

# **The Transformation of Greenpeace Strategy in the 1990s: From Civil Disobedience to Moderate Movement**

Siti Rokhmawati Susanto

*Pengajar pada Jurusan Ilmu Hubungan Internasional FISIP Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya.*

*Kecenderungan akan perubahan strategi bagi sebuah organisasi pergerakan politik adalah kepastian. Hal itu pula yang dialami Greenpeace sebagai sebuah organisasi gerakan lingkungan lintas batas negara, yang pada awalnya perjuangannya lebih memilih metode resistensi pembangkangan sipil secara frontal. Namun, seiring dengan terjadinya pergeseran penerimaan isu lingkungan sebagai isu internasional, Greenpeace mulai mengurangi model resistensi menjadi lebih moderat. Dalam konteks ini, perubahan strategi ditujukan untuk mempertahankan eksistensi dan kontribusi Greenpeace dalam penjagaan komitmen terhadap lingkungan secara menyeluruh. Oleh karena itu, menjadi sangat penting untuk mengetahui faktor mendasar yang mendorong terjadinya perubahan strategi fundamental Greenpeace, sebuah organisasi lingkungan internasional yang telah mengubah wajah lingkungan sangat signifikan sejak berdirinya.*

*Kata kunci: Greenpeace, lingkungan, strategi resistensi pembangkangan sipil, moderat.*

## **Introduction**

As one of the most prominent international environmental movement organisations, Greenpeace can have a significant impact in shaping world environmental policies. This is due to several significant strategies Greenpeace has utilized in pursuing its goals. One strategy is civil disobedience against environmental deteriorations, for instance, the phenomenon of the seagoing non-violent confrontation in Canada and France by sailing the Rainbow Warrior ship into the nuclear testing sites. Basically, this policy was applied by Greenpeace to gain

media coverage and international support in order to avoid various forms of environmental degradation.

However, the strategy of civil disobedience has changed, especially in the 1990s after Greenpeace was well-established and had gained world-wide recognition. Recently, Greenpeace has applied more moderate policies in pursuing its purposes, such as attracting more passive financial supporters, taking the role as a lobbyist in both domestic and international decision-making processes and providing scientific environmental reports. This paper examines the reasons: why Greenpeace has changed their main strategy from a civil disobedience movement into a moderate movement?

Based on the study of a social movement, this essay argues that a movement usually develops in cyclical fashion. When dealing with changing circumstances, such as social and political issues, a movement might also change its strategies and tactics from when it was established. In Greenpeace's case, internal and external factors are the cause of the organisational transformations. Internally, the changing size and structure of Greenpeace is believed to be one of the main causes of the transformations. Whereas, the external factors associated with the changing of international politics, in this case the new wave of international environmentalism and the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) 1992 are influencing Greenpeace evolution.

The arguments are structured as follows: part two discusses the definition of environmental movement organisation strategies, followed by an exploration of Greenpeace history; the origin and the strategies before the 1990s, in part three. Part four discusses the transformation and factors that create the evolution of Greenpeace strategies the 1990s. The essay closes with a brief conclusion in part five.

### **Defining the Environmental Movement and Its Strategy**

The environmental movement organisation appeared in the 1960s as a form of extra-parliamentary activism. Extra-parliamentary activism is an activity by a group that acts as a form of governance, shaping the way vast numbers of people live their lives, although they do not gain authority through governmental support per se (O'Brien et al., 2000: 18). Extra-parliamentary activist organisations are often unwilling to

compromise, and are deliberately completely independent from government agencies (Rucht, 1995: 79). The power of activism lies in popular mobilisation to influence the holders of capital and economic power making them anti-systemic (O'Brien, 2000: 12).

Similarly, Jamison et al, (in Rawcliffe, 1998: 36) determine a movement as a plurality of organisations and groups engaged in strategic action in political field: competing and bargaining with their counterparts from the established political culture as well as each other. Lipschultz (in O'Brien et al., 2000: 111) also argues that an environmental movement organisation (EMO) holds an alternative development paradigm, which is different from the conventional socio-economic paradigm and it will challenge the conventional political system. Thus, Rawcliffe (1998: 91) defines the environmental movement organisation as a fringe activism.

In practice, most social movements apply a civil disobedience strategy as one of calculated law-breaking actions (Rucht, 1995: 66). Calculated law-breaking action is meant to cover the spectrum of protest types that are beyond the threshold of legality, but avoid pure violence (Rucht, 1995: 66). According to Rawl (in Carter, 1999: 280), civil disobedience is a public, non-violent and reliable act against the law, usually done with the intent to bring a change in the policies or law of the government.

The main reason leading an environmental group to choose civil disobedience as a tactic is because the official channels for political actions, such as elections, referenda, petition, or lobbying do not exist or are considered inadequate for the resolution of the conflict in question (Bleiker, 2001: 18), whereas, they believe in the necessity for fundamental social and political change. Through civil disobedience, a social movement and its protesters claim that their activities are justified and appropriate on the ground of their symbolic message and contribution to the national or international debate.

Bleiker (2001: 18-19) explains that non-violent action thus seeks to empower those who do not have access to conventional forms of political influence. Hence, a non-violent dissent can also be an effective resistance strategy because as it creates a change of mental attitude in the person towards whom the action is directed. Unlike the military strategy, which aims to weaken the opponents mostly through physical violation, non-violent action is seen as a psychological weapon, an intervention that causes emotional and moral perturbation, which stimulates processes of social change.

Although civil disobedience emphasizes on the non-violent act, its concept derives from the definition of anarchism. Carter (1999: 261) defines that anarchism is a normative opposition to certain substantive political inequalities, along with the empirical belief that political inequality is inevitably undermined by the state power. Anarchism can be regarded as a form of political egalitarianism due to the normative component. Carter believes that most anarchists, on the proposed definition oppose the state, but this should not be confused with an opposition to society nor with a rejection of all rules that a society might need. Thus, it is believed that most anarchists are highly moral. Carter (1999: 280) also agrees that justified civil disobedience not only leads to greater fairness, but it actually plays a stabilizing role in democracies. Therefore, it is extremely important to realize that "without a rule" as the meaning of anarchism, does not have to signify "without rules", nor does it have to mean a lack of structure. Anarchism proposes to empower those within them, and does not lead to a centralization of power or decision-making. In a conflicting situation between state and people, the state usually inhibits the growth of anarchist structures. In order to survive, the people may feel compelled to abolish the state, or, at the very least, to resist it through engaging in civil disobedience.

List (1993: 2) defines that civil disobedience is the strategy of radical environmentalism. This derives from the radical environmentalism tenets that believe if they are at war in preserving the nature (Lee, 1995: 9). Thus, it is their responsibility to fight the agent of environmental devastation, for instance through civil disobedience. Explaining radical environmentalism, List argues that it is a radical wing of the environmental movement encompassing both radicalism in environmental philosophy (ecological sensibility or Biocentrism) and radicalism in tactics and action. Radical environmentalism is often contrasted with moderate or reform environmentalism. Moderate environmentalism or anthropocentrism assumes that humans can resolve the environmental crisis by modifying their anthropocentric attitudes toward nature and by reforming laws, governmental policies, corporate behaviour, and personal lifestyle to make them more sensitive to environmental considerations. Reformism generally involves tactics, which are perceived to be legitimate mechanisms within the existing political order (Carter, 1999: 26). Radicals disagree and strongly believe that uncompromised political action is the key to preserving the natural environment (List, 1993: 2).

Carter (1999: 268) explains that an environmentally motivated, non-violent direct action (NVDA) is an example of collective civil disobedience. This method could conceivably empower people who are engaged in it, while simultaneously disempowering the state. In practice, NVDA leads to autonomous cooperation among activists. NVDA helps the activists to reach a collective decision about actions and to gain a mutual support through participation within affinity groups. Direct action is also a symbolic way to demonstrate opposition and more recently, to create a media event to increase the coverage of a particular campaign (Rudig 1995: 236). Consequently, civil disobedience has often been successful in raising issues and raising the public profile of group organising the action.

However, an environmental movement could also change its strategy when dealing with a new atmosphere, for instance by changing its strategy from radical into moderate, or vice versa. According to Sprinzak (1991: 51), the history of movement radicalization is a gradual evolution, as the degree of radicalization is determined several factors, such as variation of culture, historical experiences, traditions, government opposition and the involvement of outside forces. Therefore, a movement is vulnerable to be influenced by those factors. Moreover, social movements are by definition fluid and large (O'Brien et al., 2000: 13). They evolve, transform and usually kick a permanent institutional structure. It makes them more differentiated and less cohesive than their counterpart, such as a government organisations or bodies, due to no single world state and world community.

Similarly, Weber-Michel's organisational model describes the transformation of social movements and their organisations as a natural process over time, and as a consequence of organizational growth (Rawcliffe, 1998: 102). Hence, organizational action cannot be the expression of some inner principle; claims to such principles as prime movers necessarily neglect the actual complex and contingent conditions under which organisations occur (Rawcliffe, 1998: 107).

Hermann (Rawcliffe, 1998: 108) also believes that changes within environmental groups are clearly influenced by "the rate of exchange" between a movement's ideological rigidity and its actual political efficacy. Eyerman and Jamison (Rawcliffe, 1998: 108) also agree that changes derive from the increasingly rational form in the organisation, which is consciously designed to be an efficient and effective tool in forcing the government and business to comply with its own version of environmentalism. Thus, the rationalisation in an environmental group reshapes the organisation rather than destroying its basic tenets,

and the changes in environmental movements are highly relevant to understand.

Nonetheless, the strategy changes might create an impact within the internal dimension of the environmental movement. Rawcliffe (1998: to6) argues that it led to the considerable dissatisfaction of some members. From a theoretical perspective, the conflict occurs between reform environmentalism and radical environmentalism.

## **The Greenpeace History**

### **1. Its origin and strategies**

Greenpeace started in 1969 when a group of Vancouver-area environmentalists, mostly members of the Sierra Club-British Columbia Chapter, gathered in establishing the "Don't Make a Wave Committee". This committee was founded as a response of the frustrated Sierra Club members because the organisation they felt affinity with, refused to protest against nuclear weapons testing (Lee, 1995: 8). At that time, the mainstream of the Sierra Club and other environmental groups were moderate, both in tactics and goals.

Greenpeace was established in particular opposition to the US Atomic Energy Commission underground nuclear tests in Aleutian Island, Alaska. Knowing that Aleutian Island is the centre of the worst seismic activity on Earth, and the underground nuclear blast could create a definite danger of tidal waves. Greenpeace attempted to protest nuclear test by sailing the Phyllis Cormack ship, later renamed Greenpeace, directly into the test zone in Amchitka Island and remaining there throughout the next nuclear test. While on the land, tens of thousands of British Columbians and local ecology groups supported the voyage, by blockading the US-Canada border and purchasing anti-Amchitka buttons. Although the nuclear test was finally exploded, the US Supreme Court was called into a special session to determine whether cancellation of the Amchitka blast should be ordered on environmental grounds. It was followed by the closing down of Amchitka site test by the US Atomic Energy Commission.

After the "Don't' Make a Wave Committee" was renamed the Greenpeace Foundation in 1971, Greenpeace decided to attempt their tactic of sea going non-violence and confrontation, such as in against the French nuclear test in Mururoa Atoll Tahiti and the Russian and

Japanese whaling fleets in North America. Since 1972 to early 1990s, Greenpeace has grown from having a single office in Vancouver to staffing offices in over thirty countries, and a base in Antarctica. It has its own eco-force consisting of eight ships, a helicopter, and a hot-air balloon. Greenpeace also employs over 1000 full-time staff members, plus hundreds of part-timers and thousands of volunteers (Wapner, 1995: 306). In 1979, Greenpeace International was formed, as an umbrella organisation to unify the work of Greenpeace campaigners around the world. Since then, Greenpeace International is defined as a global environmental movement organisation because a large number of individuals and groups attach significance to the environmental values, both at national and international level (O'Brian et al., 2000:

**112).**

Greenpeace International believes that the key to success in protecting the environment is by changing the way vast number of people understand the world. People process experience into action through general conception or interpretation of the world reflects a particular understanding of everyday circumstances. Therefore, Greenpeace International has applied two strategies in changing personal opinion about environmental degradation (Wapner, 1995: 312-13). Firstly, it tries simply to bring instances of environmental abuse to the attention of people throughout the world. Secondly, it is by exposing the gap between the rhetoric and the practise, from corporations to ordinary citizens and to demand an explanation for it.

In other words, Greenpeace International aims to influence public understanding of the negative environmental impact of much human behaviour. Expectedly, people will undertake actions that are more respectful to the ecological integrity of the planet. Greenpeace International believes that humankind's destruction of the environment is leading to an imminent apocalypse and that could be avoided. Greenpeace International hopes to remake society in the image of their vision: a nuclear-free and ecologically sensitive community. Adopting an Indian philosophy, Greenpeace International identifies themselves as the Warrior of the Rainbow in protecting the earth, and their eco-force ships are the Rainbow Warrior (Lee, 1995: 8).

In practise, the changing of public opinion about environmental devastation is interpreted by Greenpeace as the "Bearing Witness" strategy. Marie Bohlen, the founder of Greenpeace, was the one who had the idea to sail a boat to the nuclear testing site, in order to make the public understand the environmental deterioration the testing was causing (Bohlen, 2001: 28). This is a type of political action focuses on

the moral sensitivity and political responsibility. It portrays people taking dangerous risks by doing several actions, such as sailing and floating hot-air balloon to the nuclear test zone, climbing aboard whaling ships, parachuting from the top of smokestacks, and plugging up industrial discharge pipes. Greenpeace International focuses on direct, non-violent action, which is later advertised worldwide through the media worldwide. The Bearing Witness strategy was inspired by the Quakers, who emphasize personal witness and had twice sailed boats toward the nuclear testing sites in the Pacific in order to have their vessel seized long before reaching the target (Pearce, 1991: 19).

Greenpeace International argues that to prevent unjustified action towards the environment, there must be an actor to present those ecological injustices to the world. It is a vehicle for confrontation and an outreach to other citizens. This mechanism is an alternative to understand the contemporary affairs and sets an understanding against environmental destructions (Wapner, 1995: 51). Bearing Witness also makes Greenpeace International an environmental pioneer developing civil disobedience and direct action into a highly organised, deliberate way of generating political pressure through media stunts (Rudig, 1995: 236).

However, it is important to highlight that Greenpeace International civil disobedience is based on professionalism and effectiveness through the media in order to gain a wider support from society. According to Rucht (1995: 71), professionalism and effectiveness are the other trademarks of Greenpeace International. This means that whoever steers the outboard motor is ideally a ship's captain, and whoever climbs the chimney should be a licensed mountain guide. Consequently, most of Greenpeace protests are successful in gaining media attention. By offering spectacular image to the media, Greenpeace International encourages the public to bear witness, and enables people throughout the world to acknowledge environmental degradation and attempt to develop a solution. It also stimulates the flow of financial contribution for new or more expensive protests (Rucht, 1995: 71). This demonstrates that Greenpeace enjoy a high level of public esteem and are widely praised by the mass media (Rucht, 1995: 68). According to Hunter (Wapner, 1995: 305), Greenpeace International activists were seen as a "mind bomb" sailing across an electronic sea into the minds of the masses.

Even though Greenpeace International never supported Ecotage (Eco-sabotage) protest, which uses violence, Greenpeace International is defined as a radical environmental group due to its Bearing Witness



strategy. According to List (1993: 3) Greenpeace is an important impetus for the development of radical environmental activism that use direct action and confrontation techniques to protest and to publicize environmental degradation, such as against the underground nuclear testing and whaling. Mitchell, et al, (1992: 17) also note that Greenpeace is the first organisation, which pursue direct actions as a primary strategy by applying the Bearing Witness tactic to draw public attention around the world about environmental destructive practises in the ocean and on the coast of North America in its early establishment.

Similarly, Scarce (in Lee, 1995: 9) examines that Greenpeace was the pioneer of radical environmentalism during the 1970s because this organisation caused a watershed in the history of the North American environment movement. At that time, Greenpeace was radical because it was unlike anything the mainstream of the movement had ever seen. Lee (1995: 10) stated that Greenpeace were active activists, who not only sailed, climbed, and hiked to the sources of environmental problems, but also became daredevils who constantly created new tactics drawing the attention of the media and mobilize population at large.

For Greenpeace International, the unconventional environmental tactics, especially civil disobedience, developed after the public attitude about the ethical character of these actions softened and accepted this new method. After convincing people to take personal responsibility in preserving nature, Greenpeace International encouraged people to become involve as an active participant in every Greenpeace International direct protest. Those actions are important for Greenpeace International in mobilising civil disobedience because Greenpeace International has been deciding not to compromise and prefer offensive protest with a highly symbolic effect and do not shy away from illegal acts (Rucht, 1995: 79). As a judge charging Greenpeace International in the Baltic Sea Case commented that although Greenpeace's action is praiseworthy, it failed from a legal perspective (Rucht, 1995: 80). However, direct and non-violent actions are not simply to make a group famous, albeit this is certainly part of it. The most important is how to deliver a message to the public and builds a stronger awareness about the environmental preservation, which stimulates a dynamic social change.

## **2. Greenpeace Activities before 1990s**

Before 1990s, Greenpeace International mostly engaged in civil disobedience in taking on four issues regarding environmental degradation: toxic substance, energy and atmosphere, nuclear issue, and ocean and terrestrial ecology. Within each of those, Greenpeace International works in various issues. For instance, in dealing with the issue of nuclear materials, Greenpeace International focuses on reprocessing and dumping of nuclear material, sea-based nuclear, sea-based nuclear weapons, and nuclear testing. In maintaining the ocean ecology, Greenpeace International concentrates on whales, sea turtles, fisheries, and dolphin. Thus, it was easier for Greenpeace to demonstrate civil disobedience and direct actions regarding those issues.

As mentioned before, although Greenpeace first mission against the nuclear test in Amchitka and Mururoa Atoll in early 1970s by sailing a ship to a testing site was not a success, it fuelled other direct actions that have been conducted by Greenpeace International. For example, the Greenpeace action against the French nuclear test in Pacific Ocean in August 1973. During this mission, French commandos physically assaulted Greenpeace activists. The attack attracted considerable publicity and forced France to announce a short moratorium in November in order to minimize the international pressure following the incident (List, in McCormick, 1993:173). Unfortunately, France conducted another regular test after the 1973 incident and encouraged Greenpeace International to begin another serial protest towards the French Government. Greenpeace International protest activities against the French tests took their most serious turn in July 1985; when the Greenpeace International ship *Rainbow Warrior* was blown up in Auckland harbour, by the French intelligence service, and a Greenpeace International photographer was killed during the incident (McCormick, 1993: 173).

In 1975, Greenpeace activists carried out another environmental action by positioning themselves directly in front of two Russian harpoon boats, *Vostock* and *Vlastny*, which were each equipped with a 50 mm. cannon and 250-pound explosive harpoons, in order to prevent the whaling (List, 1993: 140-1). Greenpeace activists were able to effectively block the Soviet harpooners, but the Soviets chose to fire regardless of the risk of the activists, after Greenpeace documented the action through photograph and films.

The 1980s was the era of the Greenpeace steeplejack, an idea of climbing chimney as a form of protest (Pearce, 1991: 36). In 1984, Greenpeace signs and banners were everywhere, such as in front of Big Ben London and on the Statue of Liberty in New York to protest against nuclear weapons. The banners also appeared in the statue of the Little Mermaid in Copenhagen against whaling. To protest against acid rain, a Greenpeace team climbed the chimney of power stations in Belgium, West Germany, Austria, Britain, Netherlands, Denmark, France, and Czechoslovakia. In 1989, Greenpeace activists infiltrated a DuPont manufacturing plant in New Jersey by climbing the plant's high water tower, Greenpeace hung a big banner awarding DuPont as the world's number one ozone-destroyer because it produced half of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) in the U.S, and approximately 25 percent of world's annual production. Additionally, Greenpeace placed a steel box with two activists inside and a banner which read "Stop Ozone Destruction Now", onto the plant's railroad tracks and blocking the export of CFCs from the plant for eight hours by holding up the rail cars carrying forty-four thousand gallons of CFCs.

#### **4. Transformation in the 1990s:**

##### **4. 1. The Character Shift**

Rudig (1995: 231) argues that environmental politics entered the new phase in the late 1980s and early 1990's. Similarly, Rawcliffe (1998: 103) states that during this period most environmental groups experienced a process of transformation. This was marked by the reduced use of civil disobedience by many environmental organisations, including Greenpeace International.

Examining Greenpeace International, Scarce claims (Lee, 1995: 10) that the organisation's strategy evolved, approaching the mainstream of the environmental movement. Greenpeace International shifted to focus more on producing scientific reports and specific policy proposals than on preparing dare-devil actions to raise public awareness (Rudig, 1995: 231). Furthermore, Greenpeace International have undergone reorganisation, structuring the organisation into eight sections in early 1993; consisting of approximately twenty-five staff in each, ranging from campaign through finance and administration, marketing, legal programmes, personal and creative staff (Rawcliffe, 1998: 96). As a result, the media stunts performed by Greenpeace have lost much of their originality (Rudig, 1995: 231).

Greenpeace International believes that the scientific research and lobbying are not only about using moderate mechanisms but can also be used as an integrated campaigning tool. By acquiring three laboratory researchers centralised in Queen Mary College, London, Greenpeace International action gained legitimacy (Pearce, 1991: 37). Based on its research, Greenpeace International distributes a forty-eight pages quarterly publication, *Greenpeace News*, to its members (Rucht, 1995: 70), which is also used to influence the government, such as in United Kingdom and the U.S, to accept their recommendations.

The transformation has left Greenpeace International open to criticism by more radical environmental groups, however they still maintain moderate strategies. Some radical environmental groups define Greenpeace as "an empire-building fund-raising establishment", whose primary goal has become gaining credibility among lawmakers, and not preserving the environment (Lee, 1995: 9). For Greenpeace International, the wide ranging organisational strategy does not mean a significant change to the basic principles of the organisation. Greenpeace International is still clearly committed to non-violent direct action, and at the same time it has learned an organisational lesson. As Peter Taylor, ex staff Greenpeace member states (Rawcliffe, 1998: 112):

**"If** Greenpeace can no longer be at the forefront of those actions which require a bucking of the law, without annihilating its organisation, this needs to be balanced against what the new organisation might achieve, rather than for some nostalgia for a more heroic past".

Moreover, Steve Sawyer, from the Greenpeace U.S bureau also asserts that if possible, Greenpeace prefers not to associate with lethal action such as political scandal, sabotage, terrorism, and murder with their name (Pearce, 1991: 38). It illustrates that the process whereby the core values are either continually reaffirmed or reworked as an organisation develop are at the heart of understanding the changing nature of environmental groups.

#### **4. 2. The Cause Factors**

In dealing with Greenpeace International's transformation, there are several factors that caused the organisational shift in the 1990s: first, is the growth in the size and structural differentiation of the organisation. According to Rawcliffe (1998: 96), these changes resulted in the increased application and review of modern business practise and strategic planning within the organisation. For instance, the massive

growth of Greenpeace International membership stimulated the application of a highly professional organisational concept, which also known as the institutionalization process (Rudig, 1995: 237). This means that Greenpeace International is organised by relatively small groups of activists, while ordinary members only participate in a passive role, by making financial contributions.

After gaining total support in mass membership, Greenpeace International has concentrated its efforts on mobilising expert opinion and traditional lobbying activities. Similarly, Lee (1995: 9) observes that as Greenpeace International grew in size and wealth, it adopted the more moderate tactics in the environmental mainstream, which engages in lobbying and press conference more often than in environmental campaign. For instance, Greenpeace International constructs the environmental messages, derived from complex scientific information, by translating them into more accessible language. Greenpeace International became expert at penetrating, synthesizing, and publicizing contemporary environmental science and uses its action as a strategic form of public education (Wapner, 1995: 309). Due to the current international focus on global environmental issues and the opportunities for environmental groups to take part in international decision-making processes, Greenpeace International has accelerated the institutionalization process through its activities.

Moreover, Greenpeace International applies a centralised and hierarchical management as the consequence of institutionalization process, which consist of seven-member board the organisation's steering committee, and takes the role of consultation and acclamation (Rucht, 1995: 69). About 2000 people in approximately seventy-regional locations can be characterised as activists or considered "members" in legal sense, who have a say in decision-making at their national bureau (Rucht, 1995: 69). The relationship between the central office and the local groups is governed by elaborate contract. National bureaus are not allowed to decide their own action due to the strong ties to the international management and its associated supervisory board Greenpeace International. Major national protests have to be submitted a year before and any action requires the permission of the international campaign director. Meanwhile, about 90 per cent or over 6 million members in 1994 are taking the role as spectators, both regular and occasional contributors (Wapner, 1996: 47).

The centralised structure and an authoritarian leadership (Rucht, 1995: 70) is likely to result the minimised use of civil disobedience by the local Greenpeace activists. As a result, gung-ho activists from local

Greenpeace branches mostly take part in protests organised by other groups and sometimes withhold their affiliation to Greenpeace (Rucht, 1995: 72). The impact of organisational structure was felt for the first time when some Greenpeace members decided to split off in 1983 and form Robin Wood organisation (Rucht, 1995: 72). In addition, the member of Greenpeace wanted to become more involved with the organisation and their work (Rawcliffe, 1998: 92) rather than to communicate through the new computer technology and donation. It shows that the Greenpeace transformation in size and number brought about internal problems (Rucht, 1995: 69). Greenpeace did not have tight regulation or internal conflict in its establishment due to the smaller number of its members.

Second, the impact of the "environmental new wave" that spread around the world in the 1990s. This era was marked with a significant shift in awareness and concern about environmental issues, compared with the past when people were less concerned. In the early 1990s, environmentalism became a general trend throughout the world because the environmental protections turn into an axiom (Wapner, 1995: 312). Consequently, the green issues became a permanent feature of public opinion polls and the wider political discourse. For example, according to Gallup research, most people in twenty countries gave priority to protecting the environment even if it required slowing economic growth (Wapner, 1995: 312). It included developing countries, such as India, Mexico, and Brazil, who were willing to pay higher prices for products if it preserved the environment. Wapner (1995: 312) also observes that it is very common today to see the involvement of environmental impact assessment so-called "sustainable development" in the operation of multilateral development banks and other aid institutions.

In addition, the unprecedented growth in the membership of environmental groups is another indication the growing public environmental consciousness. Greenpeace, for instance, gained some 130, 000 members at rate of over 4,000 a week in early 1990, which represented an increase in total membership of 68 per cent from the previous year (Rawcliffe, 1993: 73). According to 1994 Greenpeace figures (Wapner: 1995, 47) the organisation had about six million 'members', effectively financial supporters and children's groups or the "Green Team" that look at the environmental question under the supervision of an adult (Rucht, 1992: 70).

The environmental new wave emerges as an outcome of the intensifying actions of the environmental movement. Using the

Blumer's language, Greenpeace and other environmental movements attempt to create a particular cultural drift, societal mood, and public orientation (Wapner, 1995: 311). Throughout the years, Greenpeace has not simply been about passing environmental protection legislation, but rather involves changing the prevailing economy, political, moral, cultural, and social characters of society, which support environmental degradation. According to Wapner (1995: 312-13), the environmental new wave is not the result of government policies. Changing sentiment toward environmental issues is associated with the widespread voluntary shift in collective understanding. Second, the shift public awareness cannot be simply correlated with a single or even a set of material transformations. It has been taking place in diverse societies in multiple arenas, especially promoted by the environmental movement.

Consequently, the emergence of the "Green Wave" stimulated Greenpeace international to be more concentrated on their participation in national and international decision-making process, rather than increasing the degree of organisational radicalization (Rudig, 1995: 230). As Peter Melchet, Director of Greenpeace, (Rawcliffe, 1998: 87) observed in 1992 that scientific and other research underpinning campaigns is important because environmentalism enters more sophisticated and knowledgeable atmosphere as the product of increased maturity of the environmental debate. Furthermore, Melchet (Rawcliffe, 1998: 88) stated that the task of the environmentalist has expanded from identifying and explaining the problems, to making solution to those problems happen. Thus, influencing policy through research and dialogue rather than protest has become a real option for Greenpeace International, both at national and international level, which have worked to develop an extensive knowledge of governmental and industrial sectors that affect the environment.

Third, the Greenpeace transformation has been influenced by The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) 1992. As Rawcliffe (1998: 194) examines, some of environmental groups have been characterised by a re-assessment and re-positioning period post-UNCED. There has been an observable shift at the international level in viewing the environmental movement, from "watchdog" role to the increasing acceptance to involve these groups more fundamentally in the policy process in 1990s (Rawcliffe, 1998: 185). Although it creates the possibilities and opportunities for change at both international and national level, this shift has brought new challenges to these actors, both political and organisational. The

involvement of the national environmental groups in the international stage impacts the nature of these groups. Greenpeace International also demonstrated changes due to the international shift.

The United Nations Conference on Environmental and Development (UNCED) held in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992, known as the 'Earth Summit' was the largest international conference ever undertaken. Leaders and officials from 150 nations, 8000 journalists, representatives from 1400 non-governmental organisation (NGOs), and 30,000 Brazilians officially attended the conference (Rawcliffe, 1995: 186). The Conference is part of the environmental wave because it emphasizes issues of sustainable development. Nonetheless, UNCED intended to review the existing progress and stimulate change towards the concept of sustainable development based on the developing international politics of the 1990s or post Cold War era, which both North-South tension and the issues of national *vis-a-vis* global interests were crucial (Rawcliffe, 1995: 186).

The major outcome of the Summit was the Rio Declarations, which included the Agenda 21, Agenda 21 is an 800-page program designed to form a basis for international action toward the development and realization of green diplomacy (Broadhead, 2002: 51), which has four sections; social and economic dimension, conservation and management of resources development, strengthening the role of major social groups, means of implementation (Connelly et al., 2003: 240).

For Greenpeace International, the involvement in this conference officially started two years leading up to the Earth Summit. It had actively prepared its activities and profile by involving most of the national offices, coordinated through Greenpeace International. Those operations needed significant organisational and financial resources. Therefore, Greenpeace International integrated the activities of their separate national organisations as a part of a board-based international campaign. This capacity reflects the truly international hierarchical structure of the organisation rather than as a grass roots social movement. Chris Rose, Greenpeace International Campaign Director, (Rawcliffe, 1998: 196) believes that gaining an environmental victory during UNCED by conducting strategy in a major way is more effective, especially when Greenpeace have to compete with governments and other actors.

For Greenpeace International, UNCED brought more organisational changes, when it involved Greenpeace International in the Preparatory



Committee Meeting (PrepComs), as a part of a series within the conference. As Chasek (2001: 73) states, Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) actors have played a more prominent role in multilateral negotiations during UNCED and the PrepComs. Greenpeace was able to be more involved in the Earth Summit after gaining the UNCED official accreditation, which stated that Greenpeace was competent and relevant while participating in the conference. As a result, Greenpeace had a position as the UNCED process official observer, an instrumental conference, which provides the secretariat and national delegations with background documents and information used in the drafting of the Agenda 21. Rawcliffe (1998: 198) noted that approximately thirty Greenpeace activists worked on UNCED and the parallel conventions, and Greenpeace International political division attended all the PrepComs. Greenpeace had 35-45 staff present at the Earth Summit.

Leading-up to the UNCED, some environmental NGOs had access to domestic processes in their countries of origin, thus, Greenpeace were most effective concentrating on lobbying and media work (Broadhead, 2002: 53). Rawcliffe (1998: 192-93) argues that three points emerged regarding the involvement of NGOs in UNCED process: firstly, NGOs were clearly important actors in the UNCED. Secondly, NGOs were brought together by UNCED. Third, it is clear that NGOs have an important role to play in the implementation of UNCED.

However, among environmental NGOs, including Greenpeace International, UNCED was still thought of as a failure. Chris Rose, campaign director of Greenpeace International observed that UNCED was mostly dominated by agenda rather than action because UNCED has a lack of a broader vision and purpose in the environment movement at that time (Rawcliffe, 1998: 202). Rawcliffe (1998: 201) states that it leads to the marginalisation of NGOs regarding the UNCED agenda.

Although to some extent Greenpeace International was disappointed by UNCED, overall, through its participation in UNCED Greenpeace International experienced an institutionalization process within the organisation, which also led to the shift of organisational strategy. Some other environmental groups, who disagree with "NGO institutionalization" during UNCED and the PrepComs, perceive the environmental NGO's transformation post UNCED as an adoption of general government-like behaviour (Doherty, 1994: 214). This is because the voice of small and poor NGOs is now possibly lost among big, rich and powerful NGOs, while the idea of creating a United

Nations-style NGO bureaucracy does not represent the origin of such a vast and diverse environmental movement.

### **Greenpeace: *Quo Vadis?***

Compared with other environmental groups, Greenpeace International has a significant impact in shaping the strategy of environmental groups around the world. Particularly in relations to the protest tactics conducted by this organisation, especially during its establishment. Although recently, the Greenpeace International strategy has evolved into a moderate or reformist strategy due to several circumstances, it is difficult to detach Greenpeace from its trademark, which is direct action.

In dealing with the transformation, it is better to describe Greenpeace International as a "bridge to radicalism" organisation, rather than either a pure reformist or a pure radical environmental movement. Greenpeace International positions itself between the mainstream and radical environmentalism. Similar to the mainstream, Greenpeace International posses a hierarchical organisational structure, such as a longing for political legitimacy and a registered membership system. But at the same time, it shares with the radical movement "direct actions", support for grass roots acti vists, emphasis on attracting the news media attention, and an adherence to eco-centric philosophy on many issues, although to smaller degree. Overall, those shifts have not changes the goal of Greenpeace International, which focuses on shaping the way a vast number of people think about and act within the world regarding the environment.

However, the major problem of the Greenpeace International's transformation lies in the internal dimension of the organisation, whether the members could maintain the organisational harmony regarding those changes or not. Therefore, all the transformation factors challenge Greenpeace in maintaining its contribution toward preventing environmental degradation, rather than weakening the effort that have been done throughout t ime.

f<sup>o</sup>

## Bibliography

- Bleiker, Roland (2001). *The Ethics of Speed: Global Activism after Seattle*, The Hague: Institute of Social Studies, Working Paper series 344, August.
- Bohlen, Jim (2000). *Making Waves: The Origin and Future of Greenpeace*. Canada: Black Rose Books.
- Broadhead, Lee-Ann (2002). *International Environment Politics: The Limits of Green Diplomacy*. London: Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- Carter, Alan (1999). *A Radical Green Political Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Chasek, Pamela (2001). *Earth Negotiations: Analysing Thirty Years of Environmental Diplomacy*. Tokyo: The United Nations University Press.
- Connelly, James and Graham Smith (2003). *Politics and the Environment: From Theory to Practice*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Routledge.
- Doherty, Ann (1994). "The Role of Nongovernmental Organisation in UNCED", in Bertram Spector, Gunnar Sjostedt, I William Zartman (eds.), *Negotiating International Regimes: Lesson Learned from the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED)*. London: Graham and Trotman Limited.
- Hunter, Bob (1993). "Taking on the Goliath Doom", in Peter List (ed), *Radical Environmentalism: Philosophy and Tactics*. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Lee, Martha F. (1995). *Earth First: Environmental Apocalypse*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- List, Peter (1993). *Radical Environmentalism: Philosophy and Tactics*. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- McCormick, John (1995). *The Global Environmental Movement*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

- O'Brien, Robert, Anne Goetz, Jan Scholte, Marc Williams (2000). *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral economic Institution and Global Social Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pearce, Fred (1991). *Green Warriors: The People and the Politics behind the Environmental Revolution*. London: the Bodley Head Ltd.
- Rawcliffe, Peter (1998). *Environmental Pressure Groups in Transition*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Rucht, Dieter (1995). "Ecological Protest as Calculated Law-Breaking: Greenpeace and Earth First! In Comparative Perspective", in Wolfgang Rudig (ed), *Green Politics Three*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Rudig, Wolfgang (1995). "Between Moderation and Marginalisation: Environmental Radicalism in Britain", in Bron Taylor (ed), *Ecological Resistance Movement: The Global emergence of Radical and Popular Environmentalism*. Albany: State university of New York Press.
- Sprinzak, Ehud (1991). "The Process of Delegimation: Towards a Linkage Theory of Political Terrorism", *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 3, No. 1.
- Wapner, Paul (1995). "In Defense of Banner Hanger: The Dark Green Politics of Greenpeace", Bron Taylor (ed), in *Ecological Resistance Movement: The Global Emergence of Radical and Popular Environmentalism*. Albany: State university of New York Press.
- (1996). *Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics*. Albany: State University of New York.