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How should we understand that in Switzerland gays activists take part in contentious politics to defend their rights in the public and political sphere while disabled activist (blind activists) and those committed in the field of mental health (bipolar activists) are engaged through much less visible actions, as community-oriented ones (e.g. self-help groups)? Literature provides us a range of explanations accounting for those differences. First, activists could have different resources in terms of economic and cultural capital and be involved in organizations with different resources. Second, the groups might have faced different political opportunities. Those explanations have two shortcomings: on the one hand, activists with similar socio-economic resources can be involved in very different forms of action. In addition, the different organization of those groups have similar resources. Moreover, acting in the same country (Switzerland), activists face similar political opportunities. On the other hand and more importantly, resources and political opportunities focus on the *how* of activism but not the *why* and thereby do not allow an understanding of the why in the first place people act as they act. Finally, the cultural factors as frames, values, attitudes and opinions hardly account in themselves for the variation as activists of the three groups have similar worldviews.

Regarding those shortcomings, I argue that what is key to understand aforementioned variation (minority activism) is not only the content of meanings (values, attitudes, frames) but also how activists map and categorize the social world though specific schema and lifeworlds, and the resonance of those lifeworld’s with the dominant conception of the political. I argue that to act together activists need to share a same definition of the situation of their activism and associate similar worldviews with this situation of action. To grasp those schema and lifeworld, I conducted interviews with gay, bipolar and blind activists and non-activists (control groups). I selected those threeminority groups because their forms of action in the Swiss context strongly vary. On the one hand, I selected gay activists as a case of study of people who are present in the Swiss public and political sphere through action as demonstration but also through their ability to put their issues on the political agenda. On the other hand, people with psychic difficulties form a second case study as they are mobilized though less visible forms of action (e.g., community-oriented actions, self- help groups) and do not put their issues on the political agenda. People with physical disability, form what would be categorized as an *in-between* case, because their issues concerning their cause are more present in the political discourse than the ones of people with psychic troubles but much less than those of gay people.

In the first empirical chapter, I show that activists and non-activists (control group) from the three groups have similar understanding of politics, society and citizenship and thereby argue that worldviews content does not in itself account for their action variation. In the second empirical chapter, through the concept of schema, I argue that what distinguishes activists from the three groups is the way they define the situation of activism. Activists from each groups share a similar schema about “what is at play” in the situation of their activism. On the one hand, gay activists define their activism as a situation of contentiousness. On the other hand, bipolar and blind activists, although they have worldviews related to contentious politics (injustice frame, state as an accountable actor) do no categorize the situation of activism as one of contentiousness but, respectively, as one of care and sociability. In the third empirical chapter, I argue that according to the way they map the situation of their activism, activists from the three groups rely on different worldviews to act and thereby construct different lifeworld around their activism. Gay activists define a lifeworld of contentiousness where worldviews as injustice frame, importance of equal rights among citizens, a conception of civil society as a political actor and an active conception of the citizens are central. Those worldviews shape the means and aims of their activism: they act in the political sphere to gain equal rights. Bipolar activists construct a lifeworld of care where a frame of care, an emphasis on immaterial goods as benevolence and a caring conception of civil society are central while injustice frame, rights and so on are excluded from this lifeworld albeit present in their mind. Relying on such worldviews, bipolar activists act in the social field to take care of each other’s. Finally, blind activists rely on worldviews which put emphasis on the cultivation of social ties as human being is seized as a social being and civil society as a social actor and thereby weave a lifeworld of sociability around their activism, where politically-related worldviews are again excluded. They thus also act in the social field to cultivate social ties between blind persons through for example the organization of leisure activities. Those lifeworlds are thus key to understand the three groups variation in term of action. In the last empirical chapter, I reflect on the three groups different ability to appear as a legitimate and audible actor in the public sphere. By showing that they share a same definition of politics as a scene of institutional struggle for equal rights, I argue that worldviews associated to care and sociability, which, as argued by feminist theory, might have a political dimension are less easily mobilizable to construct audible public claims and gain a public and political presence.

This PhD on the one hand contributes to social movement literature and in particular to cultural factors by further exploring the role of worldviews and the mind as a factor shaping civic and political action. It shows that the mind does not only play a role because of its content in terms of worldviews but also because it allows people to map and situate themselves in the social world. This is what allows them to have a shared definition of a situation and rely on similar meanings to act. On the other hand, it contributes to social theory more generally, as such an account of the mind is a way to bridge interactionism with a more individual oriented approach (phenomenology) which provides a more complex understanding of the mind and thereby the tool to understand what leads to action.