

Social Warfare in the Online Space

*Investigating the emergence of a pro-Ukrainian ideology in an
online discursive community*

Kipras Bajorinas

Student number: s1087486

Supervisor: Lothar Smith

Master Human Geography: Conflicts, Territories and Identities

Radboud University



Faculty of Management

Abstract	2
1. Introduction	3
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Aims and Research Questions	5
1.3 Delimitations and Scope	6
1.4 Structure of the Thesis	6
2. Theorizing Online Warfare	7
2.1 Russia, the Rise of Putin and Ukraine	7
2.2 The rise of a Ukrainian national identity and the origins of its support in the West	11
2.3 Community and consensus building in virtual spaces	12
3. Theoretical Framework	16
3.1 Theoretical Perspectives on Discourse and its Analysis	16
3.2 Conceptual framework	18
3.2.1 Discourse Structures	19
3.2.2 Discourse as Social Action	20
3.2.3 Discourse as a way of negotiating identities	23
3.2.4 Computer-mediated discourse (CMD)	24
3.3 van Dijk's (2006) framework for ideology analysis	26
3.4 Fairclough and Fairclough's (2012) argumentation theory on political discourse	28
3.5 Critical Geopolitics	30
4. Methodology	32
4.1 Critical Discourse Analysis	32
4.2 Reddit as a computer mediated communication platform	34
4.3 Sampling Method	36
4.4 Reflexivity and positionality statements	37
4.5 Method of data analysis with Atlas.ti	39
4.6 Limitations	40
5. Findings and Analysis	41
5.1 Descriptive findings of the comment section community in the daily "r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine"	41
5.2 Ideological Analysis of top comments found in the "r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine"	44
5.2.1 Perceptions of Ukrainian populace, military, and leadership	44
5.2.2 Perceptions of Russian populace, military and leadership	48
5.2.3 The use of News to frame and shape discourse	53
5.2.4 Discussions of the future as avenue to view the community's hopes and fears	54
5.2.5 Conceptions of Geopolitics	56
5.2.6 Use of Historical references, comparisons and analogies to the ongoing war	60
5.2.7 Active participation in the war through online communication	61
6. Suggestions for Further Research and Concluding Remarks	65
References	69
Appendix	76

Abstract

This study conducts a critical discourse analysis of an emerging pro-Ukrainian ideology in the online discursive community of the live discussion threads stickied on the front page of the r/worldnews subreddit on Reddit. Since the full scale invasion of Ukraine, the war is also being fought online. The manner in which popular communities discuss and engage with the war holds ever increasing significance on its potential outcome due to the power of the online space to shape attitudes, values and beliefs and provide a platform to organize action. The analysis of the sample shows that Ukraine as a nation is represented as brave, heroic and resilient, while Russia is conceptualized as a cruel, war-crime committing expansionist fascist state. Such framings are produced through the use of news, history and conceptions of geopolitics, as well as more explicit modes of participating in the larger war effort. The community negotiates its identity as a proactive supporter of Ukraine working towards achieving a Ukrainian military victory. Efforts to determine the effect of such popular discourse on offline behaviour as well as continued mapping of such virtual spaces is suggested, towards the broader goal of informed policymaking in this still unfolding conflict.

Word Count: 199

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Since the beginning of the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine in February of 2022, the warzone of the conflict has not been limited to the battles that take place within the physical landscapes of Ukraine. The war is also well underway in the online space. The more well-published aspect of this cyberwar has been the targeting of key IT services of critical infrastructure that is essential to civilian life. The impact of these types of attacks is rather clear-cut, usually resulting in the temporary disruption of a particular service or a data leak (CyberPeace Institute, 2022). However, I argue that there is a less researched part of this online warzone and it is one that, to varying degrees, we are all part of. The way people read, write and generally engage with the conflict arguably holds more overall power to influence the broader outcomes than the aforementioned localized cyber attacks. The reason for this is that stories and narratives that permeate both within and across groups of people should be considered to be immensely powerful political mechanisms themselves (Hajer, 2002). According to Hajer (2002), the power comes from the ability of a narrative to produce cognitive shifts within a group. When such cognitive shifts take place within a group, their power can be made visible by understanding the process of how discourse, and in turn the mechanisms of its production and reinforcement, can lead to widespread (dis)approval of a particular policy, meaning that the production of a discourse plays an immense role in the (de)legitimization of certain courses of action. Studying discourses can therefore help shed light on phenomena of political, ideological, cognitive and psychological nature. In the context of the war in Ukraine, there are many facets of the conflict that the study of the discourse of online discussions can illuminate. Discourse analysis can provide the framework for understanding the national and in this case perhaps supranational identities involved and their conceptualizations, as well as the processes of 'othering' that take place in the discussions. In turn these national and cultural identities help shape the understanding of the issue at hand or at the very least the desired perception of that understanding, in this case the ongoing war. Furthermore, the process of the emergence of experts and the mechanisms of how the audiences in the online space receive and perceive competing knowledge claims needs much more careful examination (Suurmond, 2005).

One particularly interesting and not much researched aspect of the Russia-Ukraine war so far has been how discourse has evolved and been constructed in online communities since the conflict's full-scale inception. The big tech companies behind the most popular social networking sites are becoming increasingly involved in violent conflicts, both as facilitators of communication to organize action as well as providing platforms that shape users' values and perceptions (Brooks, 2022). Such processes of influencing public opinion by amplifying particular narratives, as well as direct attempts to influence outcomes on the ground should be further explored, due their less than straightforward causal nature that is challenging to pin down, as well as its potential to influence policymakers and the outlook of the international community about the nature of this war and the types of changes to enact (Schappert, 2023).

An especially popular platform on which discussions about the war take place is Reddit. Reddit is a social news platform that dubs itself the 'frontpage of the internet', operating with user submitted content to the site, ranging from links, images, text posts and videos. The popularity of those posts is dependent on how many times they are voted up or down by other users. The posts are categorized by subject in different communities known as 'subreddits'. Depending on the popularity of the subreddit, the submitted content is moderated by other subreddit specific moderators chosen by those communities. There are numerous subreddits dedicated to discussions about the war in Ukraine, however I argue that the most interesting to further examine are subreddits called r/ukraine and r/worldnews. r/ukraine is a community with over 774,000 registered Reddit users, with discussion centering on news and events regarding the Ukrainian conflict, taking a very strong pro-Ukrainian stance. r/worldnews is one of the most popular communities on the site, with over 30,000,000 registered members. While posts are not limited to events in Ukraine, it has had a daily live thread stickied on its front page, ever since the war's inception. It reaches well over 1000 comments a day, with the most popular ones appearing at the top. With such mechanisms in place to moderate content that does not fit the rules of these communities as well as the very nature of most upvoted posts going to the top, it can be argued that every single subreddit produces its own specific type of discourse that reinforces itself, based on the general beliefs and perceptions of intra-subreddit users. Analysing the discursive practices of these communities as well as the manner in which consensus and collective identities are constructed, can shed light on the role of ideology, nationalism, power and democracy illustrating the very dynamic and chaotic nature of this war.

The question of why investigating such a topic is societally and scientifically relevant remains. As mentioned, the power of such discursive online communities is that it is a popular source of information and opinion sharing with a potential to shape public discourse and popularly held opinions. Understanding the ideological frameworks, and narratives of such communities can therefore provide important insights into the processes of how these narratives take shape and are disseminated. Furthermore, the topic of the ongoing war between Russia and Ukraine is a politically sensitive issue with significant geopolitical implications. Firstly, since the inception of the full-scale invasion in February of 2022, the conflict is no longer treated as a regional dispute, but rather increasingly portrayed in global terms, situated in the larger context of the cleavage between Western cultural values of freedom and democracy against an authoritarian and expansionist Russia. Such a change is not only reflected through the increased level of attention that is given to the conflict in English speaking media, but also in the unprecedented outpouring of support for Ukraine in public online forums (Garton Ash et al., 2023). This being a relatively new and still unresolved 'hot' conflict, understanding attitudes and beliefs of online communities active in these spaces can therefore contribute to a larger research effort to help policymakers and other stakeholders to gain insights into the role of perceptions of this conflict and their potential impact on the design, support and outcomes of particular policies. Additionally, the scientific relevance of understanding dynamics of online discourse and ideological expressions can also fill a research gap and contribute to the debates in the field of virtual community and consensus building, further explored in subsection 2.3. Further investigating such processes of discourse production within these contexts of the role of

political communication online can provide a variety of useful implications that inform future research as well as policy.

1.2 Aims and Research Questions

The aim of this study is to explore the discourse concerning the Russo-Ukrainian war of 2022 in online communities. More specifically, the interest of this paper lies in the emergence of a previously obscure pro-Ukrainian ideology in English speaking online communities. The goal is therefore to inductively arrive at a conception of such an ideology through conducting a discourse analysis composed of individual user submissions in the selected sample of online discussion threads. The idea behind this research is based on the assumption that ideological expression, reproduction and acquisition is for the most part, discursive. The properties, structures and functions of ideological formations can therefore be elicited through analysing a particular discursive setting in its broader social context (van Dijk, 2006). Furthermore, people spend an ever increasing amount of time online, with social media use being one of the most popular daily activities for young adults. These social media platforms act as means to receive information, forge communities, and develop identities that then intersect with offline life (Scott et al. 2017). This is especially pertinent when discussing the notion of political influence that arises out of the use of social media in engaging in argumentative rhetoric to articulate and spread an ideology to further legitimize and enact a desired form of change according to the values of a particular individual or group (Engesser et al. 2015; Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012). The daily discussion threads about the developments about the war in Ukraine in the subreddit *r/worldnews* on the social news media aggregation website known as Reddit are deemed to be apt discursive spaces to research these kinds of processes and are therefore selected as the data sample for this paper. This data will therefore aid in answering the following question:

RQ1: How does the process of discourse production in the daily live discussion threads about the war in Ukraine in the r/worldnews subreddit community lead to a pro-Ukrainian ideology and what does it entail?

To help elucidate this ideology, additional questions are posed:

RQ2: In what ways does the use of various discursive structures and tools aid in expressing the representations of the warring sides in the context of the war in Ukraine?

RQ3: What kind of social actions are accomplished and aim to be accomplished by this discourse?

Research questions 2 and 3 are posed for the purpose of aiding the process of answering the main research question, as by inductively arriving at the kinds of representations attributed to the warring parties, as well as the kinds of social actions, such as the negotiating identities or advocacy for a particular outcome, the larger ideological standpoint and framework of the collective online community can become more discernible. Notions of ideology, discourse

structures and social actions are further examined in the discussion of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks in section 3 of this paper.

1.3 Delimitations and Scope

While there are many different platforms and discourses surrounding the war in Ukraine online, this thesis specifically focuses on analyzing discourse of top-rated comments on the live discussion threads on the r/worldnews subreddit on Reddit, largely due to their popularity and ability to reach a wide audience. The study does not cover the processes of discourse production of traditional or other media sources on the conflict and instead focuses on untangling the nuances that make-up the ideological positions that occur within the process of community and consensus building of one specific virtual space.

1.4 Structure of the Thesis

The sections that follow include a chapter revolving the context of the ongoing war between Russia and Ukraine as well as research surrounding community and consensus building in virtual spaces, as such a chapter works as a rationale for the thesis. Subsequently, a theoretical lens that includes an exploration of the necessary theories and concepts to be able to conduct the discourse analysis is set up. Such a framework provides important theories through which the data from the sample is interpreted. Then, the thesis' methodological considerations are presented, followed by the findings and analysis of the selected online community, presented together. The thesis closes with a discussion of the broader implications and suggestions for further research and the concluding remarks. Such a structure of chapters is set up to provide a logical flow of relevant topics throughout this paper.

2. Theorizing Online Warfare

2.1 Russia, the Rise of Putin and Ukraine

In order to be able to understand the emergence of a type of pro-Ukrainian ideology in online communities, it is important to contextualize the conflict and explore the reasons for which it came to being. This can therefore be done by outlining the rise of Putin's authoritarian regime, identifying factors that led to the eventual hostilities between Russia and Ukraine, as well as discussing the ideological justifications and precursors to the full-scale Russian invasion in February of 2022.

The most apt way to begin this discussion would be to bring up the political conditions in the period following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of a Russian Federation. However, a few words must be said about the nature of Russian and Soviet rule and the state that was resurrected largely along the territorial lines of the Russian Empire. Some have attributed the historical trend of Russian expansionism in Europe largely to geographical factors. The most well-known of these proponents is Tim Marshall, who in his book *Prisoners of Geography*, maintains that Russia's flat and vast geography has posed a problem of maintaining power throughout various iterations of its existence (Marshall, 2015). Russia's geography to its East is said to protect it - the cold and vastness of Asian Russia means that an army attacking it from that side would have to be capable of holding a huge territory with stretched out supply lines that would be vulnerable to counter-attacks before even reaching its more wealthy European region west of the Ural mountains. European Russia's history, however, tells a very different story. It is through the North European Plain that Russian existence was threatened in the eyes of Russian leaders. The plain is composed of fertile flatlands that offer an avenue towards Moscow. The control of territories of what is now the Baltic States, Poland and Ukraine were deemed of crucial importance to the security of Moscow, the heart of Russia. It was this perceived vulnerability in the eyes of Russian leadership throughout its history that has created the geopolitical conditions characterised by waves of imperial expansion and collapse.

According to Marshall (2015), the Soviet Union operated with much of the same logic as the states that preceded it. United by a new ideology of socialism, communist Russia emerged with the rhetoric and aim to kickstart a global communist revolution by uniting the workers of the world. In reality, the emergence of the USSR was not a global revolution, but the creation of a state and a system with the aim to govern its subjects with total control at the hands of the very few at the top. While this is an extreme oversimplification of the intricacies and complexity of the Soviet regime, it is in this context that the rise of Vladimir Putin should be understood. Having spent his early professional life in the KGB, an institution with the aforementioned aim to wipe out any perceived threat to Soviet institutions and way of life, it is perhaps not so surprising that the post-Soviet regime of the emerging Russian Federation over which Putin gained control, shared many structural similarities with its predecessor (Marshall, 2015). Masha Gessen's (2012) book *The Man Without a Face: The Unlikely Rise of Vladimir Putin* chronicles such

similarities and the political circumstances and events surrounding them following the collapse of the USSR that led to the consolidation of Putin's autocratic regime starting at the turn of the millennium. Following the adoption of Gorbachev's *perestroika* and *glasnost* policies, Gessen illustrates the exciting and entirely new feeling for the Russian people of being able to more freely express their political positions and engage in discussions that would have previously been met with suppression. It is in this context of an exciting prospect of being able to politically organize in a new way during the period of 1988-91, that the key actors in St. Petersburg's (known as Leningrad at the time) political arena and the emergence of its new democratically elected city council were presented. It was with the election of Anatoly Sobchak to the newly created Congress of People's Deputies of the Soviet Union in 1989 as well as becoming the chairman of the Saint Petersburg city council the following year, that Putin who was appointed as Sobchak's deputy began to use his position in government to amass personal power and increasing influence over the emerging post-Soviet regime. Sobchak, perceived to be a liberal, pro-democracy politician, was a much more conservative figure than his public persona led one to believe. Considered to be part of the old-guard Soviet establishment; he did not believe in the democratic principles that many others in the city council did. This, in conjunction with Putin being an agent of the most powerful anti-democratic state security body in the Soviet Union, the KGB, (known as the FSB following the collapse of USSR), perhaps it should come as no surprise that Sobchak's cabinet would coordinate their efforts to undermine Russia's fledgling democratic institutions.

It is under this context that Gessen continues to provide evidence of the many cases in which Putin undermines democracy and human rights to establish an authoritarian regime characterised by numerous political assassinations and a proclivity for kleptomania or as Gessen more aptly puts pleonexia: '*the insatiable desire to have what rightfully belongs to others*' (Gessen, 2012:202). To understand the invasion of Ukraine and in turn the discourse of resistance in response to it, it is necessary to delve a little deeper into the details of Putin's rule and his internal justifications of both domestic and foreign actions throughout the 21st century. Not moving on from Gessen's text just yet, she brings up a number of specific key events that characterise the nature of Putin's rise to power and subsequent rule. The first of such cases to come to light took place in the office of the mayor of St. Petersburg where Sobchak, with his deputy Putin, were in charge. Putin's role in that department had turned out to be creating kickback schemes, as by entering into largely illegal export contracts of raw materials which the city had plenty of, companies handpicked by Putin would make millions of dollars in commissions. This was one of the blueprints for how Putin was able to consolidate his regime by enriching those loyal to him. While this type of kleptocratic initiatives were to consolidate inward support, outwardly, Putin used the politics of fear to garner widespread support. The dubious circumstances surrounding the 1999 apartment bombings, more specifically the case in Ryazan where FSB officers were arrested by unaware local police for planting explosives in an apartment building and the contradictory explanations by officials that followed subsequently, the preemptive storm on the Moscow theatre hostage crisis in 2002 as well as a similarly strangely early storming by Russian forces of the Beslan school during its siege of 2004 without having exhausted all avenues of negotiation, all resulted in massive casualties which Putin used to drive a hardline rhetoric combined with military action against the perceived enemies of the

Russian state (Gessen, 2012). A picture of Putin's modus operandi therefore emerges - shows of force against the enemy are crucially necessary, and negotiations are a sign of weakness, no matter how open to discussions the adversarial party is (Aron, 2013).

Aside from the numerous cases in which Putin has used the politics of greed and the politics of fear, Gessen does not attempt to identify the ideology that guides the current regime in the Kremlin. It is Tim Snyder (2018) in his work *The Road to Unfreedom: Russia, Europe, America* that delineates the ideological logic that serves as the basis of Putin's rule and foreign policy with special regard for its influence in Ukraine. He discusses the central role and revival of Ivan Ilyin's ideas to Putin and the Russian political class following the collapse of the Soviet Union and into the 2000s. An admirer of the rise of European fascism and its ideals of the 1920s and 30s in Europe, Ilyin conceptualized the Russian nation similarly to his fascist contemporaries of the time - as a type of organism 'of nature and soul' that was without sin. Wherever the powerful reach of Russia extended, it brought 'fraternal union'. He therefore denied the existence of Ukraine as a nation outside this organism, the same way a cell would have no say in its existence as part of a larger composite being. Snyder continues to analyze the ideology of the contemporary Russian regime, maintaining that it is based on the relationship between two core tenets - one of which gives way to the second. The first of these tenets is referred to as the politics of inevitability. The concept can be characterised by the sense that the set up of the current political and social structures makes history move in a predetermined, unavoidable way. When such a discourse takes hold, it evokes a feeling that despite the perceived shortcomings of a particular system, its predetermined nature means that alternatives are not possible and in turn nothing can really be done. Snyder (2018:5-6) provides examples of the discourse of inevitability politics in the European, Soviet and American contexts - the American version maintains that "*nature brought the market, which brought democracy, which brought happiness*". The European version maintains that from history, nations learned that peace is preferable over war, choosing integration as a way to bring about prosperity. Prior to the fall of the USSR, the communist inevitability politics told the story of how technology is an arbiter of social change, causing revolution which then results in utopia. In this discourse, the smaller details and evidence presenting facts contrary to this narrative are ultimately not important, as the system will allow things to inevitably work themselves out for the better. The failure of the communist story further strengthened the discourse of inevitability politics in Europe and the US.

In Russia on the other hand, the failure of the politics of inevitability ushered in what Snyder conceptualizes as the politics of eternity. Eternity politics "*places one nation at the center of a cyclic story of victimhood*" (Snyder, 2018:6). This conception of geopolitics and in turn, the resulting role of government as a response to geopolitics, no longer promises the inevitability of a better future that is to come, but instead focuses on the idea of the presence of resurgent threats from the past in which the nation in question has always been a victim of. The politicians that attempt to further eternity politics maintain that the role of government is not about helping society, but rather protecting its subjects against threats. Crises are manufactured with the aim of pulling at the emotions of their intended audiences as a way to distract them from their reluctance to reform. Factuality, be it of history or current affairs, is as a result actively dismissed

and discouraged in favor of narratives of perpetual threats, with threats originating from the outside being particularly useful, as they distract from discussion about turmoil domestically. The intended effect of this is to make other ideas unthinkable within this discourse, the assault on factuality by politics of eternity is a prime example. In Russia, factuality, something that is seen to be valued in the West, is characterised to be hypocritical as all politicians lie. Therefore lying constantly and obviously in the name of furthering Russia's goals makes it more virtuous than the selfish and devious politicians of the west. When the value of factuality in a society erodes, it therefore presents an avenue for citizens to carry doubt over everything, making alternatives beyond the current Russian system unviable, in turn making favorable domestic change untenable, meanwhile uniting the political class against the named enemy. The more pertinent example of this to this paper can be the Ukrainian joke about the 2014 invasion of Crimea - Putin's denial of the invasion contrasted with the presence of unmarked masked military men in Ukraine sporting Russian military equipment gave the military forces the name of 'little green men' as a way to point out the ridiculousness of the Russian lie, jokingly implying that these men appeared out of thin air (Reeves and Wallace, 2015). Snyder (2018) points out that acceptance of such obvious fictions not only unifies its subjects domestically, but also allows them to show loyalty to the Kremlin. The subsequent goal of eternity politics is to proclaim innocence. The logic behind invasion is the same no matter which instance of it is being discussed, whether it be Chechnya, Georgia or Ukraine. It is understood not as a country invading another, challenging its territorial sovereignty, but rather as a move aimed to protect and liberate what is part of the 'Russian world' against a global, homosexual, neoliberal conspiracy that is attacking Russian traditional values. Putin's own admission that the collapse of the Soviet Union was the 'greatest geopolitical disaster of our time' (Toal, 2017) is an example of using a framing of history to its own aims, as the Russian story about its victorious fight against Nazism in the Second World War in the psyche of its citizens allowed them to redefine the term Nazi to mean anyone that goes against Russia's foreign policy goals. The moment Ukraine decided to turn towards Europe in 2014, Russian media elites led by Putin, in their own logic conceptualized this as a red line and had no choice but to respond to the Western neo-nazi conspiracy to impose its liberal values on traditional, innocent society of the Russian world and reverse the disastrous collapse of its former empire. The proclamation of innocence contrasted with the threat of the depraved Western influence allowed for these internationally condemned manifestations of foreign policy to be framed as justified responses, gaining domestic legitimacy of Putin's regime in the Kremlin. The result of this ideological reformulation of affairs in Putin's Russia led to the consolidation of a type of ironic brand of fascism, which Snyder calls schizofascism - one that flips its original meanings on its head, the 'fascist' is now anyone who can be considered an outsider, in the name of anti-fascism it aligned itself with known fascists all the while putting efforts into its own imperial expansion. It no longer has much to do with the original meaning of the term, but rather used as a means to define the enemy (Snyder, 2018).

Both the politics of inevitability and eternity speak to the inherently powerful nature embedded within discourse and narration. The understanding of Russia's expression of geopolitical power through Snyder's exploration of its ideological lens lends further credence to the notion that the spread of particular kind of discursive framing of various issues through a

multiplicity of communication channels directly translates into real, lived and territorial changes of the balance of power on the ground. Further analysis of a framing and ideology that is directly and firmly opposed to the one described above can therefore further the larger academic effort to understand the emerging discourse, its antagonistic relationship to another discourse and the resulting human geographic changes on the ground as an effect.

2.2 The rise of a Ukrainian national identity and the origins of its support in the West

To more aptly situate the study and its larger geopolitical context, an examination of the formation of Ukraine's national identity as well as the origins of its transnational support is necessary. The reason for the necessity of such an exploration is that an understanding of the logic of a Ukrainian national movement that fundamentally clashes with the Russian one allows for the underlying core framings of both sides to be better illustrated, as well as contextualize the roots for Western support for Ukraine. The sample for this study can therefore be conceived as simply a continuation of such support from a popular standpoint.

While discussing the history of the origins of a Ukrainian national movement in a comprehensive manner is well beyond the scope of this thesis, it is important to highlight the main narratives of contemporary Ukrainian nationalistic discourse. Kiryukhin (2015), singles out three major consecutive narratives by proponents of the post-Soviet Ukrainian national project. The central message of the first narrative just after the collapse of the USSR was that of emphasizing the revival of Ukraine, and the necessity to spread the Ukrainian language. Such a focus on language, national traditions and culture framed Russia as the 'other' rather than an adversary at this stage. The second, subsequent narrative that became predominant is of Ukraine as a country enslaved by Russia, with its people as victims of a totalitarian regime. The key focus of this narrative is the opposition to Russia and identification with Europe as a way to return back to the humanitarian culture to which Ukraine used to belong. Finally, this narrative evolved into a third, and currently the most common kind of Ukrainian nationalism according to Kiryukhin. This iteration of a Ukrainian national storyline centered around fighting against the enemy, related to both to domestic issues of disillusionment against the political and cultural elite, as well as external ones centering on issues of ethnicity, in turn highlighting the struggles of ethnic Ukrainians. While of course this being a rather severe oversimplification of the complex dynamics of the evolution of a developing Ukrainian national identity after independence, it is under these conditions of nationalist discourse, combined with the conflict of identities that has continually affected both the Russian and Ukrainian speaking diaspora in Ukraine that Kiryukhin argues that the events of Euromaidan, annexation of Crimea and the subsequent absolute breakdown of Russo-Ukrainian relations should be viewed. Wilson (2015) emphasizes that Ukraine's underlying pluralism characterised by divisions along lines of ethnicity, language and religion, have been exacerbated by Ukrainian politicians to stay in power. Combined with an evolving strength of Ukrainian civil society, these national storylines were able to unite Ukraine to look Westward which together with a resistance to these developments by the parties that backed Russian objectives, caused Ukraine to descend into violence.

The question of how the Ukraine story has been told in western media remains. It is especially pertinent to this study as the origins or transnational retellings of events in Ukraine have arguably influenced perceptions of the geopolitics of the region and can therefore be considered as a precursor to the evolving discourse of support for Ukraine in the online community that is the sample for this study. Dyczok (2015) therefore provides an apt summary of how Ukraine's crisis in 2014 was covered by western media. Not to mention the impact of the Russian information warfare, there were a number of varying and competing narratives within western media's coverage of the Euromaidan protests and the subsequent regime change and Russian annexation of Crimea. Two core representations of the Euromaidan Protests dominated the reporting - the first was that of Ukrainians' brave and willing commitment to face riot police in peacefully taking a pro-European side. The other framing of these developments focused on a portrayal of a divided Ukraine between its East that preferred closer relations with Russia and its pro-European West. Dyczok points out that the shortcomings of international coverage were related to attributing the causes of violence as well as the fact that protests occurred in different parts of Ukraine that transcended the East-West divide. With regard to the ousting of Yanukovich and annexation of Crimea, international reporting focused on questions of legitimacy, while the confusion of the Russian annexation of Crimea, had meant that the framing of the story lacked clarity and credence was given both to the pro-Russian and pro-Ukrainian perspectives. While it is challenging to assess the impact of this reporting on public opinion worldwide, Dyczok suggests that the normative rules of reporting in presenting all sides of the story may have gone against the goal of providing an accurate picture of what is truly happening. With attention given to utterances such as 'persecution of ethnic Russians' and 'referendum', they are likely to remain in the minds of the media consumers.

While such discussions are important to illustrate the history of predominance and competition of such narratives, it is obvious that such conclusions are rather outdated when bearing in mind the recent developments of the inception of a full-scale war. It would not be a stretch to assume that the discourse since then has become much more radicalised since 2014, with discursive communities pushing their narratives with much more conviction, especially in the context of online discussions where the aforementioned normative rules of objective reporting to portray standpoints of both sides are not present and where multiple perspectives from individuals without institutional loyalties can be visible. The investigation of the characteristics and dynamics of such a pro-Ukrainian transnational online community is therefore an effort that can provide valuable insights into the current and evolved ideological demands from one of the warring sides.

2.3 Community and consensus building in virtual spaces

At the center of the issues this paper deals with, lie the notions and processes of community and consensus building in virtual spaces, providing another realm for actors and other stakeholders to make their presence known. The literature on this topic with a discussion on the variety of implications that arise out of the proliferation of these spaces should therefore

be examined, as a way to contextualize and situate the scientific and societal relevance of this thesis.

Digital social media platforms of varying types such as discussion boards, social networking sites and online community groups, with Reddit having adopted facets of the listed three, have been noted to allow for facilitating contact spaces of a global-local orientation. This orientation facilitated by computer-mediated communication (CMC) works to construct virtual third cultures in what in a movement referred to as virtual cosmopolitanism (McEwan and Sobre-Denton, 2011). While the definition and discussions of cosmopolitanism as a concept are far too wide-ranging across multiple disciplines for the scope of this paper, it can broadly be thought of as a general notion of a community beyond simple the boundaries of a particular locality and “*an ethical and philosophical framework through which we may envision human and mediated intercultural communication for a more humane world*” (Sobre-Denton and Bardhan, 2013:174). The virtual dimension highlights the aspect of its mediation through social spaces facilitated by way of CMCs, suggesting that transnational ideas, cultural and social capital is transmitted more rapidly and freely than by corporeal cosmopolitanism (McEwan and Sobre-Denton, 2011). Within these virtual social spaces, the more particular point of interest lies in their ability to discursively co-construct what is referred to as third or hybridized cultures. These intercultural and trans-local spaces are therefore the realms in which grassroots activism, aspirations towards social justice and consciousness-raising efforts can take place, where new, unique communities with shared goals, values, ways of (inter)acting are built, arising as larger collectives than the the sum of their individual parts such as its individual members or submissions. The research on virtual cosmopolitanism has therefore argued that it can provide the linkages in the global/local dichotomy in the context of transnational and trans-local social movements in an ever technologically increasing and globalizing world (Sobre-Denton, 2015).

The research on virtual cosmopolitanism builds upon a larger tradition in the scholarship of intercultural communication and cultural geography in studying the role and impact of new media and the unique new spaces for social contact it offers in the transformation of interactions across as well as between cultures. Pfister and Soliz (2011) summarize the core changes in the (re)conceptualization of digitally networked communication. The example of the use of digital media in the coordination of protests such as the Orange Revolution of 2004-5 in Ukraine, illuminated the power of citizens to communicate directly with each other and affect affairs outside the online realm. This meant that this new media shaped the (re)conceptualization of intercultural communication by; enabling communication without strict institutional gatekeepers; offering new spaces for such interaction for individuals sharing some common ground; facilitating a change of scale of communication from few-to-few to many-to-many, blending dialogue and dissemination; and democratizing the way in which individuals represent themselves rather than being represented.

To further understand the reconsiderations of the binary approach to the global/local dimensions in the context of globalization, Appadurai's (1990;1996) concepts of global cultural flows and its five dimensions or 'scapes' are perhaps even more relevant than when they were first conceptualized. The most relevant of these scapes to the research of this paper are the

concepts of technoscapes, mediascapes and ideoscapes. Technoscapes refer to the flow and spread of technology and its technical know-how across previously impermeable boundaries. These technoscapes give way to mediascapes and ideoscapes. Mediascapes therefore refer to the spread of the capabilities to electronically produce and disseminate information to and from an increasingly large groups of interests across the world. They take shape in the form of narrative and/or image, based accounts of reality, producing and disseminating imaginaries of the lives of others as well as their own. These constituted narratives then shape ways of thinking and in turn action towards desired future states of being. Ideoscapes are a closely adjacent concept, with focus on the spread of ideas, more specifically of those having to do with ideologies of states and counter-ideologies of social movements aiming to empower themselves. These ideoscapes are said to be closely related to the Enlightenment notions of freedom, welfare, rights, sovereignty, representation and a master-narrative of democracy and its values. The extent to which these terms are distorted both semantically and pragmatically across different polities by their political actors and their audiences according to their goals, requires careful analysis of the specific contextual conventions they are being used in. In turn, Appadurai notes that the analyses of such conventions require the question of what types of communicative genres govern the collective perceptions of different types of text, as the receptiveness of one genre over another determine the shape of the various ideoscapes in different national and trans-national contexts.

The discussion regarding ideoscapes and their shape in different contexts brings up another salient point of interest regarding the question of the scales at which to think about these notions of global cultural flows. Appadurai (1996), notes that these flows are deterritorialized, illustrating that these global 'landscapes' he talks about are no longer tied to specific localities, in turn affecting and changing the cultural dynamics of specific diaspora. This then begs the key question of how does the role of the nation, defined as groups with ideas of nationhood factor into this? The discussions and analyses concerning Appadurai's five 'scapes' as well as the cultivation of cosmopolitanism in intercultural communication, tend to highlight the rise of transnational flows. Transnationalism is therefore portrayed as generally positive, at least in the context of the transfer of social capital towards generating cross-cultural connections between communities and acting as the bridge between the global and the local to generate norms of reciprocity, trustworthiness and attitudes of openness towards the Other, as some of the positive impacts of a globalizing world (Sobre-Denton and Bardhan, 2013; Hall, 2018; Appadurai, 1996). For Appadurai (1996:21;158), the nation-state is entering what he called a "*terminal crisis*" suggesting that "*we need to think ourselves beyond the nation*". As deterritorialized populations become incompletely nationalized in a process of transnational reconfiguration and splintering, elements of steps towards a postnational order and imaginary can be evident for those that wish to see the demise of the nation state, as a postnational order might better fit the now malaligned globalized web of transnational and intercultural populations contrasted with the aim of homogeneity of the nation-state.

With consideration of the discussion above, the question then becomes - How does the study of the case of Ukraine through an analysis of a pro-Ukrainian discourse on Reddit fit into this field of scholarly literature? Firstly, let us address the question and implications of how this

virtual, English-speaking community deals with the concept of the nation in the context of the Ukrainian plight. Here, again the question of scale becomes relevant as the analysis of ideology within discourse can illustrate whether the narratives take form at the scales of national, transnational, regional, postnational or perhaps even re-national terms. A hypothesis could be made that because of the intensity of the opposition between the Russian and Ukrainian sides within the discourse, Appadurai's hopes of a postnational order may not be as evident within the master-narrative of this specific case. This study would therefore illustrate at least a part of the ideoscapes of the online discourse about war in Ukraine, reinforcing Hull and Stornaiuolo's (2010:86) point that exploring "*capacities for creatively and adaptively making and sharing meanings across modes and media, for imagining others and for other imagining us [...], for negotiating meaning and interpretations across divergent cultural, linguistic, geographic and ideological landscapes both on- and offline*" are especially crucial in the negotiations of a complex and dynamic world. The findings may also even challenge some of the findings in the aforementioned literature, especially Pfister and Soliz's (2011) point that the democratization of representation in digital media has led to a less stereotypical or at the very least a more diverse representation of the Other, as the same hypothesis of an intensified discourse as a result of the onset of war may have swung the master-narrative in the opposite direction. The aim of this study in elucidating a pro-Ukrainian ideology on Reddit as a way to illustrate the birth of a hybridized online culture is therefore both scientifically and societally relevant, as the degree to which it conforms with the conclusions made within scholarship of intercultural communication and cultural geography can fill at least some of the research gap with new findings. Therefore, the question whether the online community under investigation in this study fits the criteria of a virtual cosmopolitan movement and the potential implications of its translation into the offline world can only be answered by taking a closer look at the discursive ideological formations of these online discussion threads.

3. Theoretical Framework

As this paper centers around the exploration and analysis of the discourse of online communities, it is necessary to set up a framework and the lens through which this analysis in this context can be conducted. The first part of the theoretical framework will explore the theory and debates concerning discourse and its analysis, the second part will develop a conceptual framework of the relevant concepts for analysis, the third part of the discussion centers around the theory of ideology and the implications for research, the fourth part will describe how the theory of argumentation factors into analyses of political discourse, finally with the fifth section engaging with the theory of critical geopolitics, a tool that can be employed to help in dealing with discursive data that revolve around geopolitical topics. Key theoretical concepts necessary in the process of setting up the methodology as well as in the interpretation of the findings are introduced.

3.1 Theoretical Perspectives on Discourse and its Analysis

Before being able to delve further into the discussion of the conceptual and theoretical details that concern this paper's research, it is important to first explore the perspectives on what constitutes discourse and what makes up its analysis. When talking about discourse, it is likely that the most common connotation associated with it is that of language and of communication, and in turn discourse becomes perceived as a type of communication. From this association, Gee (1999), points out the problem with the prevalent assumption of many people who take language to be as a tool for the exchange of information. The function of language is one that is much more multi-dimensional than this simple assumption. Instead, Gee points out that language serves two primary purposes - to support and enact the performance of social actions as well as to support the processes of 'human affiliation' within cultures, social groups and institutions. This conception of language as a sociocultural practice and resource called for a new approach in the study of language that went beyond analysis at the sentence level, independent of the non-linguistic context (Waring, 2018). This emergent approach of the study of discourse takes up a wide variety of different forms, backed by a number of theoretical underpinnings, making specific definitions and concepts within discourse and its analysis notoriously challenging to pin down. It is therefore useful to continue the discussion that concerns itself with identifying the relevant theoretical assumptions and approaches to the analysis of discourse, as it will allow this paper to provide a working definition of discourse and in turn its analysis.

The approach to the study of discourse as a way to explore language as a social practice that integrates meaning, that is ways of informing, performing actions and being by way of negotiating identities are backed by long standing ontological and epistemological positions around the nature of scientific reality (Gee, 2011). The debate between realism and relativism in the ontology of social science illustrates the general relativist leaning of most discourse analysts. The relativist position is that reality is a construction of the human mind, no one truth exists and instead it is dependent on a particular individual's context and cultural surroundings

that shape it. It is generally juxtaposed with the idea that one true reality, independent of the human experience, exists with people's capacity to describe and explain it changing over time (Moon and Blackman, 2014). By ascribing value to the role of social norms, emotions, culture and personal experience in shaping reality and decision making, researchers who hold some kind of relativist positions will logically shape their research designs according to their philosophical positions by focusing on individuals' belief systems to understand the framing of their world view. Similarly, the epistemological questions of how we generate and acquire knowledge position the study of discourse somewhere in opposition to the objectivist idea that there exists an objective, true reality which can be empirically verified. The two main epistemological stances in opposition to this notion are therefore constructionism - the idea that all knowledge comes into being through human engagement and interpretation of the world, therefore meaning is not inherent to an object, but rather requires a consciousness to impose it (Crotty, 1998), and subjectivism - the idea that what knowledge is, is entirely dependent on people's perception and understanding of reality. These ideas are valuable for research, as constructionist research allows to generate contextual understandings of phenomena, while subjectivist research provides insights into the process of how experiences shape perceptions which in turn affect behaviour on both the individual as well as the group level (Moon and Blackman, 2014). The justification and aims of this study are therefore shaped by these philosophical assumptions about reality, as taking a largely relativist ontological stance and an epistemological notion that stresses the importance of the roles of human interaction and perceptions in shaping the values, beliefs and identities about the war in Ukraine in online forum communities will allow for the discourse analysis to locate the relevant findings.

On the other hand, the relativist and social constructionist ontological/epistemological positions adopted by discourse analysts provide them with other issues, Burr (1998), produces an overview of such issues. To accept the idea that there is no such thing as an ultimate truth brings in a dilemma of how to choose between existing alternative points of view. How, in the attempt to give voice to the oppressed, do we choose who is the oppressed and marginalised, if the world is composed of separate discursive 'bubbles' and truth exists in all of them, separately? The value-laden nature of analysing discourse presents another problem on top of this moral relativist dilemma. If subjectivity, combined with our conscious experience constitutes what is real, the world is therefore textual and discursive, as the moment one discusses a reality outside of language, it becomes a discursive issue concerning the linguistic representations of events - describing it is therefore impossible. The scholarly perspectives in response to these dilemmas have significant implications for the production of this paper. In response to the impossibility of language to describe a reality outside discourse, Potter (1998) suggests that this question of subjectivity versus objectivity can be suspended, and efforts should be focused on the manner in which discourses are constructed and their effects and accomplishments as a result, as the realist/relativist debates of the nature of reality are actually far removed from local decision making in political practices. Functions of ideology can therefore be highlighted regardless. Secondly, locating action with the individual as a source of agency should be criticised, as in doing so separates it from its societal influence. Instead, Potter suggests that it is more favorable to re-locate agency within the interactional realm, as reality is constructed by inter-personal relations. It is this notion that emphasizes the role of interaction in discourse that

the theoretical framework of this paper is based on, as Fairclough and Fairclough's (2012) conceptualization of discourse as argumentation links talk and text and decision making. The model will be discussed in more detail below. Finally, the response to the relativist moral dilemma has to be addressed. Burr (1998) concludes by stressing the importance of values in making moral and political choices. She looks to pragmatism as a potential way to mitigate the effects of the impossibility of stepping outside our own value systems, as we still retain our ability to critically explore them and make informed judgements based on our knowledge of the social realities. It is by reflexively acknowledging and accepting the culturally bounded nature of our values that allows a basis to call for one alternative over another.

Having touched upon some of the philosophical underpinnings and debates regarding the study of discourse, it is appropriate to return back to the question of its definition. As mentioned, the sociocultural turn of studying the use of language effectively expanded the concept of discourse to include particular beliefs, values, symbols, actions and interactions as resources that are combined with the use of language to enact a type of identity that is socially recognizable (Gee, 2011). Considering the impact of this turn in the conceptualization of discourse, Waring (2018:8), defines discourse as “*the actual use of language along with other multi-modal resources to accomplish actions, negotiate identities and construct ideologies*”. Her definition will therefore be adopted for the purpose of this paper. She continues to discuss what analysis of discourse entails, with analysis involving making close observations and connections, deconstructing, categorizing, evaluating and uncovering the meanings within, arriving at the definition of discourse analysis as: “*the close reading of actual use of language along with other multimodal resources for the purpose of dissecting its structures and devising its meanings*” (Waring, 2018:9). This definition is appropriate for the purpose of this study, although perhaps slightly incomplete, as it does not include the ‘critical’ turn of discourse analysis and its implications. This is described in section 4.1 when discussing Critical Discourse Analysis.

Now that these core concepts have been defined, it is time to turn to further engaging with the definition of discourse analysis and examine what is involved in engaging with a *close reading* when actually conducting discourse analysis. The next section will therefore contain an exploration of relevant concepts within discourse analysis, as an understanding of them will allow for the identification of which variables, constructs, tools of inquiry and their emerging interrelationships are likely to be the most meaningful in the data collection and the data analysis sections of this research paper (Miles et al., 2014).

3.2 Conceptual framework

As with most ways of doing any type of analysis, analytic work involves deconstruction of phenomena into some kind of analytic categories. The unique characteristic of discourse analyses is that there is a wide variety of approaches to doing them, depending on the stated research topics, aims, and questions. Each approach emerges and is composed out of the academic efforts that came prior in the discursive analyses aimed at exploring the concept of

meaning. Meaning can be interpreted as the “*integration of ways of saying (informing), doing (action) and being (identity), and grammar as a set of tools to bring about this integration*” (Gee, 2011:8). Therefore, producing an overview of analytical tools and concepts that have been used in discourse analyses will not only make clear what the researcher is paying extra attention to in the process of data analysis, but also aid with familiarity of such concepts for the readers. It must be mentioned, however, that the conceptual framework will not delve far into analytical concepts of talk and non-verbal conduct, as the aim and scope of this paper deals mostly with the analysis of textual sources. This overview will largely follow the topical structure of Waring’s (2018) book - beginning with the examination of the structures of discourse, continuing with discussing discourse as part of social actions, then exploring the role of discourse in negotiating identities, finally arriving at the relationship between discourse and its role in the emergence of ideology.

3.2.1 Discourse Structures

Van Dijk’s (1980) seminal work suggests a way in which textual structures can be examined. He introduces the concept of a macrostructure of a text, essentially a type of structure entailing the text’s larger meaning, topic and theme. They are used to be able to systematically elicit and make note of the essential core information of a particular discourse within a specific text. Their expression usually takes form in summaries, conclusions or short topical sentences that represent the overall meaning of the text (Gee, 2011:138). To be able to elicit a macrostructure out of a text, four general rules can be applied to the text. The first step, deletion, involves a process of eliminating the information deemed to be irrelevant in generating a macroproposition of the text. The second step, selection, is a process of selecting the relevant information in the generation of the macroproposition. Then, the process of generalization involves developing a proposition extracted from the text’s details to make it more general. The last step of construction refers to the substitution of local propositions with a general one that describes a more stereotypical statement or frame for the discourse under investigation (Waring, 2018:46). Using this concept of macrostructure can therefore be particularly useful in producing an ideological analysis of a discursive community, such as online discussion forums about the war in Ukraine. On the other hand, however, the nature of interaction within online communities means that the produced texts tend to be rather short, suggesting that there are not many microstructures such as lines and stanzas within it. In turn, the macrostructure of a particular online thread can be interpreted as the general collective message composed of multiple individual user submissions.

Another tool that plays a key role in being able to understand the makeup of discourse structures is the use of grammar. According to Mithun (2015) grammar provides speakers (in this paper, speakers will refer to the producers of discourse in text) with tools that allow for varied packaging of information. This packaging is dependent on the larger context the discourse is situated in and the particular grammatical choices therefore require an understanding of factors such as presumed knowledge base of the discursive community, as well as the speaker’s social and communicative goals. While grammatical analysis is an entire academic field of study and describing it would fall beyond the scope of this paper, instead the key point to keep in mind is that factors such as word choice, punctuation, sentence structure

and its coherence contribute greatly to the production of discourse and the shaping of its structures to meet their producers' needs. Ignoring these would harm the quality of the analysis and it is therefore crucial for the researcher to pay careful attention to the grammatical makeup of the selected units of analysis. Grammatical units are also theorized to organize interaction, as they are essential in the process of understanding what is being said and how and when to respond within participants that interact (Waring, 2018). While the role of interaction in discourse is discussed in the following subsection, making this emphasis here is key, as recognizing the role of grammar in the process of interacting makes it especially important in the context of researching online social news platforms, where engaging and responding to the participants' submissions is seen as the core tenet of how such networks are designed.

The study of genre is also a notable field of study to approach the question of discourse structure. Waring (2018:61) defines genre as "*text types used to achieve certain communicative purposes in a way that is recognizable and acceptable for other members of a given discourse community*". In turn, the concept of discourse communities or as Wenger (1998) refers to them as communities of practice are communities with a sustained pursuit of generally agreed upon goals. They are bound by three core dimensions - mutual engagement, a joint enterprise and a shared repertoire. The first dimension, mutual engagement, stresses the interactional role of discursive communities, as meanings of doing are negotiated through the engagement between their members. Out of these constant, diverse and complex interactions and negotiations between the participants, arises a general consensus of a joint enterprise. This enterprise is not simply a stated aim to be achieved, but it also generates a network to enact relations of mutual accountability among participants to engage in discursive practices to achieve this goal, in spite of the factors beyond their power to influence them directly. The third characteristic of Wenger's (1998:83) communities of practice is a shared repertoire - it includes "*routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions or concepts*" specific to the discursive productions that emerge in these communities. The notions of genre and communities of practice are therefore particularly useful in the research context of online discussions regarding the war in Ukraine, as by identifying the types of genres that exist within these online discussion forums, combined with the inquiry into the particularities of negotiations within the dimensions of mutual engagement, joint enterprise and a shared repertoire, a picture of the discursive mechanisms producing a pro-Ukrainian ideology with its stated goals can emerge. This in turn, will aid with the aim to link the gap between macro level analyses of groups and social structures with micro-level analyses that focus on individual interaction within discourse (van Dijk, 1995).

3.2.2 Discourse as Social Action

The discussion regarding genre already touched upon the core theoretical tenet of conceptualizing discourse - it arises in interaction and is one of the means through which social actions can be accomplished (Bazerman, 2012). Within discourse analysis, social action can be defined as "*the business that gets done or the goal that gets accomplished in and through talk, text and multimodal resources*" (Waring, 2018:77). This approach to looking at discourse through the lens of social accomplishments allows for the exploration of the hidden or less

visible dimensions of discourse, as by accomplishing social actions with the use of language, there is more meaning than simply the words being uttered. One theory that maintains this view of language as more than straightforward representations is the speech act theory. According to Sbisà (2009), it posits that utterances should be viewed as acts, therefore producing words and sentences are seen as speech acts being performed. By this token, three categories of speech act are distinguished - the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. The locutionary act is the act of simply uttering something, illocutionary act does something along with the utterance, for example ordering, informing, or complaining, while the perlocutionary act produces some sort of discernable effect on the reader/listener of the discourse as a result of the utterance (Waring, 2018). Concepts to help deduce whether such speech acts are successful in their intent are also offered. The key to the functioning of speech acts is intent - the concept of infelicities refers to situations where intent is not recognized within the speech act, based on the encoded rules within a particular discursive context (Medina, 2007). The key value of speech act theory in analyzing discourse is the idea that researchers should be aware of analysing more than simply the words that are being said, but also take into account the intention of the impact of utterances on the reader.

The idea that meaning does not straightforwardly lie within the utterances of a discourse meant that other conceptual tools to decode contextual meanings of discursive productions had to be introduced. Gee's (2011) notion of situated meanings exemplifies that the use of particular language forms (such as words and sentences) can take on specific and therefore situated meanings depending on the contexts they use. Many examples are given, however one can illuminate this through the hypothetical discussion about the use of the word 'Russia'. In an elementary geographical educational context, the word Russia can simply refer to the territory delineated on a map, while in a context of war from a Ukrainian perspective, it would be unsurprising that the word 'Russia' would be conceptually referred to as the enemy. The key point Gee makes in introducing the concept of situated meaning is that discourse analysts should study closely the context in which that text is situated and helps to create, as by simply examining the products of the text without 'zooming out' would harm the analysis in its aim to capture the meaning of a particular discourse. On the other hand, a validity issue arises out of such analyses of situated meaning. If the contextual lens can be widened indefinitely, there remains a possibility of the context to be always expanded to alter the interpretation of the things being said. This is a problem, but it could also be used as a tool, as once one keeps 'zooming out' but the interpretation remains the same, then analytical claims can be made (Gee, 2011).

The notion of situated meaning therefore invokes the necessity to bring an adjacent concept of frames into the framework. The concept of frames are useful in placing social actions to a larger discursive context. Frames therefore invoke specific knowledge schemas among interlocutors that lead them to interpret a situation in a particular way (Gordon, 2015). Frames can therefore be understood as the definitions of a situation or as the "*metamessage[s] that give us instructions of how to understand the message inside the frame*" (Waring, 2018:95). Framing operates through constructions of "footings", or alignments expressed in the manner of the production or reception of an utterance. For example a change in the topical footing in the

context of an undercover police officer talking about drugs as entertainment would change the framing of the conversation as casual as opposed to one with the aim to gather intelligence (Gordon, 2015). Framing therefore opens up an avenue to explore the multifaceted and extremely diverse ways of how people make sense of everyday interactions, as the frames that are brought into an interaction shapes both its process and its outcome (Marks, 2012). Not only that, the way stories are framed has a significant impact on public support for policies, indicating that such a discursive tool can be a powerful way to influence understandings and interpretations of the information being presented with implications for political outcomes (Chong and Druckman, 2007).

Having brought up the notion of framing raises a question of how do discourse participants know which kind of frame to use in interpreting a discursive production? The framing of specific interactions is shaped by knowledge of other, past interactions (Gordon, 2015). To tackle this issue of what kinds of past interactions are significant in the analysis of discourse, the concept of intertextuality is useful. Hodges' (2015) overview of the origins of the term refers to it as a permutation of texts, as any text involves the absorption and reconfiguration of another to align it with a new discursive setting. Two key dimensions of intertextuality are described - horizontal and vertical. Horizontal intertextuality involves a speaker responding to utterances made by another, building a dialogic relationship between texts where prior remarks drive the direction of the interaction, although it does not necessarily have to be a dialogue, but can also involve the response to, for example, a speech or other discursive production that took place outside the setting in which the intertextual response is produced. The second dimension is known as vertical intertextuality, referring to the relations of a text to others as part of a larger category of texts. Both dimensions of intertextuality are relevant to the research efforts of this paper. The horizontal dimension is a useful concept in analyzing the interactions between individual user submissions in online social news platforms where such interactions drive the discussion about the war in Ukraine in a particular discursive direction. The vertical dimension helps to bridge the gap between individual submissions and the emergence of a larger set of ideological beliefs shared by a group and also illuminate the conflictual relationship between discourse that does not hold the pro-Ukrainian values in the context of the war.

How does knowledge of prior texts then enter into new settings? The process of (re)contextualization involves the use of any sign to invoke contextual presuppositions to interpret a piece of discourse. These presuppositions are thought of as sociocultural assumptions that determine the interpretative frameworks in an interaction (Waring, 2018). Based on existing extra-textual knowledge, meaning is therefore disambiguated through selecting, rejecting and moulding from which the appropriated contextual inferences can be made (Jaspers, 2012).

The concepts of situated meaning, intertextuality and its processes of (re)contextualization are key concepts in the analysis of online social news media discourse due to its highly interactional nature and engagement with sources and texts that originate outside the discourse community that is being studied to generate new meanings and aims in response,

accomplishing a great variety of social actions (Herring and Androutsopoulos, 2015). It is therefore time to turn attention to the discursive effects of a particular type of social action - the negotiation of identities.

3.2.3 Discourse as a way of negotiating identities

The idea that identities can be negotiated rests on the constructionist assumption that they are never static and are always in a state of flux, open to be influenced and altered (Benwell and Stoke, 2006). Identities are therefore not referred to as some essential and unchangeable way to represent oneself, but rather an identity is a different way of being at different times for various purposes (Gee, 2011). For example, the language used in producing an academic text is significantly different than for example the text used in casual online chat environments, due to the different identities that are being taken on by the speaker in discourse production. Not only do speakers take on identities themselves, they are also attributed or imposed on others through interaction and negotiation through explicit and implicit comparisons between interlocutors, as for example taking on a racist identity would be impossible without imposing an identity of inferiority on others. The key social action that is accomplished through the negotiations of identity is the manner in which discourse participants display themselves and others to each other (Gee, 2011). Waring (2018) examines the three broad categories of identity - universal, social and interactional. Universal identities are ones that hold up when transferred across contexts; they refer to factors of identity that are outside one's personal achievements and social control. The categories of social and interactional identities are more pertinent to this paper. Social identities address the relationship between the construction of these identities and social groups. Gee (2000) further categorizes the types of social identities - institution-identity refers to identity set up by an authority within an institution, while an affinity-identity involves representation of shared experiences that bring groups together. One interesting example of an institution-identity in the Ukrainian context could be the lived experiences of civilians as opposed to members of the military. Exploring the affinity identities that emerge from the analysis of the sample, can not only exemplify the different types of affinity identities such as the overall experience of the war or for example surviving a more localized attack, but also illuminate on the processes which construct them.

The construction of these social identities can be systematically analysed through the adoption of three core concepts - membership categorization, performed social identity and stance. An identity can be displayed through a membership category that holds specific rules to be applied in order to be considered a member of that group (Schegloff, 2007). Schegloff notes that these categories come with related 'commonsense' knowledge, while the knowledge that goes against the established 'commonsense' norms, they are treated as exceptions. The membership categories also include social acts that are bound to the particular category in question. These are therefore used in the performance of social identity in interaction. Waring (2018) therefore defines such performed social identity as the participant attributes made relevant in an interaction, while co-membership refers to attributes commonly shared by a group that tend to be commonly invoked while interacting. While membership categorization and performed social identity focus on the use and relevance of social identities in interaction, The

theory of social act and stances examines the construction of such identities. Social act refers to “*recognized, goal-oriented behaviour*” while a stance involves the “*display of socially recognized point of view*” (Waring, 2018: 142-3). The use of these three tools can help in understanding the relationships between the constructions of these identities as well as the intended aims to accomplish relevant to the war in Ukraine, as part of the discursive negotiations to legitimize and advocate for particular types of policy all the while considering the social and cultural specifics of this context.

Interactional identities focus on the negotiations of social identities that happen in interaction where roles of both speaker and listener are shuffled around (Waring, 2018). Gee’s (2000) third type of identity along the aforementioned affinity and institutional identities is referred to as the discourse-identities. It involves the emergence of an identity within a discourse based on an individual’s trait that becomes socially recognized through interaction. In the context of online forum interaction about war in Ukraine, a particularly interesting phenomena that the notion of discourse-identity allows to investigate is the rise of expertise discourse and particular individuals who emerge as expert authority figures on the state of the war and the inherent power that reputation brings along in legitimizing one’s opinions as more factual than others (Sprain and Reinig, 2017; van Dijk, 2015).

Finally, the theory of positioning involves a discursive process in which participants in “*jointly produced storylines*” locate themselves (Waring, 2018:148). The self becomes located in interactions and narratives of lived experiences, positioning can therefore be interactive where a position becomes attributed onto others or reflexive where a interlocutor locates themselves (Gordon, 2015). The positioning of discourse participants in Reddit communities that deal with discussions of the Russo-Ukrainian war can provide insights into the processes of their relations with other members of the discourse but also towards attitudes and people within various strata of Russian society, as part of a larger emerging ideology.

3.2.4 Computer-mediated discourse (CMD)

The literature of concepts discussed so far, however, tended to focus on discourse before the advent of digital social communication platforms. While discourse still operates under the same principles, there are also a number of significant differences that must be noted in the context of analysing discourse since the advent of the online social media platforms. Herring and Androustopoulos (2015) use the term Computer-mediated discourse (CMD) to refer to communication and interaction through transmission of messages via any digital communication device. The nature of CMD is largely dependent on the technical features embedded within the digital communication platform that is being analysed. While the initial characteristics of computer-mediated communication (CMC) remained mostly textual, the advent of what is called as Web 2.0 expanded many of its features, therefore providing an even richer context in which to analyse the interactional relationships between discourse and socially shared practices. Web 2.0 is a term to define a set of popular online platforms that are characterised by user generated content as well as features to facilitate social interaction (Herring, 2012). The participatory nature of such platforms brings about new types of: language such as specific lingo particular to

a specific internet community, content such comment threads, sharing, likes and also new contexts such as communities based on geographic location in multiple languages. The rise of such platforms has been met with enthusiasm that such a participatory nature of user generated content will lead to a decentralised and democratised discourse previously unseen in the conventional institutional discursive settings, giving power to the individuals to choose the type of content to consume, and in turn affect social practices from a bottom-up rather than a top-down approach. This enthusiasm, however, has faced some criticism, suggesting that the platforms still engage in a variety of strategies to enact top-down control, be it in the name of profits in a capitalist system or for example to induce a discursive effect to create for example a type of desired image of the brand (Ritzer and Jurgenson, 2010). Such strategies to control the visibility of information based on notions of relevance and expected meaningfulness within the technical features of these platforms need to be accounted for in the analyses of CMD, as they have significant impacts on the outcomes on public political discourses, especially when such features are to a large extent unavailable to the general public (Gillespie, 2014). Despite such promises of democracy and equality within the digital new media, the aforementioned subtle ways the software and web features point the user toward a particular (inter)action can be considered to be inherently ideological and therefore a discursive space to enforce the unequal power relations to set the proverbial rules of the game (Jones, Chik and Hafner, 2015).

Furthermore, community specific elements of control such as the use of assigned moderators to moderate content makes specific users much more powerful in their ability to shape the direction of discourse and social action than other users. The concept of legitimization in discourse as a justification of a behaviour that seeks the approval and support of the interlocutors enacted by argumentation holds significant implications that arise out of these processes (Reyes, 2011). Both mechanisms of the invisible top-down control of the visibility of content by the platform itself and community specific content moderation enables a range of acceptable speech with anything outside it becoming deemed as illegitimate and is abruptly removed from being visible. Such a process bypasses the important role of argumentation within legitimization, as undesired posts are simply removed. All the while, the perception of participatory and democratic productions of discourse within these spaces remains, despite the powerful impacts and seemingly anti-democratic nature of these processes. On the other hand, the proliferation of social media has led to the creation of new, grass-root discursive spaces where the balance of power has shifted towards engagements among the populace rather than assigned institutional authorities (Kelsey and Bennet, 2014; Khosravinik, 2017; Khosravinik and Zia, 2014). In turn, the negotiations of identities, ideologies and social actions within this space of acceptable range of legitimate discourse is nonetheless interesting and worth researching, as one could theorize that it is out of such past negotiations that criteria for acceptable discourse arise, suggesting that current negotiations lay the groundwork for moderation in the future.

This conceptual framework has therefore attempted to illuminate key concepts of discourse analysis that should be in the mind of the researcher when going through the steps involved in carrying out the methodology of this study, as the described concepts are effective tools that can aid in systematically breaking down the complex web of discursive productions

and interactions that take place on Reddit discussions on the war in Ukraine. The following sections will therefore set up key theoretical frameworks through which analysis will be done. The subsequent subsection will involve a closer look at the concept of ideology located in discourse and van Dijk's (1995) framework to analyse it, continuing with Fairclough and Fairclough's (2012) conceptualization of political discourse as argumentation and its ability to bridge the theoretical gap between discourse and impact on policy, finally concluding with explaining how the theory of Critical Geopolitics will aid in dealing with geopolitical statements within the data in a critical and systematic manner.

3.3 van Dijk's (2006) framework for ideology analysis

The conceptual framework has defined and discussed concepts involved in analysing discourse and a picture of its multi-faceted and complex nature emerges. These tools and concepts can therefore aid in the effort to elucidate the various factors and processes involved in the make-up of ideology embedded within discourse. Due to this central role attributed to ideology in the setting up of the theoretical framework for this study, the first question that should be tackled is the definitional one. The academic saturation of works concerning ideology naturally makes the question of its definition not a straightforward one. Waring's (2018:181) definition of ideology as "*a manner or the content of thinking characteristic of an individual, group or culture*" is a good starting point, but still not satisfying enough when discussed in the context of its relationship with the production of discourse as it leaves out the impact of the social ideological practices. Van Dijk (2006:115), attempts to theorize ideology by taking it a step further from simply conceptualizing it as ideas or the content of thinking by defining it as "*systems of ideas [that] are sociocognitively defined as shared representations of social groups and more specifically 'axiomatic' principles of such representations*". To be able to employ this as the working definition in this framework, a breakdown of its meaning and underlying assumptions is necessary. The core assumption by van Dijk's works on ideology is that ideologies and how people express, reproduce and acquire them takes place for the most part in text and talk (van Dijk, 1998). The definition combines three central components embedded within the notion of ideology - the social, cognitive and discursive that come together as the sociocognitive representations shared by social groups. The caveat that adds emphasis on axiomatic principles separates ideology from other types of socially shared beliefs, as ideologies through the minds of its adherents, have the capacity to control, organize and shape attitudes towards other socially shared beliefs (van Dijk, 2006). Ideologies can therefore be thought of as foundational social beliefs that guide attitudes and actions according to shared principal cultural values and norms. The emphasis on socially shared beliefs as part of an ideology is derived from the idea that the same way there cannot be a private, individual language, a private and individual ideology is also difficult to conceptualize due to the significant roles of interaction, communication and negotiations among communities of social actors taken up in the emergence of an ideology (van Dijk, 2006). Discussions about ideology should therefore place a high value in the role of groups in producing shaping and reinforcing commonly held attitudes.

Van Dijk's (1995) seminal framework for analysing ideological expressions in discourse has been influential. The following discussion will therefore further examine van Dijk's multidisciplinary conception of ideology as being composed of the three aforementioned components, its ramifications for doing discourse analysis within this framework and the implications of adopting it to the context of discourse about the Russo-Ukrainian war on Reddit. Conceptualizing ideology as an interface between the cognitive mental representations and processes of group members and the social positions and interests of the groups at large allows for a crucial link to emerge that closes the gap between the macrolevel analyses of social groups, formations and structures with microlevels of analysis involving everyday interaction between participants of particular discourse communities. This framework can therefore aid in inductively elucidating the ideology that emerges out of situated interactions within these discursive communities of practice in the context of the war in Ukraine. Not only that, it can also illuminate on how ideology influences social actions of discourse participants and whether there is evidence for these interactions affecting the situation on the ground outside of simply the implications of textual productions. It would be difficult to make the claim that the selected sample of Reddit communities is the source of production for this ideology (largely due to the key role of invisible past sociocultural knowledge of participants in the make-up of ideological negotiations), it should be rather thought of as a public site for its expression. Van Dijk continues to make the claim that part of the social cognitive systems of mental representations among group members are highly socio-cultural knowledge shared by the discursive group. In the case of English speaking communities about the war on Reddit, a particularly interesting question arises about the kinds of socio-cultural assumptions commonly shared about Ukraine, Russia and the situation as a whole, as the discussions tend to be directed at a more international audience than Ukrainians specifically.

One bit of contention with van Dijk's framework arises out of his statement that ideology formation involves gradual and long-term processes of socialization. On the other hand, a perspective on radicalisation in the digital era shows that in extreme environments, one of them being war, ideological formation can take place much faster than previously thought (Behr et al. 2013). Therefore individual accounts in the context of the experience of violent conflict in Ukraine could therefore provide evidence for rapid changes in the value-laden statements of these discursive communities as a response to unfavorable developments in the conflict. The extent to which this can be supported by evidence from this study will be discussed in the data analysis.

Ideologies are assumed to maintain control of the group's identity, tasks, goals, values, norms, position and resources (van Dijk, 1995). Due to ideologies operating in a self-serving manner from the point of view of the group, they work to eliminate threats by the Others that work against the core values, goals, tasks and norms of a particular group. In the case of Ukraine, this process of othering is therefore an avenue to see what systems of ideas the pro-Ukrainian ideology found in Reddit threads prioritizes. Issues such as representations of the Russian military and population, the overall aims of the group, criteria for membership (who is with us, who is with them), discussions about protection of in-group resources, position of the group in regards to other groups such as for example nations that support or go against Ukraine, are expressed in the selected sample of Reddit Ukraine war discussion threads.

The next point to consider is the issue of how to make sense of the variation between different personal cognitions and interpretations of ideological attitudes. Van Dijk (1995) conceptualizes these individual mental representations of people's realities as models. They are personal, interpretations of experiences and events that are usually performed through narratives and storylines. Therefore, models combined with the contextually-bound applications of information in the social realm can link the gap not only between the aforementioned macro and micro levels of analyses but also how group ideologies come into being out of single pieces of text and talk. The analysis of online discussion threads are in turn a very fitting way to investigate this phenomenon. Due to the uniquely personal nature of describing and interpreting discourse participants' own lived experiences as well as them being part of different social groups, variation is clearly inevitable, but it is in finding the commonalities in assumptions about the world amongst individuals in a specific group that an ideology becomes evident. Van Dijk's final point in describing the theory behind his framework for analysis states that ideologies should not be reduced to being defined solely with regard to the social practices under their control, nor to their discursive expressions and (re)productions or their institutional locations in which they proliferate. Therefore, the approach in this paper will instead conceptualize ideology as an emerging property out of the combination of these three factors.

3.4 Fairclough and Fairclough's (2012) argumentation theory on political discourse

In their book, Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) aim to introduce a new approach for the analysis of political discourse within the realm of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Central to the CDA approach is the notion of power which is discussed in more detail in section 4.1. The need for a new approach stems from the failure of past analyses of political discourse to acknowledge that political discourse is fundamentally argumentative and chiefly involves practical argumentation. Before being able to go on, definitions of some of these terms are required. A discourse that is political involves a central role given to action and concerns itself with the question of *what to do?* Politics is therefore theorized as making choices on how to act in response to specific circumstances based on the aims and values of political actors in question. This conception allows for a theoretical linkage between analyses of political discourse that tend to put the notion of representations at the center, as this linkage can aid in using mental representations found within discourse to provide premises in the arguments for action. In turn, the analysis of political discourse is attached closely to political actors such as individuals, political organizations and institutions that are in some way involved in political processes and events. Therefore, as already mentioned the specific contexts attached to these processes and actors is of key importance in understanding political discourse, as these adjacent contexts allow actors to exercise their agency in ways that empower them to act and influence affairs of shared interest. While the most obvious example of this phenomenon takes

place in highly institutionalized settings such as parliamentary speeches, Fairclough and Fairclough note that it also takes place in the less institutionalized contexts such as online discussion threads where citizens engage in but are not limited to criticising their governments or specific policies for their failures to meet their commitments and responsibilities. Such discussions therefore implicitly and explicitly provide reasons for action.

To be able to expand more on the mechanisms through which political discourse provides reasons for action, an account of Fairclough and Fairclough's incorporation of argumentation theory into their framework is necessary. In a setting where a range of perspectives can be expressed, argumentation in politics is said to undergo a process of deliberation - a collective consideration of differing viewpoints in a context of both disagreement as well as incomplete information about what decision to take. The process of deliberation, perceived rationality and justification for a particular decision that arises, makes it more legitimate in the eyes of political actors. The conceptualization of political discourse as being primarily part of a practical argumentation means that political actors, that is anyone who engages in political discourse, engage in practical reasoning about what should be done and what consequences the action may lead to. The practical argument is therefore structured based on the actor's values, goals, circumstances and means-goal reasoning to finally arrive at a claim for action. To break this down, values refer to the agent's core concerns and what should be of importance to the agent. Out of these values, a goal arises towards a future that matches the agent's values. This goal can only be conceivable with regard to the circumstances such as the agent's context of action as well as a reasoning of the means to achieve the goal, for example an expectation that if the agent does X, it will get him closer to the goal. Finally, the argumentative claim can be made that the agent ought to do a particular action. This does not suggest that all productions of text and talk will flow comfortably according to all of these steps within the framework, but rather they can be pieces that form part of the larger structure of the argument.

Such an approach to analysing political discourse has a variety of significant implications for this study. First of all, the idea that analysis should focus on how discourses as ways of representing a constructed reality provide reasons for action, illustrates that discourse of online forums are inherently powerful with regard to their ability to spur action, suggesting that this research is societally relevant. Secondly, the integration of this framework means that analysis of even non-argumentative genres found in the sample such as narratives, explanations, as well as metaphors, ways of representing and identity making are actually part of the premises of the arguments they are embedded in. It therefore accounts for their political significance in influencing outcomes outside their immediate discursive setting. Thirdly, the framework aids in analysing crises such as war, as Zizek (2009) emphasized that the outcome of crises depends highly on the manner in which they are symbolized and what kind of ideological interpretation, story or narrative wins over in the process of its negotiation and shapes its general perception. Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) continue this line of thinking in maintaining that crises therefore create an arena for competition between proposed strategies to intervene and solve them. The interventions that win over the alternatives depend on the struggles within discourse on the nature of their causes, gravity and (re)solutions as well as

imaginaries of future states of affairs. This point can therefore represent a justification of the research in this paper as with the onset of a crisis as grave as war, narratives begin to compete. Therefore, Reddit discussion threads about the war in Ukraine are therefore an apt site to analyse such competition and negotiation of acceptable imaginaries through which to continuously characterise, describe and engage in through talk and calls for action. Discourse production in these processes of negotiation, especially when concerning recently activated crisis frames, can provide a lot of insight into which types of representations, identities and narratives emerge as dominant within the English speaking online communities concerned with developments in Ukraine. Detailed knowledge of these emergent legitimated discursive structures can therefore provide evidence for the ways in which they can affect political processes and in this specific case, perhaps even changes on the battlefield itself.

3.5 Critical Geopolitics

Finally, in analysing discourse about war in Ukraine, there is the question of how to address discursive productions of a geopolitical nature. Toal (1999; 2005) produces accounts of the critique of the study of geopolitics and of the reconceptualizations of the field of study that followed as a result in what is now referred to as Critical Geopolitics. The crux of the critique of orthodox geopolitics is that it operates 'from above' in the effort to conceptualize and theorize the practice of statecraft. That is, intellectuals of statecraft refused to see their own positionality and role in affecting the very relations of power they were attempting to describe and analyze. As Toal and Agnew (1992:194) put it: "*simply to describe a foreign policy is to engage in Geopolitics, for one is implicitly and tacitly normalizing a particular world*", therefore placing anyone who engages with the discourse of geopolitics by nature part of its power politics. The reconceptualization of the field with a critical turn, has therefore derived from the Foucauldian premise that geography is a discourse and in turn a form of power. From this, the critical turn within geopolitics reconceptualized it as a "*discursive practice in which intellectuals of statecraft spatialize international politics as a way to represent a world characterized by particular types of places, peoples and dramas*", with intellectuals of statecraft referring to anyone who concern themselves with the everyday conduct of foreign policy (Toal, 2005:46). Critical geopolitics therefore seeks to expose the roles of power within politics and its perceived role with geography by explaining how political actors use and by doing so reinforce geographical assumptions in the spatialization of international politics in representing a 'world' (Kuus, 2010). The discursive conceptualization of the field therefore lends itself to the analysis of discourse as the optimal manner in which to examine the constitution of spatial identities, the creation of particular images and stereotypes of spaces and in turn how these perceptions affect the process of legitimizing specific political decisions in accordance with the emerging values and norms of a group.

For research purposes Toal (1999) further divides the field of critical geopolitics into four further subfields of formal, practical, popular and structural geopolitics. The most relevant of these subfields for the purposes of this research paper are practical and popular geopolitics. Practical geopolitics is concerned with how common understandings and perceptions of

geography influence the conceptualizations of foreign policy and other political decision making practices. Popular geopolitics refers to how geographical politics is shaped within the various media in popular culture, that is the variety of socially constructed and perpetuated notions of national, and transnational understandings of territories and peoples both within and outside the relevant borders. The common thread between these two genres of critical geopolitics and their relevance to this research paper is that their reasoning deals with ordinary and informally everyday discourse, with assumptions of a general feeling of 'common sense' that is disseminated in media in popular culture. Therefore, the use of critical geopolitics as a tool to deconstruct and make visible the spread and persistence of practical and popular geopolitical conceptions in popular culture makes it relevant not only by contributing to this field of political and human geography, but also to the field of policy making, as it makes strategic thinking acknowledge the powerful role of cultural constructions and perceptions of places. This is especially pertinent in the global information age as strategic value of a place can be transformed through global media technologies like CMCs. Investigation of the case of online discourse on the war in Ukraine on Reddit can therefore be further augmented by adopting the lens of Critical geopolitics.

Traditionally, at this stage a conceptual model would be presented here to draw out the relationships that are particularly relevant to this study. However, there is an argument to be made that such a model may harm the inductive, grounded theory approach taken in this research, as having a preconceived notions of how the different key concepts that have been laid out above relate to each other within the discourse may in turn pre-emptively bias the analysis of how an ideology emerges out of a sum of individual contributions.

4. Methodology

The previous section covered the core theoretical assumptions and perspectives on the analysis of discourse and ideology, as well as defined key concepts that are valuable not only for understanding the diversity and linkages between different aspects within discourse but also in facilitating the interpretation of the findings. It is also important to reiterate that the two particular lenses of van Dijk (2006) and Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) discussed in the previous chapter are key perspectives that help approach the data. Van Dijk's theory of ideological analysis helps establish notions of ideology while the theory of argumentation helps situate these notions that arise out of discursive productions under investigation in the broader arguments they tend to be embedded in. The following section will therefore provide more detail about the research design and the methodological approach taken, starting with a justification for the adoption of Critical Discourse Analysis, followed by a description of the platform Reddit from which the sample was taken as well as the method of data collection itself and concluding with the researcher's statements on reflexivity and positionality as well as a discussion of the methodological limitations.

4.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

The adoption of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) for this research endeavor can be justified through discussion of the concepts it primarily engages with. While not a strict methodological approach, its principles guide it, as CDA focuses on the interdisciplinary problem-oriented relationships between concepts such as but not limited to discourse and relations of power, ideologies, social institutions and identities (Fairclough, 2015). This critical turn in the analysis of discourse means that CDA not only describes these relationships and realities but also explains and normatively evaluates them in their critique. Being critical also refers to the researcher being able to stay at arms length from the statements in that data, that is being able not to take it for granted and uncovering the less obvious and visible connections between the various discursive aspects of the constructed realities of the social realm, with special regard to revelations on the construction and negotiation of power relations (Waring, 2018; Mayr, 2015). CDA can therefore enable the researcher to pay attention to all levels and dimensions of discourse, making any methodological approach viable as long as it is appropriate to the investigation of the denoted social issue (van Dijk, 1995b). According to Wodak (2001), all CDA involves engaging with two of its indispensable notions - power and ideology. While the notion of ideology has been discussed in section 3.3, an additional point that should be made in the context of doing CDA, is that the study of ideology can be seen as a way to look into unequal power relations in a society. Due to the aforementioned assumption that discourse arises out of a composition of countless individual discursive productions in interaction out of which ideology is an emergent property, the individual is therefore heavily involved in this realization of power relations. Wodak continues to stress the point that no text is the work of a single individual, and their productions are determined by the differences in the power between individuals in the negotiation through interactions by language. Expressions and manipulation of power is therefore done through the use of language which can be analytically

illuminated not only through close engagement with grammatical forms but also through the control of the social circumstances through genre and other concepts described in section 3.2.

This notion of powerful control of text and context of discourse together with its intended purposes and effects is further explored in van Dijk's (2015) text. Referring back to the gap between macro and micro level analyses mentioned in section 3.3, power and dominance of and within discourse tends to be related to the macro levels of social organization and structures, however in the context of everyday interaction, the power of dominant groups is integrated in legislation, rules norms, habits and attitudes meaning that they often deductively seep into the micro-level and the two levels become unified and can be evident in the analysis of individual everyday discursive productions. In the case of the war in Ukraine, one example of this could be that a comment that outlines a shortcoming in the military operations in Ukraine is part of the discourse at the interactional micro-level, but at the macro-level it could be a way of supporting and arguing for legislation and policy towards increased funding for the Ukrainian military forces. The second key point van Dijk makes in the discussion concerning explicating the notion of power within CDA is that it can be conceptualized as a tool for control. He maintains that groups hold power if they are able to control the acts and minds of both ingroup and outgroup members. The type of power that is relevant to the case of this paper is therefore persuasive power, as it deals with engaging with information, taken for granted knowledge, opinions and perspectives on politics aimed to change the mind of the audience toward a particular direction, which at the macro level can in turn lead to the legitimization of particular sets of actions and policies outside the immediate discursive group under scrutiny. Power in terms of control of the minds of recipients of discourse is more likely to be achieved if the producers of discourse are perceived as trustworthy, authoritative or credible. Therefore, control over genre, speech acts as well as topics and change of topic and what gets said and left out is of particular interest for analysing the different properties of the communicative situation.

Much of the traditional literature about CDA and the studies that adopt this approach tend to focus on analyses of established institutions and elites such as the big name news outlets or speeches of politicians in parliament who are seen as shapers of public opinions and in turn policy (Wodak, 2001; Scollon, 2001; Teo, 2000; Wodak and Reisigl, 2015). Discussions about power in these analyses therefore tend to center around the ability to place specific individuals in these key institutional positions as authors or authorities that produce particular types of discourse that are then reproduced and assimilated into the mental models in the minds of their recipients. When studying the relatively new phenomenon of online social news media, where it is up to the users themselves to post and discuss content, with the most upvoted posts and comments rising to the top, the discussions about power are bound to be different from the analyses of more conventional outlets for discourse production. Khosravini's (2017) delineation of implications for critical discourse studies of social media is relevant here. The roles of social media are described as disruptive, providing a previously unseen avenue of intersection between interpersonal and mass communication, as in such platforms users produce, compile content while at the same time perform interpersonal communication at a mass scale all the while responding to both user generated as well as the more traditional forms of content. The lines between producers and recipients of texts have been blurred, the traditional directionality

of one producer to many recipients is therefore disrupted with a multiplicity of producers and recipients. While this is brought up in 3.2.4, this is important to bring up in the context of CDA, since the impacts of this on power relations are significant, as the ability of mass media to push content onto an audience is being replaced with a more decentralised and participatory direction in mass communication. Power in such participatory online platforms takes up a variety of previously unaccounted for forms such as likes, hyperlinks, sharing and above all the algorithm that determines the visibility of a post. Therefore, while the main principles of power in a CDA perspective remain, it is important for the researcher to consider the findings in a wider context while also taking into account the previously unaccounted for dynamics of power within the technical properties of such participatory online platforms on top of the original perspectives of power in discourse.

4.2 Reddit as a computer mediated communication platform

As already stated in the introduction chapter, Reddit is the chosen platform from which the data sample to investigate the ideological notions that emerge out of the discourse regarding the war in Ukraine will be taken. The reasons for this have been explained in 3.2.4 as it comfortably fits into the mold of Web 2.0 CMCs where user generated content combined with social media features provide a particularly interesting space to study the various elements of ideological and identity negotiation of political discourse among specific discourse communities that share a common interest. Due to the aforementioned issues regarding notions of power and control embedded within the design of such platforms, the specifics of what Reddit is and how it functions should be described and discussed.

Reddit is a social news aggregation and discussion website with more than 50 million unique daily active users, and over 100,000 active different communities known as subreddits (Reddit, 2021a), making it the 9th most visited website in the world (Semrush, 2022). It has been a site of multiple, often controversial events with them impacting social phenomena outside of its immediate setting such as the case of mistaken identity in the search of the Boston bomber, the coordinated effort to cause a short-squeeze of the Gamestop stock as well as its political influence in the 2016 US presidential campaigns of Bernie Sanders and Donald Trump (Volpp, 2015; Mancini et al., 2022; Mills, 2017). Reddit is composed of user-generated content that includes links, videos, photos and text-based posts with each post having a discussion board attached to it. Each piece of content is posted to a specific subreddit, a space for discussion on a particular topic subject. This content is accessible publicly without needing to be a registered user, with an exception of a small number of private subreddits. To be able to post and participate in discussions, a user, also known as a "Redditor " has to be registered. To become a user, all that is needed is selecting a unique username and password without a requirement for email verification, meaning that a majority of the interactions that take place are anonymous. Although, due to the fact that all previous platform-wide participation history is visible on the user's profile information, discussions of potentially sensitive and stigmatizing topics are done through anonymous "throwaway" accounts so that the personal details of the

user through its account history cannot be identified, meaning that the same person can have multiple accounts on the platform (Ammari et al, 2019).

Discussions on Reddit are organized topically, based on the general rules and criteria set by the creators and moderators of each subreddit with a general exception of platform wide rules as part of the site's content policy. These include rules against harrasment, bullying threats of violence, revealing other's private information, all illegal activity as well as general restrictions on activity that interferes with normal use of Reddit such as various deceptive manners of content manipulation (Reddit, 2022a). Visibility of posts and discussion comments are determined by a voting system. Redditors who like a post or comment, find them interesting or wish to make them more visible will click an up arrow (upvote) or if they dislike them, find them irrelevant to the subreddit and want to make them less visible will click a down arrow (downvote) (Anderson, 2015). Each user can sort the category of post by Best, Top, Hot, New, and Rising, with comment sorting having additional categories of Old, Q&A and Controversial all based on the ratio of upvotes to downvotes. The Top category is posts and comments with the most upvotes from a specified time range; Hot is content that is gaining popularity rapidly; Rising indicates a similar phenomenon but at a slower rate than Hot; Controversial signifies a similar ratio of upvotes and downvotes to show contention within subreddit communities; New and Old sort content by their recency, while Q&A shows comments to which the original poster has responded to (Anderson, 2015). The Best sort category uses a machine learning algorithm developed by Reddit with the goal of providing the most relevant content that takes into account various aspects of each Redditor's usage of the platform such as but not limited to upvotes, community subscriptions, recently visited communities, post age, topics of interest and general location (Reddit, 2021b). Each time a user's posts and comments get upvoted, their account receives a "karma" point, while every downvote takes one away. Karma points are used as a reputation system to indicate the poster's history of providing relevant, useful, interesting or generally desired content among the subreddits (Anders, 2015;). There is also an award system where users can pay money to gift other posters and commenters a silver, gold or platinum award, meaning that an icon of the corresponding award will show up next to the awarded post or comment, as a way to "*award exemplary posts or comments*", although they do not affect their visibility (Reddit, 2022b).

Due to its popularity, influence, and a large amount of diverse and readily available topical data based on the characteristics of its subreddit communities, Reddit has been used as a data source for a wide variety of research endeavors. A systematic literature review by Proferes et al. (2021) has found that 727 peer reviewed research studies have been used from 2010 to May of 2020. Out of such a wide variety of research, a number of methodological and ethical implications for using Reddit as a data source arise that should be considered. Firstly, due to the anonymity embedded within the structure of the site, obtaining demographic information has proven to be challenging, although the Reddit's administrators have claimed that the site's users generally skew young and male, with 58% of redditors being 18-34 years of age and 57% are male (Reddit 2021c). These numbers, however, are platform wide, meaning that demographics of research from data from a specific subreddit are unavailable. This suggests limits in terms of generalizability of data outside of the Reddit context. Secondly,

research that uses Reddit to gather data should aim to account for the potential impacts the platform's structure itself on its findings. This is in part due to the way sorting and in turn visibility of posts and comments works on the platform, as it may drive particular conversational patterns, as for example the posts that are the most visible tend to have content that is more witty, agreeable or provoking to garner attention and discussion and in turn making it a tool for amplifying rhetorical arguments (Proferes et al. 2021; Shepherd, 2020).

There are also a number of perspectives to consider regarding the ethics of doing research with the Reddit dataset. While Reddit's terms of service do not prohibit data collection (Reddit 2021d), there are also other criteria to be considered for ethical online research. The biggest points of concern are the privacy and consent of the subjects of analysis. In the context of discussions of sensitive subjects such as the experience of war, a concern is that the participants do not have a way to withdraw consent outside its immediate context of Reddit, as by removing a post or comment on the platform, the data would still be available in a different context of a research study. This is especially salient when the original poster no longer holds the expressed views or feelings at a later time than the original contribution was made (Adams, 2022). Furthermore, when using data that is publicly available, participant identification is also a risk, and an effort to maximise anonymity should be made. For this reason, all usernames in the analysis of this paper will not be revealed. However, these considerations are more pertinent to research of smaller subreddits than larger ones, as smaller discussion communities tend to be less anonymous and also tend to position themselves as safe-spaces (Proferes et al. 2021; Adams, 2022). As this research focuses on the daily discussion thread stickied on the front page of the r/worldnews subreddit, a community with over 30 million members, the data within it can be considered to be a much more public stage of discussion.

4.3 Sampling Method

The sampling strategy for this paper involves a type of purposive sampling driven by the theory that has been laid out. To be able to see the relationship between factors involving ideological formation and discursive productions in the online CMC space concerning the war in Ukraine, a specific forum of discussion from which the textual data was gathered needed to be selected. As already mentioned, the data was collected from 365 live daily discussion threads about the war in Ukraine stickied on the front page of the r/worldnews subreddit. The justification for choosing the r/worldnews subreddit over another such as r/ukraine or any other of the wide variety of offshoot subreddits about the ongoing war in Ukraine is that r/worldnews is by far the most popular one with over 30 million subscribers, and the discussion threads themselves reach well over 1000 comments a day. Due to the popularity of this subreddit, posts within it often appear on the front page, therefore increasing a likelihood that the subreddit will be visited by new users. Furthermore, due to the embedded concern around the notion of power as part of this paper's methodology, the popularity of the subreddit and the discussion threads within it suggests that the more visible the comments are, the more power they hold in the ability of the ideology embedded within them to act as rhetorical tools of control. As already mentioned in the discussion about Reddit, the technical features of the site have to be part of the context of

this analysis, therefore further emphasizing the importance of the sorting categories of the comments function. Therefore, due to the power embedded within the most visible comments, the sample for this study involves 10 top-rated comments of each daily thread. In addition, the discussions above have also stressed the significance of the role of interaction and negotiation. Therefore, a maximum of two additional highest rated comments in response to each of the 10 initial comments as well as a maximum of two replies to each of the responses will be part of the sample as a way to account for the interactional nature of these discussion threads and also of identity and ideological formation themselves.

4.4 Reflexivity and positionality statements

When doing research within the social sciences, the personal biases, beliefs, experiences and general background of the researcher can influence the analysis and conclusions of the findings. Awareness, recognition, delineation and constant self-monitoring of the researcher's biases throughout the research process as part of a reflexive practice is a way to both increase the credibility of the produced research but also deepen the understanding of these productions by both the author and the reader (Dodgson, 2019). While reflexivity is a constantly ongoing process throughout the research, describing the positionality, that is the researcher's worldview, and position chosen to adopt within a research task is one instance in which the reflexive approach can be adopted (Holmes, 2020). The following positionality statement will therefore include a discussion in which I locate myself in regards to the subject under investigation, the research context and process.

Being from Lithuania and researching an aspect of the war in Ukraine, it is virtually impossible for me to not deeply sympathize with the plight of the Ukrainians. Having come from a background in which tales of life in Soviet occupied Lithuania from my relatives and family around me were a common topic of discussion, I developed and still hold a great distaste for Russian imperialism, especially in light of being fortunate enough to have many great experiences that were simply not possible for my parents or relatives when they were the same age as I am now. Therefore my reaction to the Russian invasion in February of 2022 elicited a feeling of being threatened that such a situation could be possible in the places where my family and relatives currently live, a feeling that was perhaps not matched in its intensity by some of my peers here in the Netherlands. Having already developed a strong interest in geopolitical developments across the world with special regard to conflicts, I followed the developments of this war closely, and have found myself thinking that my understanding, opinions and interpretations of this war have been much more black and white than my knowledge of other conflicts elsewhere on the globe. This may be in part due to its closer geographical proximity to people I personally know, but it may also be due to my general opinion of this invasion as an attack on values of democracy and human rights, something that I believe should be strived towards in society. I therefore believe that Ukraine's move towards the sphere of influence of the EU and Western liberal democracies in late 2013 to early 2014 and away from the influence of

Russia's authoritarian kleptocratic regime was a geopolitical move that I supported as it more closely aligned with my values. Therefore my opinions of all developments that followed from these events with the Russian annexation of Crimea all the way to the beginning of this full-scale invasion in February of 2022, can be thought of as being part of the aforementioned framing.

The worldview and values I have described above, therefore present a dilemma that has to be wrestled with when presented in the context of the point made in 4.1 that doing a CDA requires to keep distance from the data to be able to uncover the less obvious meanings embedded within it as well as to not take the statements that are analysed for granted. The question then becomes what to do if I agree with some statements? While this may happen, my goal is that through the use of the theory and concepts I have discussed above, as well as guided by the research questions, to be able to keep distance from the data and follow through with analysis in a systematic way to be able to break down the data and answer the laid out questions.

Holmes (2020), also discusses the insider-outsider debate within the positionality of the researcher. That there are different implications to the research if a researcher considers to be an outsider or an insider to the culture being studied. During the beginning of the war, I, as a user of Reddit did find it interesting to gauge the sentiment on the ongoing war on the platform, as I found that it offered an alternative of a picture of some of the more lived experiences of the war. I also found myself thinking when reading through some of those discussion threads that a type of ideological positioning from the standpoint of the collective community was taking place on the platform, as discussions favouring particular political outcomes, as well as descriptions of Russians were seemingly converging in similarity. These ideas therefore grounded the justifications for doing this research study. Returning back to the point about the insider-outsider dichotomy, my position in this study I argue is two-fold. One position I take is the insider, emic perspective situated within a cultural relativist recognition that actions are relative to the meaning given to them within that specific culture. The insider perspective I take is therefore to the Reddit community as I am greatly familiar with how the platform works and the variety of subreddit communities that exist there. On the other hand, I would still consider myself to be an outsider to the experiences and much of the cultural knowledge of the Ukrainians, although on the other hand perhaps commonalities of coming from a post-Soviet country makes me more of an insider than I would care to admit. According to Holmes (2020), the advantages of the insider perspective are therefore a priori knowledge of the context, and the ability to produce a more truthful and authentic understanding of the culture under investigation, while the disadvantages may include the inherent and unknowing biases and being too close and sympathetic to the culture under investigation, therefore impacting the analysis of the findings. While I hope that being aware of the potential for this to happen in a constant self-reflexive process will minimize these limitations, it must be acknowledged that it is not a guarantee of higher quality research.

4.5 Method of data analysis with Atlas.ti

Having elaborated on the core elements of CDA, the platform in which the data sample is located, the question of what specific method to adopt for the analysis of data remains. The first phase of the analysis involved the creation of a coding system with a code referring to a label or a keyword that “*symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language based or visual data*” (Saldana 2013:3). Since this first step involves analysis at the descriptive level - that is to explore, and look through the data through a first reading, noting down the aspects that are found to be interesting, marking the parts of the data that are deemed to be useful further in the process of analysis, and labeling the keyword to the data segment (coding) (Friese, 2019). Due to the large amount of data from a year of comments, the data was first analyzed by examining 12 consecutive threads, each spaced out equally throughout 4 parts of the year. The reason for this was to first get a general picture of the types of discussions that take place and begin attaching labels to the data. The increments of 12 consecutive threads were examined to maintain consistency of what was topically relevant in the discussions at different points in time. While the labels attached at this stage were not set in stone and were subject to change with each reading, the initial coding process nevertheless allowed for describing the thematic aspects or phenomena and making sense of them in terms of differences and similarities. Throughout this process and in general the entirety of the data analysis process, analytic memos and notes were taken to serve a purpose to, firstly document how the process of inquiry is developing in the attempt to find the answers to the research questions and also as part of the effort to maintain researcher reflexivity to think critically about what is being done and for what reasons in the data analysis and whether these thoughts follow its internal logic (Saldana, 2013). At the end of this stage, the aim was to be left with a code list which can then be used in the next phase of the analysis.

In the second phase of data analysis, the aim was to take a step further from a descriptive endeavour to begin identifying relationships between phenomena. At this stage, the aim was to observe the data with the research questions in mind. Based on the initial coding, a process of querying data using the Atlas.ti software was employed to discover patterns, processes, sequences or typologies. Due to the sheer size of the data, the text search function was extensively used to see how key terms within the discourse were used and how they co-occurred with other relevant concepts. Through a recursive process between rearranging codes, rethinking and redeveloping patterns, the analysis moved forward in this reiterative manner so that a written interpretative summary of the results could be produced (Friese, 2019).

Throughout the analysis, the concepts and tools laid out in the conceptual framework in section 3.2 were used as a guide towards the goal of answering the research questions. The various uses of discourse structures and tools such as grammar and genres aided in painting a picture of the discursive processes that take place in the discussion threads part of the sample. Secondly, to answer the research questions, the notion of social actions such as speech acts, situating meanings, framing and identity negotiation were proven to be necessary, as these tools and concepts help to illustrate the discursive dynamics of a pro-Ukrainian ideology in an emerging online hybridized culture. The engagement with the data in the two aforementioned

phases of analysis therefore involved a constant deliberation of the analytical tools and concepts laid out in 3.2 to aid with the coding of themes and in the presentation of the findings and their analysis.

4.6 Limitations

It is important to address some of the limitations in conducting a critical discourse analysis of Reddit discussion threads on the Russian invasion of Ukraine. As briefly touched upon, the question of how representative the sample is cannot be fully answered. Reddit is just one of many platforms in which discourse about this war takes place, with each having its own perspectives, subtleties and dominant ideological stances, making generalizability to other discursive communities difficult. Additionally as mentioned, the design of the platform itself highly affects the type of discourse that rises to the top, due to both the influence from the moderating team as well as the algorithm that filters comments, the mechanics of which are not fully available to the public. Furthermore, the choice to research the top-rated comments may present the research with a sampling bias, as they may represent only a subset of the wider discourse within these threads, however as mentioned before, this consideration is addressed by stressing the fact that the most popular and visible comments are considered to be the most powerful in potentially affecting change and attitudes towards desired outcomes. There is also the question of limited contextual information of the contributors that participate within these threads, as the platform's anonymity excludes the possibility for further exploring the background and motivations for their contributions and the reasoning for why they may hold particular viewpoints. Finally, the nature of critical discourse analysis leaves the interpretation of the data to the researcher, who can be influenced by their own positionality, suggesting that different analysts may have differing interpretations of the same data, hampering the reliability and validity of the analysis.

Nevertheless, analyzing the discourse of the r/worldnews Live Thread discussions can provide insights into the manner of discourse production processes that construct and reproduce identities that align with emerging dominant ideological values and beliefs as well as the power relations embedded within such mechanisms.

5. Findings and Analysis

In this section, the findings and their analysis are presented together, as the qualitative nature of textual discourse analysis better suits to embed the presentation and discussion of the findings rather than attempting to separate them. The section is split up into three main parts - the first revolves around painting a descriptive picture of the community under investigation to more aptly situate the setting of the study; the second part involves a presentation and analysis of the discursive tools and processes involved in the make-up of a pro-Ukrainian ideology in the online community in question with a focus to answer the research questions; with the third part including a discussion of possibilities for future research and the broader view implications for this field of research. Quotations from the sample are referenced to Table 1 of the Appendix according to the day of the invasion.

5.1 Descriptive findings of the comment section community in the daily “r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine”

While the sample of data for this study comes only from the comment sections of these threads, it is important to note that it is only one part of the entirety of these Live Threads. The first part is the Live Feed Ticker - a dynamic news feed that has been constantly updated ever since the creation of these Live Threads with the newest post appearing at the top of the feed. The posts include an aggregation of news and updates to the Russian invasion of Ukraine, using mainly Tweets from a variety of verified mainstream media sources as well as other independent analysts and other prominent Twitter accounts revolving around developments in the war in Ukraine. These posts are selected and posted to the Live Feed Ticker by a team of 34 Reddit users, approved by the moderation team of the r/worldnews subreddit (Day 200). The Live Feed Ticker itself is not part of the sample of data for this study for a few reasons: firstly, the viability of data collection is questionable as posts disappear after a certain amount of time; secondly, they consist of secondary sources which would then have to be analyzed separately; and thirdly, evidence from the sample suggests that users are less interested in reading these Live Tickers themselves rather than engaging in discussions below them (Day 10). Instead, due to the already highlighted importance in the role of social (inter)actions and negotiations within discourse to make ideological formations visible, the comment sections below these Live Feed Tickers were selected as the appropriate data sample to answer the research questions. Although one possible drawback of not including the data from the Live Ticker could be missing out on the kind of ideological selection of what sources should be posted and in turn considered to be legitimate news as opposed to what is left out all left up to the discretion of the moderator team, the sample of data in this study that is found in the comment sections is considered to have been ample to account for this consideration.

To foster a community where the latest development in the war can be discussed, a new Live Thread is created daily at around 05:00AM Central European Standard Time. The vast

majority of these threads reach well over 1000 comments a day, with engagement increasing at different points in time, usually tied to significant developments in the conflict. 365 days into the war, there were a total of 506 different Live Threads created and stickied on the front page of the r/worldnews subreddit. This is due to a new thread being created every time the previous one reaches 10,000 comments as according to one of the moderators, once a thread passes this threshold, moderating it becomes a challenge (Day 1). Once a new thread is created the previous one gets archived. A single day's live thread can be divided and numbered into consecutive parts in order to account for this and is therefore the reason for why there are more threads than there were days since the beginning of the full-scale war, as the first days of the war had attracted an unprecedented amount of attention and in turn a demand for a place to engage in sharing news, feelings and other ideas with others about events in Ukraine.

When the comments are sorted by the categorization 'Top' as they were in the data collection stage of this study, the comments that are upvoted the most appear at the top, meaning registered Reddit users upvoted the comments they might agree with, find interesting or because they wish to make it more visible for other 'lurkers' of the community, i.e. readers who do not participate in the discussions that take place. The 'Top' comment section is therefore one that is deemed to have the most importance in terms of the power they hold in their ability to shape and legitimize the most popular and agreeable ideas within the discourse of the r/worldnews community. However, it must be acknowledged that part of the reason for why the some comments appear at the top could be due to a snowball effect where if a comment receives some upvotes early on in the thread's lifespan, those who visit the thread later on in the day and sort by 'Top' will just upvote that comment simply due to it being already visible. The replies to each of the top comments work in a similar fashion with the highest rated reply to the initial comment appearing right below it, with lower rated replies appearing lower. However, a design feature aimed at preventing the threads from appearing cluttered, collapses some of the replies, with a reader needing to click to load the remaining replies. The criteria for which replies are collapsed and which are readily available to read is seemingly based on replies needing to have an upvote score of around 20, however it is not always consistent, perhaps due to the 'Crowd Control' feature which controls the collapsing of comments left to the discretion of each subreddit's moderators (Reddit, 2021e). This reinforces the idea that the moderators as well as the inherent design of the Reddit platform hold a significant amount of power in directing the flow of acceptable and visible discourse. The power to direct discourse is also, of course, held by users themselves who participate in upvoting and downvoting. Those comments that are downvoted more than they are upvoted hold a negative comment score, which automatically collapses them showing a message stating "*comment score below threshold*" which requires another click to make it visible. Some of the replies with a negative score are part of the sample as they provide insights into the kinds of comments the subreddit's users deem unacceptable and should not be readily available to view.

Having covered how these live threads function, it is appropriate to turn to the content of these discussion threads, in order to produce a general account of what these discussions entail and the manner in which communication is done. While there are many facets to the discourse

production within these discussion threads which are explored in more depth in the next section, what follows is a broad characterization of the active community within these threads.

First and foremost, the commenters of these threads are wholly dedicated in their support for a Ukrainian military victory to retake its sovereign territory. While the optimal manner in which this should be done is debated, sympathy for the Ukrainian people, leadership and military is commonly expressed. The reasons for engaging with these threads appear to be either sharing, discussing or finding news of what is happening in or at the very least in relation to the war in Ukraine, speculation of the implications of these developments for the future and expressing sympathy and solidarity for the Ukrainian populace, military and leadership as well as sharing their own experiences and emotional reactions to these events, while also expressing their intense distaste for the various dimensions of the warring Russian side. The community is English-speaking, indicating a largely international member base. The discussions are often centered around references to US politics and the US influence on the war. This US-centricity within the discourse could be attributed to the biggest fraction Reddit's user base hailing from the US, however some of it could also be explained by the fact that the US is also the largest ally to Ukraine in terms of military aid and in turn is highly relevant to discussions about the war in Ukraine (Armstrong, 2023). This being an online community, the language used in these comment threads is therefore largely informal, often using profanity to express emotion. With this being an online community, it is also full of the use of common internet slang, humorous comments with references to online memes as well as popular culture.

A particularly interesting aspect to note is the emergence of often recurring commenters, who tend to consistently reappear in the top comment sections of these threads, usually filling their own niche roles within the community. One commenter posts daily updates on his experiences of going through the war in Kharkiv, becoming a recognizable and respected feature of the discourse with an outpouring for sympathy by other contributors. Others tend to fill in their niche in for example posting statements from official sources or translations from Ukrainian to English and or compiling daily updates in a single comment. Such notable members of the community tend to be applauded for their work and efforts in filling their self attained roles within this online space: "*Amazing effort!*" (Day 199). "*Our daily mailman has arrived as expected. Thanks, man*" (Day 219). Such a select number of users therefore can be considered to be powerful shapers of the narrative by providing their own interpretations of events and frame them in a way that resonates with the larger community's attitudes and values. As reputable and trusted members of the community, they are also important in setting the agenda of what is to be considered significant and in turn mobilize and support particular types of actions and outcomes towards their and community wide ideological positions.

Having produced a descriptive account of these threads' contents and functions, analyzing the manner in which the process of discourse production leads to a pro-Ukrainian ideology and what it entails requires a much more detailed analysis of the different types of discursive processes and tools that are employed by the top commenters of the subreddit's community.

5.2 Ideological Analysis of top comments found in the “r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine”

The following section is divided into seven separate themes that emerged in conducting the ideological analysis of the live threads. The first two include discussions concerning the types of representations of the populace, militaries and leadership of Ukraine and Russia respectively. The third subsection revolves around the use of news in framing and shaping the online discourse, with the fourth focusing on the community’s discussions of the future as a way to get insights into its hopes and fears. The fifth section considers the ways in which discussions about geopolitics are framed through the discursive community’s ideological lens, followed by a discussion on the use of history in shaping the perceptions and identities of members of this virtual space. Finally, the analysis chapter ends with a discussion of how contributors of the community aim to more actively and explicitly participate in the ongoing war through online communication.

5.2.1 Perceptions of Ukrainian populace, military, and leadership

One of the most glaring ways in which representations of the two warring sides within these threads can be highlighted is by examining the perceptions of Ukraine as a nation. The analysis of these perceptions is split up into three main categories - the general public or populace of Ukraine, its military and its political leadership. The reason for this categorization is due to the topical variation within these discussions, although it has to be acknowledged that there is overlap when discussing the actions of the Ukrainian people, military and leadership due to the highly interconnected nature of these three facets.

Ukrainian populace

The main characteristic of the Ukrainian people that is consistently highlighted throughout the discussion threads is their immense bravery, heroism and resilience in the face of an invading force. Examples of acts of brave resistance by regular people are used in the production of the discourse as a way to solidify the idea that the Ukrainians are motivated and united in their collective efforts to resist the Russian invasion as long as it may take. An especially relevant example of this has been the emergence of the image of the sunflower as a symbol of this Ukrainian bravery and resistance. This is in reference to an event in the early days of the full-scale invasion where a Ukrainian woman made an impassioned speech to a Russian soldier, offering sunflower seeds to put in his pockets so that they may grow when he dies on Ukrainian land (Sharma, 2022). The reaction to the speech had made a significant impression on some members of the community, with one commenter remarking “[t]hat sunflower line was raw” (Day 2) with another stating that the “[s]unflower woman is my hero.”(Day 3). This event is one that would commonly be referenced in the community later on in the war, with a commenter making a comment hoping that “the sunflower fields grow in spectacular numbers this year” (Day 43), alluding to his hope for many Russian casualties in the war. The sunflower emoji (🌻) would also become a commonplace symbol in which commenters would use in comments expressing uplifting developments and messages of support and

solidarity to other commenters, as a way to show their own ideological standing in the context of the ongoing conflict as members of the in-group. Similar plaudits of courageousness of Ukrainian people are commonplace in these threads, usually in response to a piece of news that highlights such gallant and heroic acts. One example is the praise for the workers in the Zaporizhzhia Nuclear Plant in intense conditions under Russian control, with a commenter stating that “[t]hose guys are seriously brave” (Day 189). Another commenter responds to an account from another user who describes his experience of hearing artillery strikes landing close to him by sending a message of solidarity saying “Ukrainians are unstoppable” (Day 360). A retelling of a story of a nightclub owner who rescued one commenter’s parents out of Mariupol when it was under siege, praises them by saying “I want to applaud these people. You will forever be my heroes” with others responding with “Absolute legends, those rescuers. Balls of steel.” and “It’s unbelievable what ordinary people are capable of, isn’t it?” (Day 98). Discursively, these messages serve an important purpose in reinforcing the idea that members of this online community hold the Ukrainian people, as brave, courageous and resilient and also evoking a feeling of support and solidarity with their plight, as there is a conscious effort to highlight such acts bravery and make sure that they do not go unnoticed.

An important element of the process of discourse production in the context of how Ukrainian people are perceived is the manner in which perspectives from Ukrainians in the threads are received by other commenters. The reactions to Ukrainian perspectives are overwhelmingly positive, with messages of solidarity as well as those of encouragement, support and sympathy are commonly expressed. One contributor in these threads has provided a daily account of their experience of living in Kharkiv, describing what it is like to live through every day of the invasion with warfare happening in their close proximity. The responses have been an overwhelming show of support, ranging from practical survival advice such as instructions to “boil off the pure water and collect the condensation” (Day 5) in response to the lack of clean water, to psychological encouragement and support such as “[p]lease stay safe, wishing you hope and health” (Day 34) or “good to hear you’re ok!” (Day 57) and even to providing help financially through PayPal “Sent 100 euros. I hope it helps.” (Day 65) Such social actions not only provide an inherent sense of togetherness and community between members of the in-group, but also negotiates a collective identity of helpfulness that encourages more active participation in helping Ukrainians to ease the struggles of their situation. Using Fairclough and Fairclough’s theory of argumentation, it also sets the discursive grounds for support of more concerted and large-scale aid without having to state it explicitly. Of course, such demands are also stated explicitly, in discussions revolving around Ukrainian military and leadership.

Ukrainian military

The same characteristics of courageousness, resilience and heroism are also attributed to the Ukrainian Armed Forces, with plenty of praises for Ukrainian soldiers such as simple statements characterizing them as “heroes” (Day 2), but also employing discursive tools such as profanity to express a stronger emotional reaction to emphasize the commenters’ admirations for them such as “[h]oly fuck those guys are incredible” (Day 182) in response to a linked video

of a Ukrainian combat mission. Aside from these commonplace acclaims of heroism and bravery, an interesting characteristic that is commonly attributed to the Ukrainian military is that of competence and professionalism. Comments such as “[s]hout out to Ukraine’s military leadership. Let’s take a moment to appreciate their very effective command and control during the most stressful two weeks of their lives.” (Day 15) or “[t]hat is a professional team” (Day 189) are just examples of the collective impression of the r/worldnews community in discussing the professionalism, integrity and competence of the UAF. On top of these notions of competence, the Ukrainian military is also perceived to be intensely motivated to fight. One commenter mentions that they “*can’t imagine the fervor of those recruits coming out of training*” (Day 99) referring to the training programmes for mobilized Ukrainian soldiers, with another mentioning that “[t]he quality of reserves is high, people are very motivated” (Day 68). The combination of these perceived qualities of motivation and capabilities also invokes a view of the Ukrainian military as one with high morale, for example, a reaction of a video of food and living conditions on the front line has made one commenter state that “*no wonder morale is that high when that’s what they eat*” (Day 101) while another reacts to a video of destroyed Russian equipment near Kharkiv, observing that “*the morale of these lads seems high.*” although acknowledging that it is “*just a tiny snapshot of a much larger battlefield, of course*” (Day 73).

Such qualities of motivation, competence and high morale are usually contrasted with the opposite of those qualities on the Russian side, which are discussed in more depth in the following subsection. These have important implications for both the general negotiations of this community’s identity as a collective proactive supporter of Ukraine this itself as well as its general ideological standing that favours increased measures of support for its military. Firstly, the perception of high morale amongst Ukrainian soldiers also yields high morale within the microcosm of this online community. When a member of these discussion threads has noticed a downtick in engagement once the initial attention cycle has gone down, another commenter offers support by saying: “[p]lease don’t take the reduced traffic here as a diminishing of support. The global support for Ukraine couldn’t be stronger. [...] We just realize that right now things are a little slow, and filling the void with garbage helps no one.” (Day 91). This message serves two discursive purposes, firstly, as a social act of reassurance to note that the support for Ukraine has not gone away, and secondly in boosting the overall mood of those who feel less motivated in engaging in ways to express their support, as high morale as well as the conviction of the Ukrainian army to hold qualities of competence and professionalism also implicitly signals an ideologically valued notion that Ukraine is capable to continue to fight and receive continued international aid towards its goal of militarily defeating Russia, especially when contrasted with the idea early on in the stages of the full-scale invasion that “*Kyiv was supposed to fall in 3 days.*” (Day 132).

Ukrainian leadership

While the overlap between military actions and decisions by the political leadership in Ukraine is high, naturally, the discussions about Ukraine’s leadership typically revolve around the actions and speeches of Ukrainian president Volodymyr Zelenskyy. The discourse surrounding him centers on admiration for his leadership style on top of the aforementioned

qualities of bravery, competence and high level of motivation to fight. This admiration can be exemplified by the reactions of commenters to Zelenskyy's visits to frontline positions, with a commenter remarking: *"Way to fucking lead, Mr President! Be there among your people. Thank them directly. Listen to what they have to say. And holy shit, those were some damn strong handshakes! I love how he did that, I love how he did that, took their hand in a strong fashion, and then made direct eye contact with them. [...]"* (Day 103). This vigorous and expressive remark with short and concise punctuated sentences sums up the general collective attitude found in the discourse of these threads, admiring not only the more broad public relations campaign aimed towards the West to garner any possible support, and to Russia to attempt to provide a counter-discourse within Russia, but also the smaller details of what is perceived to be good leadership. Him being thrust into a leadership position in wartime has led to numerous comparisons with other historical wartime leaders, such as Churchill or Leonidas: *"Just a bit more fun than Churchill, and without C's position as colonial hardliner. Churchill was somewhat zelenskyian."*(Day 65) *" This guy is a fucking legend. Leonidas of the 21st century."*(Day 3). An interesting aspect to note about the production of discourse surrounding Zelenskyy's rule is that the discussions virtually exclusively center on his foreign policy and speeches with little to say about any possible negative aspects of his leadership or any domestic dynamics of his presidency as a Ukrainian commenter notes: *"Unlike some people might think he doesn't have the hero status here, if not for this war, there would be no Zelenskyy by this point, he was massively unpopular before the war, and a new Maidan would have already happened if not for Russia."* (Day 175). Irrespective of the veracity of this conditional claim, the lack of criticism or even the presence of discussion of domestic dynamics of Ukrainian leadership can indicate two possibilities about these r/worldnews discussion threads. Firstly, this could be due to the fact that this is an English-speaking community, which can indicate a lack of knowledge of domestic Ukrainian politics, which can also act as a barrier for Ukrainians for being able to engage in such discussions. The other possibility could be due to the members of these threads downvoting such perspectives on Ukrainian leadership for ideological reasons, be it perhaps the belief that any critique might come from malicious pro-Russian supporters or bot farms that aim to make readers question the support for Ukraine. Whether it is due to one of these factors or a combination of the two, it is important to acknowledge the inherent power in the ability of the community to direct discourse away from potential critiques towards a more stable notion of Ukraine as having a strong and competent wartime leader, which in turn can make it a more favorable destination of various kinds of support.

Having discussed the three topical categories through which discussions about the Ukrainian side take place, it is important to return back to the conceptualization of Ukraine as a whole. Ukraine is therefore conceptualized not solely as a geographic location, but rather as a nation made up by the characteristics attributed to its people, its military and its leadership in the context of its heroic and brave resistance to an invading force. Participants in this discourse constantly highlight new cases of the aforementioned attributes that Ukraine exemplifies such as filled with heroism, bravery, resilience, along with competence, strength and capability to defeat the enemy. The community's identity as one that wholeheartedly supports Ukraine is further emphasized through the common use of the *"Slava Ukraini"* slogan in which the next commenter tends to respond with *"Heroyam Slava"*(Day 8), a Ukrainian national salute which

translates to “Glory to Ukraine” and “Glory to the Heroes”. It is an important discursive tool to situate the meaning of the conversation in the frame of supporting Ukraine and a way to identify, locate and engage with similar minded members of the same community that hold similar beliefs.

5.2.2 Perceptions of Russian populace, military and leadership

Having explored the discourse surrounding perceptions of Ukraine as one side of the warring parties, it is appropriate to contrast it with the way the Russian side is approached by the community in the r/worldnews discussions threads. Again, Russia as a nation can topically be split up into three topical differences of talking about its populace, military and leadership structures.

Russian populace

Unlike the mostly uniform perceptions of the Ukrainian people within this online space, the perceptions of the Russian people is a topic more hotly negotiated in this discourse. A large part of this discursive community views the Russian people as adversaries complicit and responsible for enabling the crimes of the invasion. Commenters note: *“I have never felt this level of hatred for a foreign power or a foreign peoples before.”* (Day 44). *“The denial, crazy excuses, and in some cases, applause, by far too many Russian people is absolutely horrible. It’s sickening really. [...]”* (Day 124). Another makes a similar observation: *“I’ve been watching street interviews made by some Russian vloggers... and I’m shocked and appalled how detached from reality these people are, both the interviewed and the vloggers. And they are the young ones who have access to the internet. I have never expected that people’s brains can be mushed into such pulp by propaganda. Not to such extent”* (Day 33). The discussions of the extent of Russian peoples’ responsibility therefore tend to revolve around their agency, that is whether their complicitness is due to effectiveness of propaganda or due to their own and willing agency in both actively and passively participating in and supporting the invasion of Ukraine. One side of the argument involves an attribution to less culpability by the Russian people as they *“have been apathetic to a tyrant controlling their country and oppressing the opposition for decades. This is the reality finally catching up with them.”* (Day 235) or *“[i]t’s Putin’s war in the sense that he chose to go to war, and used state propoganda to convince the Russian people that it was the right thing to do.”* (Day 284). *“Russia’s is willing to take Ukraine at any cost. Russias poor are to brainwashed and powerless to resist.”* (Day 51). One commenter acknowledges the role of both propaganda as well as agency: *“[...] It doesn’t feel like kindred spirits with governments going at it. This feels different. Like there is something seriously, seriously wrong with the Russian people who are brainwashed into supporting the war but yet it feels more... conscious than that”*(Day 44). However, this notion of propaganda, diminishing the culpability for the war crimes being committed is also actively resisted amongst members of this online space: *“No one forces Russians to wear “z” symbols. The Russians support the war against Ukraine”* (Day 192). *“Are we still following this naive narrative that this is Putin’s war?”*

We known by know that the majority of the Russian people support him and what he's doing." (Day 284). *"[...] [F]ar too many still act like Russian people are innocent children. No, a majority wanted this war."* (Day 202). Using Fairclough and Fairclough's (2012) theory of argumentation, it is possible to deduce two practical avenues these two perspectives may point towards. When taking the perspective that the Russian people are willing and active agents in enabling and supporting the invasion of Ukraine, the solution is implicitly made to be further isolation and distance as the ideological differences are simply considered irreconcilable for any normal relations. From the perspective of the idea that Russian people are influenced for the most part by their consumption of pro-Russian media which then get internalized and expressed by them, the proposed solution seems to be split. Some argue for isolation from the point of hopelessness: *"They are brainwashed, and know nothing about the real world. There isn't even a point trying to convince them otherwise."*(Day 59). *"I don't care about political correctness and russian civilians anymore. Fuck Russia and russians who support this, brainwashed or not. Isolate the country, and let them rot from the inside."* (Day 44). The other potential avenue, on the other hand, by acknowledging the key role of information and media in its ability to influence people's minds is to therefore engage in combating disinformation and support like minded Russians who are opposed to Putin's rule and in turn the ongoing invasion.

The perceptions towards Russians therefore can differ depending on their positioning in the war and the aforementioned active willingness to play a role in it or submission to the propaganda. The r/worldnews discussion threads also provide discursive spaces to express sympathy and applaud the braveness of those Russians who are active in the resistance to the invasion, with partisan activity being lauded as heroic: *"Heroes. At least there are some in Russia"* (Day 361), other evidence of resistance being met with *"It's good to see some Russian people growing a set."* (Day 206). Similar sympathies are also extended to Russians that comment in these threads: *"I am so ashamed. We will protest today. No to war. Stay strong ukraine."* *"You look like a Russian from post history. Good luck brave person. I respect you greatly."* (Day 18). Although it must be mentioned that the framing of these plaudits are situated against the perceived minority of such cases as well as the even higher cost of Ukrainian suffering. A response to a commenter that *"feel[s] bad for the protesters in Russia taking the beatings and jailings for the audacity of not wanting to have a war with their neighbors and ruining their economy"* is met with a caveat: *"Same, but I feel worse for Ukrainians getting shot while attempting to flee, children who are separated from their parents who are staying to fight, and all the other things Ukrainians are enduring."* (Day 12). Nevertheless, this discourse produces perceptions of the Russian people as adversaries or at the very least framed as parts of a problem that has to be fixed. A fix is possible by either isolation from contact from the point of view of those who believe that there is a point of no possible return of any 'normal' relationship with Ukraine and the West or by enabling and supporting those who are actively willing to bravely engage in resistance against Russian leadership. These ideological arguments embedded within the process of discourse production can therefore have significant practical implications in the future after the active conflict ends.

Russian military

In the sample of discussion threads, the narrative surrounding the Russian military overwhelmingly represents it as an invading, cruel and evil force that needs to be defeated despite potentially great costs in doing so. One aspect that stands out and is consistently reiterated are the manner in which the Russian army commits war crimes. Responding to Russia's intentional targeting of hospitals in the first days of the war, the commenters wondered whether their actions broke international law: *"That's a war crime, no?"* *"Yes, Very, very, very serious war crime."* (Day 3). Such acts were discursively highlighted through the use of expression of emotion and appealing to a common sense of morality in response to the various acts committed by the Russian military: *"[y]eah... they are going scorched earth. So much evil."* (Day 12) *"It's just unabashed terrorism now. It does not serve any military purpose even"* (Day 102) *"Made my stomach turn. This is some ISIS level shit. Another important reason why we must not let these fuckers win. Brute force and utter brutality as a means of achieving goals should have no place in the world today."* (Day 355). Use of swear words, and expressing heartbreak and disgust are all common emotional reactions that commenters use in these threads to express the hardline position that the Russian army should be defeated militarily and not through any peace talks as long as Russian soldiers have boots on the ground on the sovereign territory of Ukraine. Even the use of humor is employed to point out the ridiculousness of the injustice of the situation: *"It's the geopolitical equivalent of big brother hitting little brother with his own hand while saying 'stop hitting yourself!' I have no words"* (Day 92).

Another point that is emphasized when discussing the Russian military, is its failures and incompetence in the abilities to achieve its goals, in contrast to the competence of the Ukrainians in their ability to resist them. In response to the conceptions of the Russian army as one of a great power a commenter notes a change in his perspective after its failures to achieve a quick victory in taking control of the territory of Ukraine: *"Before the invasion I saw the Russian military as strong, intimidating, and the 2nd best in the world. Now they're just a bunch of prepubescent boys LARPing in a different country with actual weapons."* (Day 12). The comment refers to the sudden change in perception, jokingly suggesting that their incompetence is akin to the combat capabilities of prepubescent boys doing live-action role play, but also suggesting the very serious implications of them possessing real weaponry. Humor is also a commonly used discursive tool in which the Russian military is the object of jokes, highlighting its incompetence: *"Russians donating their equipment to Ukraine in show of solidarity and hoping it helps get Putin kicked out of office"* (Day 10), jokingly suggesting that their military failures are a gesture of goodwill to Ukraine.

In response to the aforementioned video of Ukrainian living conditions, a commenter contrasts the relative comfortability the Ukrainians can afford on the front with the lack of adequate resources the Russian army provides to its own soldiers: *"Meanwhile Russians eat out-of-date rations and poisoned pies"* (Day 101). This is in reference to videos from Russian soldiers of their encampments on the front as well as a story where a Ukrainian woman tricked Russian soldiers into eating pies that she poisoned (Sicard, 2022). Such notions of Russian incompetence are therefore constantly reiterated in a way that results in the extreme contrast between the military and combat capabilities of Ukraine and Russia: *"Ukraine is only going to get stronger with new weapons and trained up troops getting deployed as it continues. I don't*

see *Russia turning this around apart from general mobilization, and even that has a high chance of going poorly for Russia.*" (Day 103). Even after a general mobilization within Russia, the effort is widely perceived to be a failure and an exercise in cruelty that has resulted in a strategy of using the mobilized as dispensable cannon fodder to shore up frontline positions: *"Straight into the meat grinder. Looks like Russia doesn't have anybody left"* (Day 113). *"They use [the conscripts] as cannon fodder. Russia does not value human life. Normal fucking values? They see them as liabilities."* (Day 26). The agency of mobilized conscripts in choosing to participate and actively not resisting in being used as 'meat' on the frontlines is also highlighted as a way to discursively impose their responsibility for the crimes of the invasion: *"Instead, they complain about not having enough equipment and lacking the proper leadership to allow them to do bidding of their slave drivers more effectively. Despite being hated and downtrodden, they're apparently all too happy to be used as cannon fodder for the imperialistic ambitions of a handful of politicians. [...]"* (Day 339). This achieves the discursive purpose of highlighting the extent of responsibility of the crimes of the invasion towards the soldiers from a passive frame of being powerlessly subjected to the institutional forces of its authoritarian government to the frame of soldiers' active role in them being willing enablers and participants in entering a foreign territory at the possible costs of injury and even death.

Another important element of the process of discourse production in these online spaces is their legitimation of violence against the Russian military. In response to a comment of a new headline *"Russian ammo depot destroyed in eastern Ukraine, claims it killed 39 Russian soldiers. [Embedded link]"*, other contributors react: *"Spicy! They should just get out of Ukraine", "I agree. Things are getting too spicy for the pepper", "need more like this ... kaboom !!!"* (Day 96). Similar sentiment is repeated throughout the discussion threads with comments such as *"Fuck those Russians up!"*(Day 193), *"May both St. Javelin and St. HIMAR watch over [Russian soldiers]"* (Day 192) *"Woohoo!!! Finally at 50 k!! Now let's get to 100k!! [Russian KIA]"* (Day 195), *"Hurray for a four figure mobik day. Slava Ukraini"*. (Day 360). Humor, and a celebratory mood towards Ukraine successfully inflicting casualties on the Russian army is therefore actively expressed, as a way to discursively represent Russian soldiers as invaders that should be killed as long as they are on Ukrainian land as well as legitimate the ideological position of continued support to the Ukrainian military in their mission to get rid of the Russian military presence on Ukrainian territory.

Russian leadership

The part of the discourse that revolves around Russian leadership for the most part centers around the actions and statements from Russian president Vladimir Putin and its administration in the Kremlin. Overwhelmingly, Putin is portrayed as the main actor responsible for the crimes and injustices committed by the Russian state to Ukraine and is perceived as a great threat not only to Ukraine, but to peace and stability in Europe. *"We cannot let these bastards get away with this. The Putin regime must be buried when all is said and one, and the man himself must be held accountable and jailed [...]"* (Day15). One of the standout parts of the discourse mentioning Putin is the overwhelming feeling of anger and contempt directed at him by the contributors of this online space: *"May Putin burn in hell."* (Day 3). *"I hate Putin"* (Day 24)

"Fuck you Putin. Ukraine will thrash you you worthless turd." (Day 34). There is a sentiment of many contributors in this community wishing death upon Putin, although these are made less explicit due to a rule by Reddit, as one moderator notes: *"Friendly reminder that Reddit Terms of Service prohibit any death threats to anyone including Putin, for any reason. Don't complain to us, we don't make this specific rule"*(Day 9). However, contributors find discursively creative ways to get around this, with a commenter in the same thread that quotes *"[a]n old Russian joke. A man is looking at the newspaper, sighs, and puts it away.*

'What are you looking for? a seller asks him.

'I am looking for an obituary' the man responds.

'But obituaries are not on the first page!' the seller says.

'The one I'm looking for will be there' " (Day 9).

The implication from the moderators message asking others not to complain to them about the rule implicitly implies that such views in their eyes are acceptable and the only reason for their removal is to comply with Reddit ToS. This suggests then the power in the ability of the moderators to legitimate a particular discourse without explicitly saying so. The contributor's quotation of a joke as well as its highly upvoted nature suggests that many within this online space hold such views without their ability to explicitly express them.

The discursive portrayal of Putin continues with the pattern in expressing perceptions of his incompetence as a leader and the immorality of his actions, especially standing out when considering the contrast with the perceptions of competence and courageousness of Zelenskyy and Ukraine: *"Putin invaded Ukraine and decided to keep at it despite it being a colossal failure [...]"* (D34) *"Putin can afford Russia's isolation and failure because he spent the last 22 years stealing money from it's own country."* (Day 147). *" [...]Putin can only dream of his legacy being 1% of what Zelensky's is. Instead Putin will go down as Putin the Pathetic, dragging Russia down with him and rightfully so."* (Day 288). These comments tend to be expressed within the larger context of discussions about Russian failures on the battlefield, showing the fierce ideological opposition to Putin's rule in this online space.

Having discussed the community's perceptions and attitudes towards the Russian populace, military and leadership, it is appropriate to return to the question of how Russia as a nation and concept itself is represented. The discourse represents Russia in quite black-and-white terms - as an evil state led by a greedy and immoral leader that is willing to take as many lives, both of its own military as well as innocent Ukrainians as it takes to achieve his imperial ambitions. A common slogan used throughout some of the discussion threads captures this feeling: *"Russia is a terrorist state"* (Day 206). This phrase is repeated throughout the threads for a number of reasons, firstly to express the feeling that Russia as a state uses terrorism to achieve its aims, and secondly, to discursively influence policy by putting pressure on nations and organizations in the 'West' to designate Russia as a state sponsor of terrorism, which would allow for an avenue to continue to weaken Russia and its ability to wage war on Ukraine. Another way some contributors stylize the spelling of Russia is by referring to it as *"Ruzzia"* - such a spelling refers to the Russian 'Z' symbol of the invasion of Ukraine and perhaps also in reference to the electric style of the logos of the SS of Nazi Germany - suggesting the existence of similarities between the two regimes through discourse.

Furthermore, Russia's failures and incompetence in its ability to achieve its imperial aims is a source of uplift and inspiration for this discursive community, usually using humor in making a joke of Russian efforts to attempt to increase morale that reiterates the possibility of a Ukrainian victory. The contrast between perceptions of Ukraine and Russia therefore results in a clear-cut discourse in terms of good versus evil, the guilty and the innocent, the brave and the cowardly, and is in turn a powerful ideological tool to express what should be valued and allowed to continue and what must be stopped even at great costs.

5.2.3 The use of News to frame and shape discourse

One of the most common types of comments being upvoted to the 'Top' of these discussion threads can be classified as news. Comments containing information, quotes from analysts, key figures and world leaders regarding the developments related to the war, usually embedded with a link to the original source tend to make up a significant portion of the top rated comments and act as topical conversation starters from which the discussion can flow. Analyzing the selection of what is considered to be news, what is included and omitted from this category can yield insights into the ways in which its power works to discursively and in turn ideologically influence the implicit and explicit arguments made within and by this discourse.

The first aspect to consider when discussing the discourse of news in these discussion threads, is the selection of the kinds of news that are being upvoted into the 'Top'. The aforementioned trend of discursively representing the warring sides as Ukraine being competent, brave, and willing to resist the invasion and Russia as a terrorist state that is riddled with failures continues also with the use of news. One classification of news commonly shared in this community are statements and speeches from Ukrainian officials. While the majority of such posts involve released statements from president Zelenskyy, some also quote other high ranking members of the military and political ministers, depending on the context. While some of these news comments only contain direct quotes from the primary source, other contributors editorialize their news comments by giving their own input and contextualization of the provided source: "[Embedded Link] This might be worth adding, Ukrainian commander giving an inspiring speech" (Day 2). The commenter therefore provides legitimacy to the speech by describing it as inspiring which therefore lends further credence to the linked source. Such legitimization also happens in the responses of news comments without such an editorialization. The responses to this original comment "*Ukraine war: Zelensky rules out territory deal with Putin in BBC interview. [Embedded Link]*", include explicit approval of his decision: "*Good. Putin/Russia coming out of this with literally anything they wanted is terrible for global peace and security.*" "*100% and thank fucking Christ Zelenskyy knows that you should never reward psychopathic genocidal bullies. Not one fucking inch of land goes to Russia*" (Day 359). This is an example of Waring's (2018) notion of negotiating jointly produced storylines and social identities, in this case, ones of unwavering pro-Ukrainian support. Same types of social actions of support and approval also occur below news comments about cases of resistance by the Ukrainian people.

The next subset of types of news posted can be categorized as battlefield updates - events relating to the military outcomes of the war from both warring sides. Generally, similar social actions as mentioned above are accomplished - negotiation of a pro-Ukrainian identity through highlighting Ukrainian successes and reporting on Russian war crimes, defeats and failures. One example of this can be seen in the comment “ *[Embedded Link] South: Ukrainian Armed Forces destroy Russian command post and equipment, killing 67 invaders*” and a response to it: “*With the airstrike on the ammo depot that's over 100 invaders killed in just these two locations. The good news just keep coming today!*” (Day 96). The initial news comment uses a Ukrainian source, with referring to Russian soldiers as invaders, showing an explicit ideological leaning in and of itself, while the response reiterates the support for Ukraine’s efforts in using their military to fight, at the same time celebrating Russian losses on the battlefield. The pattern continues in the third subset of types of news, related to Ukraine’s allies’ official statements, speeches and other news of their support, especially relating to military aid, with responses to a comment reporting that “*Norway has delivered self propelled howitzers to Ukraine*”, numerous commenters respond with “*This is the way.*” (Day 103), a commonly recognized message of approval on Reddit, in reference to a quote from the show ‘Mandalorian’ popularized through the phrase’s common use during the Gamestop short squeeze by traders from the subreddit r/wallstreetbets (Platt et al., 2021).

The use of news by this discourse therefore not only serves the purpose of informing the r/worldnews community on the most recent facts of the matter on the ground, but also helps to frame them according to the ideological values of the visitors of this virtual space. Such framing which occurs either through editorializing the initial news comment or by reacting to it in the comments below, negotiates identities towards pro-Ukrainian and anti-Russian stances by emphasizing the perceived characteristics of both warring sides. These editorializations can be perceived as especially influential when done by already reputable, respected and recognizable members within the community. All of this is of course facilitated by the upvote/downvote system itself to make such framings visible. Such a discursive process is inately powerful as it can shape the manner in which idle ‘lurkers’ of this community interpret the ongoing situations based on the way the information is presented and discussed about. These changes in perception can therefore be due to the embedded arguments within the frames, towards desired policy, in this case, ones of continued support for Ukraine’s military and other mechanisms to weaken Russia.

5.2.4 Discussions of the future as avenue to view the community’s hopes and fears

The manner in which the contributors within the sample discuss about the future can indicate important insights into the types of outcomes the commenters fear as well as wish to see, in turn further highlighting the ideological positions of this online space as a whole. One way to categorize discussions regarding the range of possible futures in relation to the outcomes of the war in Ukraine is by eliciting discursive differences between the possible, the expected, as well as the desired and undesired conceptualizations of the future.

The contributors within the r/worldnews discussion thread spaces acknowledge the much undesired potential outcomes of Russian successes in the context of the war. The discourse surrounding undesired futures revolves around Russia potentially learning from their past failures, making their military more effective and successful in achieving its aims, as well as the potential for a diminishing of Western support for Ukraine, which could ultimately lead to a potential Ukrainian defeat. For example, some of the contributors place an emphasis on the outcome of the 2024 US presidential election, hoping to avoid a Republican victory: *“though if the US has another bipolar episode in 2024, there’s a chance Russia may make some headway assuming that they withdraw from supporting Ukraine directly. [...]”* (Day 354). *“If the GOP takes both houses of Congress, maybe RUS sees them as a sticky enough agitator that the aid flowing now will slow down. As a friendly reminder, DO NOT TRUST THE AMERICAN GOP TO DO WHAT’S BEST FOR THE USA. Ever.”*(Day 95). Such a clear cut message in the imperative mood, suggests a clear indication that the ideal outcome aligning with the values of this virtual space would be one that maintains status quo of the Democratic Party within US political leadership due to the perceptions of Republicans as being less likely to maintain or increase the current levels of support for Ukraine. However, despite some contributors like this one acknowledging the possibility of such a future with Republican US leadership, discursively there is no expectation that such an outcome will come true, as it is portrayed as something that is generally avoidable in this case through voting. On the other hand, some undesired futures within the sample, discursively indicate a level of confidence that the undesired outcome will come true. One example of this can be seen in the following comment: *“I’m becoming convinced that the Russian people aren’t going to move against Putin. Its an endemically complacent population whose greatest civil disobedience is the occasional draft dodging, and that’s only to serve themselves, not to attack the Russian government.”* (Day 241). The key difference between a conception of an outcome as possible versus expected, is that expectation invokes the frame of it being less avoidable than simply a possibility, therefore invokes less calls to action by portraying it as something that is bound to happen. Such discursive differences are ideologically significant, as it sets up figurative obstacles towards favoured outcomes - ones that can and cannot be overcome. By allowing the community to focus on tackling the obstacles that are more malleable, their likelihood to impose change according to their preferred ideological outcomes can therefore be strengthened.

In a similar fashion, the commenters also let their hopes be known, in terms of the kind of future they would like to see in the context of the ongoing conflict. The desired future is therefore one of a swift Ukrainian victory, justice for the victims of Russia’s war crimes, and an end to Putin’s regime or any elements facilitating even incremental progress towards such outcomes are welcomed within these virtual spaces. Perceived by different commenters of such outcomes as being both possible and expected, some see it as an expected outcome with a contributor responding to a new package of US military aid as *“[...] the glorious end of russia”* (Day 191), while others add conditionalities to the possibility of their desired vision of the future coming true: *“If the Ukrainians advance in the north, they will roll up the Russian lines and collapse the front. If the Ukrainians advance in the center, they will cut off half of the Russian forces. If the Ukrainians advance in the south, they will cut off all of the Russian forces. The*

Ukrainians are in an advantageous position, which will only improve if they keep up the pressure. Seems like Russia can at best limit how fast they lose Kherson." (Day 191), *"Forget ammo, fuel, or even food. If they refuse to fight because they're running out of water, then the Russians are truly fucked."* (Day 194). Discursively, adding a desired outcome based on a conditional state, it frames it not as a given but as something that should be encouraged, therefore eliciting a cognitive schema of action, and therefore reinforce the community's identity of one that should proactively encourage such outcomes in any way its members are able, in turn shape strategies for achieving their ideologically ideal vision of the future. In this case, the lack of guarantees towards Ukrainian successes, therefore shape this community's strategic approach towards achieving its goals by encouraging proactivity rather than being passive witnesses of a predetermined course of events. Suggestions and avenues for actionable ways to enact a future that is desirable are therefore explored: a commenter responds to the news of shortages of cash in Russia by noting: *"Good. How do we make it worse?"* with another suggesting: *"I'd say boycott the hell out of the western companies with a massive russian presence"* (Day 356).

On the other hand, the contributors who are confident and expect the desired future to come true are perhaps influenced by the community's understanding of the present - one of successful Ukrainian resistance and Russian failures may result in a vision of the future with the expectation of such a trend to continue which in turn may invoke complacency based on the frames of predetermined outcomes. Some contributors are even self-aware to acknowledge this possibility by referring to their optimistic interpretation of events as *"hopium"* - a portmanteau of the words "hope" and "opium" and a term popularized by internet meme culture that refers to a metaphorical drug that causes people to have irrational hope and optimism in a desperate and dark situation.

The visions for the desired and undesired future outcomes regarding the war in Ukraine within the sample not only illuminate key beliefs, values and ideological standings of active participants of this online space, but also provide insights into the discursive processes of negotiating its identity as a proactive rather than a passive supporter of Ukraine. By eliciting frames that encourage action, it shapes the community's aspirations and develops a shared sense of purpose in acknowledging that a desired future of victory is possible, but not yet guaranteed and conditional on successful and actionable support.

5.2.5 Conceptions of Geopolitics

The conceptions of geopolitics in this online discursive space is another aspect of the discourse production process that plays a role in forming the ideology of this community. The manner in which members of the r/worldnews discussion threads talk about international organizations, positioning of countries as well as noteworthy individuals that play a role in the conflict, all have an impact in the important process of its framing, identification of ally and foe as well as justification for specific measures to be taken.

The perceptions and attributed value and 'goodness' of supranational bodies or international organizations within the discourse in the sample are highly dependent on how they are positioned in the context of the conflict. For example, NATO and the EU are seen as powerful allies to Ukraine and ones that have the power in their ability to swing the outcome of the conflict towards the desired direction of a Ukrainian victory and Russian defeat providing there is enough political will. While these have been clearly identified as allies by the discourse, there is some criticism of these structures, usually centering on their lack of urgency and cases of inaction in their efforts to support Ukraine with one contributor highlighting reluctance of NATO members to provide weapons: "*[Zelenskyy] kept asking for weapons from every NATO nations relentlessly and he managed to get what he wanted even though most nations were reluctant at first.*" (Day 65), while another reacts to the reluctance to issue an EU-wide ban on issuing tourist visas: "*EU should be doing better for a neighboring democracy. I have/had little intellectual sympathy with Brexit. But I'm beginning to understand the feels for it. It must be so easy to stoke nationalist separatism against these morons.*" (Day 175). Despite the overwhelming portrayal of these organizations as positive and a force for good, at least in terms of supporting Ukraine, cases of their reluctance and lack of further measures to weaken Russia are still met with contempt by some members of these discussion threads. The actions of international organizations are therefore evaluated through the lens of how supporting or damaging they might be to the Ukrainian cause. One apt example is the severity of the response to the report critical of the Ukrainian military tactics by Amnesty International (2022) with members voicing their distaste for the organization in various ways, first by engaging with the contents of the report: "*There are many things wrong with the new #@amnesty report. First and foremost, it's a blatant example of shifting the blame away from the aggressor.*", by disavowing their previous support: "*I'm done EVER supporting Amnesty International again. I donate more than six figures a year to things on average. So far this year that's been going to Ukraine.*" (Day 162), as well as profanely expressing their anger and opinion: "*Amnesty are fucking idiots.*" (Day 163). The severity of such a response suggests the power of previous social actions and negotiations of the collective discursive identity as a vehement supporter of Ukraine, as such a united response implies an overall strong ideological alignment both within contributors as well as those who participate in the upvoting/downvoting in the discussion threads. On the other hand, the question of the most optimal level of intervention by Ukraine's allies is a less unified position between contributors. However, generally the consensus is of one that falls just short of NATO members directly militarily intervening and instead their support should be focused on providing the necessary financial and material aid to allow the Ukrainian military to fight themselves. The argument behind this red line tends to revolve around fear of nuclear war and succumbing to a larger global conflict. One contributor voices his criticism of others in the community for holding the more uncompromising interventionist views: "*Everyone wanting a nato military intervention - no, salivating at the thought of it is fucking stupid. Forget the WWIII argument, Putins own country is questioning him. The order of magnitude he had fucked up is so large that we haven't even begun to see the ramifications yet. His own army is half assing the invasion and his oligarchs are starting to question him openly. The minute a single NATO ordinance hits a Russian asset, that all changes and the Russians will be unified. What the west has to do is make sure Ukraine is well supplied, well fed, and well informed. There's a chance that this will collapse the current Russian regime. Alternately, NATO can*

interfere and all hell will break loose" (Day 6). The notion that other militaries allied to Ukraine should provide soldiers in the war against Russia is therefore not a popular one amongst the Top rated comment sections of these threads.

Furthermore, the regional conceptualization of this war as a wider clash of free, liberal democracies and an expansionist imperial Russia, views Ukrainian resistance as fighting also for these countries, as Ukraine is perceived as simply the first step in the ambitions of imperial Russia. For this reason, Ukrainian membership in the EU and NATO is viewed as a welcome reward and a thank you for the sacrifices made on behalf of other EU and NATO members and an outcome that would strengthen the security of Ukraine as well as the entire EU and NATO sphere of influence. One commenter describes such a wish: "*Coming from a NATO country I do not want Ukraine to apply for membership. I want to send them a formal invitation to please do us the honor of joining our alliance. [...]*" (Day 169).

A similar dichotomy of ally and enemy is evident in discussions regarding the alignment of different nations in relation to the war in Ukraine. The more pronounced and intensity of support for Ukraine is perceived, the more favorable view the discourse tends to take on the particular country. The most favourable bloc of countries can be considered to be Poland and the Baltics due to their intense outpouring of support for Ukraine, partly attributed due to their own recent experiences of being under Russian occupation. One comment aptly encapsulates such a perspective: "*Western Europeans never knew the taste of the Russian boot heel. They can't empathize with the Ukrainians like the Baltic states and Poland can, countries that Russia fucked hard in the not too distant past.*" (Day 32). This is of course not to say that the discussions do not view the Western European states favourably as news of aid from other EU countries is welcomed and lauded. However, some EU countries, especially France and Germany also face some general criticisms for the lack of urgency and obstacles hampering the swiftness of the process to aid Ukraine, as illustrated by this comment: "*This is probably controversial on a European sub but not so much here. I think France and particularly Germany have left a lot to be desired as the unofficial leaders of the EU.*" (Day 147). The critiques for France tend to revolve around Macron's commitment to diplomacy with Putin long after many crimes of the invasion have occurred, while for Germany, the lack of urgency in providing military aid to Ukraine is attributed to years reliance on Russian energy. Such criticisms are sometimes contrasted with the overwhelmingly positive attitude towards the US and UK and their political leadership in their swiftness and amount of military aid given to Ukraine. These delineations of what actions should be applauded and which should be criticised within Western nations from which most of these contributors hail from, suggests the power and effectiveness of the negotiated social identities within the discourse in aligning the community ideologically.

On the other hand, there are also discussions on the actions of countries that are perceived to be harmful and enemies to the general values and overall ideological ideals of the r/worldnews discursive community. One of the countries to which a great deal of distaste is directed towards is Hungary. This tends to be centered around the anger towards its undemocratic leadership and its friendliness to Russia, as well as their hampering of a unified process and swift process to aid Ukraine from within the EU and NATO: "*Unfortunate that the*

European Union and NATO currently have to deal with Putin's puppet in Hungary" (Day 152). As a result of these policies, many contributors voice their concerns about Hungary's EU membership and wish to see a future without Hungary as part of the union. It therefore suggests that the ideological values of the community translate into a view of a desired geopolitical landscape in which those who actively hamper Ukraine's progress towards their victory should be excluded from the political and institutional structures that make up the concept of the 'West'. Furthermore, the discursive tools of contempt and distaste about enemies of Ukraine continues with discussions about Belarus and Iran, which are conceived as Russian allies. Belarus is considered an illegal, and authoritarian dictatorship and Russia's vassal state with little autonomy of its own, with a support for the same measures that Russia is and should be facing should be also extended to Belarus. One commenter expresses such a position: "*Belarus needs to feel every inch of pain that Russia will from the West. Kyiv is in the dire straights that it is because of the ability of Russian forces to move freely and with help through Belarus into Chernobyl. It is terrible for the Belorussian people, who voted AGAINST their fake illegal president, but his government needs to be as ostracized from the civilized world as Russia's soon will be*" (Day 2). Hostility towards Iran is expressed due to its provision of weapons and drones, directly resulting in the increased ability for Russia to conduct strikes on non-military targets: "*Fuck Iran for selling those drones to bomb Ukrainian cities*" (Day 224). India and China on the other hand are perceived as self-serving opportunists taking advantage of cheap Russian energy due to the war, with China especially being positioned to gain an upper hand in the perceived geopolitical competition against Western democracies.

The discursive conceptualizations of the geopolitical landscape with regards to Russo-Ukrainian war therefore have significant implications for both the ideological standings of the *r/worldnews* community as well as more broadly. The discourse conceptualizes global affairs relevant to the conflict in Ukraine, with Ukraine being the front line for the larger cleavage between free, Western democracies against a fascist authoritarian Russia, its allies and lesser strategic partners. The intensity of plaudits or contempt for nations as well as international and supranational bodies depends on the perceived levels of support or opposition to Ukraine. This process therefore frames the Russian invasion as both one that goes against the values of democracy and freedom, as well as a regional threat to the security, safety and global stability, inching Westwards towards other European nations and the EU in which a significant part of the contributors reside. As a result, the discourse has identified geopolitical allies and enemies to its cause and the negotiations within it allow for the ideologically shared beliefs and attitudes to be aligned, at least at the top of these discussion threads. Such frames of both the immorality of the invasion and a perceived regional threat therefore discursively legitimizes high levels of mobilizing action in providing as much aid in Ukraine's resistance against the invasion as possible by the denoted geopolitical allies, although delineated by a red line of direct NATO deployment of soldiers to Russia or Ukraine. Such notions of geopolitics where spheres of ally versus enemy depend on the alignments of countries and institutional structures in regards to the war in Ukraine can perhaps challenge the Appadurai's (1996) point discussed in section 2.1, where the ideoscapes are becoming de-territorialized in the creation of new and hybrid spaces that blend elements from different cultural traditions. While true, as even in the context of these English speaking discussion threads about the war in Ukraine, one can notice a reinterpretation

of both cultural and geopolitical understandings to fit this emerging third culture of an online community, the term “deterritorialization” is perhaps less appropriate here than “reterritorialization”. The term deterritorialization suggests a separation of the emerging cultural forms from their original geographic and cultural contexts. Instead the term “reterritorialization” may be more appropriate as evidence from this sample suggests that the ideas of nation as well as the territory of the in-group of this ideology (the idea of the West) are still an extremely vital element in the production of notions of ‘good’ and ‘bad’, as well as the negotiation of commonly shared values and attitudes with which people generally should agree to live by. Appadurai’s notion of ‘thinking beyond the nation’ is therefore perhaps premature and idealistic as despite the presence of global interconnectedness, this case suggests that transcending national and regional identities, especially in a context of conflict is certainly not possible any time in the near future and still remains a significant determinant of the lines that are drawn between “us” and “them”.

5.2.6 Use of Historical references, comparisons and analogies to the ongoing war

The use of history, historical comparisons and analogies to the ongoing situation is a powerful discursive tool in shaping the perceptions and identities of members of this virtual space, as it contextualizes current conflict with already ideologically loaded and preconceived commonly shared interpretations of history and in turn situates it within a broader historical narrative.

Arguably the most stand-out historical parallel drawn by the discourse of the discussion threads is the similarities between the contemporary Russian state and Nazi Germany: “*The differences between modern Russia and Nazi Germany is shrinking day by day. By some measures, they’re one and the same right now.*” (Day 57), “[...] [with] the atrocities committed in Bucha and elsewhere and this [article by RIA Novosti] calling for genocide, we’re basically dealing with Nazi Russia right now.” (Day 40). Such a conceptualization therefore frames Russia as an aggressive, expansionist and genocidal power that seeks to control its neighbors. This framing therefore suggests that the threat of Russia is not only confined to the territory of Ukraine, but also other neighboring states, which in turn can be viewed as a discursive way to justify the continuation of the war under Ukraine’s terms as opposed to yield to Russia wishes to negotiate peace based on the territories divided by the front line. The reference to events in Bucha likens atrocities in Ukraine to those of the holocaust, providing a sense of urgency to encourage swift action. Such an argument is not only based on the already evident moral motivation to prevent further genocidal atrocities, but also based on a historical lesson from appeasement by not surrendering to the demands of fascist states. Using such a comparison is also useful in mobilizing further support, as the comparison of Russia with a losing warring party can be made in the argument that the current sacrifices that are being made are ultimately going to be worth it once victory is achieved.

References of other historical events are also commonly made within the sample to further situate the meanings of the ongoing conflict. One way to put the human cost of the war in perspective, comparisons of Russian casualties with those of the US throughout the entirety of the Vietnam war is another useful way in which the scale and unsustainability of the Russian war effort is emphasized: “ [...] *For perspective, the U.S. Lost 66,000 in Vietnam over 9 years (1964-1973). Russia has lost that many in 4 months.*” (Day 130). “*Russia speed running Vietnam once again*” (Day 194). Other parallels such as a likening of the current situation with the Russo- Japanese war and a continuation of oppressive and expansionist rule due to the legacy of the Soviet Union are all examples to discursively elicit a frame of inevitable Russian capitulation : “*Isn't it funny to think that both the 20th and 21st centuries might show Russia early on getting outmatched by a foe that was once perceived as much weaker? Maybe a revolution will eventually follow defeat again.*” (Day 194). “*Putin repeating history. This war will do the same to his USSR wet dream.*” (Day 23).

The use of history to contextualize and shape understanding of the war in Ukraine is therefore a powerful tool to simplify a geopolitical event with many moving parts into an easily digestible and familiar narrative for the wider online audience. The power lay not only in this simplification and its capacity to influence perceptions, but also in the absence of neutrality. The choice of the kinds of historical analogies to use shapes the perceptions and in turn urgent support for the measures that should be taken. In this case, the use of comparisons to WW2 and a likeness of modern Russia to Nazi Germany implies that the war should only end on Ukrainian terms, while references to other historical events to frame Russia's current efforts as unsustainable further strengthens the argument and in turn, hope, that victory is achievable provided the support for Ukraine continues. Such a use of history also provides an important counter-discourse to the narratives of the Russian side, filled with concrete arguments and analogies for why the interpretations of the other side should be refuted.

5.2.7 Active participation in the war through online communication

Having discussed the various ways in which the process of discourse production has influenced the negotiations of identities, values and attitudes and representations of the warring sides, ultimately resulting in a version of a pro-Ukraine ideology particular to this discursive community, it is also important to bring up the explicit and active efforts by members of this online space to participate in this war through the use of CMC. Potentially the most significant element of this is the explicitly stated intentions of the discussion threads' moderators, as they have the power to direct and influence the flow and visibility of particular kinds of discursive productions. One of the key initiatives the moderators concern themselves with when they moderate the subreddit is getting rid of bots and trolls that spread disinformation and Russian state sponsored propaganda as part of its larger cyber-warfare strategy. The moderators post updates on their method of identification of such accounts as well as on the numbers of the amount of accounts banned in a time period: “*It's been a couple of hours but if you had a feeling of déjà vu from reading a comment on the live thread or elsewhere you may have seen a comment from a comment spammer bot.*”

•At least 20 bots were banned that were advocating violence. If you clicked on the bot's profile you would have seen the comment along with "redditor for 6 months" or "redditor for 5 months" on most of those profiles. These accounts were dormant during that time and had activity on one other sub.

•Another 30-40 bots were banned that had a different motive and were copy-and-pasting comments on this sub and others. Most of these accounts were under 24 hours old.

[...]

Reminder: Report any of the bot accounts if they manage to slip through." (Day 121). In addition, the community is actively encouraged to participate in this process of finding accounts with irregular activity so that they can be removed from the comment threads: *"Keep an eye out for dormant 1 year old accounts. Some of these accounts have become active recently and have been submitting a lot of items to the sub in a short time span. It looks like they are attempting to get some of their posts to the front page of the sub. The dormant accounts were created in June 2021. Some of them were created within 5 minutes apart of each other. So far two of the accounts have been suspended by the admins. You can click the "report" link if you find one those bot comments or posts. Thanks if you already do this."* (Day 121). The active effort to rid of any influence from the Russian side is therefore a powerful tool to rid the discussions of the live threads from any attempts to sway its audience from its negotiated identities, reinforcing the attitudes and values that are desired by both the moderation team as well as those who upvote, downvote and report undesired accounts within this space. To further capture the desired wishes and direction of the mod team, one comment encapsulates the motivations behind their volunteer efforts: *"We're into our 7 month of covering the war and we won't. Stop. until Ukraine has recaptured all of its territory. When this war is over and Ukraine is victorious nobody will ever wonder or question where this sub stood. Folks may criticize this sub (sticks and stones), but never doubt our commitment. To all of you. To doing what's right, even when that isn't clear. To ensure quality in the face of mis/disinformation. Folks forget we're just volunteers, trying out best! This is a decisive moment in history we're collectively experiencing. It's out utmost honor to be serving all of you and doing our (small) part of continuing to update the Live Thread, which we see as part of the larger war effort. Thank you all for being here with us and being part of this amazing community."* (Day 198). This comment is a very illuminating one as it indicates a number of unmovable positions by the most powerful members of these threads in the effort of creating a community. Firstly, the grammar and use of short sentences such as *"we. won't. Stop."* and *"To all of you."*, suggests an unquestionable resolve to continue on the path to moderate the community in the manner it has done. Secondly, the sureness of Ukrainian victory in retaking all of its territory is clear, further reinforces the ultimate end goal for this community and the reassurance that the subreddit's position in regards to the war will not be questioned, further emphasizes its unyielding commitment to supporting Ukraine. The comment also acknowledges the power of discourse and recognizes that this community is conceptualized as being an active part in the larger war effort that is working towards a Ukrainian victory and in turn discursively promoting support for a pro-Ukrainian ideology and discursively battling the spread of pro-Russian talking points.

However, such an active participation in the larger war effort is not only limited to the moderators of the community, but regular contributors also play a large part. Efforts to battle

Russian disinformation are also evident in comments of regular users, taking the form of advocacy or providing evidence or perspective that counter the pro-Russian talking points. Advocacy type of comments tend to revolve around spreading warnings about potential bot influence similar to the above comments of the moderators and threats of clicking on potentially malicious links: “*REMINDER - DO NOT CLICK ON LINKS YOU ARE NOT FAMILIAR WITH These threads are full of bots and could easily disguise malware as a news or video link and have you click it without thinking. [...]*” (Day 2). The warning in all capitalized letters implies urgency and acts as a discursive tool to gather your attention for an important warning. The other form of battling Russian disinformation is by providing a counter-message to the pro-Russian talking points: “*Russian troll factory claims they shot down Lithuania’s crowd-funded Bayraktar drone after 3.5 minutes of flight. What an unbelievable shot! Unbelievable because the drone is still in the factory. [Embedded Link] Russian propaganda has the same quality as Russia’s third rate, dilapidated weaponry. Only gullible ignoramuses hooked on Russian state TV believe their propaganda nonsense.*” (Day 97). Using humor, a strong statement about the nature of those who believe such a viewpoint and a verifiable fact, the narrative is effectively taken apart by a contributor of the community with relative simplicity. However, the lines can become more blurred in regards to what is considered to be a Russian troll, as opposed to someone wanting to share and discuss the bad news about Ukraine, from the standpoint of this collective community. One contributor addresses how they deal with such a dilemma: “*It’s pretty easy to distinguish between an informative comment that contains bad news about the difficult situation Ukraine is in, and a comment that goes “Gee IDK is Ukraine about to lose maybe we should negotiate IDK though can someone explain how Russia is so awesome I’m just asking don’t downvote?” [...]*” (Day 92). This discursive macrostructure therefore socially negotiates the lines of thinking between acceptable discourse within the community and one that should be considered to be pro-Russian by using a generalization and a caricature of the argument made by a malicious actor posting within the community. These examples of explicitly and actively calling out unwanted discursive productions in this online space can therefore be considered a small part of the entire community’s role in producing a counter-discourse to the narratives of those holding pro-Russian points of view. The significance of this is that it strengthens the pro-Ukrainian stances, as they have more arguments and evidence to support their positions, reinforcing the emerging ideological stances. Presenting such convincing arguments is also a tool to rally international support for the Ukrainian by appealing to international actors for further aid to Ukraine. On the other hand, it might not be an effective way to convince those who may hold some of those views that are deemed unacceptable by the community, leading to a complete breakdown of dialogue between the opposing sides, although this is clearly not in the intentions of both the moderators or the wider r/worldnews community in engaging in such a persuasive exercise.

The use of advocacy as a way to actively participate in the wider war effort is not limited to contending with pro-Russian narratives. It is also used to advocate for desired political outcomes. The most prevalent instance of continued advocacy throughout the lifespan of these discussion threads is encouraging voting for the Democratic Party for the US citizens within the community. Discursively, the advocacy is accomplished by relating it to its relevance to the war in Ukraine by encouraging others to “[r]emember when casting your vote this November that

Former President Trump threatened to leave NATO, characterized Putin's invasion of Ukraine as "savvy" and "genius," and attempted to blackmail President Zelenskyy by illegally withholding Ukraine military aid, and that nearly the entire Republican party went along with it. Both sides are not the same." (Day 195). Such a reminder is consistently repeated throughout these threads together with a flurry of criticisms for the GOP, stressing the power of those who have the ability to vote in the US in their ability to alter the outcome of the war. Such advocacy and encouragement of mobilization to action beyond the immediate context of the discourse can therefore have significant impact on international relations, providing the community is popular and influential enough to have some sway in electing political leaders who are willing to take a more hardline stance towards Russia. Advocacy is also done by encouragement of donations to various pro-Ukraine causes, by emphasizing the notion that they are effective in the effort to make use of the popularity of the subreddit to financially support people doing work on the ground: *"Donations make a difference. [...]"* (Day 87). *"Donate, and please plan to REGISTER and VOTE for the CRUCIAL midterms in the US this year."* (Day 104). Such discursive tools are therefore powerful when combined with the popularity of these threads, as it can result in the generation of significant financial aid that would otherwise not be possible without this discursive community's social actions of negotiating an identity that encourages proactive action in the support for Ukraine.

By examining the moderators' intentions and encouragement to actively participate in their efforts to remove any pro-Russian influence in the community of the live threads, as well as the contributors' use of advocacy, the pro-Ukrainian ideology is further revealed in its aims to actively participate in the larger war effort to influence political as well as financially aided outcomes beyond the immediate setting of the discursive productions.

6. Suggestions for Further Research and Concluding Remarks

The findings have produced insights into the discursive strategies used to produce representations of two warring sides and accomplishing social actions in the emergence of a pro-Ukrainian ideology in the *r/worldnews* discussion threads about the Russian invasion on Ukraine on Reddit. While the potential for generalizing the findings to other online communities may be low due to the design of the Reddit platform as well as the discursive processes unique to the *r/worldnews* subreddit, the broader arguments about supporting Ukraine are likely to be found in other discursive communities and cultural contexts. These threads act as apt virtual spaces for like-minded individuals to get together to share their ideas about the ongoing conflict, but their ideological dispositions are not exclusively shaped within these online threads but rather reinforced and collectively negotiated within these spaces, with the make-up of their worldview also being shaped by other broader cultural, social and historical factors. The power within this virtual consensus and community building is that it unites like-minded individuals under a common set of values, beliefs and desired outcomes to not only find a sense of belonging and psychological support, but also set a framework for mobilizing action towards enacting change beyond the immediate setting where the discourse takes place. Continued efforts to map such spaces and the demands embedded within them may therefore provide further insights into what kind of grievances and desired outcomes motivate different collectives of people to spend their time and energy into discursively building a unified community. Such efforts can have significant implications for political as well as geopolitical outcomes depending on the concern of the discursive community in question. Further research that aims to understand such online communities is one of the first steps in building a policy framework that can address grievances and concerns of communities that may not necessarily hold power in the more traditional domains. The understanding of each community's red lines and potential avenues for negotiation and change can set the policy makers on the right track to make informed decisions towards the path of widely desired change.

Traditionally, such a sample as the one used for this paper may be triangulated with other methods, for example such as interviews with experts on war and war rhetoric. However, I argue that such an effort would be more useful after this initial analysis of virtual communities and the ideological manner in which they deal with the ongoing war. The effort to first unground the micro-politics of this kind of online spaces would therefore lead to more insightful reflections with key figures in this field, as having the findings ready in such discussions would provide an opportunity to deduce whether the opinions of experts actually match up with what is taking place in online discourse or whether there is some discord among the types of thematic and conceptual relationships the analysis of this study draws out.

In the wider context of the Russo-Ukrainian war and online discourse surrounding it, a number of pertinent questions remain unanswered. Firstly, there is the question of causality, an issue that is very challenging to resolve in doing textual analyses. That is, to what extent do

social media platforms shape ideological discourse, as opposed to being already a reflection of the wider societal trends. By the same token, the findings of this study mentioned the community's efforts to mobilize action, investigating the impact of such efforts on offline behaviors still remains an important issue to tackle, especially when dealing with such high-stakes geopolitical implications in the context of a violent conflict. Secondly, an important unexplored avenue within this context remains the question of representation and demographics and its relationship with the emerging pro-Ukrainian ideology. Investigating the intersections between the emerging ideological discourse and the social identities of the individuals that adopt it - that is factors such as age, ethnicity, gender, religion and nationality are all important elements that are missing from this analysis that could provide further insights into how they affect the kinds of perspectives that are welcomed or undesirable within the communities in question. Insights into representation and the level of impact of the online discourse would enable an understanding of the potential political influence these virtual spaces can enact on national as well as transnational scales. Finally, a comparative analysis with another discursive space about the war in Ukraine would help further contextualize the findings of this study by providing key similarities and differences in the framing and ideological interpretations of the ongoing conflict in Ukraine. With reconciliation between the two warring sides seemingly virtually impossible now, with clear red lines having been established and the outcome of the war still very much an unknown, an informed understanding of the ideologies, values, and priorities for all stakeholders involved is a crucial element in effective decision-making both during and after the war.

To conclude, by conducting a critical discourse analysis, this thesis has investigated the emergence of a pro-Ukrainian ideology in a series of discussion threads stickied on the front page of the r/worldnews subreddit on Reddit. Building on research of community and consensus building in virtual spaces, the exploration of ideology of the selected discourse is seen to fill a research gap in providing insights into a relatively new yet geopolitically significant online space. By aiming to elucidate the ways the process of discourse production represents the warring sides, accomplish social actions in the emergence of a pro-Ukrainian ideology within the selected sample, knowledge of key ideological attitudes, demands, values, and narratives provide a previously unknown framework that the community uses to shape their perspectives and mobilize themselves towards desired future outcomes. The theoretical framework justifies the study of discourse as the most appropriate way in which to tackle the aims of the study, as well as provides an important conceptual lens that aids in the analysis of the data. Returning back to the discussions regarding constructionism and subjectivism in the theoretical chapter after having done the analysis, the findings suggest that while both paradigms certainly hold credence in this context, the constructionist perspective lends itself more easily in explaining the data. Of course, it is impossible to deny that the subjectivist perspective that emphasizes the role of the individual in shaping the reality within the discourse is not important, but it is the constructionist idea that reality is shaped through language and discourse that seems to hold more weight when considering this context. The online community that was investigated here has engaged in negotiating an emerging ideology, explicating its attitudes, values and frameworks toward ideal futures through repetitive and multiplicitous conversing and negotiating

the dynamics of what has happened and should happen. The emerging ideological standpoints are then continually reinforced and reproduced, shaping not only the contributor's and the visitors' understandings of the war, but also their future interactions. The use of van Dijk's (2006) framework for ideology analysis helps at inductively arriving at a conception of an emerging ideology through examining situated interactional discourse of online communities, while Fairclough and Fairclough's (2012) argumentation theory aids in relating the representations found in discourse to the implicit arguments towards political actions and outcomes they are embedded in. An awareness on the background of Critical Geopolitics allows it to be used as a tool to deconstruct the discussions surrounding such a crucial geopolitical topic such as the war in Ukraine.

The analysis of the findings produces a number of interesting conclusions. The narratives surrounding Ukraine as a nation represent its populace, military and leadership as brave, heroic, resilient as well as competent, with the entire discourse centered around how to best achieve outcomes towards its victory. This is contrasted with a perception of Russia as a cruel, war-crime committing and expansionist fascist state that is considered to be an enemy of the collective community and one that has to be defeated even at great costs. The arguments embedded in the discourse surrounding the active or passive frames of the role of Russians in being complicit with Russian war-crimes, suggests different preferences for future relations. The use of news further aids in the social action of reinforcing the framings of Ukraine as brave, heroic and competent, while contrasting it with the image of Russia as incompetent and cruel invaders, and is a powerful way of shaping the interpretations of the conflict by the threads' visitors as a large frame of good against evil. Discussions of the future show the discursive community's hopes and fears, with the ultimate goal of a swift Ukrainian victory to retake its sovereign territory. Even though the individual submissions are varied and there is heterogeneity in the types of perspectives the community pays attention to, a general consensus still emerges and is radicalized throughout the lifespan of these threads as the war progresses. The array of different positions and the stance of the community depends on the topic in question. As an example, one topic of heterogeneous opinions is of a scenario that has not been played out yet - Ukraine's accession to NATO and EU and the discussions of the most ideal scenarios relative to this topic are still being negotiated at this moment. On the other hand, a much more common occurrence in this community is the collective convergence into a unilateral position. One key example of this can be seen in the attention and calls for emphasis towards Russian war crimes and cruelty having become increasingly loud, which has directly translated into calls for more Western weapons to stop the status quo of a trickling approach to military aid and begin a phase of large scale increased levels of weapons provided to Ukraine so that they can be much more well equipped in their efforts towards victory over Russia. That is something in which there is little debate over, at least in the top, most visible levels of the discourse of these live threads. This may in part be due to the upvote/downvote design of Reddit, and also due to the moderators' having power in the ability to set a general range of what is to be considered acceptable discourse. However, the end result of this analysis is that we end up knowing the identity of the community, but not the identities of the individuals that it emerges from. Now knowing both the demands, and values of a community visited by thousands, if not millions of people, the problem becomes in answering the question of on where and in which political and

institutional arenas such identities are expressed and how do such expressions of views and contributions online translate into offline behaviour. As already mentioned above, further research efforts are required to fill this knowledge gap.

The desired, expected and conditional framings of the future allow for a community-wide negotiation of an identity that is a proactive supporter of Ukraine, as well as define the most appropriate avenues for actions to take. Additionally, the conceptions of geopolitics play an important role in the ideological formation in the discourse, as they portray the conflict in the larger context of Western democracies against an imperial Russia, and attribute the values of good or unfavorable according to the perceived urgency and level of support they give to Ukraine. The use of history is also considered to be an effective discursive tool to simplify and contextualize the ongoing conflict with references to commonly shared historical interpretations and in turn influence others' perceptions, while also engaging in an implicit argument with the kinds of prescriptions that should be taken. The use of advocacy and encouragement is noted as a tool to organize a more active participation in the wider war effort to influence the types of discursive productions are made invisible within the discourse as well as attempting to affect political and financial outcomes outside the immediate discursive setting in the goal of aiding even incrementally towards Ukrainian victory. A clear overall framing towards community-wide identity as a proactive supporter of Ukraine is clear, however finding the manner in which such support materializes and influences political, financial and social outcomes beyond the immediate context of this online space has been beyond the scope of this paper, but is an important avenue towards a continued research endeavour. Such findings are therefore considered to be only part of a proposed deeper research effort into mapping such virtual spaces, in order to be able see their influence on offline behaviours that may then impact cultural, political and economic outcomes in both the context of the conflict in Ukraine as well as more broadly, depending on each online discursive communities' ideological standpoints.

References

- About. Reddit. (2021a). Retrieved December 9, 2022, from <https://www.redditinc.com/>
- Adams, N. N. (2022). 'Scraping' Reddit posts for academic research? Addressing some blurred lines of consent in growing internet-based research trend during the time of Covid-19. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*.
- Ammari, T., Schoenebeck, S., & Romero, D. (2019). Self-declared Throwaway Accounts on Reddit: How Platform Affordances and Shared Norms enable Parenting Disclosure and Support. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 3(CSCW), 1–30.
- Amnesty International. (2022). Ukraine: Ukrainian fighting tactics endanger civilians. Retrieved from <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2022/08/ukraine-ukrainian-fighting-tactics-endanger-civilians/>
- Anderson, K. E. (2015). Ask me anything: what is Reddit? *Library Hi Tech News*, 32(5).
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7, 295–310.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Vol. 1). University of Minnesota Press.
- Armstrong, M. (2023). The countries sending the most military aid to Ukraine. *Statista*. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/chart/27278/military-aid-to-ukraine-by-country/>
- Aron, L. (2013). *How Putin Does It: A dull man, a brilliant politician, a ruthless dictator*. *Commentary*, 42–50.
- Bazerman, C. (2012). *Genre as social action*. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 226–239). essay, Routledge.
- Behr, I., Reding, A., Edwards, C., & Gribbon, L. (n.d.). (rep.). *Radicalisation in the digital era: The use of the internet in 15 cases of terrorism and extremism* (pp. 1–58). RAND Europe.
- Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Brooks, A. (2022). Scroll and share: The role of social media on conflicts. Retrieved from <https://www.mercycorps.org/blog/role-social-media-conflicts>
- Burr, V. (1998). Overview: Realism, Relativism, Social Constructionism and Discourse. In I. Parker (Ed.), *Social Constructionism, Discourse and Realism* (pp. 11–27). essay, Sage Publications.

Chong, D & Druckman, J.N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 103-126.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The Foundations of Social Research*. Sage Publications.

Crowd control and other safety updates [Official announcement]. Reddit. (2021e).

Retrieved from

https://www.reddit.com/r/modnews/comments/lw9m6q/crowd_control_and_other_safety_updates/

CyberPeace Institute Analysis on Ukraine Conflict Highlights Hidden Impact of Cyber Attacks on Society. CyberPeace Institute. (2022). Retrieved December 8, 2022, from <https://cyberpeaceinstitute.org/news/cyberpeace-institute-cyber-attacks-in-times-of-conflict-platform-ukraine/>

Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In C. Schaffne & A. L. Wenden (Eds.), *Language & Peace* (pp. 17–33). essay, Routledge.

Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage Publications.

Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), 115–140.

Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dijk, T. A. (1995b). Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, 1, 17–27.

Dijk, T. A., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 466–486). essay, Wiley Blackwell.

Discover what makes Reddit Ads unique. Reddit. (2021c). Retrieved from

<https://web.archive.org/web/20210117184818/https://www.redditinc.com/advertising/audience>

Dodgson, J. E. (2019). Reflexivity in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Human Lactation*, 35(2), 220–222.

Engesser, S., Ernst, N., Esser, F., & Buchel, F. (2017). Populism and social media: how politicians spread a fragmented ideology. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(8), 1109–1126.

Evolving the Best Sort for Reddit's Home Feed. Reddit. (2021b). Retrieved 2022, from

https://www.reddit.com/r/blog/comments/o5tjcn/evolving_the_best_sort_for_reddits_home_feed/

- Fairclough, N. (2012). Critical discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 9–21). essay, Routledge.
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A method for advanced students*. Routledge.
- Friese, S. (2019). *Qualitative Data Analysis with Atlas.Ti*. Sage Publications.
- Garton Ash, T., Krastev, I., & Leonard, M. (2023). United West, divided from the rest: Global public opinion one year into Russia's war on Ukraine. *European Council on Foreign Relations*. Retrieved from <https://ecfr.eu/publication/united-west-divided-from-the-rest-global-public-opinion-one-year-into-russias-war-on-ukraine/>
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an Analytic Lens for Research in Education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99–125.
- Gessen, M. (2012). *The Man Without a Face: The Unlikely Rise of Vladimir Putin*. Penguin Group.
- Gordon, C. (2015). Framing and Positioning. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 324–346). essay, Wiley Blackwell.
- Hajer, M. (2002). Discourse Analysis and the Study of Policy Making. *European Political Science*, 2(1), 61–65.
- Hall, O. (2018). The Internet and cosmopolitanism. In G. Delanty (Ed.), *Routledge International Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies* (2nd ed., pp. 406–418). essay, Routledge.
- Herring, S. C. (2012). Discourse in Web 2.0: Familiar, Reconfigured, and Emergent. In D. Tannen & A. M. Tester (Eds.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 1–29). essay, Georgetown University Press.
- Herring, S. C., & Androutsopoulos, J. (2015). Computer Mediated Discourse 2.0. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 127–152). essay, Wiley Blackwell.
- Hodges, A. (2015). Intertextuality in Discourse. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (Vol. 1, pp. 42–61). essay, Wiley Blackwell.

- Holmes, A. G. D. (2020). Researcher Positionality - A Consideration of Its Influence and Place in Qualitative Research - A New Researcher Guide. *International Journal of Education*, 8(4).
- Hull, G. A., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2010). Literate Arts in a Global World: Reframing Social Networking as Cosmopolitan Practice, *54*(2), 85–97.
- Jaspers, J. (2012). Interactional sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 135–147). essay, Routledge.
- Jones, R. H., Chik, A., & Hafner, C. A. (2015). Introduction: discourse analysis and digital practices. In R. H. Jones, A. Chik, & C. A. Hafner (Eds.), *Discourse and Digital Practices: Doing Discourse Analysis in the digital age* (pp. 1–18). essay, Routledge.
- Kelsey, D., & Bennet, L. (2014). Discipline and resistance on social media: Discourse, power and context in the Paul Chambers 'Twitter Joke Trial.' *Discourse, Context and Media*, 3, 37–45.
- Khosravinik, M. (2017). Social media critical discourse studies (SM-CDS). In J. Flowerdew & J. E. Richardson (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies* (pp. 582–596). essay, Routledge.
- Khosravinik, M., & Zia, M. (2014). Persian Nationalism, Identity and Anti-Arab Sentiments in Iranian Facebook Discourses: Critical Discourse Analysis and Social Media Communication. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 13(4), 755–780.
- Kuus, M. (2010). Critical Geopolitics. In R. Denemark (Ed.), *The International Studies Encyclopedia* (Vol. 2, pp. 683–701). essay, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mancini, A., Desiderio, A., Clemente, R., & Cimini, G. (2022). Self-induced consensus of Reddit users to characterise the GameStop short squeeze. *Scientific Reports*, 12.
- Marks, A. R. (2012). Participation Framework and Footing Shifts in an Interpreted Academic Meeting. *Journal of Interpretation*, 22(1).
- Marshall, T. (2015). *Prisoners of Geography* (1st ed.). Elliot & Thompson.
- Mayr, A. (2015). Institutional Discourse. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 753–775). essay, Wiley Blackwell.
- McEwan, B., & Sobre-Denton, M. (2011). Virtual Cosmopolitanism: Constructing Third Cultures and Transmitting Social and Cultural Capital Through Social Media. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 4(4), 252–258.

- Medina, J. (2007). How to Undo Things with Words: Infelicitous Practices and Infelicitous Agents. *The Philosophy of Language*, 8(1).
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Mills, R. A. (2018). Pop-up political advocacy communities on reddit.com: SandersForPresident and The Donald. *AI & Soc*, 33, 39–54.
- Mithun, M. (2015). Discourse and Grammar. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 11–42). essay, Wiley Blackwell.
- Moon, K., & Blackman, D. (2014). A Guide to Understanding Social Science Research for Natural Scientists. *Conservation Biology*, 28(5), 1167–1177.
- Pfister, D. S., & Soliz, J. (2011). (Re)Conceptualizing Intercultural Communication in a Networked Society, *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*(4), 246–251.
- Platt, E., Smith, C., Darbyshire, M., Kantor, A., & Wigglesworth, R. (2021). 'This is the way': the Reddit traders who took on Wall Street's elite. *Australian Financial Review*. Retrieved from <https://www.afr.com/markets/equity-markets/this-is-the-way-the-reddit-traders-who-took-on-wall-street-s-elite-20210131-p56y4x>
- Potter, J. (1998). Fragments in the Realization of Relativism. In I. Parker (Ed.), *Social Constructionism, Discourse and Realism* (pp. 27–47). essay, Sage Publications.
- Proferes, N., Jones, N., Gillbert, S., Fiesler, C., & Zimmer, M. (2021). Studying Reddit: A Systematic Overview of Disciplines, Approaches, Methods, and Ethics. *Social Media + Society*, 7(2), 1–14.
- Reddit Coins*. Reddit. (2022b). Retrieved from <https://www.reddit.com/coins>
- Reddit Content Policy*. Reddit. (2022a). Retrieved December 9, 2022, from <https://www.redditinc.com/policies/content-policy>
- Reddit User Agreement if you live in the EEA, United Kingdom, or Switzerland*. Reddit. (2021d). Retrieved December 9, 2022, from <https://www.redditinc.com/policies/user-agreement-september-12-2021#EEA>
- reddit.com Web Traffic Statistics*. Semrush. (2022). Retrieved December 9, 2022, from <https://www.semrush.com/website/reddit.com/overview/>
- Reeves, S., & Wallace, D. (2015). The Combatant Status of the “Little Green Men” and Other Participants in the Ukraine Conflict. *International Law Studies*, 91, 361–401.

- Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse & Society*, 22(6), 781–807.
- Ritzer, G., & Jurgenson, N. (2010). Production, Consumption, Prosumption: The nature of capitalism in the age of the digital 'prosumer.' *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 10(1), 13–36.
- Saldana, J. O. (2013). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Sage Publications.
- Sbisa, M. (2009). Speech act theory. In J. Verschueren & J.-O. Ostman (Eds.), *Key Notions for Pragmatics* (pp. 229–242). essay, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Schappert, S. (2023). The impact of social media on the Russia Ukraine war. *CyberNews*. Retrieved from <https://cybernews.com/editorial/impact-social-media-russia-ukraine-war/>
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 462–482.
- Scott, C. F., Bay-Cheng, L. Y., Prince, M. A., Nochajski, T. H., & Collins, R. L. (2017). Time spent online: Latent profile analyses of emerging adults' social media use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 75, 311–319.
- Sharma, S. (2022). Brave Ukrainian woman tells Russian soldier: 'Put sunflower seeds in your pocket so they grow when you die'. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/ukraine-russia-soldier-woman-confrontation-b2022993.html>
- Shepherd, R. P. (2020). Gaming Reddit's Algorithm: r/the donald, Amplification, and the Rhetoric of Sorting. *Computers and Composition*, 56, 1–14.
- Sicard, S. (2022). Russian soldier's journal: 'Some grandmother poisoned our pies'. *Military Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.militarytimes.com/off-duty/2022/08/29/russian-soldiers-journal-some-grandmother-poisoned-our-pies/>
- Snyder, T. (2018). *The Road to Unfreedom: Russia, Europe, America*. Tim Duggan Books.
- Sobre-Denton, M., & Bardhan, N. (Eds.). (2013). *Cultivating Cosmopolitanism for Intercultural Communication: Communicating as Global Citizens*. Routledge.
- Sobre-Denton, M. (2015). Virtual intercultural bridgework: Social media, virtual cosmopolitanism, and activist community-building. *New Media & Society*, 18(8), 1–17.
- Sprain, L., & Reinig, L. (2017). Citizens Speaking as Experts: Expertise Discourse in Deliberative Forums. *Environmental Communication*.
- Suurmond, J. M. (2005). (rep.). *Our Talk and Walk* (pp. 19–22). Hague, Netherlands: Clingendael Institute.

- Teo, P. (2000). Racism in the news: a Critical Discourse Analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. *Discourse & Society*, 11(1), 7–49.
- Toal, G. (1999). Understanding critical geopolitics: Geopolitics and risk society. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 22, 107–124.
- Toal, G. (2005). *Critical Geopolitics*. Routledge.
- Toal, G., & Agnew, J. (1992). Geopolitics and Discourse: Practical Geopolitical Reasoning in American Foreign Policy. *Political Geography*, 11(2), 190–204.
- Toal, G., & Toal, G. (2017). Geopolitical Catastrophe. In *Near Abroad: Putin, the West and the Contest over Ukraine and the Caucasus* (pp. 55–92). essay, Oxford University Press.
- Volpp, L. (2014). The Boston Bombers. *Fordham Law Review*, 82, 2209–2220.
- Waring, H. Z. (2018). *Discourse Analysis: The Questions Discourse Analysts Ask and How They Answer Them*. Routledge.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about ± a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1–14). essay, Sage Publication.
- Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2015). Discourse and Racism. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 576–597). essay, Wiley Blackwell.
- Zizek, S. (2009). *First as Tragedy, Then as Farce*. Verso. In Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A method for advanced students*. Routledge.

Appendix

Table 1: Title of Live Threads used in sample

Date Posted	Title
24/02/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 1, Part 3 (Thread #3)
25/02/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 2, Part 1 (Thread #17)
26/02/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 3, Part 1 (Thread #30)
27/02/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 4, Part 1 (Thread #44)
28/02/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 5, Part 1 (Thread #57)
01/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 6, Part 1 (Thread #74)
02/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 7, Part 1 (Thread #83)
03/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 8, Part 1 (Thread #91)
04/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 9, Part 1 (Thread #99)
05/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 10, Part 1 (Thread #107)
06/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 11, Part 1 (Thread #113)
07/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 12, Part 1 (Thread #117)
08/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 13, Part 1 (Thread 122)
09/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 14, Part 1 (Thread #126)
10/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 15, Part 1 (Thread #126)
11/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 16, Part 1 (Thread #130)
12/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 17, Part 1 (Thread #134)
13/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 18, Part 1 (Thread #137)
14/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 19, Part 1 (Thread #139)
15/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 20, Part 1 (Thread #142)
16/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 21, Part 1 (Thread #144)
17/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 22, Part 1 (Thread #147)

18/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 23, Part 1 (Thread #150)
19/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 24, Part 1 (Thread #152)
20/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 25, Part 1 (Thread #154)
21/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 26, Part 1 (Thread #160)
22/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 27, Part 1 (Thread #162)
23/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 28, Part 1 (Thread #164)
24/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 29, Part 1 (Thread #168)
25/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 30, Part 1 (Thread #170)
26/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 31, Part 1 (Thread #171)
27/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 32, Part 1 (Thread #172)
28/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 33, Part 1 (Thread #173)
29/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 34, Part 1 (Thread #174)
30/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 35, Part 1 (Thread #175)
31/03/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 36, Part 1 (Thread #176)
01/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 37, Part 1 (Thread #177)
02/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 38, Part 1 (Thread #178)
03/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 39, Part 1 (Thread #179)
04/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 40, Part 1 (Thread #180)
05/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 41, Part 1 (Thread #181)
06/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 42, Part 1 (Thread #182)
07/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 43, Part 1 (Thread #183)
08/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 44, Part 1 (Thread #184)
09/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 45, Part 1 (Thread #185)
10/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 46, Part 1 (Thread #186)
11/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 47, Part 1 (Thread #187)
12/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 48, Part 1 (Thread #188)

13/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 49, Part 1 (Thread #189)
14/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 50, Part 1 (Thread #190)
15/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 51, Part 1 (Thread #191)
16/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 52, Part 1 (Thread #192)
17/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 53, Part 1 (Thread #193)
18/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 54, Part 1 (Thread #194)
19/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 55, Part 1 (Thread #195)
20/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 56, Part 1 (Thread #196)
21/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 57, Part 1 (Thread #197)
22/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 58, Part 1 (Thread #198)
23/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 59, Part 1 (Thread #199)
24/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 60, Part 1 (Thread #200)
25/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 61, Part 1 (Thread #201)
26/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 62, Part 1 (Thread #202)
27/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 63, Part 1 (Thread #203)
28/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 64, Part 1 (Thread #204)
29/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 65, Part 1 (Thread #205)
30/04/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 66, Part 1 (Thread #206)
01/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 67, Part 1 (Thread #207)
02/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 68, Part 1 (Thread #208)
03/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 69, Part 1 (Thread #209)
04/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 70, Part 1 (Thread #210)
05/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 71, Part 1 (Thread #211)
06/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 72, Part 1 (Thread #212)
07/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 73, Part 1 (Thread #213)
08/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 74, Part 1 (Thread #214)

09/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 75, Part 1 (Thread #215)
10/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 76, Part 1 (Thread #216)
11/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 77, Part 1 (Thread #217)
12/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 78, Part 1 (Thread #218)
13/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 79, Part 1 (Thread #219)
14/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 80, Part 1 (Thread #220)
15/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 81, Part 1 (Thread #221)
16/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 82, Part 1 (Thread #222)
17/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 83, Part 1 (Thread #223)
18/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 84, Part 1 (Thread #224)
19/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 85, Part 1 (Thread #225)
20/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 86, Part 1 (Thread #226)
21/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 87, Part 1 (Thread #227)
22/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 88, Part 1 (Thread #228)
23/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 89, Part 1 (Thread #229)
24/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 90, Part 1 (Thread #230)
25/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 91, Part 1 (Thread #231)
26/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 92, Part 1 (Thread #232)
27/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 93, Part 1 (Thread #233)
28/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 94, Part 1 (Thread #234)
29/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 95, Part 1 (Thread #235)
30/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 96, Part 1 (Thread #236)
31/05/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 97, Part 1 (Thread #237)
01/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 98, Part 1 (Thread #238)
02/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 99, Part 1 (Thread #239)
03/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 100, Part 1 (Thread #240)

04/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 101, Part 1 (Thread #241)
05/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 102, Part 1 (Thread #242)
06/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 103, Part 1 (Thread #243)
07/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 104, Part 1 (Thread #244)
08/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 105, Part 1 (Thread #245)
09/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 106, Part 1 (Thread #246)
10/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 107, Part 1 (Thread #247)
11/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 108, Part 1 (Thread #248)
12/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 109, Part 1 (Thread #249)
13/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 110, Part 1 (Thread #250)
14/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 111, Part 1 (Thread #251)
15/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 112, Part 1 (Thread #252)
16/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 113, Part 1 (Thread #253)
17/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 114, Part 1 (Thread #254)
18/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 115, Part 1 (Thread #255)
19/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 116, Part 1 (Thread #256)
20/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 117, Part 1 (Thread #257)
21/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 118, Part 1 (Thread #258)
22/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 119, Part 1 (Thread #259)
23/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 120, Part 1 (Thread #260)
24/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 121, Part 1 (Thread #261)
25/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 122, Part 1 (Thread #262)
26/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 123, Part 1 (Thread #263)
27/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 124, Part 1 (Thread #264)
28/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 125, Part 1 (Thread #265)
29/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 126, Part 1 (Thread #266)

30/06/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 127, Part 1 (Thread #267)
01/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 128, Part 1 (Thread #268)
02/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 129, Part 1 (Thread #269)
03/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 130, Part 1 (Thread #270)
04/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 131, Part 1 (Thread #271)
05/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 132, Part 1 (Thread #272)
06/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 133, Part 1 (Thread #273)
07/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 134, Part 1 (Thread #274)
08/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 135, Part 1 (Thread #275)
09/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 136, Part 1 (Thread #276)
10/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 137, Part 1 (Thread #277)
11/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 138, Part 1 (Thread #278)
12/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 139, Part 1 (Thread #279)
13/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 140, Part 1 (Thread #280)
14/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 141, Part 1 (Thread #281)
15/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 142, Part 1 (Thread #282)
16/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 143, Part 1 (Thread #283)
17/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 144, Part 1 (Thread #284)
18/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 145, Part 1 (Thread #285)
19/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 146, Part 1 (Thread #286)
20/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 147, Part 1 (Thread #287)
21/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 148, Part 1 (Thread #288)
22/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 149, Part 1 (Thread #289)
23/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 150, Part 1 (Thread #290)
24/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 151, Part 1 (Thread #291)
25/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 152, Part 1 (Thread #292)

26/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 153, Part 1 (Thread #293)
27/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 154, Part 1 (Thread #294)
28/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 155, Part 1 (Thread #295)
29/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 156, Part 1 (Thread #296)
30/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 157, Part 1 (Thread #297)
31/07/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 158, Part 1 (Thread #298)
01/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 159, Part 1 (Thread #299)
02/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 160, Part 1 (Thread #300)
03/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 161, Part 1 (Thread #301)
04/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 162, Part 1 (Thread #302)
05/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 163, Part 1 (Thread #303)
06/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 164, Part 1 (Thread #304)
07/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 165, Part 1 (Thread #305)
08/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 166, Part 1 (Thread #306)
09/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 167, Part 1 (Thread #307)
10/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 168, Part 1 (Thread #308)
11/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 169, Part 1 (Thread #309)
12/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 170, Part 1 (Thread #310)
13/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 171, Part 1 (Thread #311)
14/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 172, Part 1 (Thread #312)
15/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 173, Part 1 (Thread #313)
16/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 174, Part 1 (Thread #314)
17/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 175, Part 1 (Thread #315)
18/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 176, Part 1 (Thread #316)
19/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 177, Part 1 (Thread #317)
20/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 178, Part 1 (Thread #318)

21/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 179, Part 1 (Thread #319)
22/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 180, Part 1 (Thread #320)
23/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 181, Part 1 (Thread #321)
24/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 182, Part 1 (Thread #322)
25/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 183, Part 1 (Thread #323)
26/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 184, Part 1 (Thread #324)
27/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 185, Part 1 (Thread #325)
28/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 186, Part 1 (Thread #326)
29/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 187, Part 1 (Thread #327)
30/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 188, Part 1 (Thread #328)
31/08/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 189, Part 1 (Thread #329)
01/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 190, Part 1 (Thread #330)
02/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 191, Part 1 (Thread #331)
03/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 192, Part 1 (Thread #332)
04/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 193, Part 1 (Thread #333)
05/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 194, Part 1 (Thread #334)
06/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 195, Part 1 (Thread #335)
07/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 196, Part 1 (Thread #336)
08/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 197, Part 1 (Thread #337)
09/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 198, Part 1 (Thread #338)
10/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 199, Part 1 (Thread #339)
11/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 200, Part 1 (Thread #340)
12/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 201, Part 1 (Thread #341)
13/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 202, Part 1 (Thread #342)
14/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 203, Part 1 (Thread #343)
15/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 204, Part 1 (Thread #344)

16/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 205, Part 1 (Thread #345)
17/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 206, Part 1 (Thread #346)
18/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 207, Part 1 (Thread #347)
19/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 208, Part 1 (Thread #348)
20/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 209, Part 1 (Thread #349)
21/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 210, Part 1 (Thread #350)
22/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 211, Part 1 (Thread #351)
23/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 212, Part 1 (Thread #352)
24/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 213, Part 1 (Thread #353)
25/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 214, Part 1 (Thread #354)
26/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 215, Part 1 (Thread #355)
27/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 216, Part 1 (Thread #356)
28/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 217, Part 1 (Thread #357)
29/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 218, Part 1 (Thread #358)
30/09/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 219, Part 1 (Thread #359)
01/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 220, Part 1 (Thread #360)
02/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 221, Part 1 (Thread #361)
03/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 222, Part 1 (Thread #362)
04/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 223, Part 1 (Thread #363)
05/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 224, Part 1 (Thread #364)
06/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 225, Part 1 (Thread #365)
07/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 226, Part 1 (Thread #366)
08/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 227, Part 1 (Thread #367)
09/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 228, Part 1 (Thread #368)
10/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 229, Part 1 (Thread #369)
11/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 230, Part 1 (Thread #370)

12/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 231, Part 1 (Thread #371)
13/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 232, Part 1 (Thread #372)
14/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 233, Part 1 (Thread #373)
15/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 234, Part 1 (Thread #374)
16/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 235, Part 1 (Thread #375)
17/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 236, Part 1 (Thread #376)
18/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 237, Part 1 (Thread #377)
19/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 238, Part 1 (Thread #378)
20/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 239, Part 1 (Thread #379)
21/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 240, Part 1 (Thread #380)
22/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 241, Part 1 (Thread #381)
23/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 242, Part 1 (Thread #382)
24/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 243, Part 1 (Thread #383)
25/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 244, Part 1 (Thread #384)
26/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 245, Part 1 (Thread #385)
27/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 246, Part 1 (Thread #386)
28/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 247, Part 1 (Thread #387)
29/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 248, Part 1 (Thread #388)
30/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 249, Part 1 (Thread #389)
31/10/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 250, Part 1 (Thread #390)
01/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 251, Part 1 (Thread #391)
02/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 252, Part 1 (Thread #392)
03/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 253, Part 1 (Thread #393)
04/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 254, Part 1 (Thread #394)
05/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 255, Part 1 (Thread #395)
06/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 256, Part 1 (Thread #396)

07/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 257, Part 1 (Thread #397)
08/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 258, Part 1 (Thread #398)
09/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 259, Part 1 (Thread #399)
10/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 260, Part 1 (Thread #400)
11/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 261, Part 1 (Thread #401)
12/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 262, Part 1 (Thread #402)
13/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 263, Part 1 (Thread #403)
14/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 264, Part 1 (Thread #404)
15/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 265, Part 1 (Thread #405)
16/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 266, Part 1 (Thread #406)
17/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 267, Part 1 (Thread #407)
18/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 268, Part 1 (Thread #408)
19/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 269, Part 1 (Thread #409)
20/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 270, Part 1 (Thread #410)
21/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 271, Part 1 (Thread #411)
22/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 272, Part 1 (Thread #412)
23/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 273, Part 1 (Thread #413)
24/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 274, Part 1 (Thread #414)
25/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 275, Part 1 (Thread #415)
26/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 276, Part 1 (Thread #416)
27/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 277, Part 1 (Thread #417)
28/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 278, Part 1 (Thread #418)
29/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 279, Part 1 (Thread #419)
30/11/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 280, Part 1 (Thread #420)
01/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 281, Part 1 (Thread #421)
02/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 282, Part 1 (Thread #422)

03/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 283, Part 1 (Thread #423)
04/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 284, Part 1 (Thread #424)
05/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 285, Part 1 (Thread #425)
06/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 286, Part 1 (Thread #426)
07/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 287, Part 1 (Thread #427)
08/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 288, Part 1 (Thread #428)
09/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 289, Part 1 (Thread #429)
10/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 290, Part 1 (Thread #430)
11/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 291, Part 1 (Thread #431)
12/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 292, Part 1 (Thread #432)
13/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 293, Part 1 (Thread #433)
14/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 294, Part 1 (Thread #434)
15/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 295, Part 1 (Thread #435)
16/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 296, Part 1 (Thread #436)
17/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 297, Part 1 (Thread #437)
18/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 298, Part 1 (Thread #438)
19/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 299, Part 1 (Thread #439)
20/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 300, Part 1 (Thread #440)
21/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 301, Part 1 (Thread #441)
22/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 302, Part 1 (Thread #442)
23/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 303, Part 1 (Thread #443)
24/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 304, Part 1 (Thread #444)
25/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 305, Part 1 (Thread #445)
26/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 306, Part 1 (Thread #446)
27/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 307, Part 1 (Thread #447)
28/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 308, Part 1 (Thread #448)

29/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 309, Part 1 (Thread #449)
30/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 310, Part 1 (Thread #450)
31/12/2022	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 311, Part 1 (Thread #451)
01/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 312, Part 1 (Thread #452)
02/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 313, Part 1 (Thread #453)
03/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 314, Part 1 (Thread #454)
04/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 315, Part 1 (Thread #455)
05/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 316, Part 1 (Thread #456)
06/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 317, Part 1 (Thread #457)
07/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 318, Part 1 (Thread #458)
08/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 319, Part 1 (Thread #459)
09/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 320, Part 1 (Thread #460)
10/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 321, Part 1 (Thread #461)
11/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 322, Part 1 (Thread #462)
12/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 323, Part 1 (Thread #463)
13/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 324, Part 1 (Thread #464)
14/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 325, Part 1 (Thread #465)
15/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 326, Part 1 (Thread #466)
16/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 327, Part 1 (Thread #467)
17/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 328, Part 1 (Thread #468)
18/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 329, Part 1 (Thread #469)
19/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 330, Part 1 (Thread #470)
20/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 331, Part 1 (Thread #471)
21/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 332, Part 1 (Thread #472)
22/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 333, Part 1 (Thread #473)
23/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 334, Part 1 (Thread #474)

24/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 335, Part 1 (Thread #475)
25/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 336, Part 1 (Thread #476)
26/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 337, Part 1 (Thread #477)
27/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 338, Part 1 (Thread #478)
28/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 339, Part 1 (Thread #479)
29/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 340, Part 1 (Thread #480)
30/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 341, Part 1 (Thread #481)
31/01/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 342, Part 1 (Thread #482)
01/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 343, Part 1 (Thread #483)
02/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 344, Part 1 (Thread #484)
03/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 345, Part 1 (Thread #485)
04/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 346, Part 1 (Thread #486)
05/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 347, Part 1 (Thread #487)
06/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 348, Part 1 (Thread #488)
07/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 349, Part 1 (Thread #489)
08/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 350, Part 1 (Thread #490)
09/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 351, Part 1 (Thread #491)
10/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 352, Part 1 (Thread #492)
11/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 353, Part 1 (Thread #493)
12/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 354, Part 1 (Thread #494)
13/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 355, Part 1 (Thread #495)
14/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 356, Part 1 (Thread #496)
15/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 357, Part 1 (Thread #497)
16/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 358, Part 1 (Thread #498)
17/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 359, Part 1 (Thread #499)
18/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 360, Part 1 (Thread #500)

19/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 361, Part 1 (Thread #501)
20/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 362, Part 1 (Thread #502)
21/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 363, Part 1 (Thread #503)
22/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 364, Part 1 (Thread #504)
23/02/2023	/r/WorldNews Live Thread: Russian Invasion of Ukraine Day 365, Part 1 (Thread #505)