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Key Findings

1. **On X (formerly Twitter),** over 220,000 posts were found to include loaded language such as “climate cult” (>65k posts alone) and over 90,000 posts and replies contained securitised language such as “eco terrorist” (>34k posts alone) between 1 January 2022 and 30 November 2023.

2. The overall volume of posts containing terms like “climate cult” or “eco terrorists” has not risen dramatically over the past two years. However, the number of replies containing securitised, dehumanising or ‘othering’ language to describe activists has more than doubled.

3. References to “climate cultists” and “eco-terrorists” featured prominently in high-traction posts, both in reference to specific protests and anyone broadly concerned by climate change or climate action.

4. As with #ClimateScam (explored extensively in “Deny, Deceive, Delay Vol.3”), high-traction content about climate protests stems from a small group of accounts. This includes accounts such as ‘End Wokeness’ (1.9m followers), right-wing influencer Ian Miles Cheong (861k followers) and far-right conspiracy channel Disclose.TV (1.2m followers).

5. **On Facebook and Instagram,** over 68k posts were found to contain denigrating language such as “climate lunatic”, “eco extremist”, “green zealot” or “Net Zero terrorist” in the same period, from more than 35k unique accounts. This content was shared a cumulative 1.86 million times across the two platforms.

6. **On TikTok,** the platform’s comparatively strict content moderation has created a culture of coded violence that uses dog whistles and irony to evade detection.

7. Even when original TikTok content was ‘neutral’ towards climate activists, violent rhetoric often emerged in the comments.

8. Direct calls to shoot protesters were rare in the content analysed, but users frequently voiced support for police violence. This includes comments suggesting or endorsing: the use of batons, cattle prods or pepper spray; running people over; knocking people unconscious, setting dogs on protests; and/or electrocuting those involved.
Introduction

In recent years, groups like Just Stop Oil, Extinction Rebellion, Fridays for Future and Last Generation have raised the profile of climate protest across the Global North. In tandem, they have generated controversy over their tactics and messaging. There is a debate over whether disruptive protests are, on balance, the most effective route for advocacy, or if they can serve to alienate a ‘mainstream’ audience. If the aim of these groups is to increase visibility and build public pressure for action, such questions can and should be explored in good faith. However, whether you support civil disobedience or baulk at it, violence against activists should never be accepted.

Activists as a “Security Threat”

Labelling climate activists as “extremists”, “lunatics” or “zealots” is common amongst right-wing media, as are calls to proscribe environmental groups as “terrorist entities” (see examples shared by Spiked, The Daily Mail, GB News and Turning Point UK, to name a few). As Amy Westervelt and Geoff Dembicki have revealed, vilifying activists is also a well-worn and explicit strategy used by groups like the Atlas Network – a US-based non-profit supporting over 500 “free market” think tanks and organisations across the globe.

However, the problem extends beyond mere rhetoric or posturing, with these narratives becoming normalised by political actors and law enforcement alike. One example: in October 2022, US Congressman Mike Johnson posted a video by Jordan Peterson titled “Wicked Globalists Are Causing Starvation and Poverty Under the Guide of Environmentalism”, in which he warned of the “the Left’s radical climate agenda”. Johnson is now Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives, making him second in line to succeed the President in a crisis (after the Vice-President). Equally, UK Home Secretary Suella Braverman (recently replaced) has branded groups like Extinction Rebellion as “militant eco-zealots” and urged police to adopt a more stringent approach to “the radicals, the road-blockers, the vandals, the militants and the extremists”. 18 US states have passed anti-protest laws after extensive lobbying from the fossil fuel industry, as Westervelt and Dembicki report; they also detail how everywhere from Germany and Guatemala to Canada and the United Kingdom, responses to activism are becoming more securitised.
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GB News segment from August 2023 in which a Greenpeace protest at Prime Minister Rishi Sunak’s home is referred to as “mafia-style intimidation” that “exposes a gaping flaw in [the UK’s] national security”. The host goes on to claim that “these eco-zealots rely on the British public being decent and not battering them”, arguing that “nutters could look at the actions of Greenpeace and others like them and be more likely to commit atrocities”.

Why Does this Matter? A Pipeline to Violence

Nearly 2,000 land and environmental defenders have been killed in the last decade, with 177 fatalities in 2022 alone.

At COP27, we explored how pushback against activists was increasingly graphic and dehumanising across the online world. In the year since, activists have been denigrated in mainstream media headlines in English, French and German, while many posting online hold them explicitly responsible for social ills, including the cost of living crisis and spiralling energy bills after Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine. Such scapegoating drives an ‘us versus them’ narrative and lowers the threshold for violence, sometimes with fatal outcomes.

Human rights experts, including Amnesty International’s Catrinel Motoc, have raised the alarm about the “criminalisation, harassment, stigmatisation and negative rhetoric” of climate activists. UN Rapporteur on Environmental Defenders, Michel Forst, has also expressed dismay over governments “calling these people eco-terrorists, or…using new forms of vilifications and defamation”, stating that such rhetoric “has a huge impact on how the population may perceive them and the cause for which these people are fighting.” Last December, Volker Türk, the UN’s High Commissioner for Human Rights, urged governments to safeguard “civic space” for environmental protest, warning against the “crack down” seen in “many parts of the world”.
Case Study: Panama Shooter

In November 2023, two people protesting a copper mine were fatally shot in Panama. Photos and videos of the killing were circulated widely online, with comments expressing both outrage and indifference to the violence. Many posts clearly glorify the murders and the shooter himself in coded form, although on the surface they appear anodyne and/or beyond the scope of content moderation. Since the shooting, a ruling from Panama’s Supreme Court found that the mine’s contract was unconstitutional – it will now be shut down.

Media Matters has explored how US pundit Matt Walsh blamed the protesters for their deaths, but his framing was by no means unique. Multiple X Premium accounts (formerly known as Twitter Blue) sympathized with the shooter’s “frustration”, with tweets stating “This is what happens when you try to impose your will on others. It was only a matter of time” or “Block a public road on purpose, get shot. I am OK with that. Problem solved.”

Social media platforms, including X, have clear rules regarding incitement to violence. As such, many high-profile accounts stopped short of condoning the murders and instead “reported the headline” with footage of the shooting – this level of restraint was not echoed in the comments underneath. For example, right-wing pundit Ian Miles Cheong (861k followers) got 1.7 million views for tweeting a picture of the shooter captioned “Hero or villain?” While replies were mixed, many commenters landed on “hero” or even “martyr”, with some posts lionising the shooter via generative AI or turning footage of his crime into memes.
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X/Twitter

Climate Action Against Disinformation collected 430,000 posts and replies that used ‘neutral’ language to describe climate activism on X between 1 January 2022 and 30 November 2023 – for example, content including phrases like ‘climate protest’, ‘green activist’ or ‘net zero demonstration’ (see Annex 1 for further details). We found another 220,000 posts that included loaded language such as “climate cult” (>65k posts alone) and over 90,000 posts and replies with securitised language such as “eco terrorist” (>34k posts alone). Since our approach was based on prominent but specific keywords, these categories cannot fully represent the extent and proportion of such language across the platform. However, it is notable that while the overall volume of posts has not risen dramatically over the past two years, the number of replies has more than doubled.

Number of original posts containing ‘neutral’, ‘loaded’ or ‘securitised’ language posted on X/Twitter between 1 January 2022 and 30 Nov 2023 (see Annex for further details on each category)

Number of posted replies containing ‘neutral’, ‘loaded’ or ‘securitised’ language posted on X/Twitter between 1 January 2022 and 30 Nov 2023 (see Annex for further details on each category)
### Notable Trends

- As with #ClimateScam (explored extensively in “Deny, Deceive, Delay Vol.3”), high-traction content about climate protests stems from a small group of accounts. This includes users such as ‘End Wokeness’ (1.9m followers), right-wing influencer Ian Miles Cheong (861k followers) and far-right conspiracy channel Disclose.TV (1.2m followers).

- While there are comments that condone violence, celebrate protestor injuries, or argue for excessively harsh sentencing, the majority of these have minimal engagement. Some isolated examples gained hundreds of likes.

- One widely-shared video showed a Nevada Tribal Ranger breaking through a roadblock of climate protestors with his truck (nobody was harmed) and arresting those involved. It has 1.2m views, 245k likes, 35k shares and 16k comments. The comments include widespread support for the Ranger, but most stop short of actively condoning violence or rough handling; instead, they express general delight or approval at the events depicted. A few comments (see below) suggest more extreme tactics and received thousands of likes.
Screenshots from X – original ‘neutral’ posts from Ian Miles Cheong (861k followers) and End Wokeness (1.9m followers) provoke debate, with indicative comments posted underneath that condone or celebrate violence against protesters. One commenter, @TWOTHEREDDRAGON, has over 16k followers and suggests impunity for running people over.
- **References to “climate cult” or “climate cultists” are extensive, especially on the right wing of US politics.** This language is generally used to dismiss climate action writ large, rather than criticise specific protests. Widely shared posts include “the Sh-tposting King of MAGA Twitter” Catturd2 (2.1m followers), Republican Congresswoman Marjorie Taylor Green (2.8m followers), Republican Presidential candidate and climate denier Vivek Ramaswamy (1.5m followers), and ‘alt-right’ agitator Mike Cernovich (1.1m followers).

![Graph showing number of original posts or replies on X/Twitter using either of the terms “climate cult”, “climate cultist” or “climate cultists” between 1 January 2022 and 30 Nov 2023.]

Comments responding to an original post by End Wokeness (1.9m followers) which criticised a Just Stop Oil stunt at The National Gallery in London and referred to those involved as “lunatics” from the “climate cult”.

![Comment: One hand, please. A little extreme, maybe, but what’s extreme is continually letting these little kids do this.]

![Comment: I’m so hungry, Pwase feed me.]

![Comment: I think it’s time to incentivise security to carry mace and apply it liberally in these situations. Should cut down on the frequency a bit.]

![Comment: New rule - whatever they do to the art the public can do to them.]

![Comment: Just watering my hippocies.
2:10 PM - Nov 6, 2023 - 82.9K Views]

![Comment: 1:52 PM - Nov 6, 2023 - 199.5K Views]

![Comment: Subscribe.
2:10 PM - Nov 6, 2023 - 82.9K Views]
TikTok

TikTok’s comparatively strict content moderation has created a culture of coded violence that uses devices like dog whistles and irony to evade detection. Rather than call for outright violence against climate activists, popular videos rely on veiled references that signal to certain groups while remaining opaque to ‘outsiders’.

One video on the platform received over 80,000 likes and features footage of climate protesters alongside clips from the video game Grand Theft Auto, with the accompanying text “when protesters block the wrong people.” Grand Theft Auto is a game known for reckless driving (see here: a player mowing down pedestrians for 6 minutes straight).

Another video identified by CAAD had 4.5 million views and came from an account called “Cheeky Laughs Comedy.” The video featured footage from 2020 of a truck veering into crowds at a George Floyd protest in Minneapolis, with the text “Climate protesters vs Oil Tanker”. While framed as a ‘joke’, the comment section underneath reveals the true implications and resonance of such content. High-ranked responses included “full speed ahead” and “this is the best thing ever,” as well as users urging the driver to “keep going” (i.e. to run over the protestors).

Video from the account Cheeky Laughs Comedy (400k followers) with a snapshot of popular comments. The video has 240k likes, 24k bookmarks and 1.8k shares (including to other platforms). Although the footage depicts a racial justice march from 2020, it has been falsely credited as a standoff with Just Stop Oil using the hashtags #climate and #protesters.
Even when original TikTok content was ‘neutral’ towards climate activists, violent rhetoric often emerged in the comments. For instance, one video from CBS News shows a man confronting climate protesters and pushing someone to the ground. Users celebrated his actions, commenting “This dude genuinely deserves a medal” and “Not the hero we want but the hero we needed” with hundreds of likes. Another posed the (rhetorical) question “Why do you need an AR15?”, implying that climate protests were enough rationale to obtain an automatic rifle. When asked if they were joking, the user doubled down: “Not after the 2020 riots, I don’t joke around getting stuck behind protesters in traffic *locked and loaded at all times bitches*.”

Calls to shoot protesters were rare in the videos and comments analysed, but users frequently voiced support for police violence. Under one video, which showed a police vehicle driving through climate protesters, comments included “Thank you for your service! #backtheblue” and “that’s how it’s done.” Another video from Channel 4 News (a UK broadcaster) discussed the “pain grip” used by German police and showed footage of a climate protester screaming in pain, asking viewers “Should German police be doing this?”. Users answered with their resounding support, including some who suggested such measures do not go far enough. The video has over 13,000 comments, many of which propose or endorse more severe tactics – for example the use of batons, cattle prods or pepper spray; running protesters over; knocking protesters unconscious, setting dogs on them; and/or electrocuting them.
**Conclusion**

This is an essential moment for climate action – citizens are expected to step up in building a liveable future, yet increasingly punished for engaging via activism. As the findings here demonstrate, violence against activists is increasingly normalised across the digital world. Far from being isolated in fringe or extremist platforms, such content is readily accessible via high-traction accounts and circulating unchecked within comment sections on mainstream social media. Users are routinely finding ways to evade platform moderation, whether through image-based content, coded language or layers of context that require human review.

As noted in CAAD’s [Policy Asks](#), we urge platforms to publish data on how their products are being weaponised and misused. From that basis, they should engage civil society to produce meaningful plans that can curb the spread of climate disinformation, hate speech and content which threatens public safety before another tragedy occurs. This could include stronger community content standards; robust enforcement mechanisms; greater allocation of resources across languages and contexts; and clear channels to report or flag content that may endanger users.
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The following searches are written in Boolean query format. Rationale for the various categories were informed by various studies, including:


- “Think tank’s talking points deepen the divide about climate change” (The Conversation, February 2012)

1) ‘Neutral’ Language

“climate protest” OR “climate protests” OR “climate protesters” OR “climate activism” OR “climate activist” OR “climate activists” OR “climate demonstrations” OR “climate demonstrator” OR “climate demonstrators” OR “green protest” OR “green protests” OR “green protesters” OR “green activism” OR “green activist” OR “green activists” OR “green demonstrations” OR “green demonstrator” OR “green demonstrators” OR “net zero protest” OR “net zero protests” OR “net zero protesters” OR “net zero activism” OR “net zero activist” OR “net zero activists” OR “net zero demonstrations” OR “net zero demonstrator” OR “net zero demonstrators” OR “eco protest” OR “eco protests” OR “eco protesters” OR “eco activism” OR “eco activist” OR “eco activists” OR “eco demonstrations” OR “eco demonstrator” OR “eco demonstrators” OR

2) ‘Loaded’ Language

“climate cult” OR “climate cultist” OR “climate cultists” OR “climate radicalism” OR “climate radical” OR “climate radicals” OR “climate zealotry” OR “climate zealot” OR “climate zealots” OR “climate fanaticism” OR “climate fanatic” OR “climate fanatics” OR “climate hysteria” OR “climate hysteric” OR “climate hysterics” OR “climate lunacy” OR “climate lunatic” OR “climate lunatics” OR “climate crusade” OR “climate crusader” OR “climate crusaders” OR “climate narcissism” OR “climate narcissist” OR “climate narcissists” OR “climate apocalypticism” OR “climate apocalypticist” OR “climate apocalyptists” OR “climate doomism” OR “climate doomist” OR “climate doomists” OR “climate doomster” OR “climate doomsters” OR “green cult” OR “green cultist” OR “green cultists” OR “green radicalism” OR “green radical” OR “green radicals” OR “green zealotry” OR “green zealot” OR “green zealots” OR “green fanaticism” OR “green fanatic” OR “green fanatics” OR “green hysteria” OR “green hysteric” OR “green hysterics” OR “green lunacy” OR “green lunatic” OR “green lunatics” OR “green crusade” OR “green crusader” OR “green crusaders” OR “green narcissism” OR “green narcissist” OR “green narcissists” OR
"green apocalypticism" OR "green apocalyptist" OR "green apocalyptists" OR "green doomism" OR "green doomicst" OR "green doomists" OR "green doomster" OR "green doomsters" OR "eco cult" OR "eco cultist" OR "eco cultists" OR "eco radicalism" OR "eco radical" OR "eco radicals" OR "eco zealotry" OR "eco zealot" OR "eco zealots" OR "eco fanaticism" OR "eco fanatic" OR "eco fanatics" OR "eco hysteria" OR "eco hysteric" OR "eco hysterics" OR "eco lunacy" OR "eco lunatic" OR "eco lunatics" OR "eco crusade" OR "eco crusader" OR "eco crusaders" OR "eco narcissism" OR "eco narcissist" OR "eco narcissists" OR "eco apocalypticism" OR "eco apocalyptist" OR "eco apocalyptists" OR "eco doomicsm" OR "eco doomicst" OR "eco doomicsts" OR "eco doomicsters" OR "net zero cult" OR "net zero cultist" OR "net zero cultists" OR "net zero radicalism" OR "net zero radical" OR "net zero radicals" OR "net zero zealotry" OR "net zero zealot" OR "net zero zealots" OR "net zero fanaticism" OR "net zero fanatic" OR "net zero fanatics" OR "net zero hysteria" OR "net zero hysteric" OR "net zero hysterics" OR "net zero lunacy" OR "net zero lunatic" OR "net zero lunatics" OR "net zero crusade" OR "net zero crusader" OR "net zero crusaders" OR "net zero narcissism" OR "net zero narcissist" OR "net zero narcissists" OR "net zero apocalypticism" OR "net zero apocalyptists" OR "net zero doomicsm" OR "net zero doomicst" OR "net zero doomicsts" OR "net zero doomicsters"

3) ‘Securitised’ Language

"climate extremist" OR "climate extremists" OR "climate terrorist" OR "climate terrorists" OR "green extremist" OR "green extremists" OR "green terrorist" OR "green terrorists" OR "net zero extremist" OR "net zero extremists" OR "net zero terrorist" OR "net zero terrorists" OR "eco extremist" OR "eco extremists" OR "eco terrorist" OR "eco terrorists" OR