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ABSTRACT

Environmental movement organizations in the United States have engaged with the global
justice movement differently depending on the extent to which they view human rights and
social equity issues as part of their environmental work. These organizations, influenced by
their organizational history and their work with international groups and coalitions, appear to
view these issues and engage with the movement in distinct ways. Some organizations have
concentrated on seeking out the root causes of environmental destruction, which has led them
to target corporations and corporate practices. These organizations have become involved
with the global justice movement from the anti-corporate point of view. Other environmental
movement organizations have explicitly incorporated human rights and social equity concerns
in their view of environmental problems. These organizations tend to critique international
institutions for their inattention to human, as well as environmental, problems, and approach
the global justice movement from a human rights and development perspective. This thesis
suggests that there are nuances, even within organizations with roots in the same movement,
in how organizations interpret and engage with the global justice movement. Some
environmental groups may relate to the anti-corporate nature of the movement, while others
are drawn more to the human rights and development components.
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Introduction

As economic globalization has rapidly increased the flows of goods, services, and money across borders as well as the wealth and power of multi-national corporations, a transnational resistance has grown to the increasing consolidation of corporate power in the hands of a small global elite. This opposition to corporate-led globalization has fed into a more broad-based global justice movement, which also includes a number of progressive movements, including the human rights, labor, development, anti-war, and environmental movements. The media and corporate interests have dubbed this broader movement, particularly with respect to its mobilizations around the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), as an “anti-globalization movement,” however, I use the term “global justice movement” because of its more proactive and broader connotation.

Environmental movement organizations have made significant contributions to this global justice movement. In the past two decades, a number of U.S. non-governmental organizations (NGOs) working on issues such as rainforest conservation, large dams, wildlife conservation, and other environmental issues, have initiated campaigns targeting the same institutions as the global justice movement. These campaigns focus on international financial institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, trade institutions and agreements like the World Trade Organization and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and multi-national corporations.

This thesis examines the organizational history, campaigns, and activities of four environmental movement organizations currently engaged in targeting international
institutions, multi-national corporations, and trade agreements: Friends of the Earth US (FoE), Greenpeace USA (Greenpeace), International Rivers Network (IRN), and Rainforest Action Network (RAN). Friends of the Earth explicitly targets international financial institutions, corporations, and trade agreements through target-based campaigns. Greenpeace targets corporations, international institutions, and trade agreements for their environmental abuses through its issue-based campaigns. International Rivers Network targets the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and regional development banks for their role in financing large dam construction. Rainforest Action Network targets multi-national corporations for the role they play in the destruction of rainforests and also periodically targets trade rules that make corporations even less transparent.

This thesis looks at the factors that contribute to and influence the way that these organizations interpret issues of environment, human rights, and social equity, including how the organizations have developed over time and the nature of their work with international groups and coalitions. The thesis also discusses what the organizational interpretations of global justice may mean for the environmental and global justice movements.

These environmental movement organizations, influenced by organizational history and their work with international groups and coalitions, appear to engage with the global justice movement in distinct ways. RAN and Greenpeace both seek out the causes of environmental destruction and tend to target corporations and other entities for the environmental problems they cause. Consequently, they have become involved with the global justice movement from the anti-corporate point of view. FoE and IRN see human rights and social equity as a significant part of their organizational goals and tend to critique international institutions for their inattention to human, as well as environmental, problems. These organizations approach
the global justice movement from a human rights and development perspective. As a result of
the way the organizations view global justice issues, there are nuances, even within
organizations with roots in the same movement, in how organizations engage with the global
justice movement.

Chapter one describes the global justice movement, its composition, and why and how it
has developed in the United States. Chapter two looks at the interactions between the
environmental movement and the global justice movement, and also how NGOs have
contributed to the global justice movement by targeting multi-national corporations,
international institutions, and trade agreements. Chapter four describes in depth the history
and global justice activities of four environmental movement organizations: Friends of the
Earth US, Greenpeace USA, International Rivers Network, and Rainforest Action Network.
Chapter five discusses patterns and variations exhibited by these groups in their global justice
activities, and also the implications of the findings for the environmental and global justice
movements.
Chapter 1. Global Justice Movement

The globalization of the world economy has engendered criticism from many progressive movements, including the labor, human rights, development, and environmental movements. These organizations and their respective movements have blamed corporate practices, increased trade, and neo-liberal policies for slow economic growth in developing countries, human rights abuses, poor labor conditions, and environmental destruction. Individuals and groups from these movements and others with similar concerns have come together to protest the institutions and corporations supporting rapid economic globalization. This resistance to economic globalization, combined with concerns around labor, human rights, peace and the environment, has become known as the global justice movement. This chapter describes some of the social and environmental concerns that have grown in response to corporate globalization and the growth of the movement to address these concerns.

Globalization and Trade

Over the last thirty years, the world has experienced a significant increase in the volume of flows of capital, goods, and services across international borders.\(^1\) This ‘globalization’ of the world economy has significantly affected economic, social, and environmental conditions worldwide. International social and cultural interconnectedness has strengthened as a result of improved information technologies and increased ease of travel across borders, while the increased movement of goods and resources across borders has hastened the extraction of

\(^1\) It is important to note that economic globalization is not a new trend: transnational flows of goods and services have been on the rise since the beginning of the nation-state. The present situation is distinct not because of the increase per se; rather, it is distinct because of how rapidly this flow has increased in recent years.
resources. Increased flows of goods and services have improved economic wellbeing in some areas, however, there are still many people who have been negligibly or even negatively affected by the increasingly globalized economy.

International trade has both contributed to and been fueled by globalization. Improvements in information and transportation technologies have allowed multi-national corporations to rapidly increase the amount of goods and services they buy and sell. Global competition has led to what has been referred to as a “race to the bottom.” Companies search out the cheapest resources, which can hasten the destruction of the environment, particularly in developing countries, as forests, oil, and other natural resources are extracted and shipped across borders. Corporations also seek the cheapest labor, which often means the poorest working conditions. As trade has increased, the importance and influence of multi-national corporations in world economics and politics have also increased. In an effort to further facilitate trade, these companies have pressured governments to ease trade restrictions, often at the expense of labor, environmental and human rights protections.

Eager to bolster economic growth, governments have responded by working to reduce barriers to trade through the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) and now through the World Trade Organization (WTO). Governments in the Western hemisphere have also negotiated multi-lateral free trade agreements such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and are now pushing for a Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) and a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). Countries are also developing a number of bilateral trade agreements.

These agreements have largely neglected environmental and labor protections, maintaining that these protections are an unnecessary barrier to free trade. The agreements
support multi-national corporations in extracting natural resources from developing countries, often displacing indigenous people or harming their livelihoods. The activities of the multi-national corporations also result in pollution from manufacturing and transportation. Manufacturing is rapidly moving to developing countries, where wages are lower and factories have lower standards for worker health and safety. Instead of using trade as a means to lift people out of poverty, factory and farm workers work long hours for low pay in poor conditions, often because higher pay, fewer hours, and health and safety standards would raise costs and could consequently be seen as trade barriers. In addition, trade agreements can treat existing national environmental and labor laws as barriers to trade, threatening the autonomy of nations to set their own environmental, health, and safety standards.

The Bretton Woods institutions, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), have also been supportive of free trade and neo-liberal policies, particularly since the 1980’s. The IMF places restrictions on developing countries needing loans, requiring governments to take on structural adjustment policies (SAPs) to developing country governments. The World Bank gives loans and approval to countries for environmentally destructive infrastructure projects such as large dams and mining operations, which often also threaten human rights by displacing indigenous communities.

With increasing threats to the environment, labor, and human rights resulting from trade and neo-liberal policies, non-governmental organizations have adjusted their programs and campaigns or have been established to address what they see as the increasingly negative impacts of international institutions, policies, and corporations. Taken together with anti-corporate concerns, these labor, development, human rights, and environmental NGOs can be seen as contributors to a growing transnational grassroots movement for global justice.
Rise of the Global Justice Movement in the United States

Growing grassroots resistance to the increasing consolidation of corporate power, in addition to labor, environmental, human rights, and other abuses, has become popularly known as the “anti-globalization movement.” Smith (2001) suggests that the movement is in fact better described as a “comprehensive globalization movement,” a “global justice movement,” or a “movement for global democracy,” because it in fact calls for an globalization that is politically, socially, and economically integrated, that takes into account environmental, human rights, and equity concerns, and that calls for transparency and democratic processes in international regulation and economic decisionmaking.

In describing this movement, I have chosen to use the term “global justice,” which describes the movement in a broader and more proactive way than “anti-globalization.” In addition, instead of using “anti-corporate globalization movement” and “global justice movement” interchangeably, as is sometimes done in practice, I identify an anti-corporate movement within the broader global justice movement. While much of the global justice movement is against the current mode of economic globalization, the anti-corporate movement specifically criticizes the growing power of multi-national corporations. This anti-corporate sentiment is what drives much of the protests at the WTO and at regional trade summits. The global justice movement is more all encompassing, and focuses on human rights abuses, increasing inequality, and labor and environmental destruction caused by international institutions, governance systems, and corporations.

The most recent phase of the global justice movement builds on previous resistance to economic globalization. At the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries, a transnational labor
movement, an international human rights movement, and a worldwide environmental conservation movement emerged in response to a wave of transnational financial consolidation. Although these movements were concentrated largely in Europe and the United States and were stalled by the World Wars and the Great Depression, the movements created a cultural space for opposition against elite-driven financial globalization (Podobnik and Reifer, 2004). These movements, however, did not coalesce into one definitive movement, nor were they truly global in nature.

The emergence of governance institutions like the WTO and the proliferation of multilateral trade agreements in the 1990s provided additional levels at which social movements could engage government systems. Previously, transnational actors like NGOs would target national governments to change their policies or alignments in an effort to affect international agreements. Now, social movement actors are able to connect with other international organizations to protest international institutions and agreements around meetings and summits (Ayres, 2002). In the late 1990’s, several well-publicized events also sparked concern around corporate practices, which fed into earlier critiques of issues of inequality, exploitation of local communities, labor conditions, and the environment.

For anti-corporate globalization activists, the Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, Mexico in 1994, which occurred concurrently with the NAFTA trade agreement, is generally heralded as the genesis of the modern era of the anti-corporate globalization movement (Chen, 2003). In the U.S., anti-corporate came to public attention in 1996 it was found that talk show host Kathy Lee Gifford’s clothing line was manufactured in Honduran sweatshops. But civil society and public sentiment against corporate power, neo-liberalism, trade policies, and inequality had been growing well before that, both in the U.S. and abroad.
In the U.S., the environmental movement and organized labor had been concerned about the practices of multi-national corporations for some time. The emergence of new institutions and structures governing trade policy provided an outlet for this growing concern. The World Trade Organization (WTO) was established in 1995 as an extension of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT). Unlike the GATT, however, the WTO was viewed as a system of global governance as opposed to a set of rules for trade. In the U.S., Canada, and Mexico, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) came into effect in 1994. There was some opposition to the agreement at the time of implementation, and that opposition grew as the effects of the agreement on labor and the environment became more apparent. More wide reaching regional trade agreements – the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) and the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) – are still being negotiated, and they have received increasing opposition from civil society as negotiations have progressed.

Opposition to other trade-related agreements and legislation included the protest in 1997 of the Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI), which civil society groups denounced for being negotiated in secret. In 1997 and 1998, civil society groups in the U.S. also protested Presidential ‘fast track’ authority renewal, which would have allowed the President special authority to negotiate and approve trade agreements. These concerns around trade and the governance of multi-national corporations combined and fed off a growing criticism of international institutions like the World Bank and the IMF, which had been pushing neoliberal policies and projects on developing countries for years without the promised results. At a base level, protesters tend to object to the hierarchical character of neoliberal institutions and trade negotiations. Trade rules and agreements are viewed as new and undemocratic structures for global governance that pay little attention to social concerns (Ayres, 2002).
The “Battle in Seattle” in November 1999, when thousands of activists succeeded in collapsing the WTO trade talks, was the first high-profile anti-corporate globalization protest. Although this was protest was notable, most activists agree that it did not signal the beginning of the movement so much as a sort of ‘coming out party.’ The event was lauded as an impressive coalition, with environmentalists and labor unions, as well as a number of other activists, all out for the same reasons – to protest the WTO (Gould, et. al., 2004; Danaher and Mark, 2003; Chen, 2003).

This protest and other anti-corporate protests have fed into the global justice movement. This broader global justice movement includes the anti-corporate aspect in addition to labor and environmental activists and organizations, activists from the anti-sweatshop, debt relief, fair trade, AIDS, human rights, and international hunger movements are involved in the movement. In general, those involved in the protests against the WTO and other global justice actions oppose the increasing political and economic power of large multi-national corporations. The movement is also critical of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization because these institutions “favor narrow private interests over the common public good,” (Cavanagh and Anderson, 2002).

The global justice movement advocates greater levels of democracy, human rights, and environmental sustainability. These changes would result from limiting the power of corporations, keeping common goods such as water in the public domain, and putting checks on global capital flows (Cavanagh and Anderson, 2002). Different viewpoints at work within the movement, however, make a proactive message much more difficult than an antagonistic one.
One of the earliest attempts to classify the approaches within the global justice movement, or in her words, the anti-corporate movement, was by Starr (1998), who described three broad types of attitudes towards globalization. The most extreme attitude is the idea that localities should have full autonomy and local sovereignty, fueled by a deep democracy that would give citizens the utmost voice in local affairs. Another slightly less radical attitude is a "people’s globalization," or "globalization from below," which would include replacing current systems of international governance with highly participatory democratic structures such as those espoused by the World Social Forum. The third, least radical of the three major attitudes within the movement, is demand for a radical reform of the established international governance frameworks (Starr and Adams, 2003; Starr, 1998).

Given the tendencies of many national and international NGOs to work with existing institutions to reform them, many larger environmental, labor, and human rights groups are likely to fall into the last category of radical reform globalization, if they can be characterized as being a part of the "anti-corporate globalization" movement at all by Starr’s definition. Some NGOs do indeed desire a ‘radical reform,’ with substantial changes to institutions and governance structures. Many of the more conservative NGOs, however, even those that are critical of trade agreements and corporate practices, are not yet at the point of calling for ‘radical’ reform, instead choosing to work well within established systems of governance.

Since the WTO protests in Seattle, academics have begun to discuss the nature of this growing anti-corporate movement and the broader global justice movement. The suggestion has been made that the anti-corporate movement would be better defined as a ‘protest field’ than a social movement, given the heterogeneity of the movement and the nature of the mobilizations (Crossley, 2002). It has also been described as a ‘protest movement’ (Ayres,
2004). Indeed, the public expression of the global justice movement, and the anti-corporate movement in particular, has largely been through mobilizations and protests at major meetings and summits where decisions about trade agreements and trade policies are made (see Table 1. Chronology of Global Justice Mobilizations).

Table 1. Chronology of Global Justice Mobilizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protest Target</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G8 “First Day of Global Action”</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>WTO Meetings in Geneva G8 Meetings in Birmingham, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTAA First People’s Summit</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Second Summit of the Americas in Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 “Second Global Day of Action”</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>World financial centers G7 Meetings in Cologne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>November, 1999</td>
<td>WTO ministerial meetings in Seattle, WA (50,000 protestors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank, IMF</td>
<td>April, 2000</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank, IMF</td>
<td>September, 2000</td>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Economic Forum</td>
<td>September 2000</td>
<td>Melbourne, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank, IMF, UN</td>
<td>October, 2000</td>
<td>Washington, DC, New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTAA Second People’s Summit</td>
<td>April 2001</td>
<td>Third Summit of the Americas in Quebec City, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>G8 summit in Genoa, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>September, 2003</td>
<td>Cancun, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank, IMF</td>
<td>April, 2003</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTAA</td>
<td>November 2003</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank, IMF</td>
<td>April, 2004</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The protests, particularly those against the WTO and regional trade agreements, can perhaps best be described as anti-corporate in nature. Many of the activists would describe themselves as being against corporate-led globalization, and the protests may tend to draw the more radical arm of the global justice movement. The protests do, however, draw a wide
range of people, all with critiques of trade agreements or the actions of international institutions.

Mobilizations are comprised of members of labor unions, NGOs, community-based groups such as university student groups, family farm groups, and community groups working for economic justice, anarchists, radical ecologists, and others (Cavanagh and Anderson, 2002; Buttel and Gould, 2004). Protestors outside of trade summits see themselves as working in solidarity with governmental delegates from developing countries:

The defiance is contagious: Marches and rallies of thousands of people build up "street heat," which inspires representatives of nongovernmental organizations to stage their own demonstrations from within the security perimeter — which encourage delegates from developing countries to resist the demands of the United States, European Union, and Japan during trade negotiations (Chen, 2003).

In Seattle in 1999, the protests were so unexpected and so large that the WTO meetings could not, in fact, take place, and the meetings were cancelled. Since then, the impacts of protestors have been mixed. At the WTO meetings in Cancun in September 2003, protests outside were focused around agriculture, which was also a major topic of discussion inside the meetings. According to one Friends of the Earth staff member, there was a sentiment that the presence of the protestors was affecting what happened inside the meetings. At the FTAA meetings in Miami in November 2003, however, police kept protestors far away from the meetings and protestors felt like they had much less of an impact (personal communication with FoE staff member, 3/18/04).

These protests are remarkable in a variety of ways. They are characterized by both their grassroots and transnational nature, which has been made possible through increased ease of communication, particularly the Internet. This form of communication is able to reach large
numbers of people all over the world, and facilitates information exchange, the planning of actions, and increasing turnouts.

The protests are also unique in that they strive to be non-hierarchical. Organization at mobilizations occurs through affinity groups, or groups of people, often who share similar beliefs and values, and also who support one another during the protests and other actions. These affinity groups send representatives to “spokescouncils,” which in turn make strategic and tactical decisions for the larger group. Some activists warn that the non-hierarchical nature of the movement is at risk, however, because plans for protests are now being made far in advance in “virtual spokescouncils,” which are dominated by NGOs. Consequently, decisions that were previously made by all protestors – grassroots and NGO members alike – are now being made by NGOs. NGOs often provide financial backing for the protests as well, increasing their influence.

Beyond the protests, the global justice movement has taken some action to form a more proactive message. There are often “alternative” summits that occur during trade ministerials, where participants come together to discuss other visions for a socially just world. Even more ambitious, the World Social Forum, which drew 15,000 people in 2001 and has been held every year since (Seoane and Taddei, 2002), provides a venue for creating alternative conceptions of globalization and an alternative knowledge. Many groups and individuals who are part of the global justice movement are also working at a local level outside the trade ministerials to construct alternative social and economic infrastructures (Köhler and Wissen, 2003). While the need for positive steps is acknowledged, however, progress towards that goal is slow given the diversity within the movement.
The recent actions of the global justice movement have given it an identity as a ‘protest’ movement, however, the actions of individual organizations outside of protest activities should also be included in the evaluation of the movement. If environmental organizations have programs and campaigns targeting the same institutions, ideas and issues as the protests, this should constitute part of the movement. The next chapter looks at how the environmental movement has fed into the global justice movement and also how individual organizations – both environmental and non-environmental, have contributed to the movement as a whole.
Chapter 2. Global Justice and the U.S. Environmental Movement

The environmental movement has contributed to the global justice movement through the participation of environmental advocates in anti-corporate protest activities and also through the campaigns and actions conducted by environmental organizations. The scope of the U.S. environmental movement has expanded over the years to encompass a wide range of environmental issues, and the movement has grown more global as environmental organizations have attempted to address environmental issues in countries worldwide. Environmental organizations have also turned their attention to international institutions and to global governance systems that can have effects on the environment.

In the past decade, U.S. environmental movement organizations, which are environmental organizations that seek to bring about a change in the status quo (Kriesberg, 1997), have joined other types of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in working to influence these emerging institutions that affect environmental and other global justice issues. These institutions include multi-national corporations, which threaten the environment, human rights, and labor conditions in developing countries; the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF), which fund potentially destructive infrastructure projects and impose neo-liberal policies on developing countries; and trade institutions and agreements like the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which shape trade rules and can affect the implementation of environmental and other policies. This chapter traces the growth of the environmental movement and how the movement and organizations within it interact with the global justice movement.
Growth of the U.S. Environmental Movement

The environmental movement first took root in the United States in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth centuries with the establishment of conservation organizations. Since then, the issues that the environmental movement addresses have expanded from conservation and preservation to include urban environmental issues, public health, and environmental side effects of technologies like pesticides and toxic chemicals. Global environmental threats like ozone depletion and climate change have pushed U.S. environmental NGOs to take on increasingly global concerns, while community environmental justice issues have pushed the movement in a more local direction. With substantial size, strength, and increasing legitimacy, international environmental NGOs have become a force in world politics, both by working within established governance structures and by pressuring them from the outside.

Early U.S. Environmental Efforts

In the early 1900s, the major ideological split in the movement lay between natural resource management for human use advocated by Gifford Pinchot and the preservation of nature for its own sake espoused by John Muir (Dunlap and Mertig, 1992). Although this dichotomy was perhaps the prevailing ideology, concern over the environmental health impacts of rapid urbanization and industrialization also increased during the early twentieth century (Carmin, 1999).

The two World Wars sidetracked efforts around environmental issues, but following each war, conservation issues again emerged as concerns in the United States. In the 1950s, the movement focused around the preservation of natural areas (Switzer, 2003). The
publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in 1962 raised awareness of the possible effects of pesticides and other manmade chemicals on environmental and human health. Consequently, the 1960s saw the emergence of complex concerns over the often difficult to detect environmental effects of technological advances (Dunlap and Mertig, 1992).

By 1970, consciousness about environmental issues had coalesced to the extent that 20 million people participated in the first Earth Day demonstration that year (Nelson, 1980). The movement of the late 1960s and 1970s was marked with the formation of many new organizations that were addressing diverse issues, including air and water pollution, wildlife protection, and energy conservation (Mitchell, et.al., 1992).

U.S. environmental groups were also beginning to recognize the need to act internationally as a result of transboundary and global environmental problems like ozone depletion and climate change. By the 1980s, environmental NGOs were already becoming quite active in United Nations conferences. They also expanded their role from mostly scientific and technical support to having a lobbying presence at UN summits. Campaigns were undertaken to address climate change, ozone depletion, trans-boundary air pollution, and endangered species, and U.S. and international environmental NGOs pressured for multilateral environmental agreements (Caldwell, 1992).

Environmental NGOs have also been growing in size and legitimacy. Major transnational NGOs such as Greenpeace International, Friends of the Earth, and the World Wildlife Fund now have millions of members internationally, giving them a greater ability to influence political processes (Wapner, 1995). They also have substantial spending power, with the biggest organizations having budgets even larger than the U.N. Environmental
Program (Wapner, 2000). Smaller NGOs have less substantial budgets, but they also leverage their resources to effect environmental change.

**Effects of Globalization**

Economic globalization has significantly affected the environmental movement, as environmental NGOs have responded to the increased resource use, pollution, and other environmental problems wrought by rapid increases in consumption. With globalization, the participation of environmental NGOs in politics has increased, as environmental NGOs both continue to influence state power by pressuring governments to support environmental protection efforts (Wapner, 2000) and by targeting other actors as well.

In response to the increasing prominence of multinational corporations, many environmental NGOs have expanded their targets to include corporations they see as being responsible for environmental destruction. The increasing influence of governance structures at an international level has also led environmental NGOs to expand their targets to international institutions like the World Bank, the IMF and the WTO, and trade agreements. Environmental NGOs worked to promote environmental policies at the World Bank and add environmental provisions to treaties such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

This increased involvement of environmental NGOs in the international arena has augmented the ability of NGOs to network with each other. For example, NGOs have developed side meetings in conjunction with governmental conferences and summits where they build their own agendas (Clark, et. al., 1998). Outside of the conferences, environmental NGOs have used improvements in information technologies to capitalize on their
effectiveness at coalition building. For example, they have built networks for information sharing, resource pooling, and strategy coordination (Wapner, 2000).

Globalization has also increased the effectiveness of communicating information to the public. Television, radio, newspapers, and magazines can now bring remote areas of the world into peoples’ lives (Wapner, 1995). This has increased the ability of NGOs to undertake media campaigns and public education efforts. They are disseminating a broader environmental awareness to the general public and working to involve local communities in developing countries in environmental protection. Building off their networking capabilities and the increased ease of information exchange, environmental NGOs have worked to mobilize the public around environmental issues through broad educational campaigns (Williams and Ford, 1999). Environmental NGOs also target social behavior by working to get people to adopt an environmental sensibility and to change environmentally harmful cultural practices (Wapner, 2000). Several NGOs even specialize in socially responsible advertising as a way to encourage consumers to buy environmentally-friendly goods. Environmental NGOs also see themselves as a conduit between the general public and the government, in that the organizations provide a voice for people and a means to reach elected officials (Switzer, 2003).

Environmental NGOs also engage institutions by more confrontational means such as organizing protests. NGOs will often engage the same institutions both through lobbying and through protest-oriented activities. Williams and Ford (1999) describe these two activities as engagement and rejection, however, they dichotomize the activities into international NGOs and grassroots groups. Since the WTO meetings in Seattle in 1999, it appears that more
established NGOs have become more involved with protest movements, usually while engaging institutions at a more formal level at the same time.

**NGO Involvement in the Global Justice Movement**

Although the global justice movement, particularly its anti-corporate component, is often viewed as a "grassroots" movement, it appears that formal organizations play a large role. NGOs provide financing and also encourage activists to attend protests. In addition, many organizations also have ongoing campaigns around targets of the movement that attempt to reform institutions and modify trade rules.

Organizations are also very involved in mobilizations around the WTO, IMF, and World Bank. They may disseminate information, provide activist trainings, and bring their members to the protests. In the U.S., labor groups often supply the largest numbers for protests. Environmental groups are also very active, as are human rights, public interest, and research groups. The broad coalitions, especially between labor and environment, are seen as integral to the success of both the mobilizations and to the movement as a whole.

Efforts of NGOs and coalitions of NGOs outside the protests are very important in continuing pressure on the institutions and actually demanding specific changes. NGOs are involved in corporate campaigns against companies abusing labor rights, human rights, and environmental protections, and they are also involved in campaigns to reform international institutions and trade agreements. NGOs often target trade agreements and trade rules developed in the WTO because they threaten national labor and environmental laws. Environmental NGOs have been fairly active in their work outside the protests, and in many
cases, the environmental community pursued campaigns against these global justice targets well before a movement was acknowledged as such.

The following description of the campaigns and programs of the environmental NGOs serves to identify NGO involvement in the global justice movement and also ways in which environmental NGOs have interacted with and contributed to the global justice movement.

Multi-National Corporations

As corporations have become larger and increasingly multi-national, activists and NGOs have blamed these companies for worsening labor conditions, human rights, and the environment. NGOs have targeted companies with campaigns and consumer boycotts to pressure them to change their practices. They also work to hold companies accountable through pressuring for corporate labor and environmental codes, labor and environmental certifications, and monitoring. In addition, NGOs continue to lobby national governments for higher environmental and labor standards.

In 1996, the National Labor Committee, a labor rights organization, exposed the fact that Kathie Lee Gifford’s clothing was being made in Honduran sweatshops, sparking public concern around labor conditions in the garment industry. The NLC and other NGOs have campaigned against corporations such as Nike, Disney, and the GAP, targeting them for labor abuses in their factories, both overseas and in the U.S. NGOs often call for boycotts until labor conditions are improved, or they will expose the companies and ask the public to contact company CEOs to change their practices. Corporations have responded by developing codes of conduct for their factories and having them audited. Following criticism
of these systems, these corporations have also allowed second and third party monitoring in their factories.

Global Exchange, a human rights organization, has run similar corporate campaigns around companies like Starbucks. The organization urged consumers to write letters and petition Starbucks to serve only coffee that is Fair Trade certified, meaning that coffee growers have received a fair price for their coffee. Starbucks has since agreed to offer a Fair Trade whole bean coffee option and also to brew Fair Trade coffee once a month in its retail stores nationwide.

Environmental NGOs have also been active in targeting corporations. Rainforest Action Network’s first campaign in the late 1980’s targeted Burger King because the company’s beef was imported from tropical countries where rainforests had been destroyed to create pastures. Since then, the organization has run campaigns targeting Weyerhauser, Home Depot, Boise Cascade, and Citigroup to change their corporate environmental policies. Rainforest Action Network has been quite successful in getting commitments from corporations, especially in its campaigns to stop the sale of old growth wood.

A number of environmental groups including Earth Island Institute boycotted tuna companies in the late 1980’s in an effort to stop the slaughter of dolphins in tuna nets. After a two year campaign, the major tuna companies agreed to stop using the type of nets that did the most harm to dolphins, and the number of dolphins killed in tuna nets began to drop. This campaign also led to one of the first major disputes under NAFTA, which is discussed below.

Another landmark event demonstrating the ability of NGOs to dictate corporate practices was the Greenpeace campaign against the Brent Spar oil rig. In 1995, Greenpeace publicized plans by Shell oil company to dump the Brent Spar oil rig into the Atlantic Ocean. Media
attention created by the occupation of the oil rig by Greenpeace activists combined with public pressure on the company forced Shell to dismantle and recycle the rig instead of leaving it in the ocean. Although the events took place in Britain, the incident got substantial press in the United States, and the incident served as a prime example of the sort of influence NGO action could have on the practices of a powerful multi-national corporation.

These corporate campaigns have continued, and groups like Rainforest Action Network and Greenpeace take on new and larger companies to change their practices. International institutions are often seen as obstacles in the way of reforming corporate practices, and corporate campaigning NGOs will engage them when they see an opportunity for leverage or when they feel the institution could threaten their work.

**World Bank and IMF**

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) were created in the wake of World War II to provide loans to developing countries in order to keep countries from falling into economic crisis. Civil society groups in developing countries have been protesting the World Bank and IMF for years because of the measures that the institutions required of countries to grant them loans for development. In the 1970s, the institutions imposed “austerity” measures on a wide range of countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Protest intensified in the 1980s with the debt crisis and continuing emphasis on structural adjustment by the IMF (Ayres, 2004; Podobnik and Reifer, 2004), and popular protests occurred in Peru, Chile, Bolivia, Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Argentina, Zambia, and other countries (Chen, 2003).
Northern NGOs finally began to seriously target the practices of the World Bank and IMF in the 1980s and 1990s, as the hardcore neoliberalism advocated by the U.S. and British governments in the 1980s was beginning to be questioned. As the ease of communication increased between northern and southern civil society groups, northern groups began to enter into coalitions and solidarity networks with groups from the South. Debt relief and questionable projects leading to human rights violations and environmental destruction were picked up as issues by northern NGOs, and transnational coalitions formed as a result of these concerns.

NGOs and activists have waged country-specific campaigns against World Bank and IMF endorsed projects and policies like water privatization in Bolivia, gasoline price hikes in Nigeria, labor law reforms in Korea, and telecommunications privatization in Costa Rica. In late 2001, the IMF announced support for an international bankruptcy mechanism for developing countries facing debt crises, a measure that progressive groups have been advocating for some time (Cavanagh and Anderson, 2002).

The Jubilee 2000 campaign, led by religious groups worldwide, formed in the 1990s to pressure G7 leaders to write off debts owed by the world’s poorest countries through the IMF and the World Bank. The campaign, with groups in more than 60 countries, gathered 24 million signatures. Labor groups like AFL-CIO became involved, urging the World Bank and IMF to cancel debt for poorer countries. As a result of campaign pressure, G7 leaders committed to write off $100 billion in debts from poor countries (Jubilee Research at NEF, 2004). The IMF and World Bank have also responded to activist demands with a debt relief program, but this is considered a partial victory as a result of conditions placed on relief (Cavanagh and Anderson, 2002).
U.S. NGOs will often engage the World Bank and the IMF directly to influence their internal decisionmaking on development and environmental policies. Many also join the protests outside the World Bank and the IMF that occur periodically. U.S. environmental and human rights NGOs have become more involved with the World Bank in response to major infrastructure and extraction projects in developing countries. For example, International Rivers Network often targets the World Bank for financing large dams in developing countries because the large dams often are destructive to the environment and they threaten to displace people living near them. In lobbying on behalf of grassroots groups in developing countries, International Rivers Network and its partner organizations have succeeded in lessening the impacts of several large dam projects. Several groups, including Rainforest Action Network and Friends of the Earth, also lobby around mining, gas, and oil projects in developing countries, which pose similar threats.

The 50 Years is Enough coalition, which called for major reforms of the World Bank and the IMF, is active in organizing protests of the institutions. The coalition is made up of a number of different groups, many of them from developing countries, including Focus on the Global South, Forum for African Alternatives, and Social Network for Justice & Human Rights, in addition to U.S. based groups Global Exchange and the Institute for Food and Development Policy. Environmental NGOs that have been involved in the coalition include International Rivers Network, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, Rainforest Action Network, and Environmental Defense Fund.
Trade Institutions and Agreements

The World Trade Organization (WTO) was created in 1995 as a system to enforce trade rules between countries, while regional trade agreements regulate trade between specified countries in a region. A number of NGOs criticize the WTO and regional agreements because they favor the rights of corporations over social and environmental protection and limit the rights of governments to enforce labor and environmental laws. NGOs target the WTO and regional trade agreements and policies both by protesting at meetings and summits and by attempting to influence governments and negotiations through less confrontational means. Protests have occurred at meetings and negotiations of the WTO, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA), the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), and the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI). NGOs have lobbied governments around each of these agreements, and in the U.S., groups have also lobbied Congress not to pass presidential Fast Track authority. Many NGOs, both environmental and non-environmental have developed campaigns around trade.

In the U.S., NGOs lobby the U.S. Congress on decisions affecting trade agreements and trade rules. NGOs will also try to influence other governments involved in trade negotiations by providing information to delegations and government officials outlining policy suggestions. U.S. environmental NGOs both lobby the U.S. government and provide information and scientific evidence to other governments about environmental threats.

Many NGOs have participated in protests against the WTO and trade agreements, where protesters come together from many different movements. The AFL-CIO, which has 13.5 million members, has been very vocal in its opposition to trade agreements and has urged its membership to attend mobilizations against trade agreements. Environmental groups such as
Friends of the Earth, the Sierra Club, Rainforest Action Network, Greenpeace, and International Rivers Network have all been active in mobilizations. Human rights groups like Global Exchange, development groups like Oxfam, and public interest groups like Public Citizen, religious groups like Jubilee 2000, and research groups such as the Institute for Policy Studies, Food First, Essential Information, Center for Economic and Policy Research, Economic Policy Institute and Development GAP are all active in trade policy and in protests (Cavanagh and Anderson, 2002).

**World Trade Organization (WTO)**

NGOs such as Public Citizen and grassroots groups like Direct Action Network played a role in the WTO protest in Seattle by disseminating information at protests and providing activist trainings organizations. The International Forum on Globalization held a conference and a forum discussion of WTO and the global war system, while Jubilee contributed to organizing a demonstration in addition to a forum on issues of free trade, health and environment (Seonne and Taddei, 2002). Several environmental NGOs, including Greenpeace, Rainforest Action Network, and Friends of the Earth, were also present in Seattle, and many of those NGOs have continued to attend mobilizations since 1999. They both contribute to the protest events and also have ongoing campaigns that lobby and continue work on these issues when summits are not in session.

The WTO lacks opportunities for formal consultation by NGOs, and NGOs have pushed for greater access. The organization does allow consultations, commenting on documents, briefings, and symposia, and NGOs take advantage of these fora (Williams and Ford, 1999). In fact, several of the organizations engaged in the protests of the WTO in Seattle were also
officially registered to attend the NGO events inside the meetings. Among these organizations were Public Citizen, Global Exchange, Greenpeace, Rainforest Action Network, Sierra Club, and Friends of the Earth. Many environmental organizations both protest and lobby the WTO.

One of the first major environmental controversies to arise in the context of trade regulations grew out of the corporate campaign by Earth Island Institute and other organizations to keep tuna companies from using nets that killed dolphins. In 1990, after two years of pressure from environmental groups, major tuna companies committed to sell only “dolphin-safe” tuna. The Bush administration also agreed to establish a federal “dolphin-safe” label for all tuna sold in the United States. In 1991, however, the Mexican government challenged through the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), claiming that the “dolphin-safe” label was a barrier to free trade. The U.S. government eventually withdrew from its commitment to prohibit the import of dolphin-unsafe tuna (Danaher and Mark, 2003, Buttel and Gould, 2004).

Subsequent anti-environment rulings under NAFTA and in the WTO encouraged these groups to join the Seattle protests of the WTO in 1999, as did the realization that the environmental side agreements under NAFTA were not working. For example, the WTO supported a complaint by Venezuela and Brazil saying a U.S. import ban on gasoline because of air quality control was an unfair barrier to trade. And in 1999, a Canadian company filed a complaint with the State of California for its proposed ban on MTBE. Also in 1999, in what became known as the shrimp / turtle case, the WTO ruled that a U.S. law banning shrimp imports from countries that allowed sea turtles to be killed in shrimp nets was illegal (Buttel and Gould, 2004).
While the landmark protest of the WTO in Seattle highlighted the anti-corporate globalization movement and the global justice movement, individual NGOs and coalitions of NGOs had targeted these same entities outside of protests long before this, and these NGOs have continued these actions since Seattle. The individual NGO actions, and the concerted efforts of NGOs outside of the protests make specific demands that the mass mobilizations are unable to.

North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)

In the early 1990s, in response to what groups perceived as the threat of NAFTA to labor and the environment, NGOs and grassroots organizations, including Public Citizen, formed the Alliance for Responsible Trade (ART) and the Citizens Trade Campaign (CTC) in the U.S. (Dreiling 2001), while Mexican groups formed the Mexican Action Network on Free Trade (RMALC) (Ayres, 2004).

In the environmental community, NAFTA caused a major split within the major U.S. environmental NGOs. Environmental groups such as Friends of the Earth, the Sierra Club and Greenpeace were skeptical of trade agreements in the early 1990s and did not endorse NAFTA or its side agreements. A number of the large environmental groups, however, including the World Wildlife Fund, the National Wildlife Federation, the National Audubon Society, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Environmental Defense Fund supported NAFTA (Destler and Balint, 1999).
Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) and the FTAA (Free Trade Area of the Americas)

In recent years, CAFTA and the FTAA have been opposed by many of the same groups in similar ways and for similar reasons. Labor unions and NGOs like Citizen's Trade Campaign, Global Exchange, the Sierra Club, Greenpeace and others join in protesting these free trade agreements. In the environmental community, World Wildlife Fund and the National Wildlife Federation have also started to voice their concerns over free trade agreements, although they are more likely to lobby and utilize the media and less likely to join in protests.

U.S. Fast Track Legislation

In 1997, 'fast track' trade authority, which allows the U.S. President power to negotiate trade agreements, came up for renewal. Pressure from a wide variety of groups, including labor, church groups, human rights groups, and mainstream environmental organizations contributed to President Clinton not being able to renew the authority, although President Bush was later able to pass it in 2002.

Environmental groups in particular objected to the legislation. Many of the groups that had supported NAFTA were unhappy with the results they had seen, and organizations like World Wildlife Fund and National Wildlife Federation joined the Friends of the Earth, Sierra Club, and Greenpeace in opposition (Destler and Balint, 1999).
Multilateral Agreement on Investment

In 1998, international activists, particularly in Canada and France, spearheaded a campaign against the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI). According to critics, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development had been negotiating the MAI in secret since 1995, and the agreement would have severely restricted the authority of governments to control the activity of foreign investors. Protests outside the OECD in Paris and bad publicity and pressure from NGOs led to a postponement and suspension of negotiations (Cavanagh and Anderson, 2002; Seoane and Taddei, 2002).

More than 600 organizations from 67 countries, including Friends of the Earth, Sierra Club, National Wildlife Federation, Greenpeace International, World Wide Fund for Nature International released a joint statement calling for the end of negotiations until substantial changes were made to make the process acceptable (Public Citizen, 1998).

Environmental NGO Involvement Since Seattle

Environmental organizations have clearly been involved both in protesting and lobbying for change within these trade agreement structures, international institutions, and corporations. A number of environmental NGOs have joined in street mobilizations against the World Bank and the WTO. Some of the same NGOs both attend protests and the NGO conferences associated with WTO meetings. Many of these NGOs pressure for change at the level of the U.S. Congress, and several environmental NGOs produce reports and suggestions for governments involved in trade negotiations (see Table 2. Environmental NGOs Targeting Trade, the WTO, the World Bank, the IMF, or Multi-National Corporations).
Table 2. Environmental NGOs Targeting Trade, the WTO, the World Bank, the IMF, or Multi-National Corporations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Island Institute</td>
<td>International Marine Mammal Program</td>
<td>WTO, Corporations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainforest Action Network</td>
<td>Global Finance, Old Growth,</td>
<td>Corporations, WTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenders of Wildlife</td>
<td>Trade and Environment, Multilateral</td>
<td>WTO, Trade Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Agreements, Wildlife Trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>Globalization and Environment</td>
<td>WTO, Trade Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wildlife Fund</td>
<td>Sustainable Commerce (ended 2003)</td>
<td>WTO, Trade Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Responsible Trade</td>
<td>WTO, Trade Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rivers Network</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>World Bank, Regional Development Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
<td>Corporate Responsibility, Greening Trade,</td>
<td>Corporations, WTO, Trade Agreements,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Financial Institutions</td>
<td>World Bank, IMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace</td>
<td>GM Crops</td>
<td>WTO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buttel and Gould (2004) suggest that the interactions between the environmental movement and the anti-corporate globalization movement, have coalesced in the past but, since Seattle, they have grown apart. Yet, a number of environmental movement organizations continue to have campaigns and programs addressing global justice and anti-corporate issues and continue to attend protests against the World Bank, the WTO and regional trade agreements. In an effort to better understand the relationship between environmental movement organizations and the global justice movement, this thesis examines the involvement of four environmental movement organizations in global justice activities. The following chapter describes the history and the global justice activities these organizations have undertaken, and discusses variations in the perspectives that these
organizations have on the environment and other global justice issues like human rights and social equity.
Chapter 3. Environmental Organizations and Their Campaigns

The organizations described in this chapter include Friends of the Earth US (FoE), Greenpeace USA (Greenpeace), International Rivers Network (IRN), and Rainforest Action Network (RAN). All four can be classified as social movement organizations, or organizations that seek to bring about a change in the status quo (Kriesberg, 1997). FoE’s international program currently has campaigns against all three global justice targets – international financial institutions, trade agreements, and corporate accountability. Greenpeace campaigns against corporate practices that are harmful to the environment and also maintains a presence at WTO and other trade protests. IRN works primarily to halt dam destruction and campaigns against the World Bank and the IMF, in addition to regional financial institutions. RAN is known for its campaigns against corporations that contribute to the destruction of rainforests, and, in addition has targeted the World Bank and the WTO in the past.

Selection of Organizations

Greenpeace and FoE were both founded around 1970, they both address multiple environmental issues, and they are both part of formal transnational organizations. IRN and RAN were both founded in 1985, they both address single environmental issues, and they both are organizations with routine transnational ties (see Table 3. Initial Organizational

---

2 Smith’s (2002) discussion of the groups present at the Seattle protests divides groups into four categories, the two most transnational being “formal transnational organizations” and organizations with “routine transnational ties.” International NGOs like Greenpeace and FoE seem to fall in the first category, while national NGOs that work with international groups and activists like RAN and IRN would fall into the second.
Characteristics). Given these sets of similarities, it might be expected that the two sets of organizations engage in global justice activities in similar ways and for similar reasons. This is not the case, however, as the organizations differ in the ways that they interact with the movement. These differences have to do with the way these organizations interpret and prioritize environmental and social issues. The following four case studies examine these similarities and differences between the organizations in greater detail.

Table 3. Initial Organizational Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friends of the Earth US (FoE)</th>
<th>Greenpeace USA (Greenpeace)</th>
<th>International Rivers Network (IRN)</th>
<th>Rainforest Action Network (RAN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single / multi issue</td>
<td>Multi issue</td>
<td>Multi issue</td>
<td>Single issue</td>
<td>Single issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of international connection</td>
<td>Formal transnational organization</td>
<td>Formal transnational organization</td>
<td>Organization with routine transnational ties</td>
<td>Organization with routine transnational ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns</td>
<td>International institutions, trade agreements, corporations</td>
<td>Corporations, sometimes trade agreements</td>
<td>International institutions</td>
<td>Corporations, sometimes trade agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Organizations

Friends of the Earth explicitly targets international financial institutions, corporations, and trade agreements for their impacts on environment, social equity, and human rights.

Greenpeace targets corporations, international institutions, and trade agreements through its issue-based campaigns for their environmental abuses. International Rivers Network targets the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and regional development banks for their role in financing large dam construction, an activity which is often criticized for human rights
abuses and environmental destruction. Rainforest Action Network targets multi-national corporations for the role they play in the destruction of rainforests and also periodically targets trade rules that make corporations even less transparent.

**Friends of the Earth US (FoE)**

Friends of the Earth has been very involved with both global justice and anti-corporate globalization activities for some time. Although the organization was always open to viewing humans, and especially indigenous communities, as a part of the environment, FoE shifted its focus over time from its early mission of limiting human impact for the preservation of the environment. Today, FoE addresses social equity and human rights issues as part of environmental issues, and in addition, the organization seeks out the root causes of environmental problems, seeing corporate power as a major problem behind global inequalities. This combination of organizational perspectives may help to explain FoE’s heavy involvement with global justice issues like corporate responsibility, trade, and international financial institutions.

FoE also works a great deal with other groups, both nationally and internationally, which shapes the organization’s view of global justice. The organization has formed several coalitions with other environmental groups and non-environmental groups like labor and human rights groups. FoE’s international network of grassroots organizations in 68 countries and the coordination of the groups through the international secretariat also drive this involvement with global justice campaigns. FoE’s perspective on environmental problems may have changed through the years, but it has retained an element of the original character as a hard-hitting political organization with an aggressive style.
Founding and Early Work

Friends of the Earth was founded in 1969 in San Francisco by David Brower after his resignation as executive director of the Sierra Club. Brower, a passionate and charismatic man who developed a reputation during his life as the “conscience of the modern environmental movement,” hoped at the time to establish a new environmental organization that would distinguish itself as being “international, aggressive, and uncompromising” (Carmin, 1993). Friends of the Earth’s original mission was to “augment programs in conservation publishing, political action, legislative lobbying, litigation, and international environmental efforts,” (Brower, 1991 as cited in Carmin, 1993).

The organization originally concentrated efforts around publications, media campaigns, and legislative action. For example, for the first Earth Day 1970, FoE sold one million copies of the *Environmental Handbook*, which it published for the occasion. In the same year, the organization launched *Not Man Apart*, as a journal addressing environmental issues. The organization also launched campaigns in its early years against clothing made from wild furs and feathers, dams and other projects that might destroy rivers, supersonic air transport, and whaling (Friends of the Earth, 2004).

The first international Friends of the Earth organization was established in 1971 in France, and Friends of the Earth UK opened in London the same year, with the idea that a network of international grassroots affiliates would eventually be established throughout the world. When they first opened, the international offices were mostly independent in their decisionmaking and generally self-supporting.
The organization’s philosophy through the 1970s was one that emphasized environmental preservation but also acknowledged indigenous communities and cultural diversity as values. For example, in 1977 in the midst of its whaling campaign, the organization supported limited killing of bowhead whales by indigenous Eskimo communities, something most of the environmental community rejected (Carmin, 1993; Friends of the Earth, 2004). In 1979, the mission of the organization was to “reduce the impact of human activity on the environment and to ensure that we as a species adopt policies which permit life in its varied and beautiful forms to continue” (Burke, 1979 as cited in Carmin, 1993).

Internally at this time, the organization was in debt and disorganized. Brower believed in finding inspired activists and giving them free reign to campaign for environmental change. The organization was also allowed to expand rapidly, and offices were opened around the country throughout the 1970s. By 1972, the organization’s debt was 250,000 dollars, and by 1984, the debt was 600,000 dollars. The publication arm of the organization, which was not financially viable, was kept until 1982, when, against Brower’s wishes, the organization stopped printing books in an effort to increase financial stability (Carmin, 1993). The network of international Friends of the Earths continued to grow throughout the 1970s, and by 1979, there were twenty-one international offices (Carmin, 1993).

Brower stepped down as President of the organization at the end of the 1970s, however, he continued as Chairman of the Board until 1985. When the organization made a decision to relocate and consolidate offices in Washington, DC from San Francisco against his wishes, Brower stepped down from the Board. Brower formally resigned his directorship of the
organization in 1986, when he moved his work to Earth Island Institute, an organization he had started in 1982 (Carmin, 1993).

This shift in leadership signaled a significant change in the organization. The new leadership turned its attention to getting the organization’s financial situation under control, while continuing to lobby and litigate for environmental change (Carmin, 1993). In 1988, Friends of the Earth US, the Oceanic Society, and the Environmental Policy Institute (EPI), an organization that had been established in 1972 by former Friends of the Earth staff, all merged into one organization. Michael Clark, the director of EPI, became Executive Director of Friends of the Earth.

EPI had been working on a wider range of issues than FoE, with a particular emphasis on environmental problems that also affect human rights and social equity. As early as 1983, EPI had led a coalition to reform the World Bank, a campaign that the organization eventually expanded to target the IMF and other multilateral development banks (FoE, 2004). After the merger with EPI, Friends of the Earth successfully fought for a series of laws calling for IMF reform (Friends of the Earth, 2004). By 1990, FoE had incorporated more human-centered issues into its work, and focused on three major areas in its campaigns: toxics and pollution in food, air, water, and soil; poverty, inequality, and war; and control of new technologies. The organization had shifted away from more traditional preservation areas such as whaling, wilderness preservation, and endangered animals (Carmin, 1993).

The new mission for Friends of the Earth, which came out in a 1990 issue of Not Man Apart, was “to create an independent, global advocacy organization which will work – at local, national, and international levels – to protect the planet from environmental disaster, to
preserve biological, cultural, and ethnic diversity, and involve citizens in decisions affecting their environment and lives” (Clark, 1990 as cited in Carmin, 1993).

Also by 1990, the Friends of the Earth International network had affiliates in forty-four countries, each office being led by a native citizen of that country. The organization was also making efforts to improve communication between affiliate organizations, and an international secretariat had been established in Europe (Carmin, 1993).

Global Justice Campaigns

FoE has been very involved with global justice activities over the years, particularly since its merger with EPI. The global justice initiatives at FoE cluster under its international program, which has campaigns around international financial institutions, trade, corporations, and oil, gas, and mining activities.

As mentioned above, EPI and FoE started campaigning to reform the World Bank and the IMF as early as the 1980s. These efforts have continued, and FoE continues to have an international financial institutions campaign under its international program. In 1994, FoE was instrumental in the creation of 50 Years is Enough, a coalition of organizations that called for major reforms of the World Bank and the IMF.

FoE also pressured the World Bank to stop funding for several large dam projects, including the Arun Dam in Nepal, which the Bank decided in 1995 not to fund. In 1996, FoE, in conjunction with other groups, pressured the World Bank to withdraw support for a Shell gas plant and pipeline in Nigeria. FoE also worked in the late 1990s to get the IMF to reduce debt owed by developing countries and to review its structural adjustment loan policies.
FoE has recently backed off from the emphasis on transparency at the IMF, largely because the organization is pleased with the results it has achieved:

I actually don’t do that much now on IMF transparency because I feel like internally to the IMF there actually is genuinely internally driven pushes towards transparency, so it’s not really worth my focusing on it very much. (personal communication with FoE staff member, 3/2/04)

More recently, FoE has targeted export credit agencies as lenders for environmentally and socially destructive projects. With the Bank being more responsible in its lending practices, FoE saw these agencies as the major financiers of the projects:

When we took on new issues with export credit agencies, a lot of that was because with the World Bank, we were starting to get some victories, the Bank had adopted environmental policies, we had prevented them from financing some disasters, but then these export credit agencies, in fact, no one was really paying attention to them, and they had no policies at all, and they were financing the projects that the World Bank turned down. It became kind of a logical extension, and both conceptually and in terms of its impact on the ground, that you couldn’t just go after one institution, you had to go after the other financiers. (personal communication with FoE staff member, 3/2/04)

Friends of the Earth became involved with trade policies in 1993 when the organization fought NAFTA as a threat to workers and the environment. FoE was one of the organizations that created the Citizen’s Trade Campaign as an effort to resist NAFTA at a grassroots level. In 1994 and again in 1998, FoE successfully worked to defeat the renewal of the President’s Trade Promotion Authority, or “fast track” trade negotiating authority, which FoE felt would allow future trade agreements to be negotiated without public input or democratic debate. In 1998, the organization also worked to block the Multilateral Agreement on Investment, which FoE felt would have given unnecessary power to corporations.

FoE continues its trade work today. Under the trade program, FoE concentrates efforts around trade summits internationally. At the U.S. level, the organization lobbies the U.S. government on trade issues and sits on advisory committees. The organization was involved
in the Seattle protests and is a member of a number of coalitions that have formed around trade policy. Many of the coalitions include non-environmental groups.

In addition to the campaigns targeting international financial institutions and trade, the international program also currently has campaigns around corporate accountability and oil, gas, and mining. Through its corporate campaigning, the organization is advocating on the International Right to Know, which would require businesses to disclose environmental, labor, and human rights conditions. The organization also does work around greening Wall Street and shareholder activism. The oil, gas and mining work targets both the World Bank and major corporations.

FoE in 2004

Apart from the work in the international program described in the previous section, current program areas at FoE include community, health, and environment, which focuses on food, air and water quality, and healthy communities; economics for the Earth, which works to leverage government spending on the environment; a legislative program, which monitors the environmental actions of Congress; and regional programs which work in specific areas throughout the country to improve environmental quality (Friends of the Earth, 2004).

FoE US remains relatively small, particularly for the range of issues it covers, with revenue of $4.5 million in 2003 and a staff of about 30. The Friends of the Earth International network has grown to include 68 member groups, coordinated through the secretariat in Amsterdam.
**Mission and Interpretation**

Friends of the Earth US’s mission is to “defend the environment and champion a just and healthy world” (Friends of the Earth, 2004). The mission of Friends of the Earth International goes even farther into addressing social justice issues, as the international federation aims to:

- protect the earth against further deterioration and repair damage inflicted upon the environment by human activities and negligence; preserve the earth’s ecological, cultural and ethnic diversity; increase public participation and democratic decision-making; achieve social, economic and political justice and equal access to resources and opportunities for men and women on the local, national, regional and international levels; promote environmentally sustainable development on the local, national, regional and global levels. (Friends of the Earth International, 2004)

The concern for social justice, democracy, and cultural preservation is fairly explicit in this statement, receiving nearly as much attention as the environmental concerns.

Friends of the Earth US views environmental issues very broadly, with a strong social justice component:

[At] Friends of the Earth, ...we take an unusual stance among environmental groups, in that we focus almost as much on social justice issues as on environmental issues, and we are very interested in the intersections between environmental and social issues. (personal communication with FoE staff member, 3/18/04)

The organization also looks for sources of environmental problems in deciding what targets to take on:

I think on a gut level, we go after the root causes of environmental destruction. We go after corporate power, we go after economic incentives that create a profit for people to exploit the environment, so there’s a strong justice component that undercuts what we do. (personal communication with FoE staff member, 3/2/04)

This combination of a strong commitment to social justice, in addition to seeking out the sources of environmental destruction, make the organization one of the most active environmental organizations in the global justice movement.
FoE’s organizational commitment to social justice and democracy also makes the World Bank, the IMF, and the WTO more likely targets as institutions that can be seen as threats to the environment, human rights, equity, and public participation. For example, when the organization targets the World Bank for a mining project, it will criticize the Bank both for the environmental effects of the mining and the human rights violations that the project might inflict on the indigenous communities. When FoE looks at trade agreements, it sees not only the environmental problems associated with the agreements, but it also looks at the fact that these agreements also worsen labor conditions or do not help developing countries economically.

The organization’s heavy involvement in global justice activities, which are often confrontational and reactive, became the impetus for a more proactive campaign for corporate accountability:

On issues like the corporate accountability that we do, the International Right to Know, which is basically kind of a disclosure approach to corporate accountability, a lot of that was kind of the outcome of doing a lot of years of this sort of anti-globalization work, if you want to call it that, and feeling like we needed to come up with something positive and proactive that people could endorse and work for, and not just work against things, not just trying to stop things, but actually articulate a positive change that people could push for. (personal communication with FoE staff member, 3/2/04)

This is different in many ways from previous work against trade agreements, in that it is pushing for possible alternatives. The International Right to Know is also multi-disciplinary – it deals with human rights, labor, and the environment, and it is a large coalition of groups, which plays to FoE’s strength working on more social issues and in coalitions.
Interactions With Other Groups

The coalitional work and interactions with grassroots groups in developing countries affect FoE’s outlook on global justice issues. Interactions and solidarity work with non-environmental organizations have changed the way FoE views trade issues:

I think participating in broader coalitions makes it more… likely in the trade context that one is going to be more oppositional to the entire trade system or to the regime, to the institutional regime, than might otherwise be. Because if we were focused purely on the environmental questions, we would be able, and we are able, at times, to move the ball forward on our issues, and then not worry so much about what the broader picture looks like, with a trade agreement. But being part of the broader coalitions, it means, well, we could move our ball forward, but if somebody else’s ball is not getting moved forward, but getting moved back, we’re more likely to stand in solidarity with them, so to speak, in opposing an agreement. (personal communication with FoE staff member, 3/18/04)

The coalitional work reinforces FoE’s aggressive stance on issues and makes the organization more confrontational.

Work with other groups also affects FoE because of the influence that large coalitions can have on political processes. The work Friends of the Earth does with labor groups can affect its stance on trade issues, because the organization has the political clout to make it happen:

There are presumably going to be a number of free trade agreements that are going to come before Congress – the Central American Free Trade Agreement is the one that most people are going to be focused on. It’s the one that labor has put its greatest attention to recently, and the reality is, congressionally, that it’s key to have labor as an ally. We could decide that some other agreement were more egregious in the eyes of the environmental community, but if labor weren’t too excited, I’m not sure we could make that much of a go of it. (personal communication with FoE staff member, 3/18/04)

For FoE, working in coalition means that the organization is responsive to the views of other organizations, including those that are not environmental, and incorporates those views into its decisionmaking.
Other members of FoE’s international grassroots network also influence its work and the programs it emphasizes. In trade issues, for example, developing country FoE groups may have different viewpoints than the U.S. organization, which can change how the FoE US sees trade agreements and chooses to approach them:

I think the Friends of the Earth groups in developing countries and also other groups in developing countries that work on our issues have views about trade policy that affect how we think about it. And for example, I think they tend to be quite skeptical of the notion of putting, say environmental standards into trade agreements because they tend to be much more skeptical in some ways of the trade institutions themselves. And, so, from their perspective, the real question about the trade agreements is the harm that they’re going to bring, whether it’s through investment rules, or services rules, or increased agricultural exports being dumped into their countries or what have you. (personal communication with FoE staff member, 3/18/04)

FoE’s interactions with developing country groups can make the organization more confrontational towards trade agreements as institutions affecting environmental and development issues.

FoE is driven internally by its interpretation of the relationship between human rights, social equity, and environmental concerns. This interpretation is substantially influenced by its work with other groups in coalitions and its interactions with international grassroots groups.

**Greenpeace USA (Greenpeace)**

Greenpeace has been very involved in corporate campaigns against multi-national corporations for their environmental abuses. Corporate power is seen as being destructive to the environment, and while the organization also sees social equity and democracy as problematic, Greenpeace comes to the global justice movement from an anti-corporate stance as opposed to a human rights or social equity viewpoint.
Greenpeace USA is influenced somewhat by its international headquarters, and it does enter into coalitions with other groups, but for the most part, the organization makes decisions on its own. Greenpeace has been known for its confrontational, direct action tactics since the organization’s founding, and these tactics also may make the organization more likely to attend mobilizations like anti-corporate protests.

**Founding and Early Work**

Greenpeace was founded in 1971 in Vancouver, British Columbia, by Jim Bohlen and Irving Stowe, two Americans who had moved to Canada to protest U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War. The two had helped to form a Vancouver chapter of the Sierra Club, and were active both in environmental and anti-war issues. In 1969, they and other Sierra Club members decided to sail a ship to the Aleutian Island of Amchitka to protest U.S. testing of nuclear bombs. The idea of sailing a ship came from the Quaker practice of “bearing witness” to an injustice – the practice of observing the unjust action so as to be aware of what occurred and to take responsibility for that knowledge rather than maintaining ignorance. When Sierra Club headquarters in the United States disapproved of this direct action approach, Bohlen, Stowe, and Paul Cote formed the Don’t Make a Wave Committee to raise funds for the voyage (Carmin, 1993).

The Don’t Make a Wave Committee sent a ship, but it was forced to turn back before reaching Amchitka. A second Greenpeace ship also failed to reach the island before the nuclear bomb was detonated, however, the voyages captured a large amount of media attention and public interest. The small group continued with its work, sailing a boat to the French nuclear testing site at Mururoa Atoll in the South Pacific. The organization’s name
was changed to Greenpeace Foundation in 1972 – green for the environmental concerns and peace out of the anti-war sentiment (Carmin, 1993).

Early on, the organization emphasized both the interconnectedness between peace, humans, animals, and the environment, a philosophy influenced both by Quaker and American Indian beliefs. The organization also had a very real commitment to direct action, believing that the practice of “bearing witness” could be used as a very useful tool in raising public awareness. In the early years, the organization was very informal, and worked through a fairly nonhierarchical structure. The primary focus of the organization was to stop nuclear testing (Carmin, 1993).

By the mid-1970s, several Greenpeace members were interested in expanding the organization’s work to address the plight of endangered whales. In 1974, Neil Hunter, who had been president of the Greenpeace Foundation, resigned, and Robert Hunter, who was interested in expanding Greenpeace’s work to a more ecological focus, took over. The organization established an office and became increasingly structured. Greenpeace initiated campaigns to protect whales and seals, purchasing a boat, which members named the Rainbow Warrior, to continue its direct action work. Greenpeace continued its anti-nuclear work, focusing also on preventing dumping of nuclear waste in the ocean (Carmin, 1993).

By 1976, environmental groups in the United States, Canada, and Europe, with only informal connections to the original Greenpeace in Canada, had taken the Greenpeace name. Patrick Moore took over as president in 1977, and tried to unite the Greenpeace offices under the Vancouver office. He said that the U.S. office in San Francisco, which was better off financially, should pay off the debt of the Vancouver office, because the U.S. office was benefiting from the public’s recognition of the Greenpeace name. David McTaggart, an
original Greenpeace member who had established several of Greenpeace’s European offices, responded to the international disputes by uniting all the existing offices under Greenpeace International, of which he became CEO (Carmin, 1993).

Under McTaggart, Greenpeace became increasingly professional in terms of direct actions and increasingly scientific in its analysis of environmental problems. The organization continued campaigns around whales and seals, and also campaigned around toxics, dumping, offshore drilling, and acid rain. By 1985, Greenpeace had offices in 12 countries. In the United States, there were 400,000 supporters and several Greenpeace offices around the country (Carmin, 1993).

In 1985, two French secret service agents sank Greenpeace’s ship, the Rainbow Warrior, while it was docked off the coast of New Zealand, killing a Greenpeace photographer in the process (Greenpeace, 2004). This incident brought significant attention to the organization and raised Greenpeace’s profile substantially, attracting more supporters (Carmin, 1993).

The organization continued to grow from 1986 to 1990. Campaigns continued around nuclear testing and waste, marine mammals, toxics, and acid rain. In the United States, the organization’s activities were consolidated in the Washington, DC office to limit administrative costs and also to turn attention to the environmental policies of the Reagan administration (Carmin, 1993).

In the early 1990s, the organization continued to be focused around direct action, although the organization’s tactics expanded to include scientific analysis and governmental approaches. Campaign areas had expanded to toxics, atmosphere and energy, ocean ecology, forests, and nuclear issues. Views of staff on the vision of the organization at this time differed, but as a whole Greenpeace USA was dedicated to “going about the business of
saving the planet” (Hawkins, 1992 as cited in Carmin, 1993). The organizational philosophy at this time still emphasized ecology -- that humans are not the center of life on the planet and the Earth must be respected (Greenpeace USA as cited in Carmin, 1993). These sentiments were linked to ideas of environmental justice and that all people have a right to enjoy a healthy environment. This idea also led to a critique of power – that neither humans nor the environment should be subservient to others (Carmin, 1993).

Also in the early 1990s, Greenpeace US experienced declining membership and revenue. Greenpeace’s U.S. membership, which peaked at one million in the early 1990s, dropped to 300,000 by 2000 (Kerlin, 2001). Kristen Engberg came from Greenpeace International in Amsterdam to take over as Executive Director of the US office in 1997, and around the same time, the international organization began to insist that each national group should be financially stable or should be shut down. In the summer of 1997, the organization closed down ten regional offices in the U.S. in an effort to cut costs. With these cuts, the organization also cut its campaign areas to focus on a smaller number of priority campaigns.

The entire Greenpeace USA board of directors resigned in 1999 over differences of opinion about the organization’s direction (White, 1999). John Passacantando, who came from a small organization called Ozone Action that utilized similar direct action tactics as Greenpeace, took over as Executive Director in 2000 (White, 2000).

**Global Justice Activities**

Greenpeace has for some time targeted the environmental practices of multinational corporations. As described in chapter two, Greenpeace pressured Shell to reverse its decision to dump the oil platform containing toxic waste into the Atlantic Ocean in 1995. In the late
1990s in the United States, Greenpeace helped activists keep Shintech Corporation from constructing a new PVC plant in Lousiana’s “cancer alley,” an area where numerous toxic manufacturing plants are located and contaminate the environment. Greenpeace also worked with Rainforest Action Network to target Home Depot to stop buying old growth wood, and targeted Dow Chemical to take responsibility for the clean up of the Union Carbide pesticide factory in Bhopal, India, which the corporation now owns. Greenpeace is now targeting Exxon Mobil for its role in global warming (Greenpeace, 2004).

Greenpeace does not have any campaigns targeting the World Bank or IMF specifically, but the organization will target these institutions if their practices are related to their other areas of work, such as with its energy and climate change work. For example, in 2002, Greenpeace demanded that the World Bank halt public funding for the oil, gas and mining industries, and that instead its should fund renewables.

Much of Greenpeace USA’s recent international work has also concentrated on multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). The organization has worked to raise awareness and lobby governments around international treaties like the Basel Ban on hazardous wastes to developing countries, the declaration to restrict persistent organic pollutants (POPs), the nuclear test ban treaty, and the Kyoto protocol in 1997.

Greenpeace International has a trade campaign, and Greenpeace USA engages around trade issues when it is relevant to one of its campaigns, or when the agreements could affect other work the organization is doing. The organization will both lobby inside of trade summits and protest outside them, usually as it relates to the environmental issues such as genetically modified organisms or biosafety:

Greenpeace isn't an organization that specifically works on trade, but rather finds itself compelled to engage in the debate at the WTO level, since our campaign work can be
affected by trade regulations. The important thing for Greenpeace is to maintain the relevancy of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) in the international system and try to ensure that trade rules do not take precedence over environmental stewardship, public health, and the health of ecosystems. While Greenpeace may not be as vigorously engaged in a full-fledged trade campaign, we do put the full support of the organization behind our trade work. (personal communication with Greenpeace staff, 3/10/04)

Greenpeace has been involved in protesting the WTO and other international agreements. In Cancun, Greenpeace USA participated in the protests against in addition to being one of the NGO delegates inside the meetings.

Greenpeace in 2004

Greenpeace USA currently campaigns around forests, genetic engineering, global warming and energy, nuclear power and testing, oceans, and toxic pollution. The organization continues to employ non-violent direct action and media to “bear witness” to environmental problems and communicate them to the world. It also has incorporated other tactics such as lobbying and litigation. Greenpeace’s financial problems seem to have stabilized, and the organization has refocused around more national level and international issues.

Over the years, despite financial difficulties and downsizing, Greenpeace has retained its commitment to direct action and an uncompromising stance:

The key difference [between Greenpeace and other organizations] is that we have used direct confrontation against WTO, IMF, GATT and other financial institutions, and we will use our direct action techniques again if necessary (personal communication with Greenpeace staff, 3/10/04).
Mission and Interpretation

Greenpeace’s mission is “to expose global environmental problems and to promote solutions that are essential to a green and peaceful future” (Greenpeace, 2004). In the words of one staff member, Greenpeace “has always been a leading voice for environmental protection over profit,” but the organization has also sensed a shift that has occurred in the context of globalization: “in recent years, with the increasing "globalization" of economies, we have also found that corporations have globalized their methods of profit, monopoly and environmental destruction,” (personal communication with Greenpeace staff member, 3/10/04). Greenpeace continues to target corporate power in its environmental campaigns.

Greenpeace’s targeting of the WTO through protest activities may be better explained because the WTO is viewed as a threat to its other work rather than because of the organization’s embrace of social issues. Greenpeace engages around trade because it is an “end legislative piece to the threats we’ve been working on,” (personal communication with Greenpeace staff, 2/26/04).

In choosing what aspect of the WTO meetings to address through its protest in Cancun, the organization decided on GM issues because it was an issue that made sense given other events and priorities within the organization:

Sometimes, the issues are clearly a priority, such as GM issues at Cancun: the timing is right, an MEA was entering into force in the middle of the ministerial; there had been a long and drawn out dispute process over the issue already taking place; the U.S. and E.U. had been warring over the issue, with developing nations also taking stances. The timing was right. (personal communication with Greenpeace staff member, 3/10/04)

Through the view that increasing corporate power destroys the environment, Greenpeace has also drawn connections between trade regimes, democracy, and social inequity:
Greenpeace opposes the current form of globalization that is increasing corporate power. Trade liberalization at all costs, leads to further environmental and social inequity and undermines democratic rights. It does not lead to poverty alleviation. Governments must listen seriously to the concerns expressed by citizens from all over the world, and best illustrated by the events that surrounded the Seattle Summit of the WTO in 1999. In promoting "global environmental standards" and opposing transnational corporations' (TNCs) "double standards", we advocate a new approach: forms of global governance, including trade and finance, that are open, transparent, fair, equitable and under democratic control. (personal communication with Greenpeace staff member, 3/10/04)

Greenpeace’s targeting of corporations is tied to the idea that corporate profit should not come at the expense of the environment. The organization has interpreted corporations as a substantial threat to the environment, and governmental policies and international institutions supporting corporate power are also a threat to the environment. Greenpeace has consequently come to the global justice movement from a largely anti-corporate viewpoint.

**Interactions with Other Groups**

Greenpeace works with a variety of groups on trade issues, including, Friends of the Earth, World Wildlife Fund, Oxfam, Third World Network, Focus on the Global South, Public Citizen, Center for International Environmental Law, Via Campesina, indigenous groups and movements, agricultural groups, and individual farmers (personal communication with Greenpeace staff member, 3/10/04). Although Greenpeace’s decisions on trade are made internally, interactions with these groups can sway them one way or the other.

It is as a result of the organization’s search for the root causes of environmental destruction and its commitment to direct action that Greenpeace has become involved in anti-corporate globalization issues and also the global justice movement. The organization’s propensity for non-violent direct action make the organization’s prominence at mobilizations unsurprising.
International Rivers Network (IRN)

International Rivers Network (IRN) has been very involved in global justice activities, but not as involved in anti-corporate activities as some of the other organizations. IRN’s work to reform large dam construction has led it to target the World Bank and the IMF for their promotion of large infrastructure projects without regard to the effects on the environment and human rights. IRN’s commitment to both social and environmental issues drives the organization’s work. The organization believes that dams are both an environmental issue and a social issue, and because the World Bank funds these projects, it must be reformed.

IRN is also influenced heavily by grassroots groups that it works with. Under most circumstances, the organization will not take up a new campaign in a dam-affected area without being asked by a local NGO or an individual from the area. In terms of tactics, IRN will use whatever it sees as being appropriate to the circumstances it is attempting to change – this includes some that are more confrontational and others that are much less so.

Founding and Early Work

Founded in 1985, International Rivers Network (IRN), like Rainforest Action Network (RAN), was one of the earliest projects of Earth Island Institute, the organization David Brower founded in 1982. In 1985, IRN was an all-volunteer organization of veteran activists concerned about the impacts of dams. The idea of the network was to open channels to other river activists throughout the world. In 1989, the organization began to have a full time, paid
staff of “experienced activists trained in economics, biology, engineering, hydrology, anthropology, and environmental sciences” (International Rivers Network, 2004).

Very early on in its existence, IRN began to see its work as being more than environmental. Large dam construction was viewed very much a human rights and social justice issue:

The organization started by people who had experience fighting big dam projects in the United States and who were very aware that even though we weren’t building dams in the United States any more that the dam industry itself was doing quite well. And upon our first international conference, [we] very quickly [learned] that large scale river damming projects were being built all over the developing world, and that the impacts were often even far worse that they had been in the United States. And the immediate understanding of those impacts had a lot to do with the environment and a lot to do with loss of rights associated with people who were being forcibly displaced or who were losing their land, or who were, upstream or downstream, having to suffer the consequences of these projects. So, kind of by its nature, these issues were part and parcel of what was going on. (personal communication with IRN staff member, 2/17/04)

IRN both related its work in dam-affected areas to human rights and equity issues, but it also saw the dam construction as an indicator of a larger social problem:

I think that it was just part of the evolution of the organization that we saw these projects, while they’re problematic on their face, were also indicators of something else. They were indicators of a particular model of economic model of development that consistently underserved poor populations, consistently underserved indigenous people, consistently underserved women, and that this was not a coincidence. These projects were indicators of a particular model, and that the work that we were doing was as much about questioning that model as it was about river conservation or defense of human rights, or respect of cultural identity. (personal communication with IRN staff member, 2/17/04)

In this way, IRN’s concern for the environment grew to be concern for the environment, human rights, and social equity. Moreover, the work was not only about dams; it was about the system that encouraged these sorts of projects at the expense of the environment and human well-being.
This understanding of the role of the World Bank and IMF as funders of these big dams and other development projects and policies led IRN to identify and target the World Bank and the IMF in the early 1990s for their environmental, social, and economic policies. From 1989 to 1996, IRN produced a magazine, *Bank Check Quarterly*, “which was totally devoted to the policies and practices of the World Bank and the IMF. And there was often nothing in there about rivers or dams at all. It was entirely devoted to questions of economic globalization,” (personal communication with IRN staff member, 2/17/04). This cognizance of a broader systemic problem also contributed to IRN and several other organizations leading the 50 Years Is Enough campaign to encourage major reform or outright dismantling of the World Bank and the IMF in 1994.

IRN also continued to target the World Bank as a primary financer of many of the dams the organization was fighting: “The World Bank is a huge influence, because they really have been the primary funder of large dams, the builder of large dams for decades” (personal communication with IRN staff member, 1/13/04). The organization started working in China in 1991, trying to halt international financing on the Three Gorges Dam. In the early 1990s, it worked to stop the Arun hydroelectric project in Nepal and the Lesotho Highlands Water Project, which was the largest infrastructure project in Africa.

**Global Justice Activities**

IRN continues to provide support to communities and local grassroots groups worldwide to protect rivers and watersheds and to stop large dam projects. The organization both campaigns against specific dam projects around the world and works to change global policies. IRN currently divides its work into regional campaigns in Africa, China, Latin
America, South Asia, and Southeast Asia. The organization is currently working on several
dam projects, including continuing to work on the Lesotho Highlands Water Project and the
Three Gorges Dam. It is also working to stop the construction of dams on the Narmada River
in India and Bujagali River in Uganda (International Rivers Network, 2004). IRN employs a
variety of tactics in its work, including writing reports, publications, lobbying the World
Bank, protesting, and boycotting companies. The staff will often decide on the tactics after
looking at a variety of possible options.

On a broader policy level, IRN has a campaign targeting international finance
institutions. The organization works with, lobbies, and protests, and publishes reports on
institutions like the World Bank and the IMF, as well as regional development banks:

We just finished a big analysis on the return of the big finance institutions to what they
call high risk-high return projects. And that’s going to be a big push in the whole 60th
anniversary that’s coming up of those institutions – across the board – it’s not just our
organization, but we’re working with a lot of other organizations. We’re working to
make that happen on the 60th anniversary. (personal communication with IRN staff
member, 2/17/04)

IRN has also been a part of the World Commission on Dams, a working group
comprised of the World Bank, the U.N. and other NGOs. The WCD produced a report
documenting the problems of large dams and describing steps the Bank should take to
increase transparency and local input into the dam approval process. IRN is currently
engaged in trying to get the Bank to implement the recommendations in the report.

IRN in 2004

With a revenue of $1.2 million in 2000, IRN is a relatively small organization, with only
about 15 staff members. IRN works closely with groups in developing countries and is also
an affiliate group of FoE International. With consistent leadership during the existence of the
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organization, the philosophy and strategies of the organization have stayed relatively constant, while responding to outside pressures and challenges.

Mission and Interpretation

IRN’s work is driven by the idea that the construction of large dams poses more than simply environmental problems. IRN’s mission identifies its environmental, social justice, and human rights goals:

IRN's mission is to halt and reverse the degradation of river systems; to support local communities in protecting and restoring the well-being of the people, cultures and ecosystems that depend on rivers; to promote sustainable, environmentally sound alternatives to damming and channeling rivers; to foster greater understanding, awareness and respect for rivers; to support the worldwide struggle for environmental integrity, social justice and human rights; and to ensure that our work is exemplary of responsible and effective global action on environmental issues. (International Rivers Network, 2004)

The organization’s goals clearly overlap between environment, human rights and social justice issues.

IRN sees its work with local communities as key to addressing the environmental and human rights issues associated with large dams and infrastructure projects:

As an international NGO what we’re trying to do is to support the work of local organizations that are working on different efforts to protect the rivers and the people and life that depend on rivers. So… the campaigns aren’t strictly environmental, nor are they strictly human rights oriented, nor are they strictly socially oriented, but they’re a real combination of those things. (personal communication with IRN staff member, 2/17/04)

This environmental and social view of the impacts of dams led the organization to critique the World Bank for its economic policies, but the organization will also target other funders of dam construction in an effort to halt financing to dam projects, as in the case of the Three Gorges Dam in China:
There are, on the finance side, there are a lot of policy issues, points of leverage within development institutions, the regional development banks, and even in the private banking community, we’ve tried to lay a lot of heat at the door of Morgan Stanley, for loans that it was underwriting for the Three Gorges Dam for example. So, and so that for a while included a consumer boycott campaign against the Discover Card, which is Morgan Stanley’s brand card. (personal communication with IRN staff member, 2/17/04)

IRN’s targeting of Morgan Stanley came from a desire to keep the dam from being built, and the company served as a point of leverage.

IRN has decided that large dams pose an equally strong environmental and human rights threat. By interpreting dam construction in this way, the organization looks at the structures promoting these dams, including the World Bank, regional development banks, and private banks, as threats to both the environment and human rights. These institutions and corporations are targeted for both their impacts on both the environment and human rights.

Interactions with Other Groups

IRN is also significantly affected by the international groups that it works with. IRN’s work on dam projects in developing countries is almost always solicited: “In almost all cases, we’re invited by a local organization or an individual or a small non-governmental organization, to look at a project that they are possibly concerned about” (personal communication with IRN staff member, 2/17/04). Additionally, the organization will meet periodically with people working on river issues worldwide:

On a formal level, we also have international check-ins… For instance… just this past December, we held an international conference in Thailand. It was held on a site that had been flooded. It’s by a dam that’s now been opened and this site is now no longer flooded. And there’s a village there and tents, bamboo huts and tents, were built for everybody… There were 360 people who came to it from all over the world, all of them working on river issues. And they spent 5 days sharing experiences and strategies together. (personal communication with IRN staff member, 2/17/04)
As an organization, the work IRN does on issues outside of river projects is bounded by whether the organization sees a need for the work. For example, the organization stopped publishing *Bank Check Quarterly* because other groups were targeting the Bank and IMF for their development policies:

At the time we started producing [*Bank Check Quarterly*], there was nothing out there that was covering the World Bank and the IMF. And since then, there's a lot that gives coverage to the Bank and IMF. Fifty Years is Enough became its own working network and its own organization, and there was stuff out there. And we could no longer as IRN say, 'we have to do it because no one else is doing it.' (personal communication with IRN staff member, 2/17/04)

So, the organization stays committed to the economic reform espoused by its former publication, but now focuses its work more specifically on dams.

IRN is driven in its activities targeting the World Bank out of a sentiment that the Bank's policies and promotion of infrastructure projects is destructive both to the environment and to human rights. The organization’s interactions with grassroots groups in developing countries have substantially affected IRN’s work, as the organization coordinates with people living near the dams to determine courses of action.

**Rainforest Action Network (RAN)**

Rainforest Action Network (RAN), as a corporate campaigning organization, has been very active in anti-corporate activities. The organization has targeted corporations to make environmental commitments, particularly commitments that will slow or stop the cutting of forests. In addition to its corporate campaigning, RAN has also been involved in WTO protests and in training activists in non-violent direct action techniques.
RAN focuses on the root causes of environmental destruction more than it looks at social justice issues in its campaigns, although the organization does make the connection between rainforest destruction and human rights abuses. Although the organization has connections to developing country groups, much of RAN’s work is concentrated in industrialized countries as the organization seeks to influence consumers of forest products. The organization has used non-violent direct action tactics throughout its existence, and is known for this approach.

Founding and Early Work

RAN was founded by Randy Hayes in 1985 as a project of the David Brower’s Earth Island Institute. From the beginning, RAN has worked to support activist groups in rainforest countries (Rainforest Action Network, 2004), but most of its work has concentrated on consumers in industrial countries who are consuming wood from rainforests (Ring, 2000). The organization works to educate and raise awareness in the United States among consumers about the plight of rainforests, and has always relied on direct action to draw attention to the destruction of the rainforests (Rainforest Action Network, 2004). RAN targeted the World Bank early in the organization’s existence, but since then has concentrated on reforming the practices of multi-national corporations.

In 1985, RAN targeted the World Bank for its environmentally destructive loan practices (Motavalli, 1997). The organization’s first direct action campaign led a boycott of Burger King for “importing cheap beef from tropical countries where rainforests are denuded to provide pasture for cattle,” and the organization succeeded in getting the company to agree to stop importing ‘rainforest beef’ (RAN Website). RAN followed its campaign against Burger King with campaigns against Scott Paper, Conoco, and Texaco.
In the late 1990s, RAN campaigned against the “Big Three” corporate logging companies, including Mitsubishi, MacMillan-Bloedel and Georgia-Pacific (Motavalli, 1997). RAN also targeted Home Depot, the largest retailer of wood products in the world, to stop selling wood from endangered forests (Ring, 2000). The company committed to a ‘no old growth’ policy in 1999.

Global Justice Activities

RAN’s current campaigns include a Don’t Buy Old Growth campaign that has targeted Boise Cascade, as a major forest products company, to eliminate wood and paper products from endangered forests in its products. Boise committed to this in 2003, and RAN has turned its attention to Weyerhauser. The organization has also recently initiated a Jumpstart Ford campaign, which targets Ford Motor Company for its role in climate change. For the last four years, RAN’s Campaign for a Sane Economy, or the Global Finance Campaign, has targeted Citigroup, the world’s largest financial services company, as a major funder of environmentally destructive projects. After three years of campaigning, RAN recently convinced Citigroup to sign on to an environmentally responsible investment policy, and is now targeting Bank of America.

Although not a major organizational campaign, RAN has also been involved in protests of the WTO, which it sees as a threat to democracy and its corporate campaigns:

When the WTO was meeting in 1999 and making decisions around environmental policy that would affect all of the things that we were working on, we really put a lot of energy into fighting that. (personal communication with RAN staff member, 1/12/04)
RAN in 2004

RAN is a relatively small organization, with a revenue of $2.3 million and about 20 staff members. RAN works with environmental and human rights groups in 60 countries, supporting indigenous and environmental groups, and is also an affiliate group of FoE International. Randy Hayes, the founder of RAN, continues to be President, which has provided some stability in the focus and direction of the organization over the years.

In fact, RAN has a sort of campaign model that campaigns are often built around:

I would say that there’s definitely a RAN-specific campaign style or campaign model that involves sort of high profile media and confrontational controversial tactics sometimes, not controversial in a dangerous way, but things that definitely get people’s feathers ruffled on the opposition… I think there’s definitely an organizational memory about how to campaign and what RAN campaigns look like, and we try and sort of live up to that standard. (personal communication with RAN staff member, 1/12/04)

Mission and Interpretation

RAN’s current mission statement highlights its emphasis on targeting multi-national corporations through organizing and direct action:

Rainforest Action Network campaigns for the forests, their inhabitants and the natural systems that sustain life by transforming the global marketplace through grassroots organizing, education and non-violent direct action. (Rainforest Action Network, 2004)

RAN is driven by a desire to get to the root of the environmental destruction of the rainforests. RAN’s decision to target private banks, for example, was a result of an analysis of the greatest threats to the rainforests and their inhabitants:

The impetus for the campaign… is the recognition that there are a multitude of threats that we now understand to rainforest ecosystems and their resident communities. And among them, of course, is logging, which is our old growth campaign which really tries to shift away from logging in old growth forests, but also mining, hydropower, oil exploration is a huge one because of the infrastructure and transport systems that are associated with it. And then finally our analysis around five years ago helped us to
understand that climate change is one of the leading threats to the rainforest ecosystems and of course to our global ecosystem as a whole… So when we looked at… the threats facing the rainforest, we came to one common denominator, which was the capital investment necessary to fuel all the different activities that allow the oil industry to work but also threaten the rainforest as a whole. (personal communication with RAN staff member, 1/12/04)

While searching out the greatest environmental threat drives the organization’s decisionmaking, RAN also sees growing corporate power as undemocratic:

You have to look at the fact that most of the power now globally is held by undemocratic institutions. Corporations are only fundamentally accountable to their shareholders, and as a corporate campaigning organization, we have had to acknowledge but not legitimize that power, and that’s a really tough thing to do. We need to continue to strive to reassert democracy and the role of our elected officials over the role of corporations, but in the meantime, it’s absolutely imperative that we gain concessions from corporations who hold disproportionate power in our society to save some of our last remaining ecosystems that we’re all dependent on, and to support the rights of indigenous and local communities that are on the frontlines of these battles. (personal communication with RAN staff member, 1/12/04)

In deciding on a company to target, RAN also looks for the company in a given industry that is the largest and most influential. The organization feels that if the largest company adopts the demands, RAN will gain leverage with the other companies in the industry:

In attempting to shift an industry, one thing that we need to do is determine who is doing the most harm in that industry, and the other thing we need to do is look at who the industry leaders are and get them to set a new standard that will then have to be followed by the rest of the industry to remain competitive. Fortunately in this case, both of those things lined up. Not only was Citigroup the single largest funder of rainforest destruction around the world, but they are also widely viewed as the industry leader – they’re the largest financial institution in the world. So, that information and analysis led us to launch a campaign against Citigroup. (personal communication with RAN staff member, 1/12/04)

In deciding to go after Citigroup, RAN as an organization was focusing on where it felt the greatest point of leverage was in the private banking sector.

RAN interprets corporate power as the largest threat to the rainforests – logging companies cut down the trees to sell; home improvement stores like Home Depot drive
demand for forest products; investment companies provide capital for the projects; oil and car companies contribute to global climate change, which will eventually destroy forests. From RAN’s viewpoint, if corporations are not kept from continuing their environmental destruction, the environment will suffer. The WTO, by allowing corporations increasing power and control, also poses a threat to the environment. RAN’s involvement in the global justice movement is driven by this interpretation of corporations as a threat.

*Interactions with Other Groups*

RAN has formed close alliances with grassroots organizations in the United States, which helps the organization educate and mobilize people to action. RAN is also committed to training activists as general support for activism and democratic power:

RAN as an organization is very, very committed to supporting organizing and activism both on our campaigns, but also beyond our campaigns. We think that building democratic power is instrumental for all kinds of social change, so, we as an organization... do a number of trainings per year that help acquaint activists with tools ranging from non-violent direct action tools to media and campaign strategy tools. (personal communication with RAN staff member, 1/12/04)

RAN is also influenced by its interactions with grassroots groups around the world, as it recognizes that the actions the organization takes with companies affect people in indigenous communities, and the organization is careful to listen to grassroots groups before making decisions that could be potentially harmful:

When we’re able to negotiate with these institutions, we hold a real position of privilege, and you know, you’re making decisions on what you ask for and what you’ll accept that will affect millions of people around the world, and so we keep very strong ties with pan-indigenous organizations like the Amazon Alliance... like the Forest People’s Program, that we recognize that we have to sit at the table, but they’re the ones that bear the brunt of the decisions that are made so I would not walk into a negotiation or sign off on a negotiation where I hadn’t done fairly extensive peer review on what we’re doing and how it’s impacting people. (personal communication with RAN staff member, 1/12/04)
RAN acts in its campaigning to target the root causes of rainforest destruction. The organization sees corporations as the greatest threat to rainforests and old growth forests throughout the world because the corporations directly fund the cutting of trees or because they contribute significantly to climate change, which over the long term will pose a great threat to forests. RAN has also made connections between growing corporate power and a lack of democracy. Given its tendency towards radical tactics, RAN sees non-violent protest as a tool of democratic power.
Chapter 4. Discussion

Friends of the Earth US (FoE), Greenpeace USA (Greenpeace), International Rivers Network (IRN), and Rainforest Action Network (RAN) are all contributing to the global justice movement through their campaign work and activities around trade, international institutions, and corporations. They are making decisions around these issues based on perceptions of global justice issues, which is influenced by organizational history and by interactions with other groups, particularly in developing countries. Understanding the organizations’ perspectives on global justice issues helps explain variations in how environment organizations are interacting with the global justice movement.

Explanations of Variations Among Groups

An analysis of the campaigns and activities of the four environmental organizations described above suggests there are patterns involved both in the way these organizations view the environment with regards to human rights and development, and how these views are influenced by their contact with coalitions and international groups (see Table 4. In-depth Organizational Characteristics).
Table 4. In-depth Organizational Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friends of the Earth US (FoE)</th>
<th>Greenpeace USA (Greenpeace)</th>
<th>International Rivers Network (IRN)</th>
<th>Rainforest Action Network (RAN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single / multi issue</td>
<td>Multi issue</td>
<td>Multi issue</td>
<td>Single issue</td>
<td>Single issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of international connection</td>
<td>Formal transnational organization</td>
<td>Formal transnational organization</td>
<td>Organization with routine transnational ties</td>
<td>Organization with routine transnational ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Justice Campaigns</td>
<td>International institutions, trade agreements, corporations</td>
<td>Corporations, sometimes trade agreements</td>
<td>International institutions</td>
<td>Corporations, sometimes trade agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational interpretation of issues</td>
<td>Problems are environmental and social</td>
<td>Problems are environmental; human rights and development are important, but secondary</td>
<td>Problems are environmental and social</td>
<td>Problems are environmental; human rights and development are important, but secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>Media, lobbying, education, some protest</td>
<td>Direct action, media, lobbying</td>
<td>Lobbying, publications, some protest</td>
<td>Direct action, education, corporate negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of international connections</td>
<td>Close ties with grassroots and developing country groups, affects campaign decisions</td>
<td>Ties with grassroots and developing country groups, but don’t affect decisions much</td>
<td>Close ties with grassroots, developing country groups, affects campaign decisions</td>
<td>Ties with developing country groups, sometimes affects decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perspectives on Environment, Human Rights, and Development

The organizations’ interpretations of environment, human rights, and equity issues influence the way they engage in the global justice movement. Brulle (2000) suggests that organizations with similar environmental philosophies have similar stances on environmental issues and would employ similar strategies. While this is true to some extent for organizational decisions to engage in global justice activities, it is important to look
specifically at how the organizations view their international environmental work relating to human rights and development issues. Distinct interpretations of global justice issues can be seen when considering the four organizations described in the previous chapters.

Friends of the Earth and International Rivers Network tend to view environmental issues with more of a view to impacts on human rights and social inequality. IRN has explicitly stated in its mission statement that it supports, “the worldwide struggle for environmental integrity, social justice and human rights” (International Rivers Network, 2004). Friends of the Earth also takes this sort of approach to global justice issues, and as an organization is “very interested in the intersections between environmental and social issues.”

IRN and FoE, which both have a perspective more grounded in human rights and development movements, both saw the World Bank as a threat to the environment and human rights because of its funding of destructive large infrastructure and extraction projects. Both organizations initiated campaigns against these international institutions for environmental reasons and for human rights reasons. FoE, as a multi-issue organization that seeks out the root causes of environmental and social issues, also sees trade agreements and corporate actions as a threat. The organization has become involved in a trade campaign that targets trade agreements for their environmental and social impacts. FoE’s work on the International Right to Know, which is designed to force corporations to disclose their labor, environment, and human rights impacts, also stems from the organization’s interpretation of global justice issues.

Greenpeace and Rainforest Action Network are focused more narrowly on environmental issues, although it should be noted that both also emphasize the importance of democratic decisionmaking. Both RAN and Greenpeace see corporate globalization as a
threat to environmental protections. Corporations pose a threat to the environment, and both RAN and Greenpeace have taken actions against corporations to get them to change their practices. For example, RAN has campaigned against numerous corporations in an effort to save forests, while Greenpeace uses its direct action techniques to expose environmentally harmful corporate practices. The WTO poses a threat to the corporate campaigns of both RAN and Greenpeace because of its global governance powers, so the organizations have protested the WTO on the grounds that it strengthens corporate power at the expense of environmental protections as well as democracy.

The organizational interpretations of global justice issues help explain the differences in the ways the organizations are involved in the global justice movement, particularly with regard to the targets they engage. RAN and Greenpeace, as anti-corporate organizations, come to the global justice movement from that perspective. IRN and FoE, on the other hand, come to the movement from a the point of view of the human rights and social justice movements.

**Nature of International Ties and Coalitions**

The impact of coalitions in transnational social movements has been a major topic in movement literature recently. Groups engage in transnational advocacy networks to work together collaboratively, sharing information, and organizing campaigns together (Keck and Sikkink, 1998). Environmental organizations often engage in these sorts of networks, as do other organizations involved in the global justice movement.

NGOs will often enter networks, and also more serious coalition work, because of the perception that more groups have greater influence or because more groups may be able to
leverage greater resources. These types of ties affect NGO actions because they will often agree on the same course of action, even if their original goals may be different. According to Rose (2000), groups working in coalition with one another learn each other’s positions and build relationships that lay the groundwork for ongoing cooperation. In the cases of these organizations, transnational and coalitional ties for the most part seem to make a difference.

FoE and Greenpeace, as international organizations, have strong transnational ties given that they dialogue and make decisions in conjunction with their international partners. FoE and Greenpeace are both international organizations that work with international affiliates worldwide to make decisions about the entire organization. Greenpeace’s international network is more heavily focused in developed countries, while FoE’s international network makes a claim to be “grassroots,” and, in addition, has a number of offices in developing countries. This situation may keep FoE more in touch with on-the-ground sentiment in the countries it works in.

All four organizations in the study interact with grassroots groups in developing countries, IRN and FoE perhaps more so than RAN and Greenpeace. IRN adjusts its approach to the World Bank based on its interactions with its developing country partners. FoE will change its approach to the Bank or to trade issues based on other FoE groups. RAN will also change its approach to corporations if it is worried that their negotiations might have a negative effect on indigenous populations or local communities. Greenpeace is also cognizant of the impacts of its work on indigenous peoples and communities, and will also adjust its work to take them into account if necessary.

Coalitional work, particularly for FoE, also makes a substantial impact because the organization works a great deal with non-environmental groups, the interactions and solidarity
has changed the way the organization views the issues it is working on. Although Greenpeace also works in coalitions, it appears the organization is less affected by other organizations it works with. It may be that Greenpeace’s size, which is substantially greater than the other organizations in the study, may make it more likely to stand on its own rather than bend to the wishes of other groups.

**Note on FoE**

FoE is notable out of the organizations studied because it campaigns in each of the “corporate globalization” targets: corporate practices, international financial institutions, and trade. This commitment to all of the targets may have grown out of FoE’s commitment to environmental and social justice combined with its desire to address the root causes of the multiple environmental issues it works on. FoE is also the most involved in work with coalitions and also has strong links with grassroots groups in developing countries. These factors appear to have led FoE to be more involved in global justice issues in a larger variety of ways than other organizations.

**Implications for Movements**

The global justice movement combines concerns for social inequality, human rights, and the environment, and places an emphasis on transparency and democratic decisionmaking. The movement targets international institutions like the WTO, the World Bank, the IMF, and multi-national corporations for their actions that threaten these concerns. The four organizations discussed in the previous chapter are all engaging in activities against these institutions, but in different ways and for slightly different reasons.
Nuances in Environmental Organizations

RAN and Greenpeace, which prioritize corporations and corporate practices as the most significant environmental problems, have come to the global justice movement from an anti-corporate viewpoint. FoE and IRN, which explicitly consider human rights and social equity issues in their treatment of environmental issues, come to the movement from a more development-oriented viewpoint. This suggests that even within the environmental movement, there are nuances in the ways in which movement organizations identify with and promote global justice.

The explicitly anti-corporate organizations – Greenpeace, RAN, and to a certain extent, FoE – also tend to employ, on average, more confrontational tactics through their direct actions than organizations that are less anti-corporate. These organizations feed into the anti-corporate arm of the movement, which is the more protest-oriented part of the movement, particularly mobilizations against the WTO. The actions against the World Bank and IMF, which each of these organizations has taken at some point in time, but that IRN and FoE emphasize, are more driven by a human rights and social equity agenda.

Future of the Movements

Buttel and Gould’s (2004) contention is that for the global justice movement to be successful, it will need to “coherently ideologically integrate social justice with environmental and sustainability agendas,” and that the success of the movement will depend on the environmental movement’s reception of social justice into its ideology. This thesis suggests
that all four organizations studied, albeit in distinct ways, seem to have accepted some form of social justice as part of their ideology. FoE and IRN seem particularly in tune with human rights and social equity as global ideals, while Greenpeace and RAN’s critique of corporate power has led them to a desire for more democratic processes. The organizations’ continuing work with developing country grassroots groups, which are likely to have greater concern for issues of social inequality and economic development than their northern partners, should continue this interest in global justice issues.

For these organizations, at least, the global justice movement seems to be something that will continue to be a part of their concerns. This thesis only looks at some of the more active organizations, however, and so it would be important to consider some of the larger, more conservative environmental organizations that have been involved in trade and environment issues in the past.

Smith (2002) questions whether social movements can transcend local and national identities and interests to coherently oppose corporate elites. The coalitional work and the connections with grassroots groups forged by the organizations in this study suggest that as the environmental campaigns and programs address the anti-corporate and anti-elitist concerns of the global justice movement, this transcendence is indeed happening. These environmental organizations are engaging transnationally in opposition to economic globalization run by global corporate elites.

Given the involvement of these environmental organizations in global justice issues, it seems likely that these and other environmental organizations, particularly those that have incorporated social issues or anti-corporate views into their organizational perspectives, will continue to contribute to the global justice movement and vice versa. This interaction
between the movements could be augmented as organizations continue to interact with developing country groups with alternate viewpoints and in coalition with organizations from other movements.

**Limitations and Further Questions**

The most obvious limitation of this study is that it only dealt with organizations that were already quite radical for the environmental movement. While FoE and Greenpeace are acknowledged as mainstream environmental organizations, they are still viewed as being unique – Greenpeace for its emphasis on direct action, and FoE for its commitment to social issues. RAN and IRN are fairly small organizations, and although they have high profiles within their niche areas, they probably lie outside the realm of mainstream environmental organizations.

For a more complete picture of environmental organizations’ involvement in global justice issues, it would be useful to look at the larger, more conservative organizations that have chosen to engage around trade issues, including World Wildlife Fund, National Wildlife Federation, Defenders of Wildlife, and the Sierra Club. It would also be interesting to look at organizations that have not engaged in these issues to determine why they have not. This topic would be particularly interesting because of the apparent shift of environmental organizations away from trade issues. This shift mirrors a similar shift away from environmental issues in trade negotiations for the WTO.

It would also have been helpful in this study to talk with a larger number of people in each organization, particularly staff members who had been involved with these organizations for longer periods of time. Only in one case was I able to talk with a founding member of the
organization. For another organization, neither of the people I talked to had been at the organization when the campaigns they were working on had started.

In spite of its limitations, this study raises some interesting questions about the nature of coalitions and networks between NGOs and grassroots groups in industrialized and developing countries. Developing country governments are raising concerns around issues of economic development in the WTO and are becoming more successful in making their voices heard. It appears that developing country civil society groups are raising similar concerns in their interactions with environmental NGOs based in industrialized countries. It would be interesting to explore this issue further, particularly to determine the extent to which developing country NGOs are able to influence NGOs in industrialized countries around environmental issues.

Policy Recommendations

Environmental groups are an integral part of the global justice movement. The ways in which they view social justice issues help shape the movement. The more that environmental groups can incorporate social justice issues – human rights, development, social equity – into their agendas, the more likely it is that environmental concerns will be incorporated into the global justice movement. Organizations with closer and more egalitarian contact with developing country groups seemed to incorporate global justice views into their perspectives more. The more conservative environmental groups not studied in this thesis might benefit from increased contact with grassroots groups.

The environmental community should also have much in common with groups dealing with human rights, development, labor, and social equity issues, since these are all
progressive issues that concern matters of justice. Environmental and other groups could benefit from more coalitional work around these issues. This sort of work would strengthen the organizations in that a united front on issues like these would be a very strong leverage point. The International Right to Know work that Friends of the Earth and other organizations are engaged in is a good example of how work by groups from different movements can work together to improve transparency in corporations worldwide. While some groups may see coalition work as compromising, the benefits would seem to outweigh the costs.
Conclusion

Environmental movement organizations in the United States continue to engage with the global justice movement. These environmental organizations appear to view global justice issues in distinct ways. Some organizations have concentrated on seeking out the root causes of environmental destruction, which has led them to target corporations and corporate practices. These organizations have become involved with the global justice movement from the anti-corporate point of view. Other organizations have explicitly incorporated human rights and social equity concerns in their view of environmental problems. These organizations tend to critique international institutions for their inattention to human, as well as environmental, problems, and approach the global justice movement from a human rights and development perspective. This interpretation has altered the way that organizations are involved in the movement, but the perspectives that the organizations have of global justice issues makes it likely that the organizations will continue to be engaged with the movement.

Friends of the Earth, International Rivers Network, Rainforest Action Network, and Greenpeace are all contributing to the global justice movement through their campaign work and activities around trade, international institutions, and corporations. Two of the organizations, IRN and FoE, became involved in these campaigns in large part because of their view of social and environmental issues. RAN and Greenpeace, and FoE in some ways, come to the movement from a perspective of corporations being the sources of environmental destruction.

The histories of the organizations, including leadership changes and tactical choices, have affected the organizations' perspectives on social and environmental issues and
subsequent involvement in the global justice movement. Coalition work with non-environmental groups and close interactions with grassroots developing country groups increased the likelihood that organizations will be involved in the global justice movement. If these and other environmental groups continue to have a perspective on the environment that incorporates social justice and human rights, or that critiques corporate power for being undemocratic, then it seems likely that environmental groups will continue to engage with and contribute to the global justice movement.
Appendix 1. Methodology

To understand how U.S. environmental NGOs are responding to issues of globalization, a group of NGOs were identified that 1) had an environmental goal as part of their mission statement; 2) were legally registered in the United States as non-profit organizations (although some of the groups have international secretariats or offices in other countries); and 3) had campaigns or programs specifically targeting international financial institutions, trade agreements, or corporations. From this list, a subset was chosen that had staff members who were available for interviews. Of those, four NGOs were chosen: two that addressed single environmental issues and two that addressed multiple environmental issues. All four organizations are known to use relatively radical tactics, and all could be classified as environmental social movement organizations, meaning that they are organizations working to bring about change in the status quo. As such, all have engaged in protest as a tactic for political change, but two of the groups are known specifically for their use of non-violent direct action, while the other two tend, on average, to do more advocacy and media work.

The organizations that were selected for the study were International Rivers Network (IRN), Rainforest Action Network (RAN), Greenpeace USA (Greenpeace), and Friends of the Earth US (FoE). Greenpeace and FoE, which both multi-issue organizations, also happen to be parts of international affiliate organizations, while RAN and IRN are national organizations doing international work with grassroots organizations.

International Rivers Network, which works primarily to halt dam destruction, campaigns against the World Bank and the IMF, in addition to regional financial institutions. Rainforest

---

3 The terms ‘campaign’ and ‘program’ were self selected by each organization, but both refer to a collection of activities targeting a specific institution or issue.
Action Network is known for its campaigns against corporations that contribute to the destruction of rainforests, and, in addition has targeted the World Bank and the WTO in the past. Greenpeace campaigns against corporate practices that are harmful to the environment, and is known for its presence at WTO protests. FoE’s international program currently has campaigns in all three areas – international financial institutions, trade agreements, and corporate accountability.

Data for the descriptions that follow were collected through semi-structured interviews with trade campaign coordinators or the closest relevant staff member from the organization. Some interviews were conducted in person, while others were conducted over the telephone. A set of questions in six areas was used to structure the interviews (see Semi-Structured Interview Questions below), and the interviews ranged in length from 45 minutes to an hour and a half. The interviews were audio-taped and then transcribed. The information in the interviews was supplemented with information on the organizations websites, other studies on the organizations, newspaper articles, and other documentary information.

**Semi-Structured Interview Questions**

1) Individual Background
   a. How long have you been a staff member of this organization? What positions have you filled?
   b. What do you call the set of activities you work on - program, campaign, project? What types of activities do you do as part of this campaign or program?

2) Campaign / Program Development
   a. Can you tell me how your campaign was developed? In what areas do you have autonomy to make decisions about your campaign?
   b. What was the rationale for selecting your particular campaign activities? Why did you select this particular focus? These particular targets and tactics?

3) Internal Influences
a. Does any sort of review process take place to gauge how well your campaign is going and what needs to be changed? If so, Can you describe instances in which project or campaign reviews influenced subsequent activities?
b. What groups affiliated with the organization (e.g. board, supporters, funders) or organizational procedures have the greatest impact on your campaign?

4) External Influences
a. What types of external forces have a significant impact on campaign development (e.g. relationships with other organizations, participation on task forces or commissions, attending conferences, interactions with campaigners from other organizations, etc.)? What impact do they have on campaign activities, strategies, and tactics?
b. Can you think of any instances where you or other people working on your campaign have imported strategies, tactics or ideas from their previous work?
c. What are the main points of access you have to political and policy processes? How do these points of access allow you to actually influence decision-making or bring about environmental change?
d. How have major political, technological or economic events such as NAFTA, 9-11, the election of a new US president, the Internet, affected your campaign activities? Can you tell me about any events that were important and what sort of impact they had?

5) Values and Beliefs
a. Is there an environmental philosophy that you think characterizes this organization or any other values or beliefs that are central to this organization? If so, ask: Can you think of an example of the way that this philosophy/ these values have influenced your campaign?

6) Outcomes
a. What are the main effects of your campaign? Is there an example of a project/action or an aspect of your campaign that was particularly effective or successful? Why do you think it worked?
b. In what ways do you think your campaign is aligned with and contributes to the broader environmental movement? The global justice or anti-globalization movement? Do you feel like the global justice movement is contributing to your campaigns?
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