land

MDPI

Article

Conflicted Energy Transition—Conception of a Theoretical Framework for Its Investigation

Olaf Kühne [1,*], Debi Parush [2], Deborah Shmueli [2] and Corinna Jenal [1]

[1] Department of Geosciences, Tuebingen University, 72074 Tübingen, Germany; corinna.jenal@uni-tuebingen.de
[2] Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Haifa, Haifa 3498838, Israel; dparush@campus.haifa.ac.il (D.P.); deborah@geo.haifa.ac.il (D.S.)
* Correspondence: olaf.kuehne@uni-tuebingen.de

Abstract: Energy transition plays a central role in efforts to reduce anthropogenic global warming. However, energy transition involves physical manifestations, for example in the form of wind turbines, photovoltaic plants, and power lines, which trigger resistance, especially among those who live in the vicinity of the (planned) plants. The reasons for this resistance are complex, as they relate to residents' emotional ties and/or stereotypical common-sense expectations of landscape. The complexity of landscape conflicts in general, and energy transition-related conflicts in particular, makes it difficult to capture the intricacy of the subject matter by means of a single theoretical perspective. To address this difficulty, a neopragmatic approach of identifying and combining appropriate theoretical perspectives is utilized to develop an analytic framework for understanding these conflicts. To this end, we draw on Dahrendorf's conflict theory and the framing approach. Both have high complementary explanatory potential and empirical applicability, with the framing approach broadening the theoretical prism to include micro-individuals and groups to Dahrendorf's meso-social perspective.

Keywords: energy transition; landscape; neopragmatism; neopragmatic landscape theory; conflict theory; framing approach; Dahrendorf

Citation: Kühne, O.; Parush, D.; Shmueli, D.; Jenal, C. Conflicted Energy Transition—Conception of a Theoretical Framework for Its Investigation. *Land* **2022**, *11*, 116. https://doi.org/10.3390/land11010116

Academic Editors: Baojie He, Ayyoob Sharifi, Chi Feng and Jun Yang

Received: 26 November 2021
Accepted: 5 January 2022
Published: 11 January 2022

1. Introduction

As we listen to the COP26 discussions about the challenges and goals we face globally, regionally and locally, energy transition from coal, oil and gas whose emissions are heating the planet, to "green energy"—solar, wind and nuclear—are featured as both challenges and goals. The challenges involve the process of change, the goals envision a more globally resilient and sustainable outcome. This article focusses on one aspect of the process of change—the landscape transition which is required to reach the outcome espoused and how we might help understand and ultimately reshape the emerging conflict surrounding the accompanying landscape transformation. The understanding will eventually emerge from empirical examination on local levels, the next stage of research. Here we try to define the overarching theoretical frameworks from which we can begin to guide the empirical research—and into which the insights from the data can be fed to arrive at a comprehensive grounded theory.

Transitioning to renewable energy is an urgent and complex environmental challenge. Facing climate change in the coming years, communities on local, regional, and global levels may continue to be affected by changes that hopefully lead towards a more resilient and sustainable future. These changes involve a wide range of different issues, interests, and values that affect the way stakeholders—such as government, business, special interest groups, and residents—interpret the requirements for change. While much has been learned about managing complex environmental conflicts, many such conflicts have not yet been resolved.

There is much that stakeholders and the public struggle to understand with regard to capabilities and motivations which inform the transition to renewable energy. On the theoretical level, this can be understood as an element of the "dissolution of the self-evident", which goes back to the scientific "disenchantment" [1,2], which led to critical analysis and reflection on the part of ever-larger parts of the world populace. On the other hand, it also harks back to the fact that scientific knowledge about the world is made available to ever-larger parts of humanity, in the form of "expansion of education". Dahrendorf posits that an important role of education in industrial society (with the support of the family, religion and other institutions) is in "position allocation and role internalization" [3] (p. 38). Through education, people may be increasingly empowered to understand and stand up for their own interests. In the context of scientific disenchantment on the one hand and increased access to knowledge on the other, the goal of transitioning to renewable energy opens up new alternatives. This, in turn, involves solving new problems and making new decisions that require letting go of old understandings in favor of new agreements about how to move forward. Habermas [4] proposes "practical discourse" as a universally rational strategy for evaluating potential norms based on mutual understanding [4].

In terms of "neopragmatic"[1] spatial and landscape theory, theories can be usefully combined with insights from data when the use of a single theory would not do justice to the complexity of the research topic. In this context, the blending of theories must be justified in relation to the object of research [5–8]. The purpose of this paper is to examine whether and to what extent Ralf Dahrendorf's conflict theory and the framing approach are suitable for providing a complementary theoretical framework for neopragmatic research on landscape conflicts surrounding energy transition into which observations from practice can be integrated (German: "Energiewende").

However, before we look a bit more closely at the neopragmatic approach to spatial research, we will briefly outline the topic of the energy transition. We will then turn to the central part of our paper: the conflict theory and framing approach, in order to determine what potential a combination of these two approaches offers for research on conflicts around energy transition. To this end, we will also briefly consider alternative theories of social conflict. In Conclusion and Outlook we will elaborate the potential of a neopragmatic combination of Ralf Dahrendorf's conflict theory with the framing approach.

2. Energy Transition as an Element of Anthropogenic Climate Change Mitigation—Basic Features and Conflicts

Climate change and its impacts are a matter of urgent global, regional, and national discourse. In addition to adaptation measures, climate policy focuses in particular on reducing the increase in global average temperature. Accordingly, the Paris Climate Agreement stipulates that the rise in global mean temperature must be prevented from rising more than 1.5 degrees Kelvin above pre-industrial levels [9]. An essential component of the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions lies in the conversion of the generation of electrical energy from fossil to regenerative energy sources. In Germany, the goals set are that renewable energies are to account for around 60 percent of gross final energy consumption and 80 percent of gross electricity consumption by 2050 [10]. Israel's goals fall significantly short of Germany's, with a modest interim target of a 27 percent reduction by 2030, although Prime Minister Bennet announced at the COP26 that Israel will cut "greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2050 and phase out the use of coal by 2025" [11] (pp. 1–2). Despite efforts to reduce electricity consumption by increasing efficiency, the energy transition is and will be associated with significant changes in physical spaces. With energy transition to renewables, electricity supply is no longer generated by centralized large-scale power plants and then distributed via a hierarchically-tiered transmission system; instead, the generation of electric power, particularly in wind power, photovoltaic and biomass plants, is decentralized and requires not only facilities for storing energy but

also a revised structure of the transmission network, which not least poses major challenges for spatial planning [12–15].

A key aspect of the challenge of planning facilities for the generation and distribution of regeneratively generated electrical energy involves addressing the different perspectives, interests, and demands of politicians, companies, planners, residents, recreationists, etc. in the context of the construction of the facilities [16–19]. In particular, plans for the construction of plants for the generation, distribution and storage of regeneratively generated electricity often trigger resistance from local residents and even environmental groups. This resistance is often ignited by the contradiction between the plans and traditional visual expectations, but also by health concerns (such as electromagnetic fields or infrasound), the protection of species and, in particular, the loss of the "native normal landscape" [20–22]. The conflicts that arise can be divided into factual, procedural, identity and value conflicts [23–25]. Factual conflicts relate to varying assessments of an object of conflict (such as the location of a wind turbine). Procedural conflicts refer to the (mostly administrative) control (e.g., with regard to the question of citizen involvement). Identity conflicts are mostly related to individual, collective or landscape "essence cores" in (implicit) recourse to essentialist thinking (e.g., whether wind turbines as accidental objects destroy the "essence" of a landscape). Value conflicts arise when individual or collective worldviews compete with each other (for example, a conservative worldview that expresses itself in the preservation of traditional structures versus a progressive worldview).

However, before addressing the question of the theoretical framing of conflict, we take a step back and address the question of whether and how complex research topics can be subjected to theoretical reflection without oversimplifying the issues.

3. The Neopragmatic Approach—A Meta-Theoretical Framework

Energy transition in general, and the conflicts around energy transition and its physical manifestations in particular, can be described as complex phenomena in which economic, political, socio-community, cultural, aesthetic, normative and moral aspects intertwine. Given the scientific and social relevance of the issue, researchers come from a myriad of scientific disciplines with varying sources of data, and bring with them a number of possible theoretical frameworks to guide their exploration. The theoretical frameworks also impact the methodologies used (and vice versa). Theoretical approaches do not only represent generalized abstractions of observations (in the sense of induction) or abstract propositions that are subjected to hard empirical tests (in the sense of Popper [26]), but are often accompanied by ideological attitudes [27,28] and are subject to immunization against falsification attempts by differentiation into a core and a margin that can be made accessible to falsification in order to protect the core [29–31]. Different theories (and the scholars espousing them) are often competing and present an exclusionary relationship with regard to other theories. The resulting competition for interpretive sovereignty ultimately leads to a situation in which research on a complex subject cannot shed light on essential aspects of this complexity, since theories—to use the image of Karl Popper [32]—act like spotlights that illuminate different aspects of a (complex) object. This is where the meta-theoretical concept, developed in the last decade in German-language spatial research, comes in with recourse to neo-pragmatic philosophy [5–8,33,34].

On the one hand, this "neopragmatic" approach connects to the pragmatic tradition, as based on US philosophers such as William James, Charles S. Peirce and John Dewey, and extends it. Usefulness becomes the touchstone of action, not the derivation of action from, and consistency with, principles [35–38]. "Truth", "theory", "practice", etc., are no longer perceived separately from one another; rather, these form a "unity mediated in the process of experience" [38] (p. 258). The philosophy of "neopragmatism", associated in particular with Richard Rorty [39–41], but also with Hilary Putnam [42], extends the pragmatic approach from the perspective of philosophy of language. As a postmodern approach, neopragmatism rejects conceptions of universal truth or incontrovertible objectivity. In its place is an acknowledgement of pluralistic worldviews and an "insight into contingency"

(no one correct worldview) [41]. "Contingency", that is, the accidental, the non-necessary, that which could just as well be otherwise, forms a central point in Rorty's philosophy [43]. The world we live in is characterized by contingency: "Our language and our culture are as much a contingency, as much a result of thousands of small mutations finding niches (and millions of others finding no niches), as are the orchids and the anthropoids" [44] (p. 80). Accordingly, the "insight into contingency" goes beyond philosophical reflection: "For it is not enough to recognize that a multiplicity of other vocabularies exists alongside one's own; rather, one must relate this observation to anti-fundamentalist conceptions of language, man, and the world in order to be able to diagnose contingency" [45] (p. 158).

Normatively, philosophical neopragmatism is oriented towards open-ended, democratic processes of negotiation. Statements in these permanent processes of negotiation are confronted with a constant need for justification [46–49]. For Rorty [41], the democratic justificatory community is conditioned by antifundamentalism and awareness of contingency. It is, therefore, itself a contingent result of cultural history. Habermas describes the ineffective use of justification or legitimation as a strategy for forcibly stabilizing [50] contradictory norms and values in the face of contingencies of the modern world. Instead, he proposes that stakeholders with pluralistic worldviews engage in practical discourse involving mutual understanding in order to rationally decide together which norms are worthy of keeping. This opportunity is reminiscent of Rorty's [44] plea with respect to different historicist writers' perspectives "not to choose between them, but rather, give them equal weight and use them for different purposes" [51] (p. xiii).

Following these basic features of philosophical neopragmatism, the scientific-theoretical neopragmatism advocated here extends the action reference of pragmatic social and spatial research [38,52–54] by a meta-perspective in awareness of the contingency and fallibility of theories. Complex issues can (and often should) be examined through multiple theoretical lenses and methodologies [55,56]. Incommensurability of theoretical basic attitudes, such as constructivist and positivist ones, which have been stated up to now, are subordinated to the overriding will of complementary production of interpretations of the object as well as to the interest of contingent knowledge production [6,33,57]. The use of different theories in the awareness of contingent knowledge processes does not take place arbitrarily, but is subject to a justification requirement, i.e., the application of the different theoretical perspectives must be reflected and justified from the point of view of the research topic and the questions dealt with at the same time with regard to the knowledge potentials and limits, and weighed against alternative approaches. Although this is the core of the neopragmatic approach presented here, it is not limited to a combining of theoretical perspectives. It is accompanied by varied methodologies derived from the theories, and often implemented by researchers from different disciplines with access to different datasets [58,59]. The combined approaches must be justified by the topic and questions of the research project. The choice of theories, methodologies, data, and researchers must be explored and justified [6,60].

Neopragmatic research is interdisciplinary in orientation, with the potential for resulting in transdisciplinary research[2]. It focusses on everyday life, and aims to produce results that are suitable for practical implementation (here, for example, to regulate conflicts surrounding the energy transition; [5]). Its theoretical and methodological openness makes neopragmatism, due to its multiperspectivity, particularly suitable for explorative approaches to complex research subjects, as it embarks on a search for "useful" knowledge.

Energy transition research takes place within both the natural and social science research venues. Research in the natural sciences tend to be both positive and normative in nature. The methodologies often involve the modelling of complex ecosystem processes. Social science theories and methodologies in this context focus on social constructions of "natural" processes and their interpretation and evaluation, different degrees of acceptance or rejection of the material manifestations of energy transition (sometimes resulting in conspiracy-theory generation of alternative world interpretations). Here, the complexity of the research subject becomes clear, suggesting the necessity for multi-perspective neopragmatic approaches.

4. Dahrendorf's Conflict Theory and the Framing Approach as Theoretical Prisms through Which to Explore Energy Transition Conflicts

4.1. Conflict Theories—An Introductory Overview

Social conflicts are found in all societies [61] and have been a central object of social science research from early on [62], for example in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Marx and Engels [63] understood social conflicts as triggers for revolutions and accordingly assigned them central importance for social development towards a classless society. In contrast to this macro-sociological perspective, Georg Simmel formulated a micro-sociological perspective. For him, the driving forces for social conflicts lay in human drives and interests [64]. Like Marx and Engels, for Simmel social conflicts are not dysfunctional. In contrast, Talcott Parsons [65] understood social conflict (on a macro-sociological level) as a disruption of the functional structure of society. Pierre Bourdieu combined the micro to macro sociological perspectives with his habitus and capital theory by focusing his conflict theory on the mechanisms of distribution of symbolic capital. Using economic, social, and cultural capital in the fields of society (roughly comparable with Parsons' social subsystems), conflicts arise that are played out according to different rules of the game [66–68].

4.2. Ralf Dahrendorf's Conflict Theory—Main Features and Application to Landscape Conflicts Surrounding Energy Transition

The conflict theory of Ralf Dahrendorf takes a meso-sociological perspective by analyzing typical courses of social conflict (in favor and against change) and providing guidance on the conditions under which social conflict can be productive for social development and those under which it cannot. This combination offers a fruitful theoretical framework for studying spatial and energy conflicts against the background of societal developments [69–73].

Thus, central aspects of Ralf Dahrendorf's conflict theory can be used as a framework of validity, including the interpretation of the significance of conflicts for social development, their phasic nature, as well as their regulation (especially: [61,74–76]). The validity framework refers to conflicts between groups within society having an equal or hierarchical relationship. Since conflicts in the context of the energy transition typically occur within society between social groups, this makes the theory useful for landscape conflicts. Dahrendorf asserts that conflicts are potentially productive for society in principle, provided that they are regulated. Regulation (more on this later) does not mean suppressing conflicts (i.e., not allowing them to unfold socially) or resolving conflicts by dissolving social differences. Conflicts are—according to Dahrendorf—inherent in every society. They become apparent when the conflicting parties become aware of their common interests caused by differences and confront each other dichotomously, each with their own identity. For Dahrendorf, the successful settlement of conflict, with its associated social productivity, is linked to five conditions:

1. Like social conflicts in general, the conflict parties must recognize the concrete conflict as part of social normality, not as a state of affairs contrary to the norm.
2. A settlement is related to a concrete issue, not to the social causes of the conflict. The attempt to eliminate the social causes of a conflict would mean trying to resolve the conflict, which in turn would create new social conflicts since conflict-triggering inequalities are immanent in every society.
3. The higher the degree of organization of parties in the conflict settlement procedure, the greater the chance of a successful conflict settlement. In this way, binding settlements can be reached for the conflict parties without the respective conflict party again dissolving into micro-conflicts.
4. Successful conflict settlement is linked to the parties' adherence to procedural rules, including the mutual recognition of the legitimacy of each other's viewpoints.
5. Although compliance with procedural rules is initially the parties' responsibility, conflicts can only be settled if an institutional framework is in place. A third authority sets this framework. The latter is in a position to lay down commonly binding rules on

how conflicts are to be dealt with. It also has the means to end the conflict if necessary, without the parties having reached a settlement. This situation is what Dahrendorf calls [77] "freedom under the protection of the law". The authority, for example the state, is in turn subject to the imputability of responsibility for its decisions (in particular through a rotational review of satisfaction by the electorate [78].

As a result of increasing social differentiation, the importance of macro-conflicts (such as class conflicts) decreases, while the number of meso-conflicts (such as among bargaining parties, different regions) and micro-conflicts (such as between the mayor and his/her planning administration and residents of a place encompassing a construction site), increases. Social micro- and meso-conflicts can be settled with less brutality at different intensities (they do not necessarily result in bloody revolutions), which means that this development can already be understood as socially productive (human beings are the constitutive basic unit for society and their violent death thus already structurally reduces society; refs. [32,75,79]). Not least, however, this also increases the number of conflicts that can be explained by Dahrendorf's conflict theory. Landscape conflicts involving the material manifestations of the energy transition fit within the scope of typical cases of conflict that may be explained by Dahrendorf's conflict theory. However, before we turn to the topic of landscape conflicts, we will look at the understanding of landscape used in this paper.

The theory of three landscapes on which the following is based represents a derivation from Karl Popper's theory of three worlds [80,81]. It facilitates the comprehension of the differentiated nature of the structures and processes of and around landscape (more detailed in [21,82]). Karl Popper's initial theory distinguishes World 1 as the world of matter, World 2 as that of individual consciousness, and World 3 as the world of cultural contents, ideas and theories. Worlds 1 and 2 as well as 2 and 3 are in constant exchange with each other, so the individual consciousness is introduced to the contents of World 3 through socialization, but is also able to innovate within that world. Humans have a share in all three worlds, through which they are able to intervene in World 1. This approach can be applied to space in general and landscape (as a special case of space) in particular. Landscape 3 comprises the social often aesthetic and increasingly ecological patterns of interpretation, valuation and categorization in relation to landscape as they have been developed throughout history (in Germany going back to the Middle Ages). The contents of Landscape 3 are (partially) socialized (selectively) to the individual's Landscape 2. This in turn has the possibility to have an innovative effect on Landscape 3. Landscape 2, in turn, constructs Landscape 1—material World 1 on the basis of the individually actualized contents of Landscape 3. The social and individual construction of landscape takes place in different modes: Mode a denotes the normal landscape of the home, which is based in particular on an individual and emotional experience of landscape in the everyday world and is formed in childhood. Mode b denotes the common-sense of landscape, i.e., an understanding of landscape that is shared by the majority of the members of a society (here, the systematic socialization of school lessons plays a major role). Mode c denotes expert special knowledge about landscape, which is taught in particular in landscape-related studies (geography, biology, landscape architecture and planning, etc.; for the empirical foundation, see for example: [83–86]).

Although the empirical basis of the following comments on landscape conflicts (specifically on the physical manifestations of the energy transition) emerges from research in Germany, international studies show similar patterns [69,87–92].

Landscape conflicts take their origin in the interest of use (especially framed in c-mode), which are associated with interventions in Landscape 1. These interventions have to be above a perception threshold and contradict b- and a-mode perceptions. In the context of energy transition, this becomes particularly clear with wind turbines, which have a considerable visual (in some cases also acoustic) presence. This presence contradicts the normative stability attributed to landscape construction in the a-mode (although an intergenerational change can be empirically observed here; cf. Kühne [93]). Moreover, they

also contradict the stereotypical expectations of Landscape 1 in the b-mode. These are aligned with notions of a "harmonious, romantic landscape". In the c-mode, on the other hand, the presence of wind turbines is understood and positively evaluated as striving for decarbonization of society. This view is increasingly anchored (as shown through schooling) in the b-mode as well. This pattern of interpretation is especially found among young and urban segments of the population, who are not confronted with the daily sight of wind turbines or other changes in the landscape due to a transition to renewable energy [86].

The usual development of landscape conflicts is characterized by a relatively long persistent first phase. According to Dahrendorf, in this "latent" phase, conflicts are structurally laid out, but the parties are not yet aware of their latent interests and have not yet formed interest groups [61,74,94]. Thus the planning of changes in Landscape 1 (in c-mode) is carried out, but does not reach the consciousness of the parties who, once cognizant of the impact, reject it (in modes a and b); this usually happens only when the material manifestation of the planning is imminent (this is also referred to as the "participation paradox": when in the phase of planning which is still open to alternatives, those affected by the planning do not get involved—the issue lacks "ripeness", and it is only when the planning is completed and the implementation is imminent or already being carried out that resistance is organized). The resistance is then organized very quickly—for example, using digital social media. The parties rapidly form interest groups and dichotomize into two disjunct units, so that phases two and three of the conflict formation follow at short intervals.

In the course of conflict development, there is often a transformation from a factual or procedural conflict to an identity and value conflict. The former is open to settlement according to Dahrendorf's conflict theory. In the case of identity and value conflicts, this settlement is more difficult, if not impossible. The object (here the material manifestations of the energy turnaround) is subjected to a moral charge ("wind turbines destroy the essence of the homeland"), especially in the case of identity and value conflicts. One party communicates a moral accusation against the other party to the conflict, which results in the devaluation of the other point of view. Their concerns are no longer understood as legitimate and worthy of consideration, but as pathological [70,95,96]. It is not only the refusal to recognize the legitimacy of the respective opposing position that makes conflict management difficult or even impossible; the conflict parties in landscape conflicts are also generally not clearly organized. There are four main reasons for this: First, the high speed of conflict escalation (especially for the opposing group forces) makes it difficult to develop a clear organizational structure. Second, there is often no clarity, especially among the ad hoc opposition groups, as to who is being represented (claims are often made in the name of the "silent majority", or even "the people"). Third, landscape conflicts are characterized by low spatiotemporal synchronicity. In one place (near the planned wind farm a) the conflict is still latent, in another it is already over (for instance through the manifestation or cancellation of wind farm b). This makes a supra-local organization of the parties more difficult. Fourthly, conflicts are often carried out by "masking" arguments. For example, in conflicts over the construction of wind farms, the proponents refer to "saving the future", while the opponents refer to endangered species protection. This often masks economic interests on the one hand and the preservation of Landscape 1a on the other [24,97,98]. The dual role of the state in landscape conflicts over energy transition has also proven to be less conducive to conflict resolution in Dahrendorf's sense. On the one hand, the state is a party to the conflict—as it promotes energy transition through legal regulations—while on the other hand it has the function of a "third party", since it is also responsible for the planning regulation of the expansion of the material manifestations of the energy transition. This dual role of the state promotes—especially when the conflict is accompanied by strong moralization arguments—the transformation from a procedural conflict (such as how the interests of those affected are to be integrated into the planning process) to an identity conflict ("we locals" against "the state") and a conflict of values (such as the enforcement of the "true will of the people" against the "decadent elites" dominating "the state"). This

in turn often means that, with the end of the concrete conflict, the factual and procedural conflict is transformed into a fundamental critique of the system, again often linked to the development of populist political organization [99].

4.3. Framing Theory

Framing is one approach that has been successfully applied to understanding and managing environmental conflict. This section describes framing and how it can be used to understand and contribute to the management of emerging conflicts arising from landscape transformation involved in transitioning to renewable energy.

The concept of "frame" is used to represent the perspectives people use to filter and organize their understanding of a situation [100–102]. The framing process of making meaning out of complex phenomena can be conscious or pre-conscious [101]. Different stakeholders may interpret or frame the same situation differently [103]. Framing helps people consider what to expect and how to act, for example, by protecting themselves, justifying a position, or mobilizing others to formulate a grievance. Identifying the frames stakeholders use can be useful for clarifying, simplifying, and communicating their perspectives [104]. This in turn may enable stakeholders to reframe their perspective by acknowledging the other perspectives, learning more about them, weighing the alternatives, and selecting a solution that takes into consideration the broad range of needs and interests identified [100].

The concept of framing was broadly introduced by Goffman, who traced the "frame" concept to William James' idea that "there are several different "worlds" that our attention and interest make real for us" [105] (p. 2). Here, the connection to neopragmatism also becomes clear, since the framing approach and the latter go back to the same roots of pragmatic thinking with William James.

Goffman demonstrated various ways in which the same experience can be interpreted and offered techniques for analyzing individual frames. He described how the context can influence the frame applied to assess reality, how different participants in the same experience may frame it differently, and how cultural standards and social roles inform individuals' understanding and behavior—they "elegantly confirm a frame-relevant view of the workings of the world." [105] (p. 563).

Research on environmental conflict has shown that many different frames may influence how an environmental conflict emerges and evolves, contributing to its (in) tractability. In particular, identity-, characterization-, and conflict management frames have been found to play a key role across environmental conflict case studies in a variety of environmental domains; while fact-finding-, social-control-, power-, and risk frames were also often found [100,106] (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1. Main terms of the framing approach (own representation).

Frame	Description
Identity	This frame refers to how a person defines "Who I am". Identity can be seen as an individual, a role in an organization, a member of an institution, and/or as a member of a social identity group sharing common characteristics including coming from the same place or sharing the same interests. When a person's identity is threatened, it usually results in conflict. When identity is invalidated, there is increased potential for conflict escalation.
Characterization	Lewicki et al. [104] use characterization frames to convey a party's perception of the other. They often involve blame and are subject to attribution errors. Characterization frames may stem from ingrained stereotypes.
Conflict Management	This frame refers to how the parties prefer for the conflict to be managed, including avoidance, fact-finding, joint problem-solving, expert decision-making, adjudication by a third party, political action, appeal to the market economy, and violence.
Whole Story Frames	This frame captures parties' experience of the conflict.

Table 1. *Cont.*

Frame	Description
Social Control	This frame reflects the level of interdependence and ownership parties use with respect to the conflict. An individualist frame refers to high ownership and low interdependence. An egalitarian frame involves high ownership and high interdependence—stakeholders with this frame are likely to get involved. A fatalist frame, reflecting the stakeholders' sense of lack of control, refers to low ownership and low interdependence. And a hierarchist frame involves low ownership and high interdependence. Hierarchists typically prefer expert authoritarian decision-making.
Power	Lewicki et al. [104] identified a variety of power frames using a "grounded approach" including authority, resources, expertise, personal, coalitional, sympathy, force, moral, and voice.
Risk	Different stakeholders can frame the risk involved in the conflict differently, for example by using a cost-benefit criterion or arguing for immediate urgent mitigation.
Gain Versus Loss	This frame refers to the parties' perception of the actions taken as win–win or win–lose. This frame has been found to be related to the level of risk decision makers will accept.

Table 2. Main frameworks (own representation).

Frame Type	Description
Identity and Values	This frame refers to the parties' fundamental values that are applied to the conflict, such as fairness, justice, rights, power, social control, access to information, complexity, and risk perceptions. It also refers to the stakeholders' identities including individual self-conception and group affiliation as it relates to the conflict.
Characterization	This frame refers to stakeholders' assessment of behavior—their own and others as well as their assessment of the relationships among parties.
Phrasing	Phrasing deals with how the parties communicate, for example, framing them as win-lose or win-win.
Process	This frame refers to the perception of the structure of the dispute, including who makes decisions and how, as well as the fairness, inclusivity, and legality of the process.
Substance	Substance frames relate to the issues parties perceive—what are their grievances, aspirations, and desired outcomes.

Shmueli [107] mapped a framing typology resulting from analyses of many environmental conflicts and found the following recurring frames: identity and values, phrasing, process, and characterization frames. These frames, which were consistent across case studies and geographic regions, were useful both for researchers—in identifying discourse (as explained by Habermas[3] [4]) (ir)regularities and for stakeholders—in improving understanding and even dispute resolution [108].

While framing has been applied to a wide variety of environmental disputes, including land use, water quality, toxic pollutants, and growth-related conflicts [104], as far as we know, it has not yet been systematically applied to landscape transformations (in their three dimensions) required for transitioning to renewable energy. At the same time, current literature on energy transition points to the urgent need for insights on the discourse of stakeholders and strategies for planning and implementing sustainable solutions to help overcome the social aspects of the challenges faced. The above review of framing research suggests that there is immediate value in analyzing stakeholder frames of the emerging landscape transformation conflict.

4.4. Empirical Applications

The aim of the theoretical structure suggested here is to provide a framework for empirical examinations. These may begin, for instance, with an examination of local

public media discourse on the topic of "renewable energy", or a proactive analysis of an ongoing conflict through stakeholder interviewing, combining framing and social-conflict-theories' methodological approaches (for example, modelling complex ecosystem processes, interpretation and evaluation of social constructions of natural processes, and additional grounded theory methodologies which emerge). Through this neopragmatic approach, an overarching theoretical framework based on insights from the empirical findings may emerge. Using multiperspectivity that combines conflict theory's meso-social level and framing theory's micro-individual and group levels, open-ended questions can be formed which "capture . . . potentially relevant aspects of the topic" [109], for example:

1. What frames do stakeholders use in making sense of the transition to renewable energy in general, and landscape transformation in particular?
2. Are there signs of emerging conflict? If so, what are they? Are they seen as normal phenomena? What phases of the conflict can be observed?
3. How do the parties organize, interact, and deal with the challenges?
    a. What are the key claims with respect to the integration of renewable energy into the landscape?
    b. What are the social processes involved in integrating or not integrating physical manifestations of renewable energy into the landscape? What are the relationships among the stakeholders, for example equal or hierarchical?
    c. Are the procedural rules adhered to? Are there signs of mutual legitimacy? Is there a third-party authority regulating the process? What operational processes and outcomes are found?

Insights resulting from these types of understanding have the potential for reframing/managing/resolving complex disputes.

Using the analysis of our findings, we will evaluate the application of both lenses to form a transdisciplinary, overarching theoretical framework that synthesizes bottom-up findings from the field with key aspects of conflict and framing theories. In line with the neopragmatic approach, we will consider principles and actions together, with the intention of offering concrete recommendations for policymakers and local stakeholders in addition to contributing to academic theory.

5. Conclusions and Outlook

This paper has addressed the question of whether an integration of Ralf Dahrendorf's conflict theory with the framing approach can be usefully conceptualized in order to contribute to understanding and regulating landscape conflicts. Such a test arises from the use of a neopragmatic framework that presupposes a need for justification for the use of different theories. Regarding the fit between Dahrendorf's conflict theory and the framing approach, a high degree of complementarity can be observed. Conflict theory focusses on a meso-social level with the emergence and course of conflicts, as well as the possibilities of their management. With the framing approach, these conflicts can be considered in more detail, as the individual frames of conflicts are differentiated. By addressing individual frames, the conflicting issues are more precisely differentiated and can therefore be better managed, for example when it comes to characterizing other parties to the conflict. The emergence of quasi-groups can also be captured in more detail with the help of the framing approach than is possible with the more general conflict theory, which merely states that the emergence occurs, but does not integrate the more precise processes of the emergence. In this respect, it can be stated that a combination of the framing approach and Dahrendorf's conflict theory—as the engagement with existing empirical studies from the two perspectives shows—has great potential for investigating conflicts with complex objects. One such complex object is landscape. Landscape is—according to current social and cultural science research—not simply a section of physical space. Rather, landscape is a social pattern of interpretation, evaluation, and categorization (Landscape 3) that is individually actualized (Landscape 2) and projected into material spaces (Landscape 1). The social and individual construction of landscape occurs under different modes, which

in turn directs different normative ideas to Landscape 1. An important characteristic of landscape conflict is that within a given landscape, if one object is inserted, it takes up the space, preventing use by another object—landscape conflicts involve extensive material exclusivity. For example, a specific material space can either contain a forest or a building complex (excluding attempts to combine the two, for now). Because of this limited resource, landscape conflicts involve a high level of intensity requiring the need for management (here the connection to Dahrendorf's conflict theory is particularly clear). At the same time, emerging landscape conflicts involve a wide variety of perspectives on different levels (such as individual-, social group-, and expert-modes), which require a high degree of differentiation—one perspective cannot include them all (which suggests an investigation using the framing approach). By adopting a neopragmatic, empirical investigation of landscape conflicts based on Dahrendorf's conflict theory and the framing approach, we believe there is great potential to interpret and understand the conflicts emerging around the Energiewende—transition to renewable energy—and to point out possibilities for their management.

Important insights from combining these theoretical perspectives aim to offer policymakers and local authorities a wider field of view that captures the complexity of the challenge of transitioning to renewable energy. This may enable decision-makers to proactively manage more of the issues, earlier in the process. It aims to provide a more informed approach that may be leveraged to improve processes, outcomes and relationships among involved stakeholders.

The framing approach has been used successfully in local environmental and public disputes in revealing the diversity among stakeholders in terms of how they understand a situation—the variety of needs, interests and priorities. When these understandings were shared, new understandings emerged, sometimes leading to conflict reframing; and parties were often willing to actively assist in mitigating issues of prime concern to other parties that they would not likely have agreed to without this new and broader understanding.

Dahrendorf's conflict theory offers an awareness of the phasic nature of conflict arising from social development challenges, such as mitigating global warming. This awareness may guide local authorities to monitor the impact of renewable energy projects at each phase. In a latent phase, this may result in a greater sensitivity and attention of local authorities to emerging stakeholder groups and how they may respond to the planned changes. Understanding the evolution of these developmental phases in relation to landscape disputes may allow decision-makers to consider early manifestations of conflict prior to full-fledged disputes. Full-fledged disputes often emerge only with the appearance of visible manifestations of landscape change which result from transition to renewable energy. Initial manifestations, such as posters predicting the impact of the project on the landscape where the facility is to be constructed, may elicit responses earlier in the process and thereby allow the issues to be addressed before they escalate. Interest groups may be invited to voice their views on the advantages and threats within a well-structured process with enforced procedural rules—as is done using the framing approach. Social conflict theory recommends that a third party be entrusted to accompany the process and ensure that agreements are implemented. At the same time, according to both social conflict- and framing theories, identity conflict and issues connected to stakeholders' core values are of a special nature. Local authorities and policymakers may take this into account when looking for solutions, not expecting to change who the other is or what is most dear to them.

Taken together, we imagine many ways in which framing and conflict theory can be combined to empower policymakers and local authorities with tools that support a smoother transition to renewable energy. In the next phases of our research, we aim to explore these ideas in the field—learning from the ground up what does and does not work and paying special attention to the above phenomena, their impact on the relationships among stakeholders and their outcomes.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, O.K., D.P., D.S. and C.J.; methodology, O.K., D.P., D.S. and C.J.; formal analysis, O.K., D.P., D.S. and C.J.; investigation, O.K., D.P., D.S. and C.J.; writing—original draft preparation, O.K., D.P., D.S. and C.J.; writing—review and editing, O.K, D.P., D.S. and C.J.; supervision, O.K., D.P., D.S. and C.J.; project administration, O.K., D.P., D.S. and C.J. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Notes

[1] A philosophical tradition that infers that the meaning of words is a result of how they are used, rather than the objects they represent.

[2] Interdisciplinarity combines two or more disciplines to a new level of integration suggesting the initial break down of component boundaries. Transdisciplinarity occurs when two or more disciplinary perspectives transcend each other to form a new holistic approach.

[3] Habermas refers to the use of discourse for reflexive learning to identify and deal with issues: "Reflexive learning takes place through discourses in which we thematize practical validity claims that have become problematic or have been rendered problematic through institutionalized doubt, and redeem or dismiss them on the basis of arguments [4]".

References

1. Weber, M. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Grundriß der Verstehenden Soziologie*; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, Germany, 1976.
2. Weber, M. *Wissenschaft als Beruf; 11. Auflage*; Duncker & Humblot: Berlin, Germany, 2011; ISBN 978-3-428-13509-7.
3. Dahrendorf, R. Homo Sociologicus. Available online: https://www.routledge.com/Homo-Sociologicus/Dahrendorf/p/book/9781032196763 (accessed on 25 August 2021).
4. Habermas, J. *Legitimation Crisis*; Beacon Press: Boston, MA, USA, 1976; p. 41.
5. Chilla, T.; Kühne, O.; Weber, F.; Weber, F. "Neopragmatische" Argumente Zur Vereinbarkeit von Konzeptioneller Diskussion und Praxis Der Regionalentwicklung. In *Bausteine der Regionalentwicklung*; Kühne, O., Weber, F., Eds.; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2015; pp. 13–24, ISBN 978-3-658-02881-7.
6. Eckardt, F. *Stadtforschung*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2014; ISBN 978-3-658-00823-9.
7. Kühne, O. Reboot "Regionale Geographie"—Ansätze einer neopragmatischen Rekonfiguration "horizontaler Geographien". *Ber. Geogr. Landeskd.* **2018**, *92*, 101–121.
8. Kühne, O.; Jenal, C. *The Multivillage-Metropolis Baton Rouge: A Neopragmatic Landscape Approach/Olaf Kühne, Corinna Jenal; RaumFragen: Stadt—Region—Landschaf*, 1st ed.; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2020; ISBN 978-3-658-30716-5.
9. United Nations the Paris Agreement | UNFCCC. Available online: https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement (accessed on 22 November 2021).
10. Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung Energiewende. Available online: https://www.bmbf.de/bmbf/de/forschung/energiewende-und-nachhaltiges-wirtschaften/energiewende/energiewende_node.html (accessed on 22 October 2021).
11. Yaron, L. In Glasgow, Bennett Vows to Harness Israeli "Innovation" against Climate Change—Israel News—Haaretz.Com. Available online: https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-in-glasgow-bennett-vows-to-harness-israeli-innovation-against-climate-change-1.10343814 (accessed on 17 November 2021).
12. Bruns, A. Die deutsche Energiewende—Beispiel für eine fundamentale Transition. *Geogr. Rundsch.* **2016**, *68*, 4–11.
13. Hook, S. Energiewende': Von Internationalen Klimaabkommen bis hin zum Deutschen Erneuerbaren-Energien-Gesetz. In *Bausteine der Energiewende*; Kühne, O., Weber, F., Eds.; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2018; pp. 21–54, ISBN 978-3-658-19508-3.
14. Maubach, K.-D. *Energiewende*; 2. Auflage; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2014; ISBN 978-3-658-05473-1.
15. Radtke, J.; Canzler, W. (Eds.) *Energiewende*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2019.
16. Bosch, S. Räumliche Steuerung von Erneuerbare-Energie-Anlagen. Planungsrecht, Wirtschaftlichkeit, Landschaftsästhetik und Partizipation. In *Energiewende*; Becker, S., Klagge, B., Naumann, M., Eds.; Ulmer: Stuttgart, Germany, 2021; pp. 159–170.
17. Bosch, S.; Schwarz, L. The Energy Transition from Plant Operators' Perspective—A Behaviorist Approach. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 1621. [CrossRef]
18. Weber, F.; Kühne, O. Räume unter Strom. *Raumforsch. Und Raumordn.—Spat. Res. Plan.* **2016**, *74*, 323–338. [CrossRef]
19. Weber, F.; Kühne, O. Energiekonflikte im Übertragungsnetzausbau. In *Energiewende*; Becker, S., Klagge, B., Naumann, M., Eds.; Ulmer: Stuttgart, Germany, 2021; pp. 171–181.

20. Kühne, O. Landscape Theories: A Brief Introduction. In *RaumFragen: Stadt—Region—Landschaft*; VS Verlag für SozialwWissenschaften: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2019; ISBN 978-3-658-25490-2.
21. Kühne, O. Landscape Conflicts—A Theoretical Approach Based on the Three Worlds Theory of Karl Popper and the Conflict Theory of Ralf Dahrendorf, Illustrated by the Example of the Energy System Transformation in Germany. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 6772. [CrossRef]
22. Kühne, O.; Weber, F. Conflicts and Negotiation Processes in the Course of Power Grid Extension in Germany. *Landsc. Res.* **2018**, *43*, 529–541. [CrossRef]
23. Becker, S.; Naumann, M. Energiekonflikte erkennen und nutzen. In *Bausteine der Energiewende*; Kühne, O., Weber, F., Eds.; RaumFragen: Stadt—Region—Landschaft; Springer Fachmedien: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2018; pp. 509–522, ISBN 978-3-658-19509-0.
24. Kühne, O. Landscape Conflicts around the Energy Transition in Germany in the Light of Confict Theory and Popper's Three Worlds Theory. In *Oltre la Convenzione. Pensare, Studiare, Costruire il Paesaggio Vent'anni Dopo*; Castiglioni, B., Puttilli, M., Tanca, M., Eds.; Società di Studi Geografici: Firenze, Italy, 2021; pp. 1222–1232, ISBN 978-88-908926-7-7.
25. Kühne, O.; Jenal, C. Was man von hier aus sehen kann. In *Jahrbuch für Naturverträgliche Energiewende 2021*; Kompetenzzentrum Naturschutz und Energiewende KNE, Ed.; Heenemann GmbH & Co. KG: Berlin, Germany, 2021; pp. 102–110.
26. Popper, K.R. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*; Routledge: London, UK, 2002; ISBN 9781280239304.
27. Mannheim, K. Wissenssoziologie. In *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*; Vierkandt, A., Ed.; Enke: Stuttgart, Germany, 1931; pp. 659–680.
28. Mannheim, K. *Ideologie und Utopie*; Schulte-Bulmke: Frankfurt am Main, Germany, 1952.
29. Kühne, O.; Berr, K. *Wissenschaft, Raum, Gesellschaft*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2021.
30. Lakatos, I. Die Geschichte der Wissenschaften und ihre rationalen Rekonstruktionen. In *Kritik und Erkenntnisfortschritt*; Lakatos, I., Musgrave, A., Eds.; Abhandlungen des Internationalen Kolloquiums über die Philosophie der Wissenschaft; Vieweg: Braunschweig, Germany, 1974; pp. 271–312, ISBN 3-528-08333-6.
31. Lakatos, I. Falsifikation und die Methodologie wissenschaftlicher Forschungsprogramme. In *Kritik und Erkenntnis-Fortschritt*; Lakatos, I., Musgrave, A., Eds.; Abhandlungen des Internationalen Kolloquiums über die Philosophie der Wissenschaft; Vieweg: Braunschweig, Germany, 1974; pp. 89–189, ISBN 3-528-08333-6.
32. Popper, K.R. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*; Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, USA, 1994; ISBN 978-0-691-21206-7.
33. Kühne, O.; Koegst, L.; Zimmer, M.-L.; Schäffauer, G. "…Inconceivable, Unrealistic and Inhumane". Internet Communication on the Flood Disaster in West Germany of July 2021 between Conspiracy Theories and Moralization—A Neopragmatic Explorative Study. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 11427. [CrossRef]
34. Kühne, O.; Jenal, C. Baton Rouge (Louisiana): On the Importance of Thematic Cartography for 'Neopragmatic Horizontal Geography'. *KN—J. Cartogr. Geogr. Inf.* **2020**, *71*, 23–32. [CrossRef]
35. Joas, H. Symbolischer Interaktionismus. *Kölner Z. Soziologie Soz.* **1988**, *40*, 417–446.
36. Schubert, H.-J.; Joas, H.; Wenzel, H. *Pragmatismus zur Einführung; Zur Einführung*; Junius Verlag: Hamburg, Germany, 2010; Volume 382, ISBN 3-88506-682-3.
37. Steiner, C. Von Interaktion zu Transaktion. Konsequenzen eines pragmatischen Mensch-Umwelt-Verständnisses. Für eine Geographie der Mitwelt. *Geogr. Helv.* **2014**, *69*, 171–181. [CrossRef]
38. Steiner, C. Pragmatismus—Umwelt—Raum. Available online: https://elibrary.steiner-verlag.de/book/99.105010/9783515108829 (accessed on 22 November 2021).
39. Rorty, R. *Consequences of Pragmatism*; University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, MN, USA, 1982; ISBN 0-8166-1064-9.
40. Rorty, R. *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1991; ISBN 0-521-35369-6.
41. Rorty, R. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*; Reprint; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1997; ISBN 978-0-521-35381-6.
42. Putnam, H. *Renewing Philosophy*; Harvard University Press: Harvard, UK, 1995; ISBN 978-0-674-76094-3.
43. Reese-Schäfer, W. *Richard Rorty zur Einführung*; Junius Verlag: Hamburg, Germany, 2016.
44. Rorty, R. The Contingency of Language. In *Rhetoric in an Antifoundational World. Language, Culture, and Pedagogy*; Bernard-Donals, M.F., Glejzer, R.R., Eds.; Yale University Press: New Haven, CN, USA, 1998; pp. 65–85.
45. Deines, S. *Situierte Kritik*; Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität: Frankfurt a. M., Germany, 2008.
46. Hildebrand, D.L. The Neopragmatist Turn. *Southwest Philos. Rev.* **2003**, *19*, 79–88. [CrossRef]
47. Hildebrand, D.L. Pragmatism, Neopragmatism, and Public Administration. *Adm. Soc.* **2005**, *37*, 345–359. [CrossRef]
48. Müller, M. *Rorty Lesen*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2021.
49. Warms, C.A.; Schroeder, C.A. Bridging the Gulf between Science and Action: The "New Fuzzies" of Neopragmatism. *Adv. Nurs. Sci.* **1999**, *22*, 1–10. [CrossRef]
50. Habermas, J. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*; Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought; MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 1996; ISBN 978-0-262-08243-3.
51. Rorty, R. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1989; ISBN 978-0-521-36781-3.
52. Kersting, P. Geomorphologie, Pragmatismus und integrative Ansätze in der Geographie. *Ber. Dtsch. Landeskd.* **2012**, *86*, 49–65.
53. Steiner, C. Materie Oder Geist?: Überlegungen zur Überwindung dualistischer Erkenntniskonzepte Aus der Perspektive einer Pragmatischen Geographie. *Ber. Dtsch. Landeskd.* **2009**, *84*, 129–142.
54. Weichhart, P. Auf der Suche nach der "dritten Säule". Gibt es Wege von der Rhetorik zur Pragmatik? In *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen Integrativer Forschungsansätze in Physischer Geographie und Humangeographie*; Müller-Mahn, D., Wardenga, U., Eds.; Forum Ifl; Selbstverlag Leibniz-Institut für Länderkunde e.V.: Leipzig, Germany, 2005; pp. 109–136, ISBN 3-86082-053-2.

55. Papadimitriou, F. Modelling and Visualization of Landscape Complexity with Braid Topology. In *Modern Approaches to the Visualization of Landscapes*; Edler, D., Jenal, C., Kühne, O., Eds.; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2020; pp. 79–101.
56. Papadimitriou, F. *Spatial Complexity*; Springer Nature: Cham, Switzerland, 2021; ISBN 978-3-030-59671-2.
57. Fine, A. Der Blickpunkt von Niemand Besonderen. In *Die Renaissance des Pragmatismus. Aktuelle Verflechtungen Zwischen Analytischer und Kontinentaler Philosophie*; Sandbothe, M., Ed.; Velbrück: Weilerswist, Germany, 2000; pp. 59–77, ISBN 978-3-934730-24-3.
58. Flick, U. *Triangulation*; Springer Fachmedien: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2011; ISBN 978-3-531-18125-7.
59. Morse, J.M. Approaches to Qualitative-Quantitative Methodological Triangulation. *Nurs. Res.* **1991**, *40*, 120–123. [CrossRef]
60. Kühne, O.; Jenal, C. *Baton Rouge—The Multivillage Metropolis*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2020.
61. Dahrendorf, R. *Konflikt und Freiheit*; Piper: München, Germany, 1972.
62. Bartos, O.J.; Wehr, P. *Using Conflict Theory*; Illustrated Edition; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2010; ISBN 978-0-521-79446-6.
63. Werke; Marx, K.; Engels, F. (Eds.) *9. Auflage; Unveränderter Nachdruck der 1. Auflage 1958*; Dietz: Berlin, Germany, 1990; Volume 3, ISBN 3-320-00202-3.
64. Simmel, G. *Soziologie*; Duncker & Humblot: Leipzig, Germany, 1908.
65. Parsons, T. *The Social System*; Free Press: Glencoe, UK, 1951.
66. Bourdieu, P. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*; Harvard University Press: Harvard, UK, 1984; ISBN 978-0-674-21277-0.
67. Bourdieu, P. Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociol. Theory* **1989**, *7*, 14–25. [CrossRef]
68. Kühne, O. *Distinktion—Macht—Landschaft*; VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2008.
69. Kühne, O. Die Produktivität von Landschaftskonflikten—Möglichkeiten und Grenzen auf Grundlage der Konflikttheorie Ralf Dahrendorfs. In *Landschaftskonflikte*; Berr, K., Jenal, C., Eds.; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2019; pp. 37–49.
70. Kühne, O.; Berr, K.; Jenal, C.; Schuster, K. *Liberty and Landscape*; Palgrave Macmillan: London, UK, 2021.
71. Kühne, O.; Weber, F.; Berr, K. The Productive Potential and Limits of Landscape Conflicts in Light of Ralf Dahrendorf's Conflict Theory. *Soc. Mutam. Politica* **2019**, *10*, 77–90.
72. Weber, F. Diskurstheoretische Landschaftsforschung. In *Handbuch Landschaft*; Kühne, O., Weber, F., Berr, K., Jenal, C., Eds.; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2019; pp. 105–117.
73. Weber, F.; Kühne, O.; Jenal, C.; Aschenbrand, E.; Artukovic, A. *Sand Im Getriebe*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2018.
74. Dahrendorf, R. Sozialer Konflikt. In *Wörterbuch der Soziologie*; Bernsdorf, W., Ed.; Ferdinand Enke Verlag: Stuttgart, Germany, 1969; pp. 1006–1009.
75. Dahrendorf, R. *Der moderne Soziale Konflikt*; Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt DVA: Stuttgart, Germany, 1992; ISBN 3-421-06539-X.
76. Kühne, O.; Leonardi, L. *Ralf Dahrendorf: Between Social Theory and Political Practice*; Palgrave Macmillan: London, UK, 2020.
77. Dahrendorf, R. Liberalism. In *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*; Eatwell, J., Ed.; Macmillan: London, UK, 1991; pp. 385–389.
78. Dahrendorf, R. Aktive und passive Öffentlichkeit. In *Das Publikum*; Löffler, M., Ed.; C.H. Beck: München, Germany, 1969; pp. 1–12.
79. Dahrendorf, R. *Soziale Klassen und Klassenkonflikt in der Industriellen Gesellschaft*; Enke: Stuttgart, Germany, 1957.
80. Popper, K. Three Worlds. In *Proceedings of the Tanner Lecture on Human Values*; The University of Michigan: Ann Arbor, MI, USA, 1978.
81. Popper, K.; Eccles, J.C. *Das Ich und sein Gehirn*; Piper: München, Germany, 1977.
82. Kühne, O. Die Landschaften 1, 2 und 3 und ihr Wandel. *Berichte. Geogr. Landeskd.* **2018**, *92*, 217–231.
83. Aschenbrand, E. *Die Landschaft des Tourismus: Wie Landschaft von Reiseveranstaltern Inszeniert und von Touristen Konsumiert Wird*; RaumFragen: Stadt—Region—Landschaft; Springer Fachmedien: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2017; ISBN 978-3-658-18429-2.
84. Fontaine, D. *Simulierte Landschaften in der Postmoderne*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2017; ISBN 978-3-658-16446-1.
85. Jenal, C. *"Das Ist Kein Wald, Ihr Pappnasen"—Zur Sozialen Konstruktion von Wald*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2019; ISBN 978-3-658-25713-2.
86. Kühne, O. *Landschaft und Wandel*; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2018.
87. Bues, A. Social Movements against Wind Power in Canada and Germany: Energy Policy and Contention. Available online: https://www.routledge.com/Social-Movements-against-Wind-Power-in-Canada-and-Germany-Energy-Policy/Bues/p/book/9780367439552 (accessed on 9 November 2021).
88. Hasenöhrl, U. Konflikte um Regenerative Energien und Energielandschaften Aus Umwelthistorischer Perspektive. In *Neue Energielandschaften—Neue Perspektiven der Landschaftsforschung*; Gailing, L., Leibenath, M., Eds.; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2013; pp. 79–99, ISBN 978-3-531-19794-4.
89. Kamlage, J.-H.; Drewing, E.; Reinermann, J.L.; Vries, N.; Flores, M. Fighting Fruitfully? Participation and Conflict in the Context of Electricity Grid Extension in Germany. *Util. Policy* **2020**, *64*, 101022. [CrossRef]
90. Kühne, O. Contours of a 'Post-Critical' Cartography—A Contribution to the Dissemination of Sociological Cartographic Research. *KN—J. Cartogr. Geograph. Inf.* **2021**, *71*, 1–9. [CrossRef]
91. O'Neill, J.; Walsh, M. Landscape Conflicts: Preferences, Identities and Rights. *Landsc. Ecol.* **2000**, *15*, 281–289. [CrossRef]
92. Otto, A.; Leibenath, M. Windenergielandschaften als Konfliktfeld. In *Neue Energielandschaften—Neue Perspektiven der Land-Schaftsforschung*; Gailing, L., Leibenath, M., Eds.; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2013; pp. 65–75, ISBN 978-3-531-19794-4.
93. Kühne, O. *Landscape and Power in Geographical Space as a Social-Aesthetic Construct*; Springer International: Cham, Switzerland, 2018.

94. Dahrendorf, R. *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*; Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA, USA, 1959; ISBN 978-0-8047-0561-5.
95. Grau, A. *Hypermoral*, 2nd ed.; Claudius: München, Germany, 2017; ISBN 978-3-532-62803-4.
96. Kühne, O. Vom ‚Bösen' und ‚Guten' in Der Landschaft—Das Problem moralischer Kommunikation im Umgang mit Landschaft und ihren Konflikten. In *Landschaftskonflikte*; Berr, K., Jenal, C., Eds.; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2019; pp. 131–142.
97. Brunnengräber, A. Klimaskeptiker im Aufwind. In *Bausteine der Energiewende*; Kühne, O., Weber, F., Eds.; RaumFragen: Stadt—Region—Landschaft; Springer Fachmedien: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2018; pp. 271–292, ISBN 978-3-658-19509-0.
98. Weber, F.; Jenal, C.; Roßmeier, A.; Kühne, O. Conflicts around Germany's Energiewende: Discourse Patterns of Citizens' Initiatives. *Quaest. Geogr.* **2017**, *36*, 117–130. [CrossRef]
99. Eichenauer, E.; Reusswig, F.; Meyer-Ohlendorf, L.; Lass, W. Bürgerinitiativen gegen Windkraftanlagen und der Aufschwung rechtspopulistischer Bewegungen. In *Bausteine der Energiewende*; Kühne, O., Weber, F., Eds.; Springer VS: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2018; pp. 633–651, ISBN 978-3-658-19508-3.
100. Lewicki, R.; Gray, B.; Elliott, M. *Making Sense of Intractable Environmental Conflicts: Concepts and Cases*; Island Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 2013; ISBN 978-1-61091-287-7.
101. Shmueli, D.; Elliott, M.; Kaufman, S. Frame Changes and the Management of Intractable Conflicts. *Confl. Resolut. Q.* **2006**, *24*, 207–218. [CrossRef]
102. Tannen, D. What's in a Frame? Surface Evidence for Underlying Expectations. In *New Directions in Discourse Processing*; Freedle, R., Ed.; Ablex: Norwood, NJ, USA, 1979; p. 23.
103. Chong, D.; Druckman, J. Framing Theory. *Annu. Rev. Political Sci.* **2007**, *10*, 103–126. [CrossRef]
104. Moore, C.W. *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict*; John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2014; ISBN 978-1-118-30430-3.
105. Goffman, E. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 1974; p. 586, ISBN 978-0-674-31656-0.
106. Davis, C.B.; Lewicki, R.J. Environmental Conflict Resolution: Framing and Intractability—An Introduction. *Environ. Pract.* **2017**, *5*, 200–206. [CrossRef]
107. Shmueli, D.F. Framing in Geographical Analysis of Environmental Conflicts: Theory, Methodology and Three Case Studies. *Geoforum* **2008**, *39*, 2048–2061. [CrossRef]
108. Kaufman, S.; Shmueli, D. Framing in Public Decision Interactions: Transferring Theory to Practice. In *Framing Matters: Perspectives on Negotiation Research and Practice in Communication*; Peter Lang Publishing: Bern, Switzerland, 2011; pp. 167–190.
109. Corbin, J.; Strauss, A. Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons, and Evaluative Criteria. *Qual. Sociol.* **1990**, *13*, 3–21. [CrossRef]