the same events, may also develop different philosophies based on social position.

Martin (2002) suggests that conflicts within social movements are always, at their root, conflicts over cultural meanings (p. 85). Mobilization efforts by female soldiers who have left the Israeli army having worked in Occupied Palestine focus on their ability to identify atrocity, their critique of the role of masculinity in military violence (Pavis, 2012). More male-dominated antiwar movements would not subscribe to such a gendered analysis of the military complex.

The distinctions between these organizations are not always clear cut. Social movement studies and subcultural studies, although two distinct and separate areas of theory, are both useful to explore activist networks and political protest (Martin, 2002; Redhead, 2009). Subcultural studies began to flourish with Redhead's (1995) problematizing of rigid cultural theories by proposing a more complex model of how small subcultures coexist within bigger spaces - the model he uses is the Punk scene transforming into Acid House, which was in and of itself a jumble of everything from bikers to New Agers. Protest and different social organizations operate in much the same way (as cited in Martin, 2002, p. 77). There is a need for research that explores the fluidity of membership and philosophy in activist networks.

The best example of the role of subculture in protest are those groups that have deliberately fostered philosophies quite distinct from those shared by the general majority. The Black Bloc, for example, has self-published manifestos that construct all property rights as inherently imaginary. This group in particular justifies the aggression in their tactics by constructing them as a proportionate response to violence committed by the state. They elaborate, "private property is still the foundation on which sits the house of cards of capitalism and neo-liberalism that currently are attacking access to education and our daily lives. It is what we are attacking" (Hamilton, 2012). Thus, they may engage in more destructive tactics they perceive as both necessary and justified.

Most research suggests that tactics transmit between organizations based on pathways established by social connections, modeling by other organizations, and the ideological frameworks within an organization that produce meaning. Though little research exists exploring this area specifically, these meanings may be constructed by the political and philosophical beliefs of the organization. By studying how activists make meaning of protest tactics, and perceive and interact with one another in crowd settings, I hope to use my research to expand on how exactly the intersubjective meaning networks (Fuhse, 2009) of Vancouver activists influence the transmission of tactics from one activist to another and one group to the next. This research project contributes to the writing in the field by continuing to explore the specific conflict that arises between non-homogenous activists with competing theoretical approaches.

Chapter 3.

Methods

The primary goal of the proposed project was to further understand the phenomena of political protest and resistant forms of activism, as well as to gain an understanding of how political protesters perceive and develop their own codes of behaviour at protests, how they weigh the ethics of social engagement, and how groups of protesters with different expectations of behaviour interact with one another at demonstrations.

The research for this project was done in two phases. The first phase involved participant observation conducted on Burnaby Mountain, during the Kinder Morgan pipeline blockade. This phase saw me attending the blockade for the weeks it was active, sleeping onsite and speaking at length with protest participants, some of whom were part of the Caretakers¹³ group.

The second phase of this project involved a more general study of political activists. The primary data source was interviews with Vancouver protesters, many of whom had been involved with the Burnaby Mountain protests. A second source involved further observations at specific protest events that occurred during the data collection period for this part of the project.

Evolution of the Project

I attended the Kinder Morgan protests that were held on Burnaby Mountain in the fall of 2014 after receiving ethics approval from Dr. Sheri Fabian in the context of her graduate course in Advanced Qualitative Methods (Crim 864).

¹³ A core group of activists involved in the protests. For more information see chapter 4.

I attended protests that were held during the period I was completing my MA thesis to have the opportunity to observe firsthand any tactics employed by activists, law enforcement, and the subject of the protest (e.g., Kinder Morgan at the Burnaby Mountain protest). While doing so, I did not engage in any behaviour that I knew was illegal, and, in preparation for the low likelihood that any sort of violent or riotous behaviour erupted, was prepared to maintain a location to ensure as well as possible that I would not be perceived by law enforcement as in any way contributing to that violence, thereby minimizing the likelihood that I might be arrested or detained, in order to protect my data.

Interviews

I obtained ethical approval from the university Office of Research Ethics to continue with in-depth interviews. Interviews were conducted with adults who had participated in protest events for any of a variety of different issues - women's rights, environmental issues, Indigenous rights protests, murdered and missing women. The interviews were conducted both during and after the protests. As I have participated in many of these events, I know many individuals who are involved in activist and environmentalist movements. Purposive and snowball sampling were employed. I approached activists whom I know, provided them with the study details contained in my information sheet, and asked if they would be willing to participate."

In-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with eight participants. Five were from Vancouver, two from Montreal, and one from the United Kingdom. Interviews ranged from fifty minutes to two and a half hours. Six participants were female, one male, and one identified as not fitting in the gender binary and asked to be identified by 'they/them/theirs' pronouns. Areas probed included their involvement with different resistance movements, interactions with other activists and law enforcement, and understanding of the diversity of tactics that may be employed as a form of social protest. These qualitative, minimally-structured interviews allowed respondents to explore their history of activism and the way they understand and make meaning of social resistance.

Ethics Issues

I asked participants to share some of their experience dealing with direct action and political protest. Although most of the questioning focused on protected forms of free expression, such as marching, picketing, and disruptive but legal activities, more sensitive information was shared, possibly regarding vandalism and other non-violent but illegal forms of political resistance. Given that some participants discussed sensitive interactions with police officers, and the potential sensitivity of some of the information, maintaining complete confidentiality as to the identity of sources is crucial. Though political protest and activism in and of themselves are not criminal activities, there was a chance that criminal activity could occur during these protests. As such, I was extremely careful to avoid producing research material that could be useful in the prosecution of any of my participants.

Confidentiality was protected in a number of different ways. First, in the information sheet and in the interview itself participants were told that any information they share would be completely confidential. This was done by using pseudonyms from the outset, including in the interview itself. I obtained oral consent to ensure that no paper trails were created. Each interview was transcribed as soon as possible thereafter, stripped of any potentially identifying details, and where appropriate the use of pseudonyms was maintained and extended to any other persons or places mentioned that might indirectly identify the participant or others.

Strict adherence to the confidentiality and security precautions outlined above addressed this risk. Also, in the low likelihood that confidentiality is challenged by a legal authority, the protocol outlined was intended to fulfill the two Wigmore criteria over which we have some control, i.e., (1) ensuring that there is a mutual expectation of confidentiality by making it clear to research participants that the researcher will maintain strict confidentiality as to their identities and the removal of any identifying information; and (2) making clear in our proposal that confidentiality is crucial for building rapport and my ability to acquire reliable and valid information in this study (Palys and Lowman, 2014). This was accomplished by discussing the importance of confidentiality, both in this and my previous

research on the subject in the ethics proposal, and by discussing the importance of confidentiality at the beginning of each interview.

However, over the course of previous research on political protesters, I have learned that some activists expressly wish that their names be disclosed, and resent the use of pseudonyms as a disconnection between themselves and their advocacy. Many already use pseudonyms for an activist persona, or have chosen names or traditional names that they would not wish to be forcibly separated from for reasons that are both personal and political (e.g., as part of Indigenous reclamation work or post-transition for transgender participants.) Forcing the issue of a name change can be alienating and upsetting for these participants in particular. As such, in the event that the participant initiated a conversation on the possibility of not using a pseudonym their wishes were respected and their real names, or chosen aliases were used. As such, a mixture of actual names and pseudonyms are included in this project, without noting which are which.

One key concern regarding confidentiality was the significant media attention the protest received during the participant observation portion of this project. Many incidents that occurred were the subject of media scrutiny, in the form of the incidents being reported and even filmed, and referenced in future media coverage. In several cases, behaviour occurred that could be construed as criminal, and charges were laid and arrests made of key participants. Linking the chosen pseudonyms of my participants to the easily identifiable behaviour of some activists recorded during the participant observation (for example, George Khossi's notorious afternoon spent chained underneath a surveyor's jeep) would easily render them identifiable, and any description on my part potentially useful for prosecution. My willingness to respect protester preferences for being identified stopped at the point where I might be subpoenaed as a witness for their prosecution. For that reason, the obscuring of identities in this project has been a more meticulous and nuanced process than a clear-cut use of pseudonyms across the board. Some participants are acknowledged partially under their true name, and partially under a pseudonym. Because of the sensitivity of some of the information gathered, participant safety has been of the utmost concern in constructing a work that protects the identities of all participants.

Interviews were held in mutually agreeable acoustically private locations. With the permission of the participant, the interviews were recorded using a digital recorder with no capability for wifi or bluetooth connectivity. I asked for oral consent to continue with the interview, as well as for consent to tape record our discussions.

One element of this project that was important was explaining the measures undertaken to ascertain confidentiality and anonymity, data collection and storage methods, as well as the possible risks and benefits arising from their participation. During the period of data collection, the controversy around bill C51 was still ongoing, and many of the environmental protesters in particular were keenly aware of heightened state scrutiny into their activities. All recordings were kept on an independent external USB drive (never on a laptop or desktop), encrypted using True Crypt 7.1 software, and kept in a locked filing cabinet in an off-campus location when not being used for transcription. The audio recordings were destroyed after transcription.

Chapter 4.

Results

The Setting

Burnaby, British Columbia, is a city unto itself, bordering on the much larger metropolis of Vancouver. At the heart of Burnaby sits Burnaby Mountain, a large wooded area, bordered on one side by Burrard Inlet. On the South side of the mountain, there is what is colloquially referred to as a 'tank farm,' a series of large silo-like buildings filled with oil, awaiting processing or transportation. On top of the mountain sits the main campus of Simon Fraser University.

The side of the hill where these field observations took place is a local conservation area (see map – Figure 1 – on next page). Established in the 1970s, the park has been preserved from development. Small dirt packed trails are maintained for hikers, and the space is generally peaceful and very quiet. Thick foliage muffles the sound of most of the city traffic. Old growth vine maple reach up to forty feet high. In most places, the tree canopy is thick enough that only a murky green light filters down. There are signs posted at all trailheads advertising the difficulty of the hike (blue square for moderately difficult, black diamond for a more intense challenge) and proclaiming that "it is unlawful to remove or damage any tree, shrub or flower in any park."

The clearing, Borehole One in the documents, was a small patch of sawed down trees off Gnome's Home trail in the North East section of the conservation area, and the subject of the initial legal battle. Kinder Morgan contractors, irrespective of the lawfulness of damaging trees, had sawed down enough of the old growth in the space that sunlight shone down on us. One organizer explained that there was a shared Google document where we could register to take shifts in the clearing. If there was a

**Figure 4-1: A map of the area
(Following page)**

sense of David and Goliath about the resistance, it might have been because of the sheer size of the company they were facing, or the fact that there were rumours among the activists that Kinder Morgan was owned by the Koch brothers. From their promotional materials:

Kinder Morgan is the largest energy infrastructure company in North America. We own an interest in or operate approximately 84,000 miles of pipelines and 165 terminals. Our pipelines transport natural gas, refined petroleum products, crude oil, carbon dioxide (CO₂) and more. We also store or handle a variety of products and materials at our terminals such as gasoline, jet fuel, ethanol, coal, petroleum coke and steel. (Kinder Morgan, 2015)

The company is Texas-based, and is run in part by Richard Kinder, described once by the Wall Street Journal as "the luckiest ex Enron employee" (West, 2013) since his immediate predecessor was sentenced to twenty-four years in prison for his involvement in the Enron fraud scandal.¹⁴ Before being renamed Kinder Morgan, the company was a division of Enron called Enron Liquid Pipelines LLP. Since 2013, this concern alone has raised questions for many British Columbians about the desirability of the trans mountain pipeline expansion by this company.

At another point on the pipeline, such intense local resistance might have resulted in the development plans being reassessed or changed to accommodate the city, but the Caretakers explained that the nearby city of Vancouver made Burnaby too important a location for Kinder Morgan to back away from. On their website for the TransMountain project, Kinder Morgan explains that Vancouver is the fourth largest seaport in North America. Accessing this port was crucial for the company to be able to export Albertan tar sands products to overseas markets. For the activists, stopping the pipeline at Burnaby meant a chance of stopping the expansion project along the whole rest of the proposed expansion corridor, protecting kilometers and kilometers of natural habitat, and dozens of small, rural and vulnerable communities, from the added risk of the increased carrying capacity. From their website:

¹⁴ A massive scandal in 2001, where energy company Enron succeeded in illegally concealing and misrepresenting billions of dollars in debt.

The original Trans Mountain Pipeline was built in 1953 and continues to operate safely today. Trans Mountain is proposing an expansion of this existing 1,150-kilometre pipeline between Strathcona County (near Edmonton), Alberta and Burnaby, BC. The proposed expansion, if approved, would create a twinned pipeline that would increase the nominal capacity of the system from 300,000 barrels per day, to 890,000 barrels per day.¹⁵

The new addition is intended to pass directly underneath the mountain, which Kinder Morgan states would reduce the risk of leaks (or, according to some activists, merely make them invisible.) The company began with an original effort to drill two boreholes to test the geological suitability of this effort.

Timeline

On September 3rd, 2014, the City of Burnaby issued two tickets to multi-national energy giant Kinder Morgan for the illegal cutting of trees in a protected conservation area. Because they were initially just conducting survey work, Kinder Morgan had not filed any permits, with either the City of Burnaby or the National Energy Board. In interviews about the building momentum, participants described a growing grassroots resistance all through the community. The company's hope was that the site would be suitable for an expansion of the Trans Mountain Pipeline Project.

In the first few weeks of September, an ad hoc and unofficial group of people who would come to be known as the Caretakers, began to take shifts on the side of the mountain. Though working amiably with the residents' organization BROKE,¹⁶ the Caretakers worked primarily through a more hands-on form of direct action. The fact that Caretakers were on the hillside physically repelling surveyors immediately stratified activists into two groups in terms of engagement. The first, the Caretakers, were willing to take long shifts spent sitting on the mountainside on the chance that Kinder Morgan might arrive. When Kinder Morgan surveyors entered the clearing or were discovered working anywhere near the hill, the Caretakers would stop them "by whatever means necessary,"

¹⁵ <http://www.transmountain.com/proposed-expansion>

¹⁶ Burnaby Residents Oppose Kinder-Morgan Expansion

according to interviewee Jean. In practice, this meant yelling in the ears of employees with a megaphone, or lying down in front of their equipment. The second group were residents of the city of Burnaby or Vancouver, who did not camp for hours on the hill or take shifts, but who were in the Facebook group, on the phone tree, and willing to be summoned to provide critical mass if an issue arose with surveyors.

I began field observations on October 3rd, 2014. This initially meant arriving at the Ridgeview Trailhead, off Dalla-Tina road right at the foot of Burnaby mountain, to hike to proposed Borehole One, often referred to as 'the clearing.' Orientation was led by two seasoned Caretakers and long time protesters, each of whom had been arrested in other ventures. Some of the Caretakers were simply environmental protesters, people who had come and participated in demonstrations against or blockades to stop activities that would be bad for the natural habitats of British Columbia. Others were part of the tradition of the Land Defenders, the movement of environmentalism more specifically tied to the colonization of territories traditionally belonging to the Aboriginal peoples of Canada, linking the reckless exploitation of these resources to the historical dispossession of Indigenous peoples, and the ongoing destruction and pollution to the continued oppression of our First Nations. The two group leaders that day were showing five new potential Caretakers – including me – the clearing space.

I had heard about the need for more Caretakers through Facebook's page 'recommended groups' panel, a feature of the website that uses the content of your own page to generate links to other networks that might be of interest to you. Because I had been attending and listing myself as a participant in a large variety of protests, eventually the Caretaker page was pulled up on my personal page, and I joined the group as an activist first. At this point I had not identified myself as a researcher to the entire group, because the event was as yet so small that I had no intention of actually studying it. Instead, I was speaking to the organizers about their interest in participating in a broader project involving interviews with many local activists. Although I was introducing myself as a member of the SFU community and an interested researcher, at that point I was envisioning a project in which I paired up for shifts with the various Caretakers and spoke to them about their history as protesters within the clearing space.

Instead, the orientation group sat together and discussed a little of the history of Kinder Morgan as a developer in the area, the possible efforts for forest rehabilitation that were going to be undertaken in the future, and the best way to raise consciousness specifically among SFU students with regard to what was happening so near to their campus. Knowledge of the work in the clearing was minimal, at this point. The worry was that no one at the university who was not already a member of BROKE or an affiliated mailing list knew much about transmountain. The Caretakers were already planning on organizing student events to raise awareness and try to help garner support. Interestingly, in no way did the orientation focus on camp behaviour. For one thing, there was not yet a camp; we were just being given the details of the conflict thus far and physically oriented to the locations of both boreholes on the trails. My orientation group was run by two individuals who later would be named defendants in the injunction against the protesters. They and their co-protesters would be targeted by that injunction on account of the kind of organizing that happened that day. My actual initiation into the social mores and philosophies of the Caretakers came later.

Though some length of those shifts was often spent alone, it was much more common to have company. A long portion of my field observations took place in the contemplative silence of the deep woods. Sitting alone, or with one or two other committed activists in a cleared down area gave me considerable opportunity to ask about the philosophical outlooks of the original Caretakers, with regard to environmentalism, anti-racism, and other forms of social justice.

Only over time did it become obvious to me that this project was no longer a series of in depth interviews with a handful of days of participant observation as a secondary data source. I had happened, by a combination of luck and intuition, to have been working and researching in a space that developed into a protest camp¹⁷ that was the subject of extensive media coverage. I adapted by identifying myself as a researcher and describing the work I was doing as being about this protest, and not activism in Vancouver in general.

¹⁷ A location where activists work to maintain presence 24 hours a day, setting up modest infrastructure to make the locations liveable in the short and sometimes long term.

At the point I began fieldwork, there already had been two confrontations with surveyors in the clearings. The Caretakers physically intervened by kicking equipment or lying on the ground the company was attempting to survey. They read an eviction notice from the territory Chiefs, lay physically across the ground underfoot, and yelled through megaphones to try to disrupt the work with sound. The Caretakers also staged a partial lockdown of the local Chevron refinery gates, announcing publicly that:

We are taking action today to honour the 13 trees that US based pipeline company Kinder Morgan illegally cut down in the Burnaby Mountain conservation area on unceded Coast Salish Territory. We stand in solidarity with the Tsleil-Waututh who have launched a legal challenge against the unlawful conduct of the National Energy Board (NEB) and the Crown concerning Kinder Morgan. As a penalty to Kinder Morgan, we, the people, will be here locked to the main gate of the Westridge Marine Terminal for one hour for each of the 13 trees. 13 trees = 13 hours. Kinder Morgan must be held accountable for their actions and we, the people, feel a responsibility to do so in conjunction with the actions the Tsleil-Waututh and the City of Burnaby are taking.

The unceded nature of the territory was important for two main reasons. For one thing, although Burnaby mayor Derek Corrigan expressed his displeasure with Kinder Morgan and the proposed pipeline route, no one was sure whether that would translate to direct legal intervention, because communication between the mayor's office and the activists was sparse. Although none of the activists involved here had any legal background, there was a hope that the involvement of local First Nations might activate a rights claim that could be useful in court. For another, this was the place from which many of these activists began, in terms of their environmentalism. Resource exploitation was explicitly linked to the Canadian history of colonialism, and to the lingering sense of entitlement to destroy and exploit both the Aboriginal population and their traditional home. It was a philosophical outlook that all of the dozen or so first Caretakers shared, at least to some degree. Many had worked with Land Defenders, or identified to some extent themselves as a part of that movement. Others simply had a deep respect for the history of this struggle in the area. There were ongoing efforts to get in touch with First Nations people with experience in forest management, to get their advice on how to rehabilitate the clearing, what local vegetation to plant and how to care for it, with a vision to restore the space as much as possible after Kinder Morgan had been defeated.

On the same day as the lockdown occurred, the group BROKE hosted a rally a few minutes walk away, in Burnaby Mountain Park. This seemed to reflect an initial lack of communication, but Stephen Collis, one of the SFU professors named in Kinder Morgan's injunction against the protesters, would later write that he felt that it "sow[ed] the seeds of disagreement between the two main groups organizing resistance to Kinder Morgan's work on Burnaby Mountain" (Collis, 2014), i.e., BROKE and the Caretakers. It also provides a clear and striking example of the preferred tactics and philosophies of the two groups; the Caretakers were going to chain themselves by the neck to fences, and BROKE were going to try to raise public awareness.

The City of Burnaby began the appeals process through the National Energy Board to have the work on the mountain stopped. Burnaby Mayor Derek Corrigan had deeply opposed the pipeline expansion from the outset, and when evidence of the tree cutting was discovered he moved immediately to enforce the city bylaws that would help prevent this work from occurring in the city park under his watch.

On October 23rd, the NEB dismissed that appeal and forbade Burnaby from obstructing the company representatives in gaining temporary access to the conservation area. The Board ruled that the city bylaws were 'inoperable or invalid' when it came to preventing the work, which it felt was protected under the NEB Act. The data being gathered by the company would be used to make a recommendation to the federal government about whether or not a pipeline should be established, so preventing the initial surveying work would put the city in violation of the *National Energy Board Act*, given that the geotechnical surveying work was necessary for them to be able to make a recommendation to the Federal government about whether or not the pipeline project should be allowed to proceed. Mayor Corrigan, speaking to the press, responded that;

We believe that it is inappropriate for the National Energy Board to rule on the critical constitutional issue of whether a multinational pipeline company can override municipal bylaws and cause damage to a conservation area, for a project that no level of government has deemed to be in the public interest. (Luk, 2014)

While the legal battle over the constitutional issues continued, Kinder Morgan was granted access to begin work in the park. The Caretakers had begun to step up their

presence in the clearing, with a concentrated effort to make sure there was at least one, or as many as three people staying in the clearing during all daylight hours.

Chapparahl was the first person involved with the Caretakers who was able and willing to sleep onsite. He was a young man with long hair who usually wore an anarchist-patched vest and an old pin from the Blue Drop movement.¹⁸ He began to camp out in his truck, keeping an eye on the site of Borehole Two, or 'the campsite,' and visiting the clearing in the forest during daylight hours. Caretakers still took shifts onsite, mostly to visit Chapparahl during the day and give him time off the hill, and the number of people specifically taking shifts sleeping continued to swell steadily. Where there had been a dozen regulars prior to my orientation to the group, that number doubled and eventually tripled. The catalyst for this swell of presence on the mountain was the escalating survey work.

The surveyors returned to the clearing on October 29th. The National Energy Board had stipulated that the company must give the city 48 hours notice before beginning work, which gave the activists time to mobilize a response. When the Kinder Morgan surveyors arrived at the proposed site of Borehole One, they faced aggressive resistance not only from the Caretakers, but also from dozens of other activists and community members. Word had spread through email listserves, mass text messages, and the media. BROKE's rapid responder phone tree failed to deploy correctly, but through the public and private parts of Facebook network, the word reached hundreds, which meant there were over a hundred demonstrators present by the time the surveyors arrived. Because the groups congregated over three distinct sites, exact numbers were very difficult to estimate, but at a minimum there were a hundred activists there, and maybe closer to three hundred.

October 30th began as a rally and gathering at Borehole Two, which was due East of SFU. Although Borehole One had thus far been the concentrated hub of all surveyor activity, it was a fifteen minute hike through difficult terrain, and Borehole Two was in the middle of a parking lot off a working road. For this reason, it became the main staging area for the activists, as well as the campsite for the blockade. News helicopters flew

¹⁸ An activist collective of environmentalists, some of whom were involved in the anti-Enron protests, who incorporate artistic expression and youth engagement in their activism.

overhead constantly, and many camera crews arrived to record onsite interviews and b-roll footage of the demonstrations. Their number tapered off during the day. Some camera crews still remained, though more belonged to documentary filmmakers than news organizations; three different small film crews identified themselves to me over the course of that day, each asking for interviews for different environmentalist projects.

When activists received word via text messages that the surveyors were hiking up to the clearing, dozens of people began to run, *en masse*, towards the head of the trail that would lead us to the clearing. This was quite literally a harrowing sprint up Centennial, then down a wooded mountain biking trail, slick with mud and leaves, onto Gnome's Home and into the clearing. Eventually a crowd of perhaps thirty, mostly young people able to physically manage the steep sprint, were able to arrive at the clearing site before or around the same moments that the surveyors did. This was partially impeded by the bottlenecks of the remaining news crews and filmmakers who had a harder time negotiating the mountain trails with their heavy recording equipment.

An aggressive confrontation with surveyors ensued. The entrance to the clearing was narrow enough that six activists standing in two lines, shoulder to shoulder, could easily physically turn back the workers and their equipment. As well as standing in their way, activists sounded airhorns and screamed profanity and directives at the surveyors, to “fuck off back to Texas¹⁹” and to “get off of unceded territory.”

In the face of the resistance they met on the mountain, Kinder Morgan sought an injunction against the protesters, in particular Stephen Collis, Adam Gold, Lynne Quarmbay, Mia Nissen, and the members of BROKE, plus John and Jane Doe and persons unknown. It is noteworthy that profanity and aggression were cited as supportive justification for the injunction Kinder Morgan sought against the protesters, on October 30th, just one day after the protests in the clearing. The surveyors, it was alleged, had felt threatened.

The paperwork was staggering in its volume and complexity, and the initial hearing, held mere hours after the paperwork was served, left the defendants scrambling to

¹⁹ Company headquarters.

respond. Lynne was served the stack of documents, over three inches thick, while she was at work. She was quoted in the *Vancouver Observer* saying, "It's intimidating, it's confusing, it's overwhelming. I've spent the last two hours speaking to people to figure out what to do and what's going on" (Robinson, 2014). The role the university was going to play in supporting her and Stephen Collis, the other named faculty member, was initially unclear and contributed to the confusion.

Copies of the documents also were delivered to the campsite in an unmarked cardboard box. As Jean described it, at first, Caretakers were unsure whether or not to touch it, but eventually it was opened and people broke into teams to begin combing through the thousand pages for anything with any actual substance. Most of the information contained in the papers seemed to mean very little; hundreds of pages were devoted to repetitious maps, and endless snapshots of protesters from the rally the day the surveyors tried to begin to work. It was concluded quickly that this was an intimidation tactic, to try to overwhelm the named defendants by the volume of material. One man discovered himself incorrectly identified as a 'Jane Doe.' The stack had been put together hastily, and trying to rely on the sheer amount to overwhelm the targets of the injunction, coupled with claimed damages so high as to be entirely unpayable.

The company said that if the work on the mountain was allowed to proceed, they would not pursue damages against the defendants, which the company identified as being roughly \$88 million a month in lost revenue (Robinson, 2014). The named defendants, who had been some of the most physically present people on the mountain, redirected their energies towards fighting this battle in court.

With this development, it was "game on," and the Caretaker camp began to entrench itself, developing a temporary shelter to provide dry space during the day. While the battle over the injunction was fought in court, the campers on the hill hunkered down with intention to stay. Rather than dissuading protesters or intimidating them into leaving the campsite, by and large people expressed indignation and further resolve. The company was now seen as being bullying, leveling tremendous sanctions against people who had no hope of fighting back or paying them. The amount of casual mockery

increased greatly, and campers always waited eagerly for updates from the courthouse on days when legal decisions were expected.

In the aftermath of the major protest, crowd attendance diminished to a constant presence of about ten people at a time during days, three to five during the evenings. Many dozens would visit throughout the course of the day, for anywhere from a few minutes to twelve hours. Many of them attributed their visits to having seen the news about the protests on television. Where the majority of protesters had previously been rallied by word of mouth or through connections from their participation in other environmentalist networks, there were suddenly many more people, some of whom had never previously been politically active.

On November 14th an injunction was granted in *Trans Mountain Pipeline ULC v Gold*, a case intended to prevent local activists from interfering with the surveying. Attendance at the protests on the mountain increased, both with increasing media coverage and with the growing sense that there was not going to be a legal remedy to stopping the work. As the number of novice activists increased on the hill, so too did the number of hardened veterans, including local anarchist groups and NGOs. The protesters began to organize small solidarity rallies for the community to attend, to continue to grow support. More out-of-province activists were able to make the journey, having organized travel arrangements to make it out to BC. This was a complicated period for activists, as the original Caretakers organization dealt with the arrival of all of these groups in a space that previously was occupied solely by people with a fairly homogeneous approach to protest philosophy and tactics.

By November 18th and 19th the crowds on the mountain had swelled to their largest numbers yet. Longtime 'veteran' and 'celebrity' activists began to attend, as well as huge numbers of local politically minded people who were now attuned to the fact that "this is where the fight is." Trans Mountain began work again on November 20th. The RCMP began to arrest demonstrators interfering with the surveying, including many of my participants.

The days would be marked by both successes and failures. Kinder Morgan requested that the injunction be extended, so that work could continue. Judge Austin

Cullen denied the extension of the injunction against the protesters (CBC, 2014), which was a relief to many. For Kinder Morgan, this was a shocking and embarrassing setback. They had failed to correctly read their initial GPS coordinates, and quickly discovered that the zone they had received an injunction for was marked incorrectly. "What's happened thus far is that apparently people have been arrested on the basis of an order that refers to some other piece of property," Judge Austin Cullen announced, before dismissing charges against nearly a hundred protesters (CBC, 2014). Every interviewee described receiving the news as joyous.

Despite this, the company made an announcement that the survey samples were successfully drawn, and Kinder Morgan declared that Burnaby Mountain was a stable, appropriate site for a pipeline to be placed. It left many unanswered questions. Jean wondered aloud in an interview, if the site had already been deemed appropriate, why was Kinder Morgan pushing to continue work? Had the survey been rushed, were the results incomplete, premature, possibly fraudulent? Or had they misrepresented the survey work to begin with, and was the drilling, as some of the scientists there to help postulated, possibly a step in the erection of drainage shafts that would let them control water levels underground during drilling? Everyone had conflicting theories about the confusion, about to what degree it must represent corruption of the company, and precisely how.

As of the publication of this thesis, the City of Burnaby continues to battle hard to block the pipeline from going through. It made headlines by asking Kinder Morgan to pick up the tab for policing the protests. While the judge had granted the injunction, the City of Burnaby was fighting in court to prevent the work from happening, and Kinder Morgan were the ones responsible for the bill for the policing services needed on the hill. Mayor Derek Corrigan made several comments to the media that he hoped Kinder Morgan would cover the cost of the police presence needed, considering the work had gone on against the city's strenuous objections and the policing services had cost the city an estimated \$100,000 per day (McElroy, 2014). Hearings regarding the authority of the NEB to override municipal governments continue.

People

In the conflict between the City of Burnaby, Kinder Morgan and the National Energy Board surrounding expansion of the Trans Mountain Pipeline Project, there were several other major players, particularly forming the local opposition to the work. The main two organizations involved were BROKE and the Caretakers. Where BROKE were concerned local residents who wanted to move the energy development out of their neighbourhood conservation area, the Caretakers were radical anti-colonialist environmentalists committed to fighting against the resource extraction industry in general. People who slept on the mountain tended to be affiliated with the Caretakers, and people more involved in leafletting or rally-organizing were initially mostly involved with BROKE, though membership between the two groups was sometimes fluid.

For the most part, both groups worked together very effectively. The whole camp had an atmosphere of happy chaos. The normal sounds of the site were conversation and laughter, even at two and three in the morning. Many people stayed up well into the night to feed wood to the Sacred Fire. If you did not sleep in the night, you could simply sleep in the day. One night I stayed up, from about 1:00 A.M. to 5:00 A.M., Fred, the veteran of the occupation of Oppenheimer Park, was tending the fire and the kitchen in tandem, sitting for a few seconds, stirring the flames, then climbing to his feet again and poking off into the dark. It was a tiring place to live.

The last organization to join in was a local anarchist network, who arrived in November and relieved some of the burden on the most dedicated campers. The camping Caretakers had admitted readily that they were coping with serious fatigue and burnout, partially from living in the icy temperatures, and from keeping odd hours tending the fire at night, but mostly from the energy of the conflict itself and the steady stream of strangers passing through the campsite. One afternoon, cleaning the kitchen together, Christopher and I found a mouldy plate of half-eaten salmon and rice that someone had abandoned. Christopher looked at the plate despondently, heaved a sigh, and confessed; "Sometimes I just want to shake people and tell them 'I live here. This is my home.'" He scraped the abandoned food into the compost and dropped the plate into the pile to be washed. He

and the others were becoming a little dispirited, and honestly exhausted by the complex and sometimes messy interpersonal dynamics of those who made up the camp.

Meaning Makers

Like any social organization, the exact structure of the protest movement was shifting, and resistant to categorization. At the risk of oversimplifying, the core of my participant observation relied on spending time with the organization called the Caretakers, and my observations largely center around their development over the course of the protests and their interactions with the other groups who came to join in the blockade on Burnaby Mountain. Philosophically, the group was committed to the idea of non-hierarchical organization and mobilization.

Caretakers

Initially, the two groups present on the mountain were BROKE, and the Caretakers. The Caretakers were the ones who took shifts in the clearing. The well-hiked Burnaby Mountain trails were busy enough that I reliably met one or two people every time I came to take a shift in the clearing. Caretaker interactions with local hikers were always pleasant. Whenever there were encounters, they usually happened in the clearing, amidst the sawed down old growth trees and trampled brambles that the surveyors had left. It was hard not to respond viscerally to this obvious environmental disruption in an otherwise pristine park. Once, Caretakers stormed up to two men who were writing notes deep in the brush and calling out GPS coordinates loudly, only to discover that they were friendly geocachers rather than Kinder Morgan employees. Shifts were partially coordinated through the use of Google Docs, and through a private Facebook group, both of which were invitation only. Initially, simply, being a Caretaker meant being one of the people with access to and putting their name down for shifts on those google docs.

One of the interesting things about the initial camp was that the unofficial leadership of the group had abruptly withdrawn. Adam, Mia, Stephen and Lynne were named in the Kinder Morgan injunction because they had been the most visible spokespeople and force of organization. They had been the coordinating force behind the initial Caretakers group. They ran the orientations for new members, or operated as the

official media spokespeople. With backgrounds in First Nations activism, they incorporated land rights language into their organizing very early on. They operated the initial Facebook group, as well as the phone trees. Once named in the lawsuit, they were suddenly caught up in the legal battle and spent their days dealing with meetings with lawyers, court appearances, and media requests. Though all of them still periodically visited the protest camp, and sometimes stayed for hours, none of them were full-time campers.

Being or not being a Caretaker compared to simply a protester became a shifting identity category that it seemed to be a privilege to be a part of. Once, when I was chatting about my research to George, I was talking about how I felt it was important to produce creative output and research from within the activist community. I found myself stammering, suddenly, amending, 'not to say I count as a Caretaker or anything,' as though I had overstepped, or laid claim to a mastery of some skill I maybe did not actually possess. He looked at me easily and replied that of course I was.

What was clear about the moment in retrospect was that he had the authority in that moment to convene that membership upon me. With his verdict I felt immediately at ease. As one of the main campers, one of the most aggressive and frequently arrested activists, one who was materially sacrificing the absolute most to participate in the movement, George (along with Christopher, Danica, and Chapparahl) were the meaning-makers. They, in turn, deferred constantly to each other, and to Cal and Sut'lut whenever possible.

It would have been socially inappropriate to declare oneself a Caretaker without earning the title. It was initially chosen as a name thanks to the overtone of a kind of passive stewardship of the area. The park was a conservation area, and on unceded territory besides, and no one involved in the original group wanted to declare any inappropriate ownership of the space. The title was intended to evoke a respectful custodial relationship.

The Caretaker role hinged around the idea of maintaining a presence on the hill. Because there was no specific sign-up sheet to become a Caretaker, choosing to identify yourself as one meant you had to fulfill more nebulous and unstated standards. The

primary requirement for membership in this group was hours spent sacrificed during the quiet periods, waiting to sound the alarm if surveyors arrived. In the weeks prior to the first major protests, the Caretakers group arranged for a human presence in the clearing from virtually dawn to dusk.

The exhausting, time consuming labour of physically just staying out in the cool, rainy forest conferred a kind of status on the original group. They had been there longer, they had put more time in, they had, in a sense, been working since before the protest was fashionable. They were listening to the band before it got famous, in a sense. When latecomers began being identified by the term, it was generally after periods of daily, or near-daily presence on the mountain, as well as a sense of group participation.

On the hillside, the Caretaker numbers were effectively decimated when the injunction tied the group leaders Adam, Mia, Lynne and Stephen²⁰ up in court proceedings. Every named defendant had been targeted because they were visibly active in the movement. The people who functionally stepped into their place were the ones who had been participating, but had been more hesitant to give direction.

For another thing, the boundary between who was and was not a Caretaker began to blur. Though only a dozen people or so had registered and taken shifts on the initial roster, some of them were stepping back, and others were stepping forward and taking more and more weight in terms of the workload. Danica and Chapparahl, for example, had both been visiting the mountain since September, but George and Christopher both arrived on the day the major protests began. Still, they were easily recognizable as Caretakers on account of sleeping onsite.

Sut'lut and Cal, on the other hand, were both unable to camp onsite. Cal had been visiting the clearing before the protests, Sut'lut had arrived after seeing George's crawl under the surveyor's car on the evening news. They both contributed so consistently and positively to the community and had so much respect and admiration from the younger campers that they were immediately identified as being Caretakers.

²⁰ Alan Dutton, the last defendant named in the Kinder Morgan lawsuit, was a member and organizer of BROKE and not really affiliated with the Caretaker group.

Chapparahl

"Do you need anything?" a Burnaby resident asked, one afternoon, of Chapparahl, the first person to begin camping on the hill, who was doing something with a rope and a pocketknife at the time. "Fifty radical homeless anarchists and an injunction against Kinder Morgan, thanks," he answered, absentmindedly. He walked off without elaborating, to the mystification of the helper, who eventually was informed by another camp member that they were actually in need of firewood.

Chapparahl was a young, self-identified homeless anarchist. This meant he had made a deliberate and conscious choice to remove himself from the capitalist system as much as possible. We sat down together in the empty clearing one rainy afternoon and spoke at length about his belief system. His philosophy goes something like this; if you hold standard employment, you are trapped participating in capitalist systems of oppression. Either by working for a corporation, and furthering their exploitation of overseas labour or resources, or by working for a small business, contributing to consumerism and waste, capitalist labour is harmful. An employee is kept largely at the whims of their employer and is naturally, eventually inevitably forced into a position of moral compromise to hold down said employment. The key in this philosophy is to stop living the kind of lifestyle that is wage-dependent. Money is completely necessary for the owning or even renting of a home or apartment. Thus, the price for this kind of conscientiousness, is homelessness.

Chapparahl is one of a group who simply step out of the system. Chapparahl lives in the back of his jeep. He does occasional construction jobs under the table in the informal economy where employers offer him "cash or weed." He earns enough money to keep gas in his station wagon, to replace his clothing or camping gear as it wears out, and to supplement the food that he primarily scavenges. Because of his complete lack of structured time commitments of any sort, Chapparahl has been able to attend and stay at blockades before, and was able to set up camp at Burnaby Mountain right from the outset.

While other activists had to balance sleepless nights guarding the fire with going to work the next day, Chapparahl seemed to share no such obligations. George and Christopher seemed to have similar schedules, though they never identified themselves

to me as homeless anarchists as directly as Chapparahl had. Though he and the other full-time Caretakers would not have been able to survive on the mountainside without donations of food and resources, there would have been no campsite to begin with without the level of commitment they were able to bring in terms of time spent onsite.

Chapparahl, aside from practicing a form of self-professed homeless anarchism, also had some of the more radical ideas in the group about the politics of food and nutrition. In particular, he dumpster-dove as a matter of principle. The hardcore application of the philosophy is called 'freeganism,' and refers to the decision to step out of the exploitative food economy by ceasing to buy food altogether. This, in protest of labour practices, pesticides, unethical farming techniques; dedicated freegans dumpster-dive, work out which grocery stores throw out day-olds, and in certain cases nab their morning coffees from under-supervised company lobbies. Though not a sustainable way of life in the long term, many freegans are able to practice this dietary regimen exclusively for a few months or years.

Chapparahl wasn't a hard-liner, and did supplement his diet by paying for portions of it, but frequently could be heard muttering lividly about the things people threw out, and the tremendous amount of wastefulness there was in the average Canadian home. He uncovered cans of non-perishables, unopened bags of potato chips, and whole loaves of bread in his travels. Most participants declined his offers to share his take.

Sut'lut

Sut'lut arrived on the mountain thanks to George's afternoon spent chained to the bottom of a truck. She had seen him on the news, and felt inspired by his bravery and passion, particularly at such a young age. She felt that if he were willing to make such a stand, she could certainly do the same. She was the one who helped Cal and Chapparahl establish and light the Sacred Fire at what would rapidly become the centre of the camp.

Sut'lut was a compelling woman with a moving story. Each day she showed up with the same t-shirt stretched over her sweaters, under an open jacket, emblazoned with a printed photograph of her daughter and the details of her case as one of Canada's murdered and missing Aboriginal women. She spoke often with the police officer still

working her daughter's case, so had a slightly better working relationship with police than many of the other Caretakers. Sut'lut helped organize the carving of a totem pole on the campsite, and led the women present in the Musqueam women warrior's chant on the days where the crowds became large. A few people gladly and fondly described her as the heart of the ongoing presence on the hill.

George and Anne

After the surveyors were rebuffed from the clearing, they returned to the bottom of the hill, where another controversial encounter took place. A young man who identified himself to the media as 'George Khossi' had crawled under the surveyor's jeep while they were up in the clearing, and chained himself to the frame of the vehicle. George is not actually named George, and admits it openly to fellow protesters, but keeps his real identity closely guarded and speaks to the media using that alias. The surveyors themselves called head office and were picked up by a second car after just a few minutes. Police, who had been present all morning, were called to extricate him, and a standoff ensued for hours.

Up at the top of the hill, where activists were debriefing after the confrontation in the clearing, news of his action filtered up slowly. People were coming and going en-masse; a university professor was taking a break and sitting in her car, speed-reading a final draft of someone's thesis for a defence the next morning; picnickers were setting up in the grass and signs were being painted.

Anne, one of the activists and an SFU professor, expressed that there was a chance that the media would swarm around George's stand and that it may detract from the positive message of the day if the situation were to escalate. After driving quickly down the hill, kindly giving me a ride, Anne spoke privately to the attending officers, and then to George himself. She explained that all would be forgiven if he came out and identified himself correctly, that he would not be arrested. He unlocked himself and crawled gingerly out, to be put immediately into the back of a police car. Within the hour he was released from the back of the car right there on the roadside and gently but firmly sent on his way.

The contrast between Anne and George was striking. Anne was calm in the situation, level headed, and able to communicate effectively and respectfully with the police to deescalate the situation. George was the opposite, evincing a persistent hotheadedness that was genuinely nerve wracking for activists who were interested in fighting in the court of public opinion. He later would be removed from the injunction zone after being extracted from a tree, and engaging in a confrontation with surveyors that somehow ended with him being hit by a car.

He had a habit of playing idly with a slingshot kept to hand in camp, loading it with small rocks and firing them hard at nearby trees, or the ground. The slingshot had been procured somewhere for the express purpose of trying to help construct an anti-helicopter net of fishing line that might hinder Kinder Morgan's ability to airlift drilling equipment down into the borehole site deep in the forest. The concern was that the slingshot could be interpreted as being a weapon. One visiting supporter, a middle aged local resident, advised George that if the police saw it they could 'trump it up' and insist that the slingshot was a weapon present in the camp. George tucked it into his pocket without responding, but pulled it out the moment the man was out of sight and resumed firing off rocks.

That morning, he had announced to the surrounding reporters his intention to remain under the car until Stephen Harper and Kinder Morgan were both prosecuted for crimes against the environment. Often, in the eyes of protesters like Anne, his actions seemed incredibly ill-advised. Yet, no one who spent any amount of time at the camp would argue anything other than that George was part of the backbone of the camp itself over the weeks to come.

Non-Members

From the beginning, there were groups of people present on Burnaby Mountain who sided with the Caretakers, but never gained real membership in that organization. Many of them identified primarily as members of BROKE, or other environmentalist groups local to the area. As Stephen speculated, the split between the Caretakers and BROKE seemed to have occurred before I began my field observations, but I noticed two main

groups were consistently and subtly sorted as being other than Caretakers, even when they had invested considerable time in the protests.

Veteran Environmentalists

At a rally to gain public support, a speaker came up to the microphone to explain how he had fought Kinder Morgan before; they had wanted to chop down two old sequoia trees on his golf course, and the club- 'me and the guys'- successfully fought them off. "Sequoias don't grow nearby," a woman behind me, murmured skeptically to another, "what is he talking about?" I looked around the crowd and noticed Chapparahl turning on his heel and walking away. Chapparahl and Christopher talked openly about places like golf courses as good places to slip in to sneak access to a free shower, and lived intimately connected to a community more inclined to fight that kind of development than congratulate them on keeping their scenery intact. On that day in particular, when the absolute largest number of people yet had been attracted to the camp, the words that were spoken by the newcomers seemed at least to reflect the politics and convictions of the long term protesters and original Caretakers.

Distinct from activists who were pure newcomers, these protesters actually did have a history of involvement with environmentalist causes, but perhaps little experience with anti-racism or anti-colonialist protest. The case of the golf course activist was a little extreme, but was symptomatic of a group of people who would join the camp and then say something well-meaning but along the lines of, 'black, white, purple, it's all the same to me - I don't see colour,' provoking reactions ranging anywhere from eye rolling and expressions of contempt to hissed tirades.

Novice Environmentalists

As news got out in the community what Kinder Morgan was doing in the conservation area, people began to become politicized in a way that they may not have been, previously. The ones I spoke to tended to be long time liberals or leftists who most often voted NDP, but were not necessarily used to attending rallies. One explained that she recycled, used reusable grocery bags instead of plastic, but had not been to a march since she was in college protesting apartheid.

Emily was one of the 'Nimbies,' named for NIMBY - 'not in my back yard' - a phrase with just enough of a judgemental overtone to it that it was most common to hear people self-deprecatingly refer to themselves that way. She began attending the protests because as a local homeowner, she was concerned about the potential impact on her neighbourhood. Kinder Morgan had had spills in Burnaby in 2007 and 2009, so her confidence in their ability to manage this pipeline was low. This had galvanized her, a mother of several young children, to help the camp however she could. Friendly and supportive, she was a frequent fixture of the camp, but clearly struggled with situations like these.

The culture shock between activists like Emily and activists like George and Chapparahl was tangible. No one disputed that the hearts of the recently galvanized community members were in the right place, but many had issues of sensitivity that they were struggling to address on the fly. Some were far more resistant to having their behaviours challenged than others. For example, one afternoon Emily asked if she could take photos of people around the fire, to post online. First of all, many of the radical activists did not want their photos to be posted, since they were concerned about evidence being used against them. Second, one of the prescriptions shared by Chapparahl and Sut'lut for the care of the Sacred Fire was that photos not be taken of it. Though Emily apologized right away, and moved on to other subjects, later that week someone suggested that the rule about photos being taken of the Sacred Fire was a tactical mistake, and that photos of the camp should be distributed to the media to encourage more support. The Caretakers in the group who had been told the ceremonial significance of the fire immediately protested the suggestion. In person, the discussion was polite, but on the Facebook group the discussion became much more heated, with the original request no longer just a simple mistake but now an example of rudeness, ignorance and privilege.

Another small group of activists heavily involved on Burnaby Mountain that stands out as an interesting example was the owners and employees of a local yoga studio. With a business located less than three kilometers away from the mountain, the couple that ran the studio cared deeply about the local environment, about harmony in the area and the conservation of wildlife. They committed huge amounts of time on the mountain, gave their energy, let employees have time off work to protest, and raised awareness through

signage posted in their studio and through announcements posted on their popular Facebook page. Devout spiritualists and pacifists, they got into trouble very quickly on the hill, and were embroiled in several heated discussions regarding cultural appropriation, privilege, gentrification of East Hastings, and the environmental irresponsibility of hot yoga studios. In particular, problems arose when one of the business owners loudly criticized other activists for bringing aggression and violence into the space.

Despite the conflicts in philosophy, in strategy, in personality, the group struggled gamely on. In the days to come as camaraderie grew, over a hundred of them would be arrested, some symbolically, and some engaged in direct delaying tactics to try to stop the work. The arrestees were radicals and NIMBYs alike, zap-strapped by the wrists in police vans, side by side.

Facebook

One tool for maintaining and monitoring membership in the Caretaker organization was access to the private online documents and Facebook pages. Invitations were extended initially to any person who came and volunteered to take shifts on the mountain, but were closely monitored for who was still an active participant. There was a lot of fear that these pages could be used as evidence in court, if the issue ever got that far. Although I had been invited in initially, I found that within a day of finishing my field observations and stepping back, my access to the pages had already been blocked.

The more public of the Facebook pages were also the site of a lot of the friction that occurred between the meaning making members of the movement and the people who challenged them. What responsibility did the hardened crowd of radical activists have for educating the newcomers to the environmental movement in anti-colonial politics? Should they simply have known that their comments were inappropriate? Once told, did they stick to their convictions for an inappropriate amount of time, by continuing the argument? The hostility was explained, in the argument against tone-policing, but was it justified, or a good strategy to use when this cause was succeeding in bringing out local community members some of whom had never attended a protest before in their lives. Certainly, people who deal daily with racism were not expected by the blockaders to

remain constantly, congenially engaged in the task of gently educating newcomers as to appropriate behaviour, particularly not when many of these (non-Indigenous) newcomers were consistently and even offensively dismissive of the importance of spirituality and tradition within the blockade.

Tension was escalated by the presence of multiple non-participating bystanders, who were not in attendance of any of the political protests but content to join the Facebook group and, at times it seemed like outright needling of the Caretakers and allies. They were inclined to agree with the newcomers, but also to amplify their messages, which contributed to the impression of a rift between the two sides. Emily, for example, might insist that she was being spoken to unkindly and felt dissuaded in her participation by the hostility she was feeling from some co-protesters. Then, a bystander would chime in, saying that Emily was right, and that Aboriginal activists were 'reverse-racists.'²¹ The conversation exploded with a torrent of disagreement targeted at both Emily and the non-involved interloper, only adding to her impression that people were being cruel to her, only adding to the anti-colonialist's impression that the opposite side was completely lacking in any understanding of oppression politics, and the lines of the disagreement would deepen.

Observers

All through the course of the protest, there were many camera crews present. Some were for news organizations, demarcated by the logos plastered on the sides of their cameras. Others were filming documentaries on the movement. Of the documentary filmmakers, two spoke to me at length about their projects. One crew of two men (an interviewer and a cameraman) asked questions attempting to set the scene for a complex retelling of the events of the blockade, and were interested in the political virtues of stopping the pipeline in Burnaby, as it might prevent development all down the line. They worked with a local film collective, did so quickly and efficiently, and asked questions about mobilization and effective resistance. The other filmmaker worked alone, and was

²¹ 'Reverse racism' is one of the squares in most iterations on the 'How to Suppress a Discussion on Race' Bingo card, from the ongoing anti-racism Bingo project. This project, commonly kidded about between activists, focuses on the creation of a bingo-style card whose squares involve commonly used problematic and racist phrases that surface in discussions of race.

engaged in what sounded like a broader scale passion project on the subject of environmentalism in BC in general. He spent longer visiting the camp, getting his camera out less frequently, socialized more with people around the fire, and frequently brought donations of camp materials. On the whole, he was more integrated into camp life. Both films were described as entirely positive portrayals of the blockade.

When dealing with the media, more radical activists were used to being consistently misrepresented and were less likely to trust reporters to tell their side of the story. This was partially because of how, out of context, their activities sounded. Chapparahl, for example, spoke to a member of the SFU *Peak* writing staff about how he was working to protect the mountain, and the result was an article focusing on him as a wild-haired man who lived in the woods and slept in his car. He is all of those things, but that is also an oversimplification. Outside of the context of Chapparahl's political activities, the description struck him as insulting, uncomplicated, and intended to diminish his credibility. The interview and subsequent writing deadened any desire to speak to the media.

While the more moderate activists tended to have better luck in communicating with media interviews, there was also a difference in how they saw the importance of these sorts of conversations. To the moderates, if public consciousness could be raised and public opinion could shift in their favour, then Kinder Morgan could be defeated through the pressure of demonstrations. They had never been badly misquoted or portrayed unkindly by a news source, and had no sense of the injustice regarding mainstream media.

The Enemy(?)

One of the challenging things about this protest was the shifting definitions of who the protest was actually about and against, or, who and what exactly made up the enemy. Activists expressed, at various points, disgust with Kinder Morgan and the surveying company they employed, and with the NEB and the Harper government. At various points there was also pushback against the judges who had supported the company's injunctions, or ruled in favour of the NEB, as well as against the police and various institutions in the abstract.

Kinder Morgan

Typically, in media analysis of protest tactics, the conversation focuses around the interactions between protesters and authority figures, namely security, city or policing services. One unanticipated pattern I noticed during my research was the concentrated effort that Kinder Morgan made to wage a battle for positive spin in the situation. The first clear indication of this behaviour occurred after the donation of a few coffee carafes by a major coffee shop chain in the area. One activist posted on Facebook about the generosity of the shop in providing hot coffee for the protesters, and a media spokesperson for Kinder Morgan took to twitter to announce her disappointment with the chain, and to ask head office to look into this presumably delinquent behaviour by the individual franchise owner.

Similarly, Kinder Morgan began flyer-ing local homes, and hosted a phone-in town hall where residents who called in to ask questions describe having to screen said questions with an officiator to be allowed to ask them. It was reported that only questions about the benefits the transmountain pipeline might have in the area were addressed during the meeting. In 'Green BC' this proved to be something of a losing battle. Mayor Corrigan's repeated objections, and in particular the fact that Kinder Morgan was attempting to do this work in a protected conservation area, made the situation a difficult one to salvage from a PR standpoint. This was compounded by the sense that the company was bullying local activists through their lawsuit.

Police and Courts

The police initially were there strictly to ensure that the peace was kept. Because the bylaw infractions that took place were related to the chopping down of trees and harming other vegetation in a conservation area, the surveyors present in October were not in violation of any ordinances so long as they did not harm the wildlife. That said, police did not interfere with protesters blocking surveyors from having access to the clearing. They became involved when George interfered directly with surveyor equipment, but other than that, did not take sides. However, for the rest of the protesters, the interactions with police officers were by and large respectful.

The first arrest actually involved Cal, on November 7th. I was up the hill with Christopher, checking out a Terasen Gas truck that had parked in the Caretakers' lot,

when the police officer threw Cal into Guillaume's car, head first. I heard the screaming and came tearing back down the hill. Christopher, who has about a foot on me in height, outpaced me easily and was quickly standing right in an officer's face demanding to know what he was doing, while another RCMP member tried to shield Cal and the arresting officer from the crush of protesters. Sut'lut and another woman began singing and drumming loudly in protest.

Icheb and George conferred hurriedly whether or not it would be safe to give Cal's cane to the officers, or whether they would break it for spite. This was a new level of distrust for many of the protesters, but reviewing the video footage of the arrest it was easy to see what had provoked it. On camera, Cal can be seen standing forward, voice raised, informing the RCMP officer that this is sovereign land and that he has no right to be here. The officer answers him with a laugh, calls him friend, and reaches out to touch his shoulder. Cal tells him not to do that, and threatens to charge him with assault if he persists in touching him. Eventually, the officer's patience apparently snaps, and he hits Cal bodily, sending him staggering.

In the footage Cal comes across as aggressive, frustrating, and difficult to deal with; more than one youtube comment characterizes him as 'obnoxious,' but the officer in question has such a sizeable advantage over him in terms of height, weight, and mobility that his violent assault is equally characterized as a bullying overreaction. Watching Cal's face as he was led up the hill, and the faces of the arresting officers, as well as seeing the horrified and betrayed expressions the Caretakers were wearing, it seemed perfectly credible to me that these men might snap Cal's dropped cane in half if we entrusted it to them.

Cal was the first person to be arrested on Burnaby Mountain. Without speculating as to the perceptions and inclinations of the arresting officer, Cal had spoken to me at length about his Indigenous heritage, in particular the relationship between his people and the police department. The first day we met, we sat in the clearing for hours together, discussing philosophy, politics, cooking, music, wildlife, and in particular many altercations he had had in the past with figures of authority. He recounted, with a distinct twist of pride, that he had once called a First Nations police officer a traitor, while the man tried to ticket

him on the Skytrain, making him stagger back with the force of the words. At camp, he reacted to every police officer with a distinct and unrepentant disobedience to their authority, fostered in part thanks to the ongoing issues between the First Nations and police in British Columbia (Kendall et al., 2010).

It happened that Cal already felt a lot of anger and resentment towards many bureaucratic organizations that he dealt with, particularly the ones plagued with problems that he saw as being produced by 'white management,' meaning interventionist, colonialist, or out of tune with nature by varying turns. In the same conversation where he told me about his argument with the Skytrain police, he also shared a story about finding an injured crow down on East Hastings. After giving it a little food, he'd been surprised when the crow hopped along after him, with one broken wing, as he walked down the road, first one side, and then had started trying to cross the street against traffic to follow him back up the other direction. Cal ducked into the road to save it from being struck by a car, wrapped it in his jacket, and began the hours long walk to the Vancouver SPCA. It was the only thing he could think to do, since city buses would not allow live birds on board. Despite his mobility issues, with the help of his cane, he and the bird made it to the animal shelter, where they helped him put the bird in a small cardboard box. He spoke to them, and they admitted they could not treat wildlife here, but would forward the animal to the wildlife rescue service. Cal wanted to wait with the bird for pick up, but when they could not reach the other office on the phone, he reluctantly followed their instructions to leave. The next day, he phoned back to check on his crow. The woman who he spoke to had no idea of any transfer, and upon investigation, it was discovered that the wildlife rescue had never been successfully reached, and the bird had been left overnight on a back table in the cardboard box. It had died during the night. This was, as Cal relayed to me in our interview, everything that was wrong with white organizations, top to bottom.

With that personal context, the video of Cal being arrested takes on an entirely different light. When Cal talks about Sovereign land, the officer laughs outright and steps forward, further encroaching into his personal space. The officer calling Cal his 'friend' reads as at best, oblivious to the context of Aboriginal-police relations in Vancouver, and at worst, deliberately needling to provoke an arrest. For one protester in particular, watching Cal being arrested was a transformative moment. She explained that she had

witnessed police violence against protesters in the media, but had somehow always believed that they must be responsible, and that the arrests were likely reasonable. Witnessing first hand an arrest that was, in her words, 'really unnecessary,' was a startling experience for her. To some protesters, Burnaby Mountain was an eye opening experience in the issues around race and policing, while to others it was more evidence of something they clearly understood.

In interviews, participants described the dynamic between protesters, workers and police as frustrating, complicated, and characterized mostly by a sense of overreach. While the police had been instructed to enforce the injunction within a certain number of meters that Kinder Morgan demonstrated was necessary for their work, this was soon expanded to include a safety perimeter, which widened several times over the course of work. Additionally, protesters were impacted by police lane closures that they saw as intended to prevent easy access to the protest site. All parking on the mountain side was barricaded, meaning that any protester had to either take public transportation as close to the scene as possible and then hike for seven minutes up a steep hill, or walk up from the nearest parking lot at the base of the mountain or from the top of it, a twenty minute trek for the able bodied, and a serious obstacle for the some of the Caretakers negotiating disability and chronic pain.

To the optimists (namely the newcomers) it seemed that the RCMP did not want to be there, and were enforcing the injunction on the say-so of the judge, but that if they were treated respectfully by protesters then at worst they could be considered sell-outs whose actions were going against their conscience. To the more militant members of the group, the police were a coercive force, there to continue the oppression of the Canadian (and particularly Aboriginal Canadian) peoples as much as possible.

As the protests went on, and participants were exposed to police tactics for crowd control, consensus among the protesters swung more towards the coercive control framework. The situation with the cars, for example, became ammunition in this fight. Even if the RCMP were required not to let anyone enter the protected zone, then why, asked Jean in particular, should they go beyond their mandate to do so and focus on dissuading the kinds of resistance that were permitted? Later in the week, another flashpoint occurred

that stuck in the minds of many activists. Jean described how he witnessed an elderly woman being arrested in a manner that he characterized in very physical terms (being thrown to the ground, being dragged by her bag, being pushed) and the police reportedly stated that she had tripped, and they were helping her to safety. She was put in the back of a wagon. Perceived disingenuousness and bullying behaviours soured the opinions of even those who had begun with a sympathy for the officers in question. From my background in criminology, it felt a little like seeing the years of effort to make a shift towards a community focused policing get swept away with just a few moments of perceived overreach.

The Court

While all this was happening, the injunction was still being fought in court. One afternoon Mia, one of the named defendants, came on to Facebook to tell us that she and her co-defendant Adam had been stopped on their way into the courthouse. Officials had confiscated his abalone shell and smudging materials, despite his assurances that he carried them to use later in the day and had no intention of lighting them inside the court. The materials risked producing smoke and scent, they explained. Mia, meanwhile, walked through beside him with her pack of cigarettes and lighter. The disdain they had for the court carried right over from the general consensus about the role of police. The two were just part of an interconnected structure of oppression characterized by senseless and systematically racist policies.

Because of the suit brought against Adam, Mia, Lynne and Stephen, as well as the John and Jane Does of Burnaby Mountain and members of BROKE, the legal realities of the blockade were distinctly different from those of most protests that happened around environmental issues in Vancouver that year. Rather than preserving public order, police were there to enforce a court ordered injunction. Although protesters had initially been allowed to remain onsite with minimal police intervention, after a judge granted Kinder-Morgan their injunction against interference in their work, this changed. Rather than being a case of police deciding what level of political demonstration they were going to permit in a public area, on Burnaby Mountain they had an objective clearly set out by a court of law; they were to ensure Kinder Morgan was able to complete its survey work.

Strategy

Because the position the Caretakers were in kept evolving over the course of the protest, so too did the strategies they tried to adopt. In the beginning, with Mayor Corrigan's firm opposition to the pipeline, when I spoke to protesters in the clearing many conveyed that they saw their role as activists was going to be to step in during the interim while the legal battles were fought. With much damage already having been done to the clearing prior to the survey work beginning in earnest, the potential for environmental destruction during the court case seemed too dangerous. The orientation leaders told us the cutting was probably done to make room to lower equipment in by helicopter, so all the discussions of tactics tended to involve legal ways to hold off damaging equipment drops until the court date could come.

Once it became clear that work was seriously going to be allowed to proceed for possibly months before there was any judicial intervention, there came a split in how people perceived the goals of the movement. One group wanted simply to raise awareness and show support, to be able to list community participation in demonstration against the pipeline as evidence for why the NEB and the courts should not allow the pipeline through. Many of them were prepared to violate the interventions of police and lower courts in shows of civil disobedience to advance their goals; if enough people crossed the police line, then politicians would have to take notice and effect change. Their stance and tactics evolved around lawbreaking symbolism. The second group advocated active and sometimes criminal resistance. The members of the first group's meaning network is best characterized as being consensus-based, premised on the belief that democratic participation would defeat the pipeline. The second were better characterized as having a conflict based perspective, feeling that the system was rigged irreparably in favour of the pipeline, and that therefore, all manner of tactics, even lawbreaking, were appropriate.

Showing that we care

When the goal of the consensus-seeking protesters was to attract city-wide participation, the perception of radicalism and violence was something to fight against.

The very first sign of this clash of principles occurred the day that surveyors came to try to work in the clearing, and some of the Caretakers swore at them. The fears of the more peacefully inclined activists appeared to be validated by the language the injunction used to describe that first major protest. The profanity and anger the surveyors faced constituted a kind of assault, the company alleged.

For a day or two, it seemed as though this legal argument might signal a shift towards a more pacifistic approach in general, except for the arrival of the internet meme #KinderMorganFace. To highlight the overreach of the claim that an aggressive facial expression could be an assault, people took selfies of their scowls and posted them online with the accompanying hashtag, to indicate their displeasure with the company, and highlight how a simple expression of that displeasure could not possibly constitute an assault. The online activity gained even more attention when Gregor Robertson, then campaigning for re-election as mayor of Vancouver, participated and posted his own grimace. On the mountain, it shifted some of the urgency around the dialogue of 'our anger will be used against us in court.' It may have been true that it was, but it was also clear that it was making Kinder Morgan into the butt of the joke.

The topic of Cal's arrest featured heavily in the discussion of tactics. Newcomers with a little distance from the situation, having not known him very well, were a little more prepared to offer a critique of his role in the situation, compared to the pure support from the people who knew Cal or had seen it happen. Many of these people were seasoned activists, but from a privileged background in terms of ethnicity, employment and education. Someone with moderate legal expertise commented that they were unsurprised the arrest had happened, seeing the footage, because Cal had been gesticulating at the officer, that the key to avoiding arrest was to keep your hands down and maintain a passive manner. He did not believe provoking arrest was necessary to fight these battles. Many people, online and onsite, echoed these thoughts, hinting that if Cal had handled it better it might not have happened. Debate erupted, as the more aggressive activists challenged the duty of protesters to behave 'appropriately' per authority's standards, while their more media conscious counterparts struggled to urge their friends to behave calmly. They wanted to paint a picture of reasonable, noble activists being unjustly and unduly arrested by a ham-fisted authority in the service of a ruthless

American company. This form of 'PR chicken' with authority is a common approach to protests like these (Meyer, 2004). To some degree, though, it functioned as tone-policing, leveled against the anger that on-the-ground activists had towards an aggressive and intrusive police presence.

Getting enough people together

The shifting of public will represented a victory to the majority of protesters that it did not to their more jaded, radical counterparts. Far more likely to believe in coercive governmental control and the complete lack of oversight at this level in the energy sector, the more aggressive activists saw positive media attention as having two beneficial outcomes: one, that it would give the company a PR black eye, which would irritate them, which filled the protesters with a sort of cheer; and two, that it would raise the alarm for other activists, from nearby and from afar, and lead to a potential diverting of energy and resources towards Burnaby Mountain. Indeed, as media attention grew, many people drove in from Haida Gwaii, from Vancouver Island, even from out in the prairie province where there was a similar network of people built up around tar sands resistance.

Rather than changing the hearts and minds of suburban homeowners, the blockaders hoped to attract other radicals. One man or woman willing to chain themselves by the neck to a piece of equipment outweighed the transformative potential of one thousand concerned citizens writing their MP, as far as they were concerned. Accordingly, to them, all media coverage was essentially positive, and the more radical the political activity, the more likely they were to attract these kinds of people.

To the moderates, this was unendingly frustrating, because it chased away huge segments of the public. The simple answer when two groups disagree is to let each one act as they wish, but in this case the moderates believed the radical tactics were actively harming their ability to attract more protesters, and public support. It also seemed to be personally embarrassing to them, on a level, to describe themselves to friends and family and be spending time on the mountain, having to justify the behaviour of their 'colleagues' and make explanations and excuses for why they were affiliating themselves with such a movement. In their eyes, building momentum and growing numbers of protesters on the

mountain was key to success, and by appealing to as broad a spectrum of Canadians as possible, by convincing the media of the reasonableness of their concerns, by taking TV interviews and seeming approachable and relatable and not too angry, this momentum could be built.

The moderates understood that they needed to be portrayed in a relatively sympathetic light so that any police intervention might be deemed overly forceful (Waddington, 2007). If the police arrested a peaceful demonstration, it would be the undue oppression of a worthwhile movement. If there was violence, rudeness, profanity, as these activists saw it, they would lose that public will, and stop attracting new protesters.

Where activists saw the need for balancing both approaches, there was discussion and tension around just how much weight to give either goal. Ultimately the discussions never came to any resolution since controlling the actions of the most aggressive protesters was impossible, as prepared as they were to dismiss the moderate voices as further tone policing or as well-meaning but misguided chastising.

Most people remembered or were at least peripherally aware of Tzeporah Berman's arrest at Clayoquot Sound, where she was charged with encouraging the members of the protest she helped mobilize to break the law (Berman & Leiren-Young, 2011). When rallies took place, speeches were couched in a careful language; "I personally am committed to coming here and being arrested. I would not and cannot encourage anyone to do the same, but I have to do what's right by my conscience." In the same way, discussions of potential anti-police strategies occurred quietly, and only amongst long-time members or people who were well-established members of other activist spaces.

Other activists write the media off as a lost cause, or a tool of the dominant power structure. Activists who are not concerned with media consequences have a broader spectrum of potential tactics at their disposal.

Concrete Intervention

The activists who were not as focused on appealing to the media tended to spend the most time in the campsite, so they made some defining choices in how the blockade unfolded. One of the interesting dynamics of the camp was the control of space. At the centre of the camp, physically and emotionally, was the Sacred Fire. This was ringed with a circle of lawn chairs, and bordered by a few of the parked shelter cars on one side, the kitchen tent, a large tarpaulin-covered woodpile, and a bulletin board with information about the conservation area and Kinder Morgan the company. The center had been surrounded by makeshift barriers; plastic rope was netted between the trees, and heaped up cinderblocks rescued from the junk-dumping that had been taking place in the nearby woods. There were several strange ceramic sculptures of pastoral children and cherubs, chipped and faded, also from the forest. Bits of tree branches, traffic cones, milk crates and protest signs made up the outside perimeter. Inside, tarps hung, providing privacy from news cameras and shelter from the rain.

The barrier was intended to keep out police officers and reporters. Whenever newcomers arrived, they tended to wait outside of the space, until explicitly invited in. Once they were, they would clamber over a few rocks, round a narrow corner between a tent wall and a dented up old jeep, and come to the fire, signs declaring a warm welcome, and generally at least two or three Caretakers at any given time.

This fortification reflected an ongoing sense of surveillance and persecution that existed, particularly in the last few days of the protests, following Cal's arrest. The group was beginning to talk strategy, to think about what to do to resist the surveyors and police once the injunction was enforced, which it seemed like it would be. Talking strategy was risky, because of the perceived risk of police infiltration. Any of the newcomers in particular could easily have been an undercover officer, in the eyes of anyone who had been there since the early days.

One of the main topics of discussions, both during training and over the course of the entire blockade was how this might be prevented. It was understood that helicopters were not permitted to fly within a certain distance of civilians, so a bodily presence at both borehole sites was one possible solution to prevent equipment drops, particularly at

borehole one, where hiking heavy equipment down the steep trails would be challenging. The protesters discussed constructing a fishnet like creation of a strong line, crossing wires between branches in the tree canopy to interfere with any potential material drops, but no one had approached a project like that before or knew where to begin in terms of materials.

These all reflected the main focus of the core camping group; the press and the police were the enemy. The courts could not be counted on to come through to do the right thing. Making the campsite appealing to the public was not as important as making it an effective and defensible space. It was the camp, and their radical tactics for taking back control from an unwilling and oppressive authority, against the world.

Symbolic Arrest

In particular, the anarchists started a conversation about the value of symbolic arrest. This, they explained, was the act of deliberately getting oneself arrested at a protest, while not committing any action that would significantly delay Kinder Morgan. What that would mean on Burnaby Mountain was walking peacefully across the tape into the zone of the injunction. A young anarchist named Rhaia shared with me her story of losing her job thanks to a photo of her involved in a violent protest. In the workshop she challenged activists to get arrested, certainly, but to do it in the service of something useful, like equipment sabotage or physically stopping work. The passive arrest strategy, she insisted, merely legitimized the existing systems, 'played the game on their terms' and cost activists tremendously in terms of time, in terms of energy and resources when it came to jail support. She postulated it undermined the protest by prohibiting committed activists from protesting most effectively. It was an expected kind of demonstration that once had value historically, but now was nearly meaningless, except in that it slowed things down.

She sat opposite the circle from Adam. I am not sure whether she was aware of his situation. Adam was a named defendant in the injunction against the protests, and he was currently dealing with a contempt of court charge for exactly the sort of activity she was now criticizing, chaining himself by the neck to a gate of a gas company a few miles away. He had been open in previous discussions about the difficulty of navigating the

Burnaby situation, given the potential ramifications from that case and his ongoing legal issues there. Adam's expression remained implacable throughout her critique.

Rhaia's perspective on the effectiveness of arrest was a very different one from most members of the camp. In part, the idea of getting arrested had become the hushed conversation that was repeated over and over again among small clusters of new acquaintances. One person would ask some variation of 'so, are you planning to get arrested?' and the reply would be positive, negative, or unsure. Many people were absolutely committed to the idea and were willing and even grimly enthusiastic about the prospect, stating their intentions as a measure of their commitment. Many of the original Caretakers had been arrested for chaining themselves to Kinder Morgan's gates in the first days of the action, and were prepared to be arrested again. Adam, Lynne, Stephen and Mia were in the public eye, and so were aware that they were going to be able to make a statement through their arrest. Others were quick to join them with an enthusiastic 'absolutely.'

When the answer was a 'no,' it was often framed with a soft regret, or with an explanation of why they could not afford to be arrested. The barriers most often mentioned were children or family at home, and career commitments, though more in terms of physically needing to be able to be back at the office in a timely manner rather than any worry for reputation. Even the liberal and pacifist activists generally intended to be arrested if they had no obstacles in their way.

This interest in being arrested was further evidence against the perception that people do political protest strictly for personal gain. I understood the interest in being arrested as a form of 'therapeutic civil disobedience,' disobedience for ones' own happiness (Smith, 1994), especially held in contrast to Rhaia's perspective. She and the other most radical camp members were willing to risk arrest, but not over anything symbolic. They advocated the destruction of Kinder Morgan's equipment, or finding a way to actively chain themselves to something inside the workspace. Afterwards, in Facebook conversations, they would identify that the battle on Burnaby Mountain was lost because the movement in general lost focus and began wasting time, energy, and other precious resources on this symbolic behaviour. For one thing, being arrested gave the RCMP

something to use to discourage future participation in the movement. Some of the people who were arrested were told that they would not be charged if they simply did not return to the campsite. They tried to discourage their co-protesters from playing the 'arrest game' rather than actively intervening to stop the company work.

Chapter 5.

Discussion

I stopped attending the protests on November 19th, the day before arrests began. As with other protests I attended during the course of this research, in this case giving the crowd a clear rule that could be broken immediately resulted in a focus for the conflict. As a no-longer active protester, a moderator removed me from the private Caretakers Facebook page. Instead, I followed the story through livestreaming, the public Facebook groups, and media reports. I watched avidly from afar, as the online groups began casually sourcing price quotes and potential donations of enough cement to fill two boreholes.

Left to their own devices, many demonstrations remain very peaceful. Most of the participants at Burnaby Mountain had never engaged in lawbreaking behaviours of any kind, or had attended environmentalist marches for years without issue. However, given a line to push up against, protesters immediately itched to cross it. When the injunction zone was set up, many walked deliberately in to be arrested, using this civil disobedience to express their condemnation of the legal system's ruling. I ended field observations at this point, since my supervisors and I each felt that attending an event where I understood that the intentions of many of my key participants intended to break the law would arguably fall outside of the scope of my ethics approval, which at that point had a strictly 'minimal risk' designation.

I began to explore the way in which the different groups I had observed related to one another. While the protesters espoused philosophies of non-hierarchical organizing, the patterns in my observations clearly showed a group of protesters who had at least marginal authority over the activists who joined their cause. This aspect was a predictable problem, explored in research on many other social movements (Freeman, 1972). The philosophical outlooks of the protesters involved seemed to impact not only how they related to one another in the context of the blockade, but also the kind of success they were looking for from the protest itself. Because the circumstances on Burnaby Mountain appeared to many to be an egregious overstepping by Kinder Morgan and the NEB, activists who had been galvanized by something like the fact that the pipeline was going

through a conservation area worked alongside activists who wanted to end the role of the resource extraction industry in Canada entirely.

Hierarchy

One of the core problems of Burnaby Mountain protest was that there were two very different groups of people involved. One of those groups included mostly people who are younger, unemployed, casually or underemployed, either single or in romantic relationships with other activists, many of whom eschewed the idea of property and the wage economy, and who in general had no qualms about making trouble and getting arrested. A second group were present because of a belief in environmentalism in general, but also had jobs, families, commitments. It set up considerable, inevitable conflict in terms of strategy and tactics used.

Although the organization structure on the mountain was nominally non-hierarchical, as is typically the case with such organizations there were still differences in the distribution of political resources that reflected in the relations between camp members (Gordon, 2007). Over all, power tended to be in the hands of the first group, because authority in the camp was earned through the main avenue of time commitment on the hill, which the first group was in a much better position to be able to provide. Without the structural realities limiting the amount of time they could spend at the protest site, or camping overnight, the more radical of the two forces was more present, more active, and better able to fulfill the needs of the space, as well as better able to be present to have the conversations that reiterated the discourse that gave them their own authority.

In early stages of this project, I was enthused by the message that the organization was non-hierarchical, but in analysis quickly began to see moments of power exercised between one activist and another, even to the extent of the exclusion of group members who could not absorb the politics and the strict language rules in anti-oppression communities. One person tended to speak too quickly and interject over others, which it was felt was a problem, that it was disrespectful and even silencing. It was brought up with them, (although apparently in private, this was only reported to me, never anything I witnessed) and after a few days they expressed a lot of frustration over how rude people

were about it, that they tended to be the target of a lot of casual social shaming and exclusion. This is an old problem. In 1972, Freeman's *The Tyranny of Structurelessness*, identified how anti-authoritarian organizational values were working against the best interests of the feminist movement; insisting on non-hierarchical organizational structures merely allowed informal structures to emerge, creating friendship in-groups and out-groups (Freeman, 1972).

Ownership and Voice

Perhaps because of the debate around the profanity at the initial confrontation, the first ideological conflict to rise to the surface on the hill was the tension between liberal pacifists and a broad cross-section of other activists, mostly radicals, but also anyone with any sort of background in anti-racist organizing or social justice work in spaces that used the etiquette that has evolved in anti-oppression spaces.

Anti-racism groups in particular have developed an etiquette and a set of terms describing behaviours of white and settler activists. This kind of mobilization involves actively calling out potentially well-meaning but problematic behaviour. For example, the pacifists made the case that by modelling the virtues they wished society to have, and engaging in nonviolent measures, they would better embody their politics and not compromise their ethics in seeking change. In response, the more aggressive activists felt that they were being "tone-policed," a term coined by black feminist activists (Abagond, 2010) to describe the conversations that occur when white people inform a person of colour that their anger is detracting from their message. The problem with tone policing is that it invalidates the very appropriate anger that People of Colour may experience in the face of oppression, while simultaneously discrediting them by suggesting that they are irrational.

In the context of Burnaby Mountain, the minority affected on the mountain and the ones being tone policed were largely young, First Nations men who held that they had very good reason to respond angrily to this incursion. They had little interest in listening to

the calls of 'drive-by' white activists to 'behave better' in a fight they had so recently joined, which First Nations communities had been fighting for generations.²²

There were older activists as well, men and women with long histories in the Red Power movement, equally disinclined to be instructed to behave more politely. Although they were not as likely to be physically committed to being in the space, the way Chapparahl, George, Danica and their peers were, all of these activists had a deep admiration for and belief in this kind of activism, and so their modeled respect for these issues brought them front and center.

This dynamic produced another one of the points of contention during the protest. The right of part-time activists or visiting protesters to take television interviews over the more committed, full-time activists raised a lot of concerns. If someone took an interview who was not a longstanding member of the group, it would be said that they “jumped in front of the camera,” implying they were attention-seeking. Usually it would be remarked that “I’d never seen him here before,” or “he’s been up here maybe once or twice.” The movement was technically leaderless so they could not be ordered to stop. Furthermore, most of the radical activists, like Chapparahl, had had bad experiences with reporters and had very little interest in fending off attention they saw as aggressive and adversarial. However, when the moderates spoke to the media, it became obvious to the Caretakers that they placed little to no attention on the role of First Nations rights in the struggle. It was a social negotiation that served to illustrate who had learned the politics of the movement, and who was still making gaffes, differentiating the people who would behave in ways the group coded as respectful and effective, as compared to people there engaging in ‘self-centered spotlight stealing.’

This tension was again reminiscent of Freeman’s (1972) analysis of structurelessness in organizing. She identified, as played out here, that the principles of this kind of organizing can become in and of themselves a dogma to which people ascribe. The need not to speak over marginalized voices, although a political belief that I as the

²² In particular tactics, resources, and even the members of the Unist’o’ten camp and Klabona Keepers contributed to the resistance on Burnaby Mountain.

author hold myself and respect, was functioning as a social more here that, once transgressed, led to classic ostracizing behaviour against the violator.

There is a peculiar effect that occurs in radical circles with regard to the very marginalized speaking for themselves. When you are protesting an issue that has to do with any group of people you are not a part of, most activists are trained very quickly not to take the microphone, and to refer reporters whenever possible to the people who are actually impacted. In Ottawa this policy came to the attention of the public, when an anti-racism rally dealing with police brutality against visible minorities specifically asked white allies not to speak to the press, if possible ("Canadian pro-Ferguson rally organizers ask 'whites' to stay in background," 2014). Critics reacted with variations of dismay or disgust, but for activists practicing on the ground, this is a reasonably well-established kind of etiquette. The problem it produces, though, is that the media still does ask questions of many present who are not people of colour, and the ones most likely to agree to speak to them are the ones who have not learned this rule, and therefore have little (or at least less) fluency with the talking points of anti-racist theory.

Through this effect, the first few days of media coverage on the mountain had a dearth of not just First Nations voices, but also even the mention of the fact that the mountain was unceded Coast Salish territory. One of the other interesting aspects that informed media representation were the gender politics of who was willing to speak on camera. At one point, Emily and I were stopped by a documentary filmmaker who asked us if he might speak to us. Both of us declined, citing that we were inappropriate people to talk to. He winced, and asked again, admitting that he understood our politics but had absolutely no women on tape so far who had been willing to be recorded.

In dealing with the media, pleas to 'be realistic' came up against disparaging accusations of 'watermelon activism'; liberal supporters on the mountain were 'green on the outside, red on the inside.' They were constructed as inauthentic activists. Accusations of fame-seeking also played a major part in the informal and often unspoken negotiation of who should be spokespeople. Once the media attention began in earnest on the mountain, a handful of activists with a comparatively high profile arrived, and more than one of them was quick to rise up and give speeches about the success of mobilization on

the mountain. Some of the Caretakers and long-time campers who had been visiting since September and through October and November felt that some of the speeches were a little too generous with the pronoun 'we' in discussing the success of the movement, that high-profile activists and representatives of NGOs either erroneously implied that they had been a part of or even a leader in the hard work that had been happening on the hill, even though this was their first time setting foot onsite. Though the question of whose protest it was was a difficult one for anyone to answer, everyone knew immediately that the protest did not belong to those who seemed quickest to want to claim ownership of it.

Because the crowds had swelled, by this point, from six people sitting around a fire for hours on end to a few hundred gathered and milling throughout the day, there were many more opportunities for speeches to address the gathered group. With media at hand, many of these occasions were filmed, and mined for sound bites. Predominately, the people who spoke were ones who had not been in attendance for the entirety of the blockade. This openness was fostered quite deliberately, for several reasons that participants felt were important. For one, full participation by First Nations people in the blockade had been slow to build at first, so when members representing the various Coast Salish peoples arrived, the Caretakers were eager to hear them speak. Furthermore, many activists who arrived and lent their perspective had the kinds of accessibility or mobility issues that would have made participation next to impossible, and they were gladly encouraged to take the megaphone.

However, there were speakers whose presence was less welcome. A few veterans of the 'old left,' of the 'vanguard,' were to many new activists emblematic of a kind of leftism deeply touched by capitalism, colonialism, and racism. These individuals were once-activists who had since retired to publishing column inches, securing book deals, and joining government panels for environmental oversight. They were 'sell-outs,' and they were construed as being there to profit from the media attention, to claim ownership of a movement they had little or no part of.

What reaffirmed this perspective for many of the Caretakers was the language used in some of the speeches. Although some of the vitriol and suspicion pre-empted the worst of the talks, very quickly the more concerned Caretakers felt their fears had been

validated when the more notorious speakers described 'what we've accomplished here' and described their own histories as having taught them something that helped them in this struggle, despite the fact that it was the very first day they had been seen at the mountain. Though no outright lies were told, and some of the frustration could likely be chalked up to simple misunderstanding, most present felt that an undue amount of ownership around the cause of the Mountain was implied by people who had hitherto been absent, and some of whom would never be seen again. No one could or would willingly say who did own the movement, but they were very sure who did not own it. What was clear was that the meaning-makers gained that status through time commitment in the space.

Core Conflict

There is a risk in studying social movements in depth, which is to succumb to the instinct to do what Sarah Marcus (2010) calls 'chasing the catfight.' That is, to research or report on a counterculture and to focus on conflict within the culture as a way of delegitimizing that movement. By highlighting the subtle currents of conflict occurring in the space, it is easy to cross a line into presenting the protests on Burnaby Mountain as a conflict-riddled mess, when they were not. There were tensions, and there were arguments, but on the whole the tremendous amount of work and cooperation that went into staging a camp, into fighting back together against Kinder Morgan and the RCMP, solidarity within the group day-to-day was actually very high, and people were mostly amicable and cooperative with one another. It made the aberrations, the arguments, that much more jarring.

Although I was determined that my work should be written in such a way as to not be taken in that light, the fantasy I subscribed to, briefly, in tracing out that difference between conflict and consensus perspectives among my participants, was that by studying them, I could in some way propose a solution and advocate for a mutual understanding between both sides. What I quickly found was that this was impossible and unnecessary, in equal measures. The protesters determinedly wedded to liberal philosophies would be siphoned gently into kinds of activism that they found palatable, and the radicals did not

particularly lose any sleep over what the liberals thought of them. Rather, many took a grim pride in their notoriety.

At the root of a great deal of the philosophical differences on Burnaby Mountain, was the issue of two competing theoretical frameworks, and for the transformative power of political resistance. It came down to a difference in the intersubjective meaning networks (Fuhse, 2009) held between these two groups. At one end of the spectrum was a group of activists who believed in the need for better government policy around clean energy and supported the push towards moving away from oil whenever possible, or at least controlling pipeline development in major urban areas.

At the other end of the spectrum was a group of people who believed that the fundamental structure of society was flawed and based on exploitation from top to bottom, of the land, of Aboriginal peoples, of the Canadian citizenry, to benefit the few in power. For them, pipeline activism and Indigenous resistance were part of a web of activities that could have transformative power to challenge these existing structures. These were activists who had been involved in blockading fights, who had previously worked in or with, or been exposed to the philosophies of the Unis'to'ten and Klabona Keepers. Many of these protesters knew the men and women of Rexton, New Brunswick, and were long veterans of aggressive resistance. These protesters were suddenly standing shoulder to shoulder with a brand of activist who had only recently been galvanized into direct action. Many had been involved in environmental causes before but were not engaged with anti-colonialist philosophies except in the barest of terms.

Which of these viewpoints protesters adopted, and to what degree they adopted them, impacted everything from how they related to each other in the blockade space, to how they perceived the police presence on the mountain, and the media. Many protesters who had begun somewhere closer to the first camp, learned a great deal about the struggle of their First Nations co-protesters over the course of the blockade. With exposure to the ideas and lived struggles of more radical activists, generally people became at least temporarily pulled towards the perspective that included a more serious critique of power and structural exploitation.

Most of the time these activists worked together warmly and comfortably, engaging in the free flow of ideas and educating one another and sharing perspectives. By focusing so heavily on the root of the ideological differences, I do not mean to imply that this conflict was really what characterized the whole protest. In fact, it only occupied a very small amount of space over those months. However, there were several key areas where the ideological differences produced considerable friction and put allied protesters at odds with one another. Though friction exists when the two groups connect with one another, through that process there are always a few conversions, gradually swelling the ranks of the radicals.

I began to consider why it was that activists with very different philosophies had come together under the banner of this fight, though even the name of the banner was soon contentious. Adam pointed out the role that Robert Burnaby had played in colonialism in the area and many began to refer to the space as simply 'the Mountain,' forgoing Burnaby altogether.

One potential answer was in how Caretakers explained the conflict to passers by. Many people would walk up the road past the camp, or through the hiking trails past the borehole. Many were sympathetic that the battle was taking place on unceded Coast Salish territory, but were truly horrified when they heard the role that the city was playing in the conflict. Stories of oil companies violating the rights of indigenous peoples, indeed, even of individual homeowners, are an old refrain for British Columbians. This was the first time a company had taken on a municipal government for the right to pursue development against its wishes, and in a conservation area. While the authority of the Coast Salish peoples was constructed as tenuous at best, the general public seemed prepared to accept the outrage of Mayor Derek Corrigan, and to agree that a line had been crossed.

The use of profanity marked another important fissure between the two kinds of activists that attended these protests. Although most of the people who had already been attending, mobilized through the Caretaker Facebook page, were absolutely fine with, and indeed, engaging in the tactics, some of the newcomers felt uncomfortable. Many people responded with alarm or annoyance to the aggression levelled at the surveyors, insisting

that the message would be better kept through peaceful tactics, through nonviolence and mutual respect.

Danica, one of the original handful of Caretakers and the woman who had the initial confrontation with surveyors onsite, viewed these calls for respect and communication as a kind of complicity. The surveyor she had initially confronted had asked her to sit down with a beer with him and talk this out "after we're done here," implying condescendingly that his work would be done. Mutual respect, as she saw it, fell through when that respect entailed the activists rolling over, when she saw only a lip service to that respect forthcoming from her opposition. She felt very strongly that a diversity of tactics was needed on the mountain.

How far must we push?

The dilemma of strategic voting was discussed over and over again at the camp. Vancouver Mayoral candidate Meena Wong's politics, much like the NDP and Green Party, were more closely aligned with the beliefs of most of the protesters. However, by voting for her, they risked splitting the vote away from the moderate candidate, potentially resulting in the victory of the hardline conservative. Some insisted that voting away from your politics was not only a personal moral compromise, but potentially a self-perpetuating cycle, that constantly and systematically draws votes away from far-left candidates. Though currently they were discussing the mayoral candidates, the same conversation was frequently heard regarding federal politics. Many of the environmentalists supported the Green Party or the NDP. Others thought you 'had to be realistic,' preferring Trudeau, say, to another term for Harper. Anti-Harper sentiment was quite possibly the only thing common to every single participant.

The question became the difference between 'not in my backyard' and 'not at all.' Part of the camp was aware that even the displacement of the pipeline from the 'backyard' of Burnaby would mean pushing it onto someone else's land, likely still unceded territory, possibly directly impacting the lives of people with less political capital. Energy development and environmental destruction have traditionally disproportionately impacted these groups already.

A partial success on Burnaby Mountain would be a success for the local residents, but not for the more radical activists. Thus, the radical group pushing for more aggressive tactics was on one level fundamentally incomprehensible to the NIMBY group; they saw the path to success as a straightforward one, their struggle to save the conservation area as easily surmountable. Through maintaining their image in the media they were quite correct that they likely would be successful in this struggle. For the others present, this would not be enough, so of course radical and forceful resistance was the next logical step.

Gregor Robertson was re-elected as mayor of Vancouver. The strategic voting debate was now over; Vancouver had elected a progressive candidate, but not as progressive as one might have hoped, and Meena Wong's participation in the race had not split the vote. This was a relief for the people who had supported Wong, but voted for Robertson. She would have provided more in terms of resources and support to the most vulnerable in Vancouver, the DTES community, but Robertson was better than nothing, and for many of these protesters that was good enough.

The activists in the camp who had worked and campaigned for Wong, who were DTES residents themselves, were universally disappointed. They, like the radical First Nations activists, were not going to be adequately served by a partial victory in this case. This was not an issue that everyone felt the same way about. Some saw it as a metaphor for the role moderate activism can play in furthering marginalization. The activists who had compromised and voted for Robertson strategically were going to be just fine. This had become the chief recurring question in my research; to what degree could the people who took half measures afford a halfway success?

Further reinforcing the differences in these perspectives is the desired amount of system reform. While local neighbourhood members may hope to see the pipeline diverted away from Burnaby Mountain and the conservation area in particular, the more determined activists wanted to end the dependency on oil in general, to thwart every single pipeline, train, and drill; system change, not climate change. Others, still more radicalized, wanted comprehensive social reform for Canada, ending multiple and intersecting forms of oppression and exploitation.

This difference between the conflict and consensus perspective was also evident in how protesters interacted with police officers. The first issue was that many of the moderate activists implicitly trusted the police, and believed they were there to preserve public safety, because they had to be, and that ultimately they could be trusted to behave appropriately as long as protesters were not the ones to escalate the situation in terms of violence. It became more obvious here that the moderate protesters tended to be new to on-the-ground activism, and tended to be white and middle class. Their counterparts had a much more adversarial relationship with police, were used to being over-policed and treated badly by officers. Many of them had been in physical altercations with police before, either at other protests or in their day to day lives, particularly activists who had grown up in and around reservations or who had spent time living on the Downtown East Side.

As activists spent more and more time working alongside one another, and as the vulnerable members became closer to (and humanized in the eyes of) more moderate activists, this perspective began to change. Hearing members of the community like Cal and Fred discuss their past interactions with police, the newer protesters, particularly many of the younger SFU students who came and spent time in the camp, described having had their eyes opened to the realities of police conduct towards vulnerable populations. Hearing these stories in the media was different from hearing them from the mouths of men they had eaten with, shared a joint with, had hugged.

The tendency of groups is to reinforce a political perspective and to pull each other towards more extremes of perspective. The group on Burnaby Mountain perfectly modeled Sunstein's framework for this process (2008), beginning with a group of people with a diverse way of seeing the issue at hand. Through shared knowledge, each member sharing what frustration had galvanized them to come join the protest. In Sunstein's theory, the primary cause of the radicalization was shared information and frames, ideological sound bites that reinforced previously held convictions and social modelling that drew people closer to the same perspective through peer reinforcement. The fact of visiting activists from other cities also progressed both the conflict in camp and the progressive radicalizing of the more moderate camp members, qualifying this as what Esparza and Price would call a 'convergence protest' (2015). The process of ideological alignment

occurred at Burnaby Mountain, with one additional and fascinating aspect; human connection and building empathy served to sway the more moderate activists towards the views of their more aggressive co-protesters.

There seemed to be a kind of cycle here; the more socially withdrawn, and the more they had been failed by established structures, the more keenly participants sought change and criticized the system. Perceptions of police worked in this way as well. Cal, having been assaulted by police often as a young, Aboriginal male, was more resentful towards and hostile with officers, and so quickly drew their attention and experienced another assault. In this way, the activists most devoted to radical system change had already been failed by and continued the process of consciously withdrawing from the system. This, in turn, meant that they had relatively few barriers to aggressive resistance. Cycles like this both produced and reinforced activist commitment to seek change by any means.

As people who tended to have more privilege, or had been insulated from the effects of police brutality or the immediate impact of environmental degradation, worked alongside people who had experienced both those things, the fight became more real for them. The abstract atrocities committed against people who showed up in the news cycle were different from hearing about the specific and devastating discrimination faced by participants like Fred and Cal.

Role of the Researcher

In conducting this research, I struggle with the risk that I am unconsciously further entrenching the construction of the land rights issues as typical, and violations of municipal authority as egregious. Most of the media analysis of the blockade does so, mentioning the city's resistance as a key piece of information in contextualizing the protests. I have struggled through many drafts in trying not to inherently privilege certain voices over others, or highlight the pieces of the story that validate and reproduce that framework.

For example, Mr. Eliason was previously a board member of BC Hydro who then served as an intervenor for the NEB. He quit the board with a public letter excoriating the

process as fraudulent, and a farce intended to rubber stamp and approve the pipeline without any significant review.

I applied as an intervenor with expertise to offer the Board in good faith that my time and personally incurred costs would be well spent in evaluating Trans Mountain's proposal, questioning the Proponent, preparing evidence commensurate with my expertise, answering questions on that evidence, and providing final argument. Unfortunately, I have come to the conclusion that the Board, through its decisions, is engaged in a public deception. Continued involvement with this process is a waste of time and effort, and represents a disservice to the public interest because it endorses a fraudulent process.

I have a professional background that includes over 40 years of experience in senior executive positions in the energy sector of Canada, and an understanding and working knowledge of the mandate and operations of the National Energy Board, including an appreciation of the principles of natural justice and the rules and practices of quasi-judicial bodies in Canada. I have reached my conclusions based on my wealth of experience.

Much has been made of Eliason's commentary on the situation, partially because of his role as an insider in the process, but also because of his previous work in the field of energy and development. This process is similar to one set out in Hall's *Policing the Crisis* (1978) whereby police officers are treated more seriously by journalists in reporting on protests and civil disobedience, on account of their being accredited sources in the way protest members are not. His perspective is constructed as being especially convincing evidence of the brokenness of the process, while the chorus of voices, from more vulnerable communities who have been saying exactly the same thing for decades, goes ignored. Because of how expertise and authority go hand in hand, the real newsworthiness of his objections is considerable, but nonetheless somewhat frustrating to the most marginalized activists.

Something similar happened on Burnaby Mountain. Marginalized communities have long dealt with aggressive and environmentally damaging development coming in against the wishes of local leadership (Kotak, 2006; Place & Hanlon, 2011). This time, groups that were not typically involved in major environmentalist efforts became involved. For many, there was a deeply troubling overtone to the construction of the events on Burnaby Mountain as an escalation of audacity on the part of the company. It implied that

there was something more wrong about violating the wishes of Mayor Derek Corrigan and the City of Burnaby with respect to environmental security than there might be with another space. The phrase 'not in my backyard' begs the question, in whose yard would it be more appropriate?

Additionally, I should note that my ability to choose which role I wanted to take in the protest was a direct function of my privilege, particularly as a person who is not a member of a visible minority, in this case the local Indigenous communities. The first arrest to take place, after all, was of Cal, whose crime of 'obstruction' I was certainly equally as guilty of committing at the time. At Burnaby Mountain, like in every other major protest movement, people from vulnerable populations draw disproportionate amount of police attention, and are frequently not given the choice whether or not to provoke an arrest. Through this and many other processes, they are relegated to the outskirts of the systems to begin with.

So how did it all end?

Another fractious issue during and after the protest was the post hoc assessment of what kinds of tactics were the most effective. Some of the key issues in the conversation were laid out most clearly in one of the pamphlets provided by the anarchists at their working meeting, a small zine titled *Accomplices*, not *Allies*. This writing focused on reframing the dialogue around allies to a cause, and how they could best lend support to marginalized peoples. One of the things it specifically identified was the need for people to understand that they might be able to help, but that their personal contributions to activism would not be as meaningful or as successful as those who had been directly impacted.

One entire page of the pamphlet was devoted to the role of leftist academics in radical spaces.

Although sometimes directly from communities in struggle, intellectuals and academics also fit neatly in all of these categories. Their role in struggle can be extremely patronizing. In many cases the academic maintains institutional power above the knowledge and skill base of the

community/ies in struggle. Intellectuals are most often fixated on un-learning oppression. These lot generally don't have their feet on the ground, but are quick to be critical of those who do. Should we desire to merely "unlearn" oppression, or to smash it to fucking pieces, and have it's [sic] very existence gone? An accomplice as academic would seek ways to leverage resources and material support and/or betray their institution to further liberation struggles. An intellectual accomplice would strategize with, not for and not be afraid to pick up a hammer.

This self-produced manifesto echoed many of the theories in bell hooks' *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Centre* (hooks, 1984), in which she discusses white feminist allyship to womanist and Women of Colour causes. In this book, hooks directly lays out some of the values of academic feminist scholarship, but explicitly states that contributing to written theories of anti-racism and anti-sexism will not be as effective in helping the lives of those impacted grassroots activism. The development of critical theories and good research on social justice issues helps in some ways, certainly, but relies on a kind of liberalist philosophy, in that it involves seeking equality for all through participating in the very institutions that radicals would argue need to be dismantled to attain the same goals.

Having these philosophical questions simmering in the conversation was fascinating, considering just how many participants in the protests were SFU students. Because the proposed borehole sites were on the hillside of Burnaby Mountain, and because Stephen Collis and Lynne Quarmby both taught up on the hill, there was a sense of university involvement in the blockade. Many of the members of the university community who joined the protests became much more prone to express and adopt the beliefs of the more radical group members, as weeks went on, as per Sunstein's method of small group polarization (2008) where groups that socialize together gradually become ideologically more homogenous in their beliefs, through factors like amplified mutual outrage.

I was confronted by another activist very assertively over my educational background. When I explained that I was working in the criminology department, she, having overheard just that snatch, turned to me and accused me, loudly and intently, that it was a school that pumped out more RCMP officers to arrest other activists. To her, since climate change issues were the most important battle in the world, and the police were on the other side of it, we (I?) did more harm than good.

This actually occurred while George was being put into the back of yet another police car, so the topic of arrests and the RCMP were fairly tense ones. In the confusion of the rest of the arrest, she moved away quickly, and left me thinking about her question, and my research in the context of a group with these kinds of philosophies. I became more keenly aware of the tremendous favour, the honour that was being done to me by their allowing me to be in the space and conducting research. I became more aware that my academic role was a tolerated, but negative quality. I was first and foremost to them one of the Caretakers, who took her share of shifts in the clearing, who put the hours in on the mountain, and who helped hold down the space. I resolved to hold on to the understanding that what I was producing might be interesting in academic circles, but was ultimately not really a meaningful service to many of my participants, not in any way they wanted or needed.

After I physically ended field observations George made the newspapers again, this time for crawling up into a tree near to the drilling operations, and needing to be taken down and lifted out on some sort of dolly. He continued to be one of the most fearless intervenors, and has since faced legal troubles associated with his role in other protests. In May of 2015, a notice was put up on Facebook that he had been arrested at an anti-C51 rally, with video demonstrating that the arrest was apparently unprovoked. According to posts on Facebook, George reportedly sustained a concussion when police officers took him to the ground from a standstill on the street, and was held in pre-trial detention, possibly on account of his past history of toeing the line of his bail conditions with regard to staying away from Kinder Morgan's worksites. It was the belief of many that he was targeted for this arrest on account of his reputation as a troublemaker.

Danica had one near miss with incarceration. During Kinder Morgan's attempted drilling, she and Chapparahl burst into the parking lot and lunged for a pile of concrete debris with rebar protrusions. Chapparahl was stopped by police before he could get his padlocks engaged, but Danica succeeded in chaining herself by the neck to the structure. After most of a day, police negotiated that she would be allowed to leave peacefully if she voluntarily unchained herself.

These sorts of intent and functional arrests were less common than the ones of activists deliberately setting foot over the police line as a personal and conscientious statement. Symbolic arrests were, it seemed, more likely to gather media attention, partially because they contributed to a massively growing arrest count for the mountain, and partially because a few of the arrests were very compelling. Tamo Campos, the grandson of noted environmental activist David Suzuki was arrested, and received media coverage, though not quite as much as the arrests of two young girls, both aged eleven, who crossed the line with their mother's permission. If one of the objectives was to raise public awareness and secure media attention, then the underage line-crossing was certainly an effective tactic in that respect.

There were some moments of cooperation and communication between protesters and police officers. When the RCMP was made to understand the significance of the Sacred Fire, they initially allowed Sut'lut past the barrier to tend it, provided she worked alone and did not interfere with work. Eventually they helped protesters to lift and move the fire pit to a point outside of the injunction zone.

Since the protection of the fire had come to mean a great deal to the Caretakers, this helped offset some of the wearing down that was going on. It was emotionally very upsetting, especially to activists who had begun attending the blockade right from the very beginning, to see the environmental damage that was done by the drilling equipment. The small success in saving the fire was tempered by the sense of defeat at watching more of the natural habitat destroyed. The company's drills ran all day, and most of the night, and the loud and incessant grinding was a constant reminder that the work was being allowed to continue at every moment.

In addressing whether or not the protests on Burnaby Mountain were successful, many of the activists involved remain entirely unsure. While judicial intervention did enable the surveyors to conduct some of their work on the mountain, protesters were initially able to rebuff the organization for months at a time. Their legal battle was no doubt costly, as were the delays to the project development. A report released by the Institute for Energy Efficiency and Financial Analysis estimated that protests had cost the Canadian Tar Sands approximately \$17 billion in lost revenues between 2011 and 2013 (Sanzillo et al., 2014).

If the Burnaby Mountain Pipeline Blockade contributes to seeing that figure raise even higher for 2014, then many will be pleased.

One of the primary concerns in Canada around this time was the debate around bill C-51. Since passed into law, this bill was designed to expand police powers to address the threat of terrorism. Primarily, it deals with the promotion of terrorism and the possession of terrorist propaganda, but also expands the authority of CSIS to disrupt terror plots rather than monitoring them. It sees an expanded power to arrest on suspicion (without a warrant) and provides more avenues for agencies to share gathered information about people suspected of involvement with terrorist activity. The most worrisome criticism of C-51, for environmental activists, is the concern that their activities may be interpreted as terrorist behaviours. These fears seemed to be confirmed, in February of 2015, when a leaked RCMP memo characterized members of the environmental movement as 'violent anti-petroleum extremists' (McCarthy, 2015). With a simultaneous expansion of police powers to deal with terrorism, and a broadening of the definition to include environmentalism as a kind of terrorist activity, concerns over civil liberties in Canada are far from hypothetical.

Chapter 6.

Conclusion

The protest movement on Burnaby Mountain evolved considerably over the course of these field observations. What began as a small group of local environmentalists working alongside a network of concerned local residents was an effective enough intervention against survey work in the area to attract considerable media attention and to eventually need legal intervention on behalf of the company.

It is not the function of my research to recommend any sort of approach to policing crowd situations. Even the lessening of a police response is not necessarily a recommendation I would be prepared to make, given the complex relationships that participants in this project had with 'getting oneself arrested.' Given that some are seeking to experience arrest, simply raising the threshold for what kinds of protester-behaviours will qualify for an arrest is complicated. For that reason, I conclude that there are few implications for policing services that can be adequately understood from the data collected from this project.

Many of the battles fought in court were either unsuccessful or of dubious outcome. The main issue, whether or not the National Energy Board has the authority to override municipal authority, is a legal case that is likely to stretch on for years. The injunction against the protesters was resolved based on a technicality. However, most of the local resistance happened in an extra-legal setting.

Diversity of Tactics

On the mountain, there was a great deal of cooperation between activists of many theoretical persuasions, and a great deal of community support for the blockade. There were, however, moments of friction between activists with a liberal perspective, compared to those who were more involved with radical philosophies or approaches. While many

called for an acceptance of a 'diversity of tactics,' an activist phrase that means essentially 'why can't we all agree to disagree?' the issue was more complex.

The issues the moderate activists had with radical tactics were several-fold. First, some had genuine moral or ethical concerns about the use of property damage, aggression or disrespect. For the pacifists, this 'energy' was problematic in the abstract. For others, it was the idea of directing that kind of disrespect at the local police. Kinder Morgan was the enemy, the police were there just doing their jobs. If a good relationship was fostered with police officers, then everyone would be safer.

The issue of attitudes towards and treatment of police officers illustrates how these two perspectives were not always entirely distinct from one another in the moment. The moderate activists were not the only ones imploring a non-aggressive stance with the police. Even other radicals, but with a strategic focus, instructed each other to remain calm and to not give the police an excuse to arrest anyone. The key difference, however, was in the belief that all the police would need was an excuse. One segment of the protesting population genuinely believed the police were there for the safety of all, or at least just because they were legally bound to help with the injunction that the judge had granted. The other saw police as a mechanism of state repression, a bullying presence, whose members were either individually or collectively racist, pro-industry, and generally dangerous. Since the radicals expected police intervention regardless of their chosen tactics, they had fewer qualms about aggressive resistance.

To the pacifists and liberals, however, the problems with this were twofold. Whether they would have simply been able to agree to disagree about aggression, the fact was that the radical tactics had two very real impacts on their ability to protest alongside the other activists. For one thing, it made the environment more dangerous. If police were forced to act to control a violent protest, then the pacifists would be unwillingly caught in the crossfire. More to the point, it impacted what they felt was the key strategy towards building a successful movement.

Conflict and Consensus

The way a person sees the main purpose of a political protest depends, to a great extent, on whether or not they ascribe to the belief in a fair and democratic society. Conflict and consensus models are a useful schema that has been developed to distinguish between two approaches to understanding power relations in criminological theory. They also, when adopted as a personal worldview, impact how people perceive the role of protest.

In a theory that relies on a consensus model, the rule of law is fair and applies equally to every person. Power relations are characterized by popular consent rather than dominance and control. To someone with this perspective, protest is useful in terms of 'making your voice heard,' in terms of 'showing leadership' that the democratic populace disagrees, and the goal is to raise awareness, in order to change public opinion on an issue. When public opinion changes, and when they can demonstrate that change to their elected officials, someone with this perspective expects that it will influence the ruling decisions of those in power, or at least will contribute to new people being elected if those concerns are ignored. In groups that hold this belief, if civil disobedience is discussed, it is generally in the language of non-violent resistance and in the need to 'send a message,' an expression of a profound belief that the law is being applied unjustly in this case, but not as an indictment of the legal system in and of itself. Lawbreaking, in the sense of committing actual acts of vandalism and violence, is a violation of a social contract, an unnecessary step that diminishes the credibility of all of the protesters. Worse, this lawbreaking actually drives away other activists or potential newcomers to the movement. Since so much of this consensus-approach relies on building social momentum and raising public awareness, when the activities of the radicals drive moderate activists away, in this framework they are actively harming the revolutionary potential of the movement. As such, accepting a diversity of tactics approach simply is not possible for many liberal and pacifist-oriented activists.

To the activists who ascribe to a conflict model, believing in the democratic power of political protest is at best naïve. At worst, it is a sign of a kind of brainwashing, of not having broken away from the moral majority enough to be 'in the know.' Nonviolent rhetoric

is seen as a tool used to de-fang the revolutionary potential of resistant movements. The pacifists are treated with frustration, partially because their philosophy is seen to come from a place of naïveté and privilege, and partially because when members of the left reproduce those dialogues around the value of passive resistance, they further entrench what radicals see as a deeply ineffective way of fighting.

Though the liberal participants greatly outnumbered the radicals, the more radical participants were a steadier feature at the blockade for a number of reasons. They tended to be both more entrenched in activist circles, and were generally more comfortable in the shoe-stringed together space. Many were homeless-involved or were practiced anarchists. They were physically capable of handling the environment better, and had fewer commitments to take them away from the space or to limit the consequences they could expose themselves to.

The radical protesters also tended to be members of groups that were more likely to experience discrimination. People who had mental health issues, particularly ones who had had formal interactions with the mental health system, particularly custodial care, tended to be more deeply attuned to anti-authoritarian perspectives. First Nations activists, particularly those who had experienced direct racism at the hands of police officers or who had come from communities with pollution due to industry, also tended to be more attuned to a radical perspective.

On the issue of the media, Burnaby Mountain was a rather uncommon situation since virtually all of the coverage of the protests was very positive. While anticipating media coverage, though, activists played out this same conflict. Consensus-subscribing protesters thought that positive media attention would draw them more public opinion and more participants. Conflict model protesters believed that the mainstream media in particular was a mouthpiece for people in positions of power, and were not prepared to count on any reporter to give them fair treatment in the press.

Many of the more radical protesters had identities or beliefs that made them very vulnerable to negative media representations. Their tactics, as well, were more likely to draw criticism and oversimplified condemnation. When they did engage with the media, it was because of their desire to get certain parts of their message, particularly the more

nuanced parts, to transmit clearly. Danica admitted that it made her a little uncomfortable to be taking the spotlight, but that it felt like the lesser of two evils. She was adopting the practice of speaking often to news cameras and beginning every single sentence with the phrase 'unceded Coast Salish territory,' so that news outlets would be unable to edit it out of any single sound bite she provided.

In some respects, these philosophies and approaches seemed to exist on a spectrum from radical to moderate, with many participants falling at a point somewhere in between, and those people most polarized from one another having the most difficulty communicating with one another.

Philosophical outlook influenced everything from interactions at the camp, to whether they perceived the blockade to be a success or a failure. On the one hand, tremendous environmental damage was done in the park. On the other hand, consciousness was certainly raised, and Mayor Corrigan was enabled to continue to put political pressure on Kinder Morgan and the NEB to stop work in the area. Perhaps at the next stage of the pipeline development both the municipal government and the community in general have been better primed to be able to resist the actual expansion of the pipeline. It was easy to lose sight, given the protracted and exhausting nature of this process, that what was being blockaded here was simply the survey work that would let the company know whether or not it was even feasible to commence work.

This participant observation project granted me a window into a moment of protest that highlighted a core theoretical debate that underlies political actions in many other North American cities. The participants in anti-pipeline blockades are at the centre of considerable public and political scrutiny. The upcoming signing into law of Canadian bill C-51 will impact how they continue to resist the energy sector, and will no doubt impact the civil liberties of all Canadians. As tensions around climate change, environmental destruction, and clean energy continue to grow, so does the need for further research in this area.

As the public pressure around Kinder Morgan on Burnaby Mountain slowly dies down, the Caretakers are the last ones standing. In the early summer of 2015, I returned to the hill to walk a tour of the tank farm and check for signs of new surveyor activity. Icheb

and Jean were there, as well as half dozen other faces I recognized. Some of the original people named in the Kinder Morgan lawsuit, two of the people who had conducted my very first orientation to the Borehole locations back in October. George could not be there, because apparently it would be a violation of his bail conditions. After hundreds of people had come and gone over the fall and winter, the last few people on the ground were the ones who led the struggle to begin with, plus a small handful more. Their numbers had started small, risen to the hundreds, and settled back down to close to the original level, with perhaps a half-dozen more freshly, deeply committed young activists who had been hardened by the conflict.

To them, what happened on Burnaby Mountain was neither precisely a victory, nor a ringing defeat. They had been successful in some ways, and unsuccessful in others. They had learned a little more about the company they were committed to opposing and knew some of the next steps to take in that opposition. They had gained some resources, in the form of part-time allies who could be called to the front lines if unscheduled survey work began again, and some relief in the form of new Caretakers, still there and ready to help continue the shifts on the ground, still hunting for signs of workers, still ready to lay down in the dirt in the way of equipment, if need be.

References

- Abagond. (2010). The tone argument. Retrieved December 20th, 2014, from <https://abagond.wordpress.com/2010/07/24/the-tone-argument/>
- Bekhterev, V. M. (1994). *On Collectivity: V.M. Bekhterev's Collective Reflexology*, Part I (pp. 105-149). Commack: Nova Science Publishers Inc.
- Berman, T., & Leiren-Young, M. (2011). *This Crazy Time: Living Our Environmental Challenge*: Knopf Canada.
- Bottero, W., & Crossley, N. (2011). Worlds, Fields and Networks: Becker, Bourdieu and the Structures of Social Relations. *Cultural Sociology*, 5(1), 99-119. doi: 10.1177/1749975510389726
- Canadian pro-Ferguson rally organizers ask 'whites' to stay in background. (2014, Nov 25, 2014). *The Globe and Mail*.
- CBC. (2014). Kinder Morgan loses bid to extend injunction. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/kinder-morgan-loses-bid-to-extend-injunction-1.2852222>
- Collis, S. (2014). After Burnaby Mountain (Part 3). Retrieved from <http://beatingthebounds.com/2015/02/12/after-burnaby-mountain-part-3/>
- Dauvergne, P., & LeBaron, G. (2014). *Protest Inc.: The Corporatization of Activism*: Cambridge; Polity Press.
- Earl, J., Martin, A., McCarthy, J. D., & Soule, S. A. (2004). The Use of Newspaper Data in the Study of Collective Action. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 65-80.
- The Economist. (2013). Breast-beating; feminist protest. (407), 60. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/docview/1355930901?accountid=13800> website:
- Edwards, G. (2013). Infectious Innovations? The Diffusion of Tactical Innovation in Social Movement Networks, the Case of Suffragette Militancy. *Social Movement Studies*, 13(1), 48-69. doi: 10.1080/14742837.2013.834251
- Einstadter, W. J., & Henry, S. (2006). *Criminological theory: an analysis of its underlying assumptions*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Esparza, L. E., & Price, R. (2015). Convergence repertoires: anti-capitalist protest at the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympics. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 18(1), 22-41. doi: 10.1080/10282580.2015.1005503

- Ferguson, A. G. a. J. (1997). Discipline and Practice: 'The Field' as Site, Method, and Location in Anthropology. In U. o. C. P. Berkeley (Ed.), *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science* (pp. 1-46). California.
- Freeman, J.. (1972). The Tyranny of Structurelessness. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 17, 151–164. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/stable/41035187>
- Fuhse, J. A. (2009). The Meaning Structure of Social Networks. *Sociological Theory*, 27(1), 51-73. doi: 10.2307/40376109
- Gordon, U. (2007). *Anarchy Alive! : Anti-Authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory*. London, GBR: Pluto Press. Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>
- Hall, M. (2007). Guilty but Civilly Disobedient: Reconciling Civil Disobedience and the Rule of Law. *Cardozo Law Review*, 28, 2083-2130.
- Hall, S. (1978). *Policing the crisis: mugging, the state, and law and order*. New York: Holmes & Meier.
- Hamilton, G. (2012, 2012 May 05). Black Bloc, *National Post*.
- hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: South End Press Classics.
- Johnston, H. (2005). *Radical Campus: making Simon Fraser University*. Vancouver.
- Jung, C. (2003). Breaking the cycle: producing trust out of thin air and resentment. *Social Movement Studies*, 2(2), 147-175. doi: 10.1080/1474283032000139751
- Kendall, N., Neville, K., McClaren, N.-J., Hovbrender, A., Police, A., Orca, P., & Street, C. (2010). *The spirit has no colour changing police/aboriginal relationships*. [Vancouver, BC]: Orca Productions/42nd Street Consulting.
- Kinder Morgan (2015). Kinder Morgan: About Us. Retrieved February 23rd, 2016, from http://www.kindermorgan.com/about_us
- Knowles, K. (2011). Passing Activism Along. *Peace & Freedom*, 71(2), 6-7.
- Kotak, B. G. (2006). Engaging First Nation Communities in Environmental Monitoring: The Experience of Black River First Nation, Manitoba. *Environments*, 34(1), 81-83.
- Luk, V. (2014, Oct 28, 2014). Kinder Morgan pipeline: Burnaby to appeal NEB decision, CBC News.

- Marcus, S. (2010). *Girls to the Front: The True Story of the Riot Grrrl Revolution*. New York, New York: Harper Perennial.119
- Martin, G. (2002). Conceptualizing Cultural Politics in Subcultural and Social Movement Studies. *Social Movement Studies*, 1(1), 73-88. doi: 10.1080/14742830120118909
- McCarthy, S. (2015). 'Anti-petroleum' movement a growing security threat to Canada, RCMP say. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/anti-petroleum-movement-a-growing-security-threat-to-canada-rcmp-say/article23019252/>
- McDougall, W. (1939). *The Group Mind*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- McElroy, J. (2014, November 30, 2014). Burnaby wants Kinder Morgan to pay for Burnaby Mountain policing costs, Global News.
- Meyer, D. S. (2004). Protest and Political Opportunities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 125-145. doi: 10.2307/29737688
- Michener, J. A. (1971). *Kent State: what happened and why*. New York: Random House.
- National Energy Board Act. R.S., c. N-6, s. 1.
- Pavis, T. (2012). Listening to Political Protest From Women Soldiers in Israel. *Peace & Freedom*, 72(1), 12-13. 120
- Raeburn, A. (1973). *The Militant Suffragettes*. London: Michael Joseph.
- Rebick, J. (2005). *Ten Thousand Roses*. Toronto: Penguin Canada.
- Redhead, S. (1995). *Unpopular Cultures: The Birth of Law and Popular Culture*: Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Redhead, S. (2009). Hooligan Writing and the Study of Football Fan Culture: Problems and Possibilities. *Nebula*, 6(3), 16-41.
- Robinson, M. (2014). Kinder Morgan takes Burnaby protesters to court. *Vancouver Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.vancouversun.com/news/Kinder+Morgan+takes+Burnaby+protesters+court/10340463/story.html>
- Sanzillo, T., Stockman, L., Rogers, D., McKinnon, H., Bast, E., & Kretzmann, S. (2014). *Material Risks: How public accountability is slowing Tar-Sands development*. Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis, Oil Change International (Ed.)

- Sekhar, S. (2011). Reflecting on Summit Detention: Connecting Carceral Spaces, Moving Forward. *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons*, 20(2), 144-154.
- Smith, K. (1994). Therapeutic Civil Disobedience: A Preliminary Exploration. *Memphis Law Review*, 31, P 99-134.
- Strang, D., & Soule, S. A. (1998). Diffusion in Organizations and Social Movements: From Hybrid Corn to Poison Pills. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 265-290. doi: 10.2307/223482
- Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Why groups go to extremes*: AEI Press.
- Tarrow, S. G. (1994). *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Touraine, A. (1965). *Sociologie de l'action*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Touraine, A. (2002). The Importance of Social Movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 1(1), 89-95. doi: 10.1080/14742830120118918
- Van Gelder, S. (2012). *This Changes Everything: Occupy Wall Street and the 99% Movement*: ReadHowYouWant.com, Limited.
- Waddington, D. P. (2007). *Policing Public Disorder*. Portland: Willan Publishing.
- West, B. (2013). Kinder Morgan: Another Enron-Style House of Cards in Waiting. Huffington Post. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/ben-west/enron-kinder-morgan_b_3908063.html