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List of abbreviations.

I have used few acronyms and common short forms. Many non-governmental organisations use an acronym as the name of the organisation in daily speech. This can sometimes be confusing, as acronyms change when name of organisations are translated. To make it simple, I have chosen to use the same acronym as the organisation use when they present themselves in English. With this logic Natur og Ungdom/Nature and Youth will be NU, not N&Y; while Lunto Liitto/Finnish Nature League will be FNL, not LL! This system is not totally logic, as some NGOs present themselves with different acronyms. Norges Naturvernforbund is normally Norwegian Society for the Conservation of Nature (NSCN), but they are also often identified as FoE-Norway; (Friends of the Earth). The explanation is probably that both the official name and acronym becomes too difficult to say in English.

Expressions:

ENGO Environmental Non Government Organisation.
NGO Non Government Organisation.
PCB Polychlorinated Biphenyls (an environmental persistent toxin).

Acronyms used by Non Governmental organisations.

BCC: Biodiversity Conservation Centre.
FNL: Finnish Nature League, Luonto Liitto
NU: Nature and Youth; Natur og Ungdom.
PiM: Nature and Youth Russia; Priroda i Molodeszh.
SEU: Social Ecological Union.
SPOK: Karelian Students Environmental Organisation.
TRN: Taiga Rescue Network.
WWF: (Formerly known as World Wildlife Found).
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1. Introduction.

When I travelled to Murmansk in the spring 2001 to do the fieldwork, I wanted to compare the policy tools used by Norwegian and Northwest Russian environmental non-government organisations (ENGOs). The idea came from a long fascination with organisations working in the field of environmental politics. I had noticed that ENGOs were present in environmental politics and in local communities many places around the world, and that they seemed to influence the world around them. Could it be that participation–oriented ENGOs is a kind of organisation that can be successful in different political and economic contexts?

I define the tools and strategies ENGOs use to achieve their goals as policy tools, and my first approach was to compare how these are used by ENGOs in Norway and in Northwest Russia. If ENGOs are able to reach their goals and exercise influence in different political contexts, I assumed that the policy tools they use to reach their goals can be expected to vary, adapted to different political, cultural and economic backgrounds. There is an extensive literature in political social science about how NGOs and social movements are organised, how they grow and how they fall. There has also been an interest in their impact on the political system. It is therefore surprising that less interest is given to what they actually do, and which strategies or policy tools that is successful in different political climates.

The initial idea behind the project was based on the viewpoint from activists working inside an ENGO, struggling to achieve concrete goals. From the activists point of view the most interesting topic is “what can I do to make a difference”. In other words, how can I be successful? I realised that different approaches towards use of policy tools is one variable that may explain why ENGOs fail or have success, but that there are two other important variables that also influence on ENGOs ability to have success. These are kind of organisation and use of networks.
1.1 The problem.

It is well known that ENGOs can influence social, political-, and administrative processes, in a manner that is coherent with the goals of the ENGOs. This is success. The special position of Norwegian ENGOs is well described by Selle (2000). ENGOs in Northwest Russia are also able to be successful, though to a lesser extent. But what can ENGOs do to become more successful, which factors influence success?

I have investigated how success for Russian ENGOs is best understood. I have looked at three factors as explanations and will investigate:

What is the relationship between an ENGO’s ability to be successful, and its kind of organisation, how it uses of policy tools and strategies and finally how it employs networks?

Northwest Russia seemed a strategic arena to investigate. ENGOs in Russia are relatively new, even though organisations that care for the environment have existed in Russia since the sixties. By 2001 most ENGOs had time to have gained experience, and have tested various activities and approaches. An environmental movement was emerging in Russia, in a new political context driving towards more transparency and democracy. The political climate in Russia was different and less benign for ENGOs than in Norway, and this could potentially make it easier to distinguish between success and unsuccessful approaches.

I have background from the environmental movement in Norway. I have cooperated with environmental NGOs in many former Soviet countries through several international networks, as a member of Natur og Ungdom (NU) and Norges Naturvernforbund (NSCN). From this experience I assumed that the typical membership based ENGO with a focus on participation was successful in Russia, and especially in the area around the Nordic Countries that was the area I knew best. But how adaptable is this form of organisation? Can it survive in a climate where public participation is not wanted, where implementation of laws is weak, and where many associate politicians and political activity with poor morale?

The overall situation for Russian ENGOs was to some extent already mapped. Yanitsky (2000) gives a good and historical overview of what he calls “Russian Greens”, but rarely
dives deep into the actual activities of the ENGOs. The TRN-evaluation (Bystrøm et al 2001) also gives valuable information. Glimpses of information and activities can be found in various sources such as magazines, bulletins, press releases or reports from NU, the NSCN and the Taiga Rescue Networks (TRN) and other sources within the ENGO-sector. Yanitsky (2000) describes an environmental movement in retreat, but my own previous observations and experiences with Russian ENGOs gave reason to believe that the situation in Northwest Russia might deviate from what Yanitsky described for the movements in Russia as a whole. ENGOs were not only able to stop logging and protect valuable forests, my experience from Murmansk and Arkhangelsk showed that new branches of existing ENGOs were being established, and a consolidation of ENGOs into larger structures.

1.2 Theoretical approach and thesis structure.

This thesis draws on insights offered by the social movement theory offered by MacAdam, McCarthy and Zald (1996) and Tarrow (1998). This theory was originally developed for understanding movements in the US, but it has been applied to European countries, and also lately on Russia (Yanitsky 2000). It provides a framework which is useful for understanding the activities of ENGOs on a general level. I will use some key concepts from this theory, and specially rely on the concept of mobilising structures in the definition of ENGOs.

This theory is too general to be useful in analysing conditions for success by ENGOs in Northwest Russia. To adapt it into this context I have identified three variables to explain success; networks, policy tools and policy strategies and finally kind of organisation. Kind of organisation is the broadest variable, in the sense that it covers many aspects of ENGOs activities and structure. Policy tools and strategies have a narrower scope, only covering activities of the ENGOs, while use of networks is an even narrower variable, pertaining to a certain type of activities and relations. I will discuss the broadest variable first, and then proceed to narrow the scope in order to test for stronger or weaker interrelations.

The environmental debate in Russia, activities of ENGOs and the Russian political system is not well known in Norway. I will therefore first provide general background information about Russia, present the ENGOs in the material and define the key concepts success and
ENGOs in chapter two. In chapter three I will present the theoretical approach, and describe and present the three variables kind of organisation, use of policy tools and policy strategies and use of networks. In Chapter four I describe how the fieldwork was done and choice of approach, and discuss some methodological questions.

Chapter five is the analytical chapter. I will first analyse the relation of success for the three independent variables. Based on these results I will discuss which variable is most important, and look into the relation between the independent variables and interrelation for success. The results from chapter five will be summarised in chapter six, and I will shortly discuss if the results are valid outside Northwest Russia and after 2001. Then I sum up the thesis, look at some of the lessons learned, and finally briefly focus on the future for ENGOs in Russia.

Some additional information is attached. This is the interview guide, a list of all organisations that has been interviewed and some additional information about activities of the ENGOs in Northwest Russia.

1.3 How different is really Russia?

From a Norwegian perspective it seems to be impossible to write about Russia without focusing on how different it is. When Russia is described in Norwegian and English literature, it is common to focus on the differences. A good example is the title of Petter Normann Waages book “Russia is somewhere else” (1990, my translation of title). Russians themselves are also aware that they are “different”. One of my informers gave up explaining why could not register my visa the way I thought it was logical (and indeed rational), and instead shouted: “This is Russia. Not possible!”

I think the focus on difference is misleading and makes things more complicated than necessary. Russia is after all a neighbouring country to Norway. It is only a four-hour drive from Kirkenes to Murmansk, and travel within Russia is open and easy. My experience from travelling in Russia does not leave me with a feeling that Russians are different. A trivial example is the similarity in drinking habits between Norwegians and Russians. Sitting in a Russian pub is unmistakably different from sipping a glass of red wine in at a street-café in
Paris. A more proper example is relation to nature. Nature is important in the Norwegian identity. Being a proper Norwegian somehow includes having a summerhouse (“hytte”) in the forest, and to spend the Easter holiday in the mountains. Russians have their “datsja”:

“At least 30% of Russians have one of these small country homes. Usually they don’t have electricity or running water (...) Often little more than a hut, these retreats offer Russians refuge from life and as such figure prominently in the national psyche” (Lonely Planet 2000: 73).

The datsja is used in almost the exact same way as our “hytte” for recreation, chopping of firewood and as a base for finding food in the forest. Former Prime Minister Einar Gerhardsen has even welcomed Soviet ambassadors at his hytte.

This fascination over how something that is perceived as so different can feel so similar is one of the reasons why I got interested in the Russian ENGOs. By focusing on the difference I think we are missing the similarities and the common grounds for cooperation and coexistence.
2. Background and definitions.

In this chapter, I will present the background and discuss some key definitions. First, I will define the key concepts ENGOs and success. Then I will present some background information on Russia, including information about the environment, the Russian political system and the history of the environmental debate. Finally, I will present the ENGOs in Northwest Russia, and the activities of Nordic ENGOs involved in this area.

2.1 What is an environmental ENGO?

ENGOs are one type of mobilising structures. Rucht (1996:188) describes three types of structures: the grassroots model, the interest-group model and the party oriented model. An interest organisation is a formal organisation, with expertise, access to resources and decision makers with “emphasis on influencing policies (via lobbying for instance)” (ibid). ENGOs fit the definition of interest organisations. I define ENGOs as an interest-group or organisation formally independent from the government, whose purpose is to facilitate work for protecting and improving the state of the environment. The environment is the entire biosphere. Protection refers to protection of the biodiversity understood broadly as diversity in species, types of nature and genetic material (Direktoratet for Naturforvaltning 1999:8). Improving refers to making conditions for the biodiversity better, in such a manner that human activity will not reduce diversity. This includes humans; campaigns for cleaner air in cities for improving human health are also improving the state of the environment. It is common, but not necessary to have formal structures such as boards, a chairperson, local clubs, a political manifest etc. An ENGO can be small or big in members, can have open or restricted membership, and consist of one or many chapters.

Being non-governmental indicates that there are no formal ties between the organisation and the government or government agencies. This is not a threshold preventing the organisation from cooperating with the government or receiving financial aid from it, as long as the ENGO keeps its independence. In Norway, it is normal for NGOs to receive financial support from the government, in other countries it is not. Some ENGOs, like Greenpeace,
will not accept government money as they consider that it will influence on their independence (Greenpeace International 2007). An NGO cannot be a political party. The reason for this is analytical rather than logical. It is possible to construct an NGO and a political party that are identical in organisational form. The difference lies in the activities. Most importantly, political parties choose to become part of the electoral system, and might end up as the government itself.

I looked for ENGOs that are membership based and independent. Membership based implies that they use volunteers, are open for participation, and that they to some extent look for more members. Independent means that the members run the ENGO. This is important in order to exclude youth clubs run by adults, such as the Norwegian “Miljødetektivene”, or the many “ecological clubs” in Russia, which perhaps may be described as a mixture of the boy scouts and the public after-school service. I have nevertheless presented Terra Incognita, as one example of an ecological club.

2.1.1 A ENGO versus a network organisation.

I define a network as a set of formal and informal relations between a group of persons and/or organisations. A network organisation is a mixture of an organisation and a network. The Social Ecological Union (SEU) and Taiga Rescue Network (TRN) are typical network organisations. They can have many of the same features as a NGO; a formal goal, a secretariat, and even a chairperson. The difference is that the central level of a network organisation does not have any formal influence over the participants, and that there will be none (or few) hierarchic structures such as central board, regional boards etc. A network can have a larger variety in goals and use of policy tools among its members. In the words of TRN:

“The purpose of the network is to support and publicize local struggles and strengthen cooperation between NGOs, indigenous peoples and nations and individuals. (…) Every 2 years TRN organizes international multistakeholder conferences, with a different focus and location each time, which generate new ideas, strategies and guidelines. (Taiga Rescue Network 2000: 6)

In an NGO the central level of the organisation will have more influence over the participants. This can take several forms, but as a rule one will notice that the typical NGO
will be more coordinated, have more rules, frameworks and guidelines the participants must adjust their activities to, and sometimes also try to commit the members to take part in certain centrally planned and co-ordinated campaigns.

2.2 Successes for ENGOs in Northwest Russia.

The Norwegian experience shows that ENGOs have impact on society, and that they can be successful. Professor in Political Science at the University in Bergen, Per Selle, argues that the Norwegian environmental movement has significant political influence, and has “participated in changing the political language and climate” (Selle 2000:378). Success may come on a “high” or “low” level, such as causing or influencing government decisions, or convincing a local community to start composting food-waste. I divide between success and effect, where effect is as any outcome caused by influence from ENGOs, while success is effects that are in line with the goal of the ENGOs.

ENGOs in Northwest Russia are weaker than their friends in Norway, operate under a different political climate, and have a shorter history. Still they are able to function and to be successful. There are many examples. They have managed to protect forest areas, start up energy saving programmes, carry out information programmes in schools, erect windmills, educate their members and establish new local chapters. The scale of success is limited. A campaign for protection of a forest area may lead to protection of one or two areas, programmes for energy saving are small and moves slow due lack of funding and interest from the local government.

2.2.1 Three forms of success.

I will divide between three types of success, viz. political success, organisational success and success in spreading information. When ENGOs are able to cause a change in society, I call this a political success, even if the activity may be purely administrative or only involve business or citizens. Examples are legal protection a forest, persuading companies not to log in a specific area, or persuading local administrations to start energy saving programmes. The
chain from activity of the ENGO to success is difficult to determine. From the outside, it may look easy. To illustrate: SPOK has mapped old growth forests in Karelia, and together with the Finnish Nature League (FNL) they defined and named the Kalevalsky national park. It was protected in 2006. A closer look may give a more diverse picture. Even though SPOK did much of the actual fieldwork, many other parties were involved in this struggle. Greenpeace, SEU, the BCC, WWF-Finland, FNL and even the Finnish Government have worked for protection. The work of SPOK also goes on within a larger political debate, where forest protection has been important. Could it be that the forest area would have been protected without the help of SPOK?

Success is also relevant for organisational issues. ENGOs are successful when they are able to grow, for example by attracting more members, establishing new chapters or educating the members they already have (capacity building). Success is difficult to measure in this case as well. None of the Russian ENGOs in the data has experienced rapid growth in members or numbers of chapters, but success can also be to keep a stable member base. If we look to Norway, the member base of NU was roughly between 2000 and 3000 from the seventies to 1986. Then the number of members grew to 10 500 in only four years. Persen and Ranum (1997:96-97) considers this growth to be caused by external factors, such as a general “green wave”, and some high profile cases, such as the Chernobyl accident. The number of members dropped to 4000 – 5000 from the late nineties. External effects can mask success or failure aimed at getting more members. A campaign for more members resulting in a shrinking member base can still be success, if no action would have caused a faster drop in members.¹ The conclusion is that it is important to establish a general picture in order to look for other and more important independent variables, and look for multiple sources describing the same phenomena.

Informing the population about environmental problems is also an important task, as knowledge is a precondition for action. ENGOs can be successful in informing the general population, politicians or administrators about environmental problems and solution. All

¹ In the period 1998-2001 I was a member of the executive board of NU. The board launched an aggressive face-to face campaign to get more members, and was able to stop the decrease in the member base, but not to increase the number of members.
ENGOS were asked about their information activities, and data are available on use of mass media, publications, leaflets, stands, web pages and other information activities such as roundtables and seminars. It is still complicated to measure success and determine its sources, as we do not know how the readers or listeners respond to the information from the ENGOs. I have defined success in this instance as success in spreading information. This definition of success is slightly problematic as it operates on a different level. Measuring if the specific ENGOs were actually listened to would require a new large study. Looking at the ENGOs ability to spread information is the best approach within this study, and still satisfactory, as it gives a good indication of the ENGOs ability to implement its goals, tactics and priorities.

2.3 Why Northwest Russia and why 2001?

Russia and Norway are neighbouring countries, and there has been much of attention around the state of the Russian environment in Norway. The Chernobyl accident in 1987 raised a lot of concern. Other good examples are the huge interest around Bellonas work with mapping radiation from the Russian Northern Fleet and cooperation with Alexandr Niktin. The popular film Cool & Crazy (Jensen 2001) captured and described many peoples understanding by showing the reaction of Berlevåg Men’s Chorus when they travelled through destroyed nature around Nikel, a town close to the Norwegian border. Norwegian ENGOs has shared this interest, and attempts to establish connections with Russian ENGOs was carried out already in 1989 (Nilsen 1992).

In 2001 Russia had a political system that differed from the Norwegian; perhaps primarily by the fact that transition was not finished and that the political system was still changing (Remington 2004:1-23). It was unclear who the correct decision makers were, and even which laws were valid. The democratic system was poorly developed compared to Western style democracies, in the sense that democratic channels (such as elections, public hearings, public participation, access to media etc) were less developed, or differed from what we find in the west. The political system was not designed to make life easier for NGOs, sometimes the opposite was true. This is very different from Norway, where the government part
finances many organisations, and where ENGOs are invited by the government to participate in political processes. NGO-work in Russia has been made difficult by authorities by for instance launching court cases against high-profile environmentalists such as Aleksandr Nikitin and Gregory Pasko (Bellona 2006), or by refusing to register NGOs officially. This was the case with Priroda i Molodezh (PiM) (Interview PiM-Murmansk). Making registration a prerequisite for NGOs is also a threshold against participation in itself. It is therefore interesting to see how ENGOs manage to work under such conditions.

The sheer size of Russia is a strong argument for focusing on a small part of the federation. I have chosen to focus on Northwest Russia, or the counties (or oblasts) of Murmansk and Arkhangelsk, and the Republic of Karelia. This is an area that I knew fairly well in advance, and I had access to some data and contacts. To cover all of Russia would be an overwhelming task, but I considered the Northwest region big enough to give a picture for other parts of Russia as well.

2001 was a strategic year to investigate ENGOs in Northwest Russia. Most ENGOs in Northwest Russia were founded in the nineties, and have therefore had time to settle and develop a stable structure by 2001. They have also had time to experience success and failure and learn how to survive in changing political and economic climates. The effects of the economic crisis in 1998 were no longer so strong, and the change of President the year before marked a return of a more regulated society.

2.4 Why study environmental NGOs?

I have cooperated with NGOs in many former Soviet countries. My initial interest arises from an urge to understand how ENGOs are able to function in different political systems. ENGOs are a relatively new kind of organisations, but have been innovative in campaigning for political goals. The movement is both national and international. ENGOs have similar values in different countries and use widespread international networks. This facilitates a flow of organisational knowledge, ways of organising, policies and policy tools across borders. Initially my interest was based on a wish to get things done. Activists in ENGOs spend a lot of time campaigning and working for saving the planet, and put a lot of thought
and work into designing policy tools or organisational structures that are successful and effective. From this starting point, I started to ponder if the effect or success of ENGOs is dependent on kind of organisation, use and choice of policy tools or of national or international networks. An ENGO is after all an organisation with limited resources, so such information can be very valuable in order not to waste time and work.

My background as an activist can be problematic as it my influence on my objectivity as a researcher, but it is probably unavoidable that some kind of interest will be guiding the choice of topic for a thesis. If we were to disqualify interest, participation and knowledge, many social scientists would run into trouble. The problem is thus not whether a person has an interest or not, but to which degree one becomes subjective in the analysis. Background is also an asset. Deeply fascination for the topic is not a disadvantage. Inside knowledge of ENGOs gives first hand experience on how they work and function. It has provided a network and certain “credibility”. I am confident that this has been very helpful, and made it easier to convince the informers to spend time talking to me, and made them relax during the interviews.

2.4.1 Selection of ENGOs.

After I had narrowed the scope to Murmansk, Karelia and Arkhangelsk, I started to look for ENGOs. Initially I planned to include as many ENGOs as possible in the material, as there were a very limited number of active organisations available. This turned out to be unproblematic, and all the ENGOs that were found in the main towns were included. The main criteria for inclusion were that the organisations should be open for participation, Russian, and independent from the government. As the number of organisations is limited, I have practised an inclusive understanding of these criteria. I have chosen to present Terra Incognita, which is not independent, but still functions very similar to other ENGOs in the material, although it is not included in the analysis. Green Cross is included, even if it seems only to be open for persons with certain skills or positions.

I decided in advance that Bellona should not be included in the material. Bellona has been active in Russia for many years, and has received a lot of attention, especially for the
cooperation with Alexandr Nikitin and the mapping of the Russian northern fleet and problems with radiation. Bellona is not a Russian ENGO; it is a Norwegian foundation working in Russia, with some Russian employees. It is based on hired professionals, and not on members or activists. Is has no members (in a normal sense) neither does Bellona have any system for democratic decision making. Bellona cooperates very closely with several companies, and finances its activities partly through the “B7” programme (Bellona 2007). The main reason for not including Bellona is that it is a Norwegian foundation, but all the other factors mentioned above makes Bellona different from the kind of ENGO and the type of activities I was looking for. The professionalism and for-profit design makes it something for itself.

2.5 Some facts about Russia.

In order to understand some of the challenges for ENGOs in this region I will provide some basic facts about the area, and present the historical debate about the environment. Murmansk and other towns on Kola were bombed during the Second World War, and most towns and cities are either post-war or rebuilt. The main exceptions are Arkhangelsk, which escaped quite untouched, and Petrozavodsk that was occupied by the Finns. Today people mainly live in cities, and most people live in “typical” Soviet style large concrete complexes (Doms). Flats use central heating, usually from coal-powered incinerators. The heating system does not allow for regulation of the temperature, causing people to have to vent their apartments during mild winter days. Electricity is not used for heating, and is supplied from Kola Nuclear Power Plant. At the time of fieldwork, most property was still state-owned, including almost all land and forests.

Arkhangelsk and Petrozavodsk are old cities, and Arkhangelsk still has many of her small wooden houses left. The three main cities have a diverse population and economical life and institutions for higher education. They have around 300 000 inhabitants each, and the total population in the area is around 3 millions (Republic of Karelia 2007; Wikipedia 2007a; Wikipedia 2007b) Many of the smaller towns are constructed for specific purposes, Nikel and Monchegorsk around two major plants for refining of metal, Apatity around the large
apatite extraction operation. Polyarny Zory is a satellite to the Kola Nuclear Power plant. Kandalaksja in the east is mainly a port, and Plezesk in Archangelsk Oblast serves the large Kosmodrome. There are also several military and naval towns, many closed for foreigners. Examples are Severomorsk, Severodvinsk and Zapolyarny. Most cities connect via railway. Travel is slow but reliable. There is also a bus service and an informal “taxi” system. Public transport systems within the cities are functional, though run down. Most large towns have bus and trolleybus services, and Arkhangelsk even has a tram.

**Figure 2.1.** Barents region and Environmental Threats (UNEP/GRID-Arendal 2007).
2.5.1 The history of environmental debate in Russia and the Soviet Union.

There were environmental organisations and networks in the former Soviet Union. Most known is the old state controlled Soviet Association for Nature Protection and the student “Druzhina” movement. The Druzhina, or “volunteer patrols” were small clubs in the higher educational institutions, mostly with a biological focus. The Soviet Authorities permitted these groups some independence (Kobets and Lahti 1998:12-13). The movement still exists, also in several other former Soviet countries. The main scope of their work was (and still is) specialized and often practical environmental activities such as maintenance of protected areas and prevention of illegal logging. There was an ongoing debate about the state of the environment long before the Soviet Union fell (Munk 1990:66-70). In this discourse it was possible to criticise the government or its policies with less chance of facing personal consequences. This may be due to the scientific quality of the debate, and a Russian / Soviet tradition with focus on expertise and technocratic solutions.

Focus on specialists and experts in the environmental debate is still important in Russia. The environmental discourse is different from the Norwegian, in the sense that formal background and education are more important. It is common to think that discussing or deciding on the consequences of the environmental impact of an activity is for experts only. I met this attitude several times during trips to Russia in the nineties. Hønneland and Jørgensen (2006: 128) points to the same experience. The Norwegian government often invites ENGOs and concerned citizens to present their views and voices. It is common to treat their claims and demands as valid arguments. This is not always the case in Russia. I can illustrate the difference through an example. If an activist from an ENGO argues in a political debate that more forest should be protected in order to avoid loss of biodiversity, the usual Norwegian response would be to accept the arguments from the activist as valid, and to continue the debate by agreeing or disagreeing to the content of the statement. The Russian approach would typically be to ask the activist if he or she is an expert on this issue. If the

---

activist is not, it is not unusual for the other parties to refuse to discuss the content of the statement from the activist. This is a problem for some of the ENGOs, as it is difficult to use policy tools in this context.

One can explain the difference between the Norwegian and Russian attitude by different historical and political experiences, or perhaps by a Russian Volksgeist with more servile attitude towards authorities. This type of explanations are weakened by the fact that the Russian tradition is quite similar to the political discourse in Norway the past. When experts, politicians and bureaucrats can dismiss arguments in this fashion they have a very powerful position and change of practise will imply loss of power. Becoming a legitimate voice in the political discourse had not been possible without hard work for several decades from the Norwegian ENGOs. Reliance on experts within the government and industry in the environmental discourse in Russia can be understood as a sign that the ENGOs have not been able to challenge their hegemony sufficiently. This lack of challenge can have many causes, but the short time from the fall of communism is a significant factor. A national survey from September 2002 showing who people trust most highlights this problem. (Remington; 2004:137). The survey shows that 50-60 percent trusts friends and relatives, 28 percent President Putin, but only 3 percent of the 1600 respondents trust ENGOs most, even though multiple answers are possible. Even fewer persons trust the local (town, district) governments, the courts or the State Duma most. This low level of trust is not good news for the ENGOs, but that parts of the government are even less trusted opens a possibility for the ENGOs.

A historical lack of challenge of experts in environmental politics can explain the Russian reliance on experts. By looking at two direct actions by NU and the NSCN in Norway it can be demonstrated how ENGOs can capture the political debate and become legitimate voices. Persen and Ranum (1996:86-88) describes how activists in 1985 demonstrated against emissions of EDC above legal levels at Hydro Rafnes, and uncovered barrels with toxic waste at Unger fabrikker. This was a turning point in the environmental debate, as this was when the Norwegian ENGOs started challenging the Government and Industry on a new area, industrial pollution and toxic waste. In these two actions the ENGOs carried out what they thought should be the responsibility of the Norwegian Pollution Control Agency, and
contested their expertise by claiming that the waste was more toxic than the expertise said, and that the current treatment was unlawful and dangerous. Through these actions, these ENGOs, and especially NU and later Bellona, which was founded the year after, were able to become a legitimate voice in the discourse on industrial pollution, and to be heard. They showed that their skills and knowledge could match and even outmatch the “experts”. In the first case, the Norwegian Pollution Control Agency had known about the high level of emissions for several years, and the activists wrote in the press release: “This is not about the toxicity of EDC\(^3\), but about what should be done with the problem The Norwegian Pollution Control Agency” (Persen and Ranum 1996:86-88)\(^4\). Persen cites a press-release from the Norwegian Pollution Control Agency claming that the discharges were ”not worthy public attention” (ibid), but the action prompted large cleaning operations. The ground water at the site is still being pumped up and cleaned today, as the chemical has seeped deep into the ground and groundwater (HSE manager Nils Eirik Stamland 2005: personal communication).

### 2.5.2 Environment and transition.

Before the regime-changes in the former Soviet Eastern Europe in 1989 we saw an upsurge in the public environmental debate. The environmental debate was important when the Baltic States regained their independence in 1991. An early environmental movement contesting industrial pollution, mining and oil shale extraction characterised Estonia’s struggle for independence (Eriksen 2000:34). The debate was also strong in Russia. According to Munck (1990), it was held within three thematic groups; management of the forest (The Russian Taiga), management of water resources, and pollution of the Baikal Lake. Munck (1990:69) argues that public debate was so important that it sometimes caused a change in the policy or activities of the central authorities. He does not mention the Chernobyl disaster in 1986, but

---

\(^3\) Today EDC, or 1,2-dichloroethane is listed with priority “C” in the List of priority substances established in the EU Water Framework Directive. Priority C means that emissions should be reduced significantly towards a concentration target in the EU and EEA within 2010. EDC is considered slightly toxic and carcinogen for humans, but is very persistent in water and groundwater, with a half-life in groundwater up to 300 years (Økland et al 2005:30).

\(^4\) My translation.
nuclear safety became important in the environmental debate in Russia after the accident. One of the early successes for this young Russian environmental movement appeared in 1987, when a broad grass root movement managed to stop the construction of a nuclear power plant in Arkhangelsk, and similar grass root movements appeared elsewhere in the Soviet Union protesting against construction of new nuclear power plants, and campaigning to close old ones (Interview Ecology of the North; Yanitsky 2000:43-47). The grass root movement manifested itself in public rallies and marches, letters to the editor in newspapers, and most significant, energy experts disagreeing with government policy and promoting other solutions. The construction of the Arkhangelsk-plant never started; even though it was no doubt that the city of Arkhangelsk needed more energy for the winters. The K2/ R4 plants in Ukraine, which were part of the same project, were half finished when the Soviet Union broke down. They received funding from the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) in 2000 and again in 2001 for completion.

Big and small ENGOs grew up in the Soviet Union during the eighties. A network organisation was launched in 1988 to gather as many organisations as possible under the same roof or framework. The project was called "Social Ecological Union" (SEU). It was wish from the founding fathers that the network should not develop into a strictly defined and hierarchical organisation (Social Ecological Union 2001). Organisations and individuals can become members of the network, but members were to keep their independence. This was laid down in SEUs first political guidelines:

“1. The ruling organs do not rule over the members of the associations but by all means help them do that which the members of the association believe to be necessary and important.  
2. The main task of the ruling organs is to facilitate the fullest possible information for members of the association.  
3. The common capital of the association is experience and knowledge, which the members of the association actively share with one another and with like-minded persons from other associations” (Social Ecological Union 2001).

---

5 During an interview in Arkhangelsk in 1999 I was told by one informer that it was better to live in one of Arkhangelsk many draughty wooden houses, and not in the more modern Soviet style concrete flats. Reason was that wooden houses were fitted with a wood stove. A gas pipeline were planned to bring in fossil gas, but it was still not completed by summer 2001.
The collapses in the Russian economy before and after the end of the Soviet regime made life difficult for ENGOs. The result was that there is no big all-Russian environmental organisation. Instead there is a considerable amount of small independent ENGOs. Many are members of SEU, but most are not connected to any large organisation. In addition, large international ENGOs like Greenpeace and WWF have established themselves with offices in Moscow. A “Nordic Style” style ENGO with a main office and local chapters spread throughout the country is not common.

2.5.3 The extent of the environmental problems in Russia

The environmental discourse within the Soviet Union can be read as a camouflaged regime critique. Environmental problems in some parts of Russia were and still are serious. The environmental problems and the scale of man-made activities in nature might in itself inspire people to act. Acidification from heavy industry has destroyed many areas. The pulp and paper industry have polluted rivers; radiation from poorly stored nuclear waste and old military equipment is a problem. Around the nickel plants of the towns of Nikel and Monchegorsk one can still without any knowledge of chemistry or biology see that something is wrong. The forest is dead; close to the plants, even the grass has died. Rain has washed away the soil. In the words of a travel guide:

“There’s nothing to prepare a visitor for Nikel. Even the slums of teeming Indian cities emit some sense of hope, while this particular suburb of hell seems to be past despising its own condition. (…) If Greenpeace needs a poster child or some Hollywood director chooses to film a vision of post-nuclear apocalypse. Nikel is all prepped and ready for the cameras to roll” (Lonely Planet 2000: 425).

The description of Monchegorsk is more laconic:

“If you’ve ever have a notion to visit Hell, Monchegorsk is pretty close“ (Ibid: 426).

On the positive side, one must not forget the enormous size of Russia. Russia has huge areas of undisturbed nature. Greenpeace Russia and World Forest Watch (Yaroshenko 2001) have mapped undisturbed boreal forest areas, and found areas that all together are more than 4 times larger than the entire productive forest area in Norway.
"Forest landscapes that are still intact (i.e. essentially undisturbed by human development with an area of at least 50,000 hectares) make up about 14 percent (31.7 million hectares) of the total forest area of European Russia (including the Ural Mountains)“ (Yaroshenko 2001:3).

In Norway it would be almost impossible to find undisturbed areas of the size of 50,000 hectares. The much debated Trillemarka forest area in Norway is 100,000-200,000 hectares, but the area is not totally undisturbed as there are roads into the area, and since there have been logging operations carried out there as well. A typical Norwegian forest owner has about 60 hectare forest. The same perspective can be applied on industrial pollution in Nikel and Monschegorsk. Notwithstanding the destruction of large areas, the productive forest in Murmansk Oblast alone equals half of productive forest in Norway. (Taiga Rescue Network 1999:37; SSB 2007).

2.6 Russian political system and political opportunities.

Russia was a volatile political system at the time of the fieldwork. The transition from communism was still ongoing, and the future for the Russian political system was not clear. The financial crisis in 1998 and the following devaluation were also still causing instability.

The social scientist Thomas F. Remington (1994:52-70) describes Russia’s political system. The 1993 constitution gave Russia a political system with a dominant president. Russia is a federation, and it has a complicated system with a federal level, a regional level and a local level. During the Yeltsin period the regions were granted significant independence. Yeltsin famously promised the regional level “as much independence as they can chew” (as quoted in Hønneland and Jørgensen 2006:157), but the constitution has limits for the activities of the regions. Hønneland and Jørgensen (2006: 82-83) argue that the constitution gave a significant room for manoeuvring for the oblasts and republics, especially in area where the federal laws are weak, or non-existent. They describe how the last years of the Yeltsin presidency saw a weakening of the President and strengthening of the regional level, to the extent where the federal government started to sign bilateral agreements with the regions. Vladimir Putin succeeded Boris Yeltsin almost exactly the year before the fieldwork started. One of his aims was to reduce the power of the republics and oblasts, and to increase the
Presidential chain of command. Some of the reforms were to form a new administrative level with seven Presidential representatives overseeing seven federal districts. According to Norsk Utenrikspolitisk Institutt the purpose of the reform was to: “ensure the exercise by the president of the Russian Federation of his constitutional powers, to make the work of federal bodies of state power more effective and to improve control over compliance with their decisions” (Norsk Utenrikspolitisk Institutt 2007). Later reforms continued to strengthen the federal law, and to bring the regional laws into compliance with the federal laws.

The federal level has a federal assembly (Duma and the Federation Council), a judicial branch and the executive branch (Remington 2004:57). The latter is the president, his administration and the Central Government. Russia has a very strong Presidency, and both the Government and the Duma plays a lesser role. Below the federal level, there are 89 territorial subjects of the federation of several types. Murmansk and Arkhangelsk are oblasts, while Karelia is a republic. The difference is minimal. The executive power is usually called the administration, the regional assemblies are often referred to as (regional) Dumas. I will refer to local and regional governments as “the administration” in this thesis. Oblasts and republics have their own Governor or President elected in direct elections (this practise started in 1996 and ended in 2005). In 2000 and 2001, these were very powerful positions, and the personal power of the Governors should not be underestimated. Hønneland and Jørgensen (2006:87) point out that the Russian Governors had wide authority, and often had close ties to regional business.

Below the regional level, there are 13,000 local governments. These governments also have their own executives and local or municipal councils, and experience a significant level of self-rule, especially during the Yeltsin period.
2.6.1 Environment and regional power?

Article 72 in the Russian 1993 Constitution gives significant authority to the regional levels, although both regional and federal offices govern important environmental issues (Hønneland and Jørgensen 2006:82-86). Federal and regional authorities have divided or shared responsibilities for environmental protection and management of natural resources. Power sharing on issues pertaining to environmental protection could differ from oblast to oblast, since the weakened Presidential power from the late Yeltsin period gave possibilities for industrious governors and administrations (ibid).
Environment protection is a very broad issue, and most societal decisions relate to the environment in some way or other. Prevention of pollution from industrial activities or management of mining are important, but this is only a small part of what ENGOs may choose to work with. When I assess the possibility for ENGOS success, almost all policy fields can be important, even issues not technically defined as environment by the 1993 Constitution. Typical examples can be local and regional planning processes, energy consumption or public transport. This is reflected in the scope of activities of examined ENGOs in the data, and several ENGOs work with issues such as handling of municipal waste, energy efficiency, planning and education. This is why the general level of independence of the regions is so important. It is easier for small ENGOs to exercise influence on a local or regional scale, and a high level of independence opens windows of opportunity many areas. By looking strictly at areas that the government has defined as “environmental issues” I may miss important aspects of the debate.

2.7 ENGOs in Russia.

I have interviewed twelve Russian organisations, five Scandinavian organisations and the secretariat of one International Network. This subchapter will give a short presentation of each Russian ENGO active in Northwest Russia, and briefly describe the activities of TRN and Scandinavian ENGOs in the same area. The information comes mainly from interviews, but in some cases also from previous work and literature. I will first present the Russian groups that are active in Northwest Russia. Then the Scandinavian ENGOS and TRN are included and their activities in Northwest Russia are briefly described in order to provide relevant data and background information for the discussion. A list of all interviews is attached, alongside with a fuller presentation of all the ENGOs use of policy tools.

During the fieldwork, I received valuable help from the “Garant NGO-Support Centre”. This is a NGO in Arkhangelsk which is set up to provide help for other NGOs in the area by providing services such as computer access and training, classes in book-keeping or help with legal issues. Garant also acts as an information clearinghouse and provides information about other ENGOs. The existence of Garant indicates that the ENGO sector in Arkhangelsk
was weak, and is a reminder for Norwegian readers that Russian ENGOs lack important
tools, funding and equipment. In Norway such skills are provided through the large NGO
sector, and through organisations such as The Norwegian Children and Youth Council. The
public sector is also assisting, both through funding and by providing capacity building and
information. This was not the case in Northwest Russia in 2001.

I have tried to validate the information by cross checking with information available from
other sources (such as the TRN, Nordic ENGOs etc.). In addition the interviews with BCC-
Moscow office and the SEU have provided valuable background information. Generally the
picture is quite consistent, but some discrepancies exist. A summary of the activities is
presented in table 2.1, after the presentation of the ENGOS.

### 2.7.1 Short description of Northwest Russian ENGOs.

Information about the ENGOs below is based on information from the interviews unless
otherwise stated.

**AETAS.**

AETAS is a youth NGO in Arkhangelsk oblast. Their primary focus is on providing
environmental education and information. They have about 45 members in the age from 14
to 25 years, and membership is open for all youths. The ENGO was founded in 1998, and
registered in 2001. They have no hired staff. Their primary policy tools are information and
physical tools such as tree planting, building of benches in parks, looking for the persistent
organic pollutant PCB, and a campaign to stop people from burning waste. AETAS has also
arranged summer camps for homeless youths.

AETAS has started to cooperate closely with PiM and NU, and the Norwegians have
initiated environmental lectures at schools (Green Trips) and the PCB project. Both the
secretary for Russia, members of the executive board and activists from the regional office in
Tromsø are involved in the cooperation. PCB samples have been analysed in Norway.
AETAS had some connections in the administration and Duma, but these disappeared after
the election, and good relations with the administration have deteriorated. They receive
funding from NU, and previously also from the government for the summer camp.
**BCC-Kola.**
The Biodiversity Conservation Centre in Kola has five to ten members. It grew out of the Druzhina movement in 1996. Members are students or employees at the University or College. The informer has been employed in the nature protection committee in the Oblast. BCC has a main centre in Moscow, with branches in Ukraine, Belorussia and in Kola (Apatity). The Kola office acts as an independent ENGO. They focus on biodiversity and protection of nature and forests. It has hired employees and volunteer activists, but no strategy to attract more members. “No we do not have that now. Big problem, we do not recruit. Only youth NGOs grow today” (Interview, BCC-Kola). The main activity is to investigate old growth forest and identify rare and endangered species. The mapping of areas for old growth forest, suggestions for protected areas, and the making of management plans for protected areas requires very highly skilled work, and is often based on maps of vegetation, forest types, land use etc, using modern GIS techniques and satellite photos (Bystrøm et al 2001).

The main of policy tools are information activities, cooperation with the local and regional government and activities that contest the government. They participate in a large European campaign using economic tools (Bystrøm et al 2000; Taiga Rescue Network 2001:2-14). This work, which is done together with BCC, SEU, Greenpeace-Russia etc, was started already in the mid nineties and is part of a large campaign where consumers or buyers in Europe are urged to boycott unsustainable paper or fibres from Russia. This campaign has evolved into a campaign where they together with European ENGOs and networks are working for a ban on trade of illegally logged timber, and demanding FSC-certification of timber and fibres (Russia Timber Trade Campaign). See Brack et al (2002) for more information.

BCC-Kola has good contacts in the administration and within the forestry sector. They have good international and federal contacts through the SEU and BCC-Moscow, but also use services and funding provided via TRN.
**Gaia.**

Gaia was founded in 1992 by NU and NSCN and is a mixture of an NGO and a support centre. It has offices in Murmansk and Apatity. It focuses on providing information and capacity building, and to highlight environmentally friendly solutions in local communities. The Gaia-Apatity branch has 15 participants, but Gaia has both hired staff and volunteers. The main activities include information activities, various activities related to energy, and some small scale LA-21 financed activities funded from Norway. These are activities such as projects for composting municipal food waste, energy saving and public hearings/meetings. Its most remarkable achievement is the construction of a windmill, which was set up some months after the fieldwork together with NSCN and Norsk Vind Energi AS (Norges Naturvernforbund 2005). Gaia has also participated in a campaign to get a referendum on nuclear waste. Another large project is the SPARE project which is a joint programme with the NSCN about energy saving in schools.

The main use of policy tools are various information activities, participation in governmental processes and some use of physical tools. Gaia has maintained its close contact with the NSCN, but ties with NU became looser when the younger generation in Gaia broke out and formed PiM in 1999. The NSCN provides strategic advice and funding, and has provided ideas for projects and helped implement them. According to the informer, Gaia has also made a significant effort into establish a network with contacts among politicians, scientists and bureaucrats at the local and regional level.

**Green Cross.**

This is the Arkhangelsk chapter of the Green Cross, which has chapters in many countries and in Moscow. The Arkhangelsk chapter was established in 1996. It has about 20 members and some active “participants”. The main activity has been investigation of environmental pollution in the Dvina River, and to publish a scientific report from this project. Most of the members have jobs as professors or have been bureaucrats in the administration, and are well connected. There is no office in Norway, and Green Cross must not be confused with “Norsk Folkehjelp” which also has a green cross in its logo. Mikhail Gorbachev is the Chairman of the board of the international organisation. According to their international web-page the
organisation was funded in 1993, after an idea from Gorbachev (Green Cross 2007). The idea was to found an NGO similar to the Red Cross, but working on ecological issues.

For Green Cross in Arkhangelsk the main use of policy tools is to spread information and to cooperate closely with the administration. This is in line with the Green Cross International Charter (Green Cross 2003). Funding comes from project financing via the main office in Switzerland/Moscow, but also from the Oblast. The Dvina river trip was funded by Dutch donors and by a forest company. Green Cross was charged by other informers to be a “fake government controlled NGO” (Interview BCC-Moscow; Interview SEU). Interestingly, the Green Cross informer responded to question 12 (what are the main obstacles): “Lack of money. We are afraid to be influenced by the administration or business” (Interview, Green Cross).

Ecology of the North.

Ecology of the North is a small organisation. It was founded in 1988, and has eight members. The base for formation was a struggle against construction of a nuclear power plant in the region. Several of the members are journalists. Data about Ecology of the North is not very reliable. The quality of the interview was poor, and additional information about the ENGO is insufficient. Representatives from the ENGO participated at the TRN-biannual meeting on the closed days (only open for participants who has signed the TRN platform) in Moscow in 2000 (my own observation). The ENGO is listed as a participating ENGO in the TRN at the TRN web page (Taiga Rescue Network 2007), but not in the TRN printed Boreal Forest Directory (Taiga Rescue Network 2000). This is probably because work with forests was a new activity for Ecology of the North in 2001. Its main activity is to arrange bi-monthly roundtables (every second month) for politicians, NGOs and the administration. They claim to work with criteria for forestry (FSC)6, pollution from the Arkhangelsk pulp and paper mill and the Kosmodrome in Plesetsk. There are no signs of Ecology of the North in the Russian FSC-process.

6 The FSC is a Forest Certification scheme. It is based in 10 major criteria’s for sustainable logging (FSC 1996). National working groups can make national standards, with or without the government participation. FSC certification in Russia implies making the government accept new standards for logging and activities in the forest. An FSC standard for Russia has been developed. A large area in Arkhangelsk was certified in 2005 (FSC 2005).
The organisations main use of policy tools is various information activities and some activities aimed at participating with and influencing the administration. The ENGO has participated in the TRN, but has no Scandinavian partners. I have no information regarding funding.

**PiM (Priroda i Molodezh / Nature and Youth).**

PiM grew out of Gaia, and was founded formally in 1999 as an independent youth organisation. The organisation has about 50 to 100 members, mainly between 13 and 25 years old. PiM has several local chapters, at the time of investigation there are chapters in Apatity, Murmansk, and Monchegorsk. The number and status of the local chapters are not fixed, and there have been local chapters in Kandalaksja, Polyarny Zory and several smaller towns.

Main activities are environmental education, mainly lectures at school referred to as “Green trips” and arranging seminars. PiM has also investigated for PCB (Klescheva et al 2001), and arranged local campaigns such as campaigns against illegal logging of New Year trees, nuclear power and campaigns against stray dogs.

**Photo 1.** *Banner-painting in Murmansk 1997. Private photo.*
The main policy tools are various information activities and some use of physical tools, mainly direct actions. PiM has also invested a lot of work into capacity building and activities aimed at increasing the number of members and local chapters. PiM is not part of any national network organisation, and lacks networks on local and regional level with politicians and bureaucrats. The organisation is funded mainly by NU, on grants and project financing coming mainly from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. PiM has used the funding for securing office space and equipment, travels and seminars. NU has one employed “Russia-secretary” which spends parts of the time in Russia assisting PiM. PiM is also cooperating closely with Gaia.

**SPOK (Karelian Students Environmental Organisation).**

SPOK was funded in 1996 and is a student NGO in Petrozavodsk in Karelia. Its main focus has been on forest protection and changing forestry practise. Most of this work requires considerable skill and knowledge. Members are mainly students with relevant skills, such as students of biology. SPOK claims to have 5-10 members, and has no hired staff. The FNL stipulated the member base to be bigger (50-100); this may be due to that more persons participate on field trips. Main activity has been nine field trips deep into the Karelian forest in order to investigate biodiversity in the forests and to look for forest areas with intact biodiversity. In 2001 SPOK changed its aim: “At present we change our aim, because we are finished with investigation. Now we aim to work for best forest practice, and other small forest projects“ (Interview SPOK).

The main use of policy tools are various information activities, but SPOK is also contesting the government by making suggestions for protected areas, alongside with trying to cooperate in a process in the regional administration to make new regional criteria for forestry. Together with the BCC-Kola they are also participating in a large European forest campaign also using economic policy tools. SPOK has cooperated with WWF-Finland, but now works closely with the FNLI. They also cooperate with SEU and the TRN. They claim to have received funding from FNLI, Greenpeace and international grants.
**Terra Incognita.**

It is not clear when Terra Incognita was founded. Terra Incognita was a typical example of a youth ecologic club in Russia. The main difference from the other organisations is that it is not technically an NGO. This implies that there is a (hired) adult person in charge, and that the government provides rooms and funding. Terra Incognita was based around a small greenhouse with a minor zoo in Arkhangelsk. There are such clubs in several towns in Northwest Russia. They teach participants about nature, and arrange seminars and various activities such as expeditions, tree planting etc. The nearest Norwegian equivalent would be a mixture of the Boy scouts movement and the public after-school service. What is noteworthy about Terra Incognita is that the organisation functions as an ordinary member based NGO, and that the members seemingly run the organisation. In practise there is little difference between AETAS and Terra Incognita. It competed with AETAS for members, attention and influence. The informers from AETAS were very critical towards Terra Incognita, and focused on the lack of independence and close ties between Terra Incognita and the government (Interview AETAS).

The main use of policy tools were information tools and some physical tools. Terra Incognita has good contacts within the local administration, and receives funding from it. It has no Scandinavian partners.
Table 2.1. Summary of active ENGOs in Northwest Russia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Nordic partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AETAS</td>
<td>Arkhangelsk</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Information and environmental education.</td>
<td>NU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC-Kola</td>
<td>Murmansk</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forest protection; mapping areas for protection, make better criteria’s for forestry.</td>
<td>No partner, but close with TRN, funding from SSNC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaia</td>
<td>Murmansk</td>
<td>15-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Capacity building, education and energy questions.</td>
<td>NSCN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Cross</td>
<td>Arkhangelsk</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Investigate pollution, provide funding.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology of the North</td>
<td>Arkhangelsk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arrange roundtables, provide information.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PiM</td>
<td>Murmansk</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Capacity building, strengthening of the organisation, environmental education and investigating for PCB.</td>
<td>NU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>Karelia</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forest protection; mapping areas for protection, make better criteria for forestry.</td>
<td>FNL and WWF-Finland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Incognita*</td>
<td>Arkhangelsk</td>
<td>20 (uncertain)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arrange expeditions, camps and environmental education.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not technically an NGO.
2.7.2 Activities of Scandinavian ENGOs in Russia.

ENGOs from Norway, Sweden and Finland have been active in Russia. A short presentation of these activities is necessary in order to get a full picture of the activities the ENGOs in Northwest Russia. The information below is based on the interviews, and on information available from the TRN (written material, and interviews), and from publications from the ENGOs.

Finland.
Both FNL and the WWF have cooperated with SPOK. The WWF set up an information clearinghouse to facilitate cooperation between Finnish and Russian NGOs in the nineties. On the Russian side this was mainly SPOK (and some other small local groups), BCC, SEU Greenpeace-Moscow and specialists from the Russian academy of science (Interview WWF-Finland). Finnish ENGOs participated in the “Taiga Terminator Campaign” and in the subsequent “Russian Timber trade campaign” (interview FNL; Taiga Rescue Network 2001; Brack et al 2002). These first aimed at forcing logging companies to stop logging in selected “moratorium” areas on the Finnish and Russian side of the border, and then to urge the EU to ban illegally logged timber, and ask for certification. The tool used was first to carry out inventories to map valuable old growth forest, and then to launch a campaign through the Taiga Rescue Network in the countries buying timber or timber products from Finland (Germany, UK, The Netherlands) and force the buyers to demand that that products did not come from these areas. For a description on the type of campaign, see Seither (1998:231-244) or The Taiga Terminator campaign leaflet (Taiga Rescue Network Undated). After the fall of the Soviet Union Finnish logging companies started to operate in Russia, and the Finns needed Russian expertise and help to map areas in Russia. The mapping was co-funded by the Finnish ministry of the Environment (Interview WWF). This work was successful. Most Finnish, Swedish and Russian logging-companies accepted a logging moratorium on selected areas for a period (Interview FNL).

FNL had a paid person working with Russian ENGOs, and have arranged common field trips into the forest. These trips served as a way of teaching Finnish and Russian participants how to map old growth forest, but also provided a forum for discussion of strategy, and worked as
a way of achieving uniform goals and methods. As the informer from FNL said: “at the first SPOK wanted to get tear gas spray to spray people that steal Christmas threes from the forest. The Finns refused, and wanted to talk about Old Growth and species” (Interview, FNL). At the time of the interviews the cooperation did not seem to go very well. The Finns were complaining that the Russians were using a wrong approach:

“SPOK people are not so good at investigating7. Not good at walking because they bring much things. So during investigations the Russians go near, and Finns go far from base camp. They are not good at indicator-species either, so most of Karelia is investigated by Finns” (Interview FNL).

SPOK mirrored this attitude and claimed that the Finns were only working with looking at species, and that the cooperation had worked much better with the former Finnish counterpart (Interview SPOK). WWF, FNL and other Russian ENGOs have also campaigned to protect forests as nature reserves on both sides of the border. A remarkable success is the Kalevalsky-protection area which first was protected on the Finnish side of the border, and then later was protected by the Karelian Republic on the Russian side. In 2006 it was given status as a 744 km2 large federal national park (Karelian Tourist Portal 2007). The initial proposal was on 1140 km2. The Finns have carried out many of the inventories and worked in Finland and with the European market, while SPOK has participated and worked for protection in Russia (Interview FNL; Interview SPOK; Interview WWF).

**Sweden.**

Swedish ENGOs have chosen a less direct approach, and there was no direct cooperation between Swedish ENGOs and the ENGOs in Northwest Russia. Some contacts had been established between Fältbiologerna and PiM, but this contact was on a very early stage, and it did not seem that they were aware of NUs presence (Interview Fältbiologerna). The SSNC has big programmes for funding NGOs working with forest and the environment (Interview SSNC; Bystrøm et al 2000). The programme for boreal forests funds the TRN office and

---

7 Mapping or investigating refers to special scientific way of finding old growth forest by looking for certain criteria in the forest structure and for certain indicator-species. Indicator-species are species than usually only inhabits intact forests, and that are easy to find. Typical examples are lichens and polypores. A good description of a Norwegian methodology can be found in Løvdal et al (2001).
several projects in Russia. Money is channelled through the TRN. This is important because the TRN office was the vessel that made it possible to carry out the coordinated activities of ENGOs working with forest issues in Scandinavia, Russia and Western Europe. Funding also goes directly to several ENGOs in Leningrad Oblast and Moscow (Children of the Baltic, Green World and SEU). Most of the funding actually comes from SIDA, but is distributed via SSNC (Interview SSNC). This information is in line with data from the other ENGOs and from the TRN. The 1995-2001 TRN evaluation provides a detailed description of this work (Bystrøm et al 2000). The study includes the activities of BCC-Kola. The second TRN-evaluation (De Wiel et al 2003) also gives some information.

Norway.

Norwegian ENGOs have been very active in Russia, but have chosen a different approach from the Finns and Swedes. The cooperation between NU / NSCN and the Russians started in 1989, when 70 NU-members participated in a peace and environment-festival (Nilsen 1992; Persen and Ranum 1997:149-151; Interview NU Russia Secretary). The plan was then to establish cooperation with Russian ENGOs. But, as Persen and Ranum points out: “We hoped that we through the festival could get in contact with a Russian environmental organisation. We did not know then that they did not exist” (Persen and Ranum 1997:150, my translation).

Co-operation was slow until NU arranged a buss trip to Kola in 1993, and activities aimed at establishing Russian environmental groups were (re)started. By involving local clubs in Norway and the central board and secretariat in Oslo it was possible to transfer funds, information and capacity building to Murmansk. NU received funding from the Norwegian Government and was able to employ a secretary to be in charge of the cooperation (Interview NU Russia Secretary). In 1999 PiM was established as an independent ENGO. NSCN continued with their projects with Gaia and NU continued with PiM. Scouting for new partners continued, and from 1999-2000 PiM and NU established cooperation with AETAS (Interview NU Russia Secretary 2).

Cooperation between NU and PiM / AETAS is very close. The NU secretary spends considerable time in Russia. NU transfer significant sums to the Russian counterparts, mostly
funding from the Norwegian MFA. NU arranges and participates in seminars and capacity-building activities and arranges “Green Trips”, or lectures on schools in Russia. Moreover it takes the initiative to start work with specific environmental problems. Work against the nuclear reactor and the PCB project are NU-initiated. Russian activists participate in summer camps and annual meetings in NU in Norway, and Norwegians participate in similar activities and meetings in Russia. NSCN has chosen a different role, but has been very important in channelling and assisting in getting funding, carrying out capacity building activities and suggesting and carrying out projects. The NSCN has initiated and to some degree carried out several of the activities of Gaia such as the wind-energy project and the SPARE-programme). This is verified by both parties (interview Gaia Apatity; Interview Gaia Murmansk; Interview NSCN).
3. Theory.

How can success of Russian ENGOs be explained? I will first present and use elements of social movement theory, then define important concepts and finally present the theory of success as dependent on kind of organisations, the use of policy tools and strategies or established national and international networks. At the end off the chapter I will discuss the usefulness of the three independent variables.

3.1 Social movement theory.

A theory of social movements has emerged as a way to understand the many movements that have emerged after the 1960s, such as the peace movement, the American civil rights movement and the environmental movement. A social movement is a very broad concept, and can include various structures such as NGOs, political parties, networks and think-tanks. The broadness of social movements and their existence across time, political and cultural borders will allow movements employ a myriad of different political tools and be part of various structures. Both political parties and NGOs can take part in a social movement, until, according to Rucht (1996:188) “only when these organizations succeeds in reaching a hegemonic position – controlling virtually all collective resources – would I no longer consider it a movement”. Parts of the theory are useful in the study of ENGOs.

3.1.1 Mobilising structures, political opportunities and frames.

A theory of social movements rests on the three basic concepts: political opportunities, mobilizing structures and framing process (McAdam et al 1996:2-20). I focus on ENGOs, which are a kind of mobilizing structures, but a short presentation of all three concepts is necessary, as both framing and political opportunities will receive some attention.
Change of political opportunities can have large effects, and even allow for the emergence of social movements. Gorbachev’s new policy opened the institutionalised Soviet-system for non-Party groups, and allowed for the beginning of the dramatic changes in both the communist European states and in the states emerging from the Soviet Union. A good example of this process in Estonia can be found in Kionka and Vetik (1996:137-140). A successful social movement will even be able to create new political opportunities. I will not focus on this in the thesis, but point out that political opportunity, such as the fall of communism and the relative independence of the Russian oblasts and republics are important as a general background for understanding the activity of ENGOs.

Mobilising structures is a wide concept and includes informal and formal networks, organisations and groups within a social movement (McAdam et al 1996:3). ENGOs are one specific type of mobilising structures, but other kinds of structures can be equally important for a social movement. I will use some elements from this concept in order to describe and analyse ENGOs and their ability to succeed.

Framing refers to what actually makes people act. Structures and opportunities provide possibilities, but are insufficient to make people go out and do something. Framing is an important part of the work of some of the ENGOs in the material. MacAdam et al (1996:7) defines framing as “conscious strategic efforts by groups of people to fashion shared understandings of the world and of themselves that legitimate and motivate collective action”. This applies to ENGOs as well, although not all actions have to be collective. Framing goes on in the public and private sphere, and some actions propagated by ENGOs belong to the private sphere. Making people compost waste or use public transport can be an important part of an ENGOs work, but riding on the bus every day is not a collective action.

The framing process has two sides, it is both a contest for peoples “hearts and minds” (legitimating) and a way of mobilising and motivating people. If most people believe that industrialisation and welfare always should have top priority, a direct action to stop gas fired power plant emitting the greenhouse gas CO₂ will meet little sympathy and not be efficient. A successful framing process, such as making more people believe that global warming is dangerous can cause many people to sympathise with or even participate in the direct action.
A problem is that the social movement theory with all three concepts gives a very complex model with feedback loops and indirect effects. It is questionable if the three concepts are exclusive. A framing process carried out by a group (a mobilising structure) can create new political opportunities, which again can directly shape mobilising structures. This is a problem, as the model becomes as complex as reality.

### 3.2 A typology of organisations.

There is a considerable variation in kinds of ENGOs in Northwest Russia. This becomes clear if focus is directed towards openness and participation, or on what the ENGOs do. I have developed a typology of organisation based on the findings in the fieldwork. The main parameters for classification are the openness of the ENGO for participation, what kind of members the ENGO has, and how and what issues the ENGO has chosen to work with.

*The insider-specialist ENGO* is a small organisation with active members recruited from the “elite”. Participation is restricted or closed. The ENGO bases most of its work on skills and contacts that the members already have. This strategy can be very successful, especially if good contacts can provide funding and support or cause the government to participate in activities the ENGO wants to carry out. By working very closely with the regional or local administrations, these ENGOs can be able to capitalise on the process of the weakening central Government. With the change of President, and reforms for increased Presidential (central) rule, the effect of good local connections may lose its value. The insider-specialist ENGO does not resemble any Norwegian ENGO, as it is originally built around an educated (specialist) group with good contacts. Bellona, which may look similar today, was when it was founded in 1986 based on young skilled activists from NU, with little formal education (Persen and Ranum 1997:93).

*The narrow-issue specialist ENGO* is a small organisation with few albeit active members recruited from students or scientists with special skills. The narrow-issue specialist ENGO focuses very closely on some few topics and develops specialised skills. These skills and the formal expertise of the activists and the personal networks allow the ENGOs to work with the local and regional administration and politicians. The narrow-issue specialist ENGO is
however not afraid to contest the government and to use other means such as demonstrations or participate in consumer campaigns to reach their goal. This kind of organisations tends to ignore other important environmental issues, even if they potentially influence the narrow issues the ENGO is working with. Membership is open in theory, but only members with very specific skills are wanted.

*The participation oriented ENGO* is a form of organisation that resembles the typical democratic ENGOs we find in Norway, such as NSCN and NU. This kind of ENGO focuses on growing and setting up more chapters (geographic or clubs working on special issues), capacity building, members and participation. What environmental issue the members choose to work with is of lesser interest, and many kinds of activities are welcome as long as they concern the environment. This kind of organisation will focus on spreading information about environmental problems and solutions, but can use a variety of activities to reach its goals.

### 3.2.1 Summary of kind of organisation.

I have found that there are three kinds of ENGOs in Northwest Russia. The insider specialist only attracts members for the local elite, and work closely with the government. The narrow issue specialist ENGO shares the restricted attitude towards more members, but focus on some few specific areas and on developing special skills based on already highly educated members. The participation oriented ENGO welcomes all new members, and focus more on spreading information and educating their members.

The typology is summarised in table 3.1.


Table 3.1 Typology of ENGOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGO-kinds</th>
<th>Membership features</th>
<th>Main strategy and activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The insider-specialist.</td>
<td>Educated members from the elite. Participation is closed or relatively closed.</td>
<td>Relies on established networks, focuses on working closely with politicians and bureaucrats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The narrow issue specialist ENGO.</td>
<td>Educated members mostly from the university sector. Relatively closed for participation.</td>
<td>Relies on established networks and expertise on narrow issues. Focuses on politicians and bureaucrats, but will also use other means to reach their targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation oriented.</td>
<td>Membership is open for all.</td>
<td>Focus on spreading information; strengthen the ENGO and educating members and the general population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Policy tools

An ENGO (a mobilising structure) employs policy tools to influence individuals, parts of society or society as a whole to act in as certain wanted manner. Policy tools are sometimes called repertoire in social movement theory (Tarrow 1998:30-42). When governments use such tools, they are often called policy instruments (Vedung 1994). I understand policy tools broadly and include all activities by ENGOs which are aimed influencing society. I will distinguish between policy tools and policy strategies, where the latter are strategies for using policy tools, such as establishing a local chapter. These tools are very important. ENGOs invest a lot of work into developing and employing tools, as they are the means to implement and achieve the NGOs goals or vision for the future. Tools can have other effects than intended, and failed or inefficient policy tools are a waste of time. Evert Vedung (1994:11) divides between Regulations, Economic Means and Information as classes in his taxonomy of policy tools. Eckhoff (1983:29-34) distinguishes between four categories and discuss Physical, Normative, Economical and Pedagogic policy tools. The difference in typology between Eckhoff and Vedung indicates that several approaches towards classifications of policy tools are possible, and Eckhoff argues that the boundaries between the categories are not rigid. He points to that policy tools depend on and use each other and that combinations
of tools are very frequent (Eckhoff 1983:33). Teaching the population to read (Pedagogic) will allow for the use of written signs (Normative). I have used Eckhoff and Vedungs taxonomy as a point of departure for developing taxonomy of policy tools for ENGOs in Northwest Russia.

Much of this classification is applicable for ENGOs. Governments and ENGOs aim at influencing, maintaining or changing society. The main difference is access to resources, and that governments and ENGOs do not have equal access to all the various policy tools. Governments can for instance make laws and enforce them. This is not a possible option for ENGOs, but many organisations have been very successful using direct actions and publicly break laws in order to change or remove them. Many of the tools Governments use are similar to those used by NGOs. Both launch information campaigns, use economic or physical tools. The main difference again is access to resources and scale of the tools. Vedung and Eckhoffs taxonomies are however designed for describing a broad understanding of governments. Smaller government structures such as local municipalities or small government agencies are more similar to ENGOs in that they are operating on lesser scale and have more restricted access to resources and policy tools.

It may be surprising to learn how much time many ENGOs spend refining and re-inventing their policy tools. The reason is that most policy tools used by ENGOs are not as efficient as wanted. Most of the time people, governments or private enterprises do not change the way they act. This is also true for policy tools used by governments. Durant and Legge (1993) have measured the numbers of people killed in car accidents in Michigan and compared with the use of several policy tools aimed at reducing traffic incidents. The authors argue that the effect of the first tool aimed at reducing road accidents (high minimum drinking age) was very large, and that the effects of the drink –drive reform and seat belt law four and six years later were minimal. Actually, the death rate climbed after implementation of the last tools. The authors argue that this is because the first measure raised a debate, and that it was the debate that caused a change of driving habits. When the second and third tools were implemented, the effect was smaller because they created less public debate and attention. The “first use –effect” can be transferred to NGOs. The first time someone employs a new tool the attention this activity gets can be very large. Then consumers, producers or
governments start to relate to the tool. Counter-arguments surface, PR companies are hired to find a counter strategy and the political debate moves on.

I have developed a typology consisting of four kinds of policy tools and several sub-categories. In addition I have added policy strategy, or development of the organisation. Policy tools range over a wide scale. It is not possible to define a finite catalogue over all possible policy tools. It seems that innovation and originality interrelates with successful NGO work (Wilhelmsen 2001). Innovation can be a policy tool in itself, or at least a pre-requisite or structure for successful development and use of policy tools.

### 3.3.1 Information policy tools.

Vedung (1994:27) defines information in his taxonomy as: “measures undertaken to influence addressees through the transfer of knowledge, communication of reasoned argument, persuasion, moral appeals, and so on”. He also adds that, “Information is a necessary condition for the functioning of all other instruments”. This holds true for ENGOs as well, but fact-finding should be added. A government has relatively easy access to information. For ENGOs information can be secret, not compiled or otherwise restricted. I find Vedungs definition and naming of this tool more suited than Eckhoffs pedagogic tools, but the content of the terms is more or less the same (Eckhoff 1983:32)

*Distribute information*: This tool refers to any means to spread information be it stands, to publish newspapers or reports, and have direct contact with people and public education (study groups, meetings).

*Media*: This tool is simply to reach out and use existing media such as newspapers, the internet, TV and public radio.

*Fact-Finding*: Finding information may be activities such as reading reports, participation in seminars or conferences arranged by a third party or carrying out research (such as biological inventories).

*Lobbying*: This is a specific type of information work, directed at a very limited audience. Contact with politicians at all levels is a well-known strategy. Lobby is any contact with
politicians with the aim of achieving a political goal, including trying to influence party programmes and the agenda during elections. Lobbying can be official or unofficial, direct or indirect.

**3.3.2 Participate or contest Government policy tools**

This type of tool includes working with the government, or to contest it or perform activities that is or should have been the responsibility of the government. This kind of tools does not reflect any of Eckhoffs categories, though working (or contesting) the government in order to make new laws and regulations is close to normative policy tools (making laws and regulations) (Eckhoff 1983:29).

*Participation in governmental processes* refers to participation in public hearings, letters, participation in meetings, or arranging meetings or seminars where government officials are present. I will also include use of law (judicial tools). Participation is also any other contact with employees in government agencies with the goal of influencing decision-making processes via informal contact with government employees, use of friends in strategic positions etc.

*Contesting or performing government functions and processes* refers to do work that normally is considered to be government work. Examples are investigating forest, mapping and proposing areas for protection, investigating for illegal dumping of waste or providing new renewable energy, but also more abstract activities such as providing alternative expertise and promoting of alternative solutions.

**3.3.3 Physical policy tools.**

ENGOs can use physical policy tools, or tools aimed at making a concrete difference. The use of physical tools by ENGOs is on a small scale in Northwest Russia. This category is quite similar to Eckhoffs physical policy tools, which are physical constructions that encourages or discourages certain actions and activities (Eckhoff 1983:29). A reservation here is that ENGOs have fewer resources, and are more restricted in its use of such tools.
*Direct action* and civil disobedience is a strategy used by some groups to obtain political goals by concrete action. Examples are “sit ins”, occupation and blockades, demonstrations, illegal actions or even sabotage. Direct actions are hard to classify. I have chosen to consider them as physical policy tools. An action can be intended to address the problem (Physical), or be aimed at getting media interest (Information), or both. Usually it will also function as capacity building and socialising.

*Improving the (local) environment.* This policy tool comes in several versions. The first one is similar to a direct action, albeit less controversial (and usually legal) as it intends to deal with a concrete problem. This may be actions such as cleaning up waste in public areas, providing a composter in a local school, planting trees or building benches and tables in public parks. The second variety is simply to change personal habits. A third variety is to provide some kind of service to the members. The SSNC have made their own eco-label for food and products (Bra Miljøval) and offers reduced prices on travels to members, but no such activities were discovered in Russia.

### 3.3.4 Economic policy tools

This tool aims at using economic means in order to achieve a goal. This kind of policy tool is also quite similar to Eckhoff’s understanding, which is simply any activities that influence on what humans find economically attractive (Eckhoff 1983: 31), but I think that donating funds or resources to other ENGOs should also qualify. The most obvious example of use of this tool is consumer-boycotts. Governments will again have access to a much larger variety this tool including taxation, use of fines, change interest rates etc. Some ENGOs use economic tools in concert with ENGOs in other European countries, but there are no findings of ENGOs in Northwest Russia using such tools directed at Russian consumers. ENGOs in Germany, Holland and the UK have successfully used these kinds of tools against buyers of timber products from Russian Forests.
3.3.5 Policy strategies.

I make a distinction between policy tools and policy strategies. This is in line with Vedung (1994:17-18) who considers organisation a “Policy Strategy”, or a “precondition for the use of policy instruments”, and Eckhoff who considers it a factor influencing the efficiency of the tools (Eckhoff 1983:34). Organisation or policy strategy can look very similar to policy tools. Some NGOs in Norway form or use single issue “action groups” in order to campaign for or against an issue\(^8\), and the new organisation could be considered a policy tool in itself.

I define policy strategies as the activities ENGOs invest in expanding and maintaining the organisation, and all activities aimed at educating and training the members (capacity building). That implies that policy strategies are activities, such as strengthening the organisation in order to reach certain goals. Policy strategies are different from kind of organisation, and different from the structures of an ENGO, such as local chapters. Many ENGOs spend a considerable amount of time and money trying to attract new members, and in redesigning how the organisation is organised. Figure 3.1 illustrates the relation between the ENGO, policy strategies and use of policy tools.

Figure 3.1 Model of NGO, policy strategies and use of policy tools.

3.3.6 Summary of policy tools and policy strategies.

I have showed that ENGOs have a wide menu of policy tools and strategies available, and that these tools in many instances are similar to governments use. Boundary between the types of tools is not always clear, and many tools can interact. One of the Russian ENGOs organised field trips into the Karelian Taiga. These trips served as missions to gather information about biodiversity of the area as well as activities by logging companies, and as a way of making maps with suggested areas for protection. The field trips also functioned as a way to educate members in field biology, as a tool to reach out to new possible members, and as a way of showing the devastation of nature in heavily clear-cut areas. When compared to the types of policy tools for NGOs, I find that this field trip can classify as Information (teaching and collect data), and Participate or Contest the government but also as Capacity building and a way of recruiting new members (Policy strategy). A summary of all policy tools and strategies in use is given in table 3.2.
### Table 3.2. Summary of policy tools and policy strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of policy tool</th>
<th>Variations of tool in use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information policy tools.</td>
<td>Distribute information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fact-Finding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate or contest Government policy tools.</td>
<td>Participation in governmental processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contesting or performing government functions and processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical policy tools.</td>
<td>Direct actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the (local) environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic policy tools.</td>
<td>Consumer-boycotts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donate funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy strategies.</td>
<td>Strengthen organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training members (capacity building).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Networks

All ENGOs have and profit from various kinds of networks. I define networks as external sets of relations and contacts which the ENGO use in its struggle to reach its targets, and not relations between members within the organisation. We can distinguish between international networks, networks with other ENGOs within Russia, and networks with politicians and bureaucrats at regional and local level.

#### 3.4.1 International networks

Sidney Tarrow defines transnational social movements as “sustained contentious interactions with opponents - national or nonnational- by connected networks of challengers organized across national boundaries” (Tarrow 1998:184). This definition is a fitting description for much of the cooperation between the Russian ENGOs and their international partners. Most the ENGOs in the material sustain relations with likeminded organisations abroad, and some are also in contact with international network organisations. Tarrow (1998:188) distinguishes
between transnational social movements and what he calls transnational advocacy networks. The latter are not “bases for contentious politics within domestic societies” but only “connective structures that cross national boundaries”. From the perspective of the ENGOs, the difference is not very significant. The informers appeared to give more importance to membership in their specific ENGOs than to a broader transnational movement. The ENGOs have relations with organisations abroad that fit both network descriptions. It can be argued that BCC-Kolas relations with the TRN is only a connective structure that provides information, but TRN is also the vessel which facilitates use of policy tools, capacity building and possibility for establishment of new contacts, both nationally and international.

International networks is therefore the ENGOs set of relations with organisations abroad. An organisation can be a NGO, a network-organisation, or a company. Relations can be informal contacts, formalised cooperation or participation in a network organisation. It can imply transfer of information, skills, equipment, persons or funds.

3.4.2 National networks with other ENGOs

I define this kind of networks as sets of relations and contacts with other ENGOs within the region or the Russian federation, which the ENGO uses to reach its political targets. The network can materialise through formal participation in larger structures (such as participation in SEU), or by using contacts in the same organisation in the capital or other regions. ENGOs can also have a private independent network with other ENGOs. A prime example of use of networks in political campaigns is two campaigns which collected more than two million signatures in order to call for national referendums.

3.4.3 National networks with politicians and bueraucrats.

ENGOs can have a well-developed network of contacts among politicians and employees in the administration. Such contacts can be very valuable, as the network can provide information and access to political and administrative processes. Such access can be important in several manners. A network can be developed consciously by the activists in the ENGO. In this specific case many ENGOs were relying on networks that the members
already had from positions, commissions or offices. Decision makers in the administration may be more sympathetic towards the argumentation from the ENGOs than the general population, if the members of the ENGO are also specialists or part of the (local) elite. Specialists in the administration may be more willing to listen to arguments from other specialists within the same field, and may share some of the views held by the activists in the ENGO.

3.5 Usefulness of kind of organisation, policy tools and strategies or networks.

Both social scientists and activists will benefit from an analysis of the relationship between success and the three independent variables. It provides insights into how ENGOs work, and advice into what strategies that have effect. A special strength with the three independent variables is that they are in as sense ultimately controlled by the activists in the ENGOs, and can therefore be changed by them. This could potentially be useful if the investigation shows strong positive or negative relation between success and the independent variables. This is in line with the starting point of this inquiry where I was looking for a way to find more efficient policy tools.

Kind of organisation includes many aspects of the ENGOs, but the ENGOs in the material can still be reduced down to three different kinds. The three independent variables operate on two different levels where kind of organisation is a general concept, while the other two focus on more narrow issues. This design allows for testing if the effects I find in the broadest variable are actually caused be a specific kind of organisation, or if effects are due to certain activities or relations.

Policy tools and policy strategies covers the activities that the ENGOs carry out, whether these are political or concern organisation. This is a narrower scope. This approach may reveal if success is linked to use of policy tools and policy strategies are rather than success being dependent on kind of organisation. This can potentially be useful for activists and campaigners, especially when data is relatively fresh.
During the fieldwork, I discovered that many of the ENGOs had extensive use of networks, both inside Russia and abroad. Many of these networks were already established when the organisation was founded, or had large influence on the organisation at a later stage. Since networks were so important for many of the ENGOs it is tempting to investigate if different use of networks is related to success.

A weakness in this approach is that the three categories are not exclusive. Kind of organisation is a wide concept, whereas policy tools and use of networks are narrower. The two narrow variables are actually parts of the kind of organisation variable. If I find that success depends on the use of certain policy tools, an effect from this relation will probably also be present in one or more of the kinds of organisations.

Another weakness is that the three categories are not exhaustible. There are still factors that are not controlled for. I have not looked for differences between youth, student and adult ENGOs. This is perhaps the main weakness, although I am not sure if one should expect youth ENGOs to be more, less or equally successful. The experience from Norway is that youth ENGOs such as NU can be successful and influential. Furthermore, I have not looked at other aspects such as the relative radicalness of politics of the groups, or controlled for how many years the ENGOs have been existing. The radicalness of politics and suggestions from ENGOs can potentially be very important in explaining success, as suggestions close to mainstream politics should generally be more acceptable. I have not properly assessed the radicalness of the ENGOs in Northwest Russia, but my general impression from the fieldwork in 2001 and previous contacts is that the difference is not very large. Additional variables could be included in this list. I have included the three variables that seem to be the most important for explaining success in the analysis, and which can provide valuable information for activists. This decision is based on my general knowledge of the environmental movement and the results from the fieldwork. Further investigations could be interesting.

---

9 When Bellona was founded in 1986 Frederic Hague, the most profiled activist, was only 21 years old.
4. Method

This chapter discusses general methodological decisions. I will present how data was collected; describe available sources and the strategy for collection of data. I will then proceed to discuss some questions regarding the quality of the research design and quality of data.

4.1 Research design

When I started the project it became clear that a substantial part of the work would be to find data. Little detailed information about the activities of ENGOs in Northwest Russia was available in printed sources, or from informers in Norway. This made it clear that the best way ahead would be to interview key persons within the ENGOs in Russia. Language issues, cultural differences and a general lack of willingness to discuss political issues openly with foreigners strongly pointed against use of any other design than personal appearance and face-to-face interviews. An attempt to interview via fax and e-mail in 2000 made it clear that personal appearance was necessary in order to get any answers at all. A qualitative design was preferable as it allows for various approaches, while at the same time allowing the possibility of going deep into a few cases. The use of activities of ENGOs is not always apparent from the outside. Only the participants within the NGOs know exactly what they do, and what they do not.

My previous experience with working with Russian ENGOs, and my knowledge of the field of environmental politics and NGO-work were useful. It is easier when you know where to look or whom to ask. The value of my old network of contacts and knowledge of the environmental discourse in Northwest Russia should not be underestimated in this context. Combined with the flexibility allowed by the research design I was able to meet with the right people, avoid misunderstandings and get good answers. My knowledge about and interest for the subject could cause biased opinions and infer with the results from the
investigations. This can be helped by demonstrating interest, and otherwise follow common scientific procedures.

4.2 Collection of information.

I started work on this thesis in 2000. Back then limited data was available on this subject, apart from information from the ENGO-sector itself. Yanitskys “Russian Greens in a Risk Society” gave some information, but since it was published in 2000, it was not yet available in Norway. Communication was not as developed as they are today either. ENGOs in Russia did not normally have web pages, and finding them was hard. Many groups had e-mail addresses, but response time could be very slow, as groups did not have their own computers. Typically, “modus operandi” was to acquire as much information as possible, and then ask contact persons or groups by e-mail or fax what ENGOs were active in the area. Interviews were scheduled to the extent it was possible. During the actual fieldwork, I again asked about other NGOs in the area, and tried physically to locate them. Some NGOs such as “Ecology of the North”, “Green Cross Arkhangelsk” and the “BCC-Apatity” surfaced this way. Some NGOs (such as the Student Alliance of the Murmansk Region) were not included, as they did not fulfil the criteria’s for this study. The fieldwork included time for such detective work, and the entire fieldwork in Russia was carried out within three weeks in April and May 2001. In addition comes some interviews that were carried out before and after the fieldtrip. Before the fieldtrip I interviewed key persons in Norwegian ENGOs cooperating with NGOs in Northwest Russia, and key persons from two Russian network-ENGOs in Moscow. Some additional interviews were also carried out after the fieldwork was ended, such as the TRN interviews. My previous knowledge of Russian ENGOs and the TRN system was highly valuable in the data collection-process. This additional information was very important to obtain a better understanding of the general situation for ENGOs in Russia, but it was also important as a way of obtaining confirmation on data from the Northwest Russian ENGOs.

Regarding written sources I have used all written material provided by the ENGOs (including magazines, reports, web pages etc), in Norwegian, Swedish and English. I have also used
other written material such as Yanitsky (2000) and several directories of NGOs in Russia (Taiga Rescue Network 2000; Kobets and Lahti 1998).

4.2.1 Development of interview guide and description of the fieldwork.

The questionnaire was designed in 2000 and 2001. The questions were first tested on three members of PiM in Murmansk late 2000 (chairperson, board member and one ordinary member). The results were processed, and the questionnaire was modified. Before the fieldwork started, I tested the set of questions again on the secretary in NU responsible for coordinating work in Russia. Several ENGOs working in Russia were present at the Forest Movement Europe conference in early April 2001 in Oslo. I carried out interviews with one informer from the “BCC-Moscow”, one from the Social Ecological Union main office in Moscow.

The fieldwork started in late April 2001 and lasted for about three weeks. I started in Murmansk where I interviewed Gaia-Murmansk and PiM. I travelled to Arkhangelsk to interview AETAS, Green Cross, and Ecology of the North. I also interviewed the NGO support centre Garant. The latter provided valuable information, but Garant is not and ENGO it is not included in the analysis. In Apatity, I was allowed to attend an internal seminar within PiM, and interviewed the local PiM-club, BCC-Kola and Gaia-Apatity. In Petrozavodsk I could only find “SPOK”, even though substantial work was put into finding other NGOs which were supposed to be present. Work in Petrozavodsk vas somewhat hampered by trouble with registration of the visa, and one day was spent at the OVIR office solving this problem. In Helsinki, I interviewed FNL and WWF, as both had activities in Russia. Finally, I interviewed SSNC in Stockholm who had a person responsible with forest issues in Russia and who gives grants to Russian ENGOs.

Back in Norway, the results was analysed. In order to increase the quality of the analysis, I decided to perform some additional interviews. During a trip to Sweden later in 2001 one board member from Fältbiologerna was interviewed, and two informal interviews with “Taiga Rescue Network” employees was done in Jokkmokk. TRN was very active in Russia, and funds projects and capacity building. I also carried out an interview with one employee
in NSCN who has worked with NGOs in Russia since before the break-up of the Soviet Union and one additional interview with the new Russia Secretary in NU. After assessing the quality of the gathered data I decided that it was sufficient. During a trip to Estonia and St. Petersburg arranged by NSCN I met with several ENGOs in St. Petersburg Oblast. I went to several lectures by local ENGOs\textsuperscript{10}, and also discussed with some of them. However, I decided against increasing the number of informers for several reasons. Further expansion of the universe and additional data may not give additional clarification. The lectures I attended and the discussion with ENGOs in St. Petersburg showed that the situation did not differ significantly from the ENGOs that were already included. The main challenges were similar, as were kind of organisation, scope and way of working. Data collection must stop at some point, and I decided that I had sufficient data.

4.3 Validity and reliability.

Kvale (1996:229-252) shows that reliability refers to how consistent the results are, whereas validity refers to whether the study investigates what it is intended to. He stresses that the “issues of verification do not belong to the some separate stage of the investigation, but should be addressed through the entire research process” (ibid: 234).

Reliability in qualitative studies demonstrates that the operations of the study can be repeated with the same results. In this case, the fieldwork and data are from 2001. Because of the passage of time, a new study would probably find other results, as the ENGOs have developed. Apart from this, the reliability rests on the questionnaire, the log from how and when the research was carried out, and the description of the work.

Validity is if the study measures what it intends to. Kvale (ibid: 241) argues that validity in qualitative social science should be understood as what he calls Craftsmanship, or how strong one has tried to falsify the theory by questioning all answers and findings. The validity of the thesis will thus be depend on to what extent it has been controlled if the informers

\textsuperscript{10} Coalition Clean Baltic and Green World
misinform, how accurately the notes from the interview were transcribed, and to what extent information can be double (or triple) checked. Several inconsistencies in the data are found and addressed. The general consistency among various sources points to that the results are valid.

Yin (1994:33) divides the issue of validity into three sub-groups, viz. construct validity, internal validity, and external validity. This typology is useful, as it illuminates some additional issues. Construct validity is a test to ensure use of correct measures, if conclusions can be drawn from the operationalisations to the theoretical constructs, or if propositions are properly discussed and given grounds for. Criteria for success are discussed in chapter 2.

Internal validity determines whether a relationship is casual or spurious. The best way of addressing this issue is to compare data from several sources and to try to establish an overview. Obvious mistakes are to confuse the effect from the three independent variables, or to fail to discover spurious relations by not seeing that what seems like success by ENGOs is caused by other factors.

The external validity refers to whether the findings can be generalised. There are ENGOs of several kinds from North-West Russia in the study, from both small and large cities. They are from both Oblasts and Republics. It is possible to generalise some of the results from the investigations to other NGOs in the area. The general conditions for ENGOs (political, economic and environmental threats) are more or less the same throughout Russia as well, so there are no apparent obstacles to generalise the findings throughout the Russian Federation. The fact that several of the ENGOs participate in Russia-wide campaigns is a strong indicator for this. One exception is for inhabitants of secret (or military) cities, where special restrictions may prevent ENGOs from forming or using specific tools. The passing of time since the fieldwork was carried out is an argument against generalisation today.

4.3.1 Interviews.

I used standardised interviews, apart from the interviews with the TRN staff. This implies that all interviews were carried out in the same manner with the same questions asked in the
same order, and the informers are asked to answer in their own words. The interview in itself will look more as a structured conversation, quite similar to the kind of interviews journalists perform. All interviews in Russia were performed in English. On three occasions (interview with Ecology of the North, SPOK and partly AETAS) I used and an interpreter. This is not an ideal situation, as the interviews slow down, and there is a risk that information gets lost. In the case of SPOK and AETAS this was eased by the fact that the interpreters also were activists in the ENGOs, and would be familiar with activities and jargon. In these situations extra care was taken to ensure that questions and answers were understood. In the case of Ecology of the North, time and language issues have compromised the interview, and the transcription did not give a fully description of the ENGO.

I decided against using a tape recorder since it could cause a distance to the informants. This was based on experiences from 1999 with interviews with Russian youth in Arkhangelsk; a tape recorder made the informers insecure and reserved. Treatment of high profile environmentalists such as Alexandr Nikitin and Gregory Pasko, and experiences and stories of experiences with the Soviet and Russian secret services may explain this reservation. Interviews with the TRN, the Moscow-based Russian ENGOs and the Finnish organisations were in English, and the Norwegian and Swedish in Norwegian. I dropped question 14 on these occasions, and question 4-10 and 12 were been rephrased, in order to ask what they were doing in Russia.

Transcription.

Transcription is a process where things can go wrong, and where speed and fresh memories are important. The lack of a tape recorder meant that I hade to write everything down by hand. I had previous experience in carrying out interviews for a magazine using this method. This has limits, as it was impossible to write down everything as it was said, and continue the interview. The solution was to use some abbreviations, and to focus on answers to the questions in the questionnaire rather than writing down everything. In the interviews with interpreter, this is not a problem, as the interpreting gives a lot of extra time. At the end of each session, I summarised the answers on each question and asked the informer if he or she agreed. The transcription was then accepted, changed or new explanations added. I would like to add that the oral form of speaking is different from the written, and oral languages are
re-written in order to make sense for the reader. The use of a tape recorder can give a false sense of safety. The tape-recorder records everything as it is said, and is a very authoritative source when the interviews are transcribed. The problem is that all body language is lost, and it will depend in on the researcher’s memory if she remembers the context in which things were said when she transcribes the tapes back to written language. By taking notes during the interview, there is a better chance that body language important for the context is included in the transcription.

I did usually not take specific notes of body language, though this is an important part of the human language. The loss of information by the lack of body language made up for by the design of the questions, when I go over use of policy tools several times. I also asked again if I felt that there was a need for that, when the oral statements did not cover the full extent of the message.

4.3.2 Possible sources of errors.

Language
Most of the interviews were in English, which is not the native language for the interviewer or the informers. Language difficulties, different understanding of terms, and different understandings of what ENGOs are supposed to do are items that can confuse. The researcher and the informer can use the same expression to communicate different meaning or content. The strategy to avoid this has been to do the interviews in person, and to use a flexible design. This can allow for extra explanations or going back and ask over again if there are misunderstandings.

One problem occurred regularly during the interviews. The understanding of the phrase “political activity” is very different in Northwest Russia and Norway. I was aware of this problem, and confirmed this when using the test questionnaire in 2000. This was still a problem, especially in the questions regarding use of policy tools. In Norway ENGOs often divide their activity into political activity, and organisational tasks. Russian ENGOs try to distance themselves from political activity, as this means taking part in party politics. In order to avoid misunderstanding I tried to avoid the phrase political and use examples
instead. Questions regarding political activity will usually yield a negative reply, since the ENGOs are not political parties, and very rarely cooperate with them. Question five and six are designed to analyse the activity of the ENGO in a concrete manner.

**Misinformation?**

The questions have a built in tendency to get the informer to quantify in order to get a better grasp on subjective terms, such as “many”, or “often”, and follow up questions were used in order to quantify issues such as contact with politicians, articles in local media, number of members etc. Quantification is handy as the content of terms such as “many” can be very different from person to person and country to country.

Example:

**Q:** Do you feel you have access to local politicians?
**A:** Do you mean only politicians or officials also?

**Q:** I mean both elected politicians and bureaucrats. Is it possible for you to call them? Can you get a meeting, and will they possibly listen to you?

**A (discussion)** We can call, and get a meeting, but I do not know about listening.

**Q:** How often do you meet with them?

**A:** We do not know, maybe a one maybe three times every year.

(Interview SPOK) ¹¹

There is a probability that the informers may consciously or unconsciously tells only parts of a story, misinforms, or present a biased version. Most of the ENGOs in the material are in some kind of relation to each other. Wrong or biased information can be discovered by looking for deviations in the material. I have found several differences. Most of them are different understandings or descriptions. SPOK and FNL have different descriptions of their cooperation, both on how it was started, and on the value of the work of their partner. PiM has an understanding of how the ENGO was founded which is different from the one NU and Gaia has. This is hardly a sign that the interviews are not reliable, rather a sign that people

---

¹¹ This short part of the interview was written down word by word during the interview for illustrating this problem. Most of the transcriptions do not have such level of detail.
have various views on what the world is like. A real deviation is Green Cross that claims to work for funding and fund organisations such as AETAS, while AETAS does not mention any such assistance from the Green Cross.

Another obstacle is if no other sources can provide information about an ENGO. In this case it is difficult to verify the data and information must be treated with care. This was the case for Ecology on the North.
5. Analysis

In this chapter, I will investigate if success is dependent on kind of organisation, use of policy tools or can be seen an effect of networks. In the final discussion, after analysing all the variables, I will investigate if the three independent variables are interrelated.

5.1 Can small ENGOs have success?

In 1988 I attended a conference by the Taiga Rescue Network in Estonia where Arne Næss held a short lecture on deep ecology and strategy for the environmental movement\textsuperscript{12}. The debate was about logging operations in Estonia and Russia by large European companies. Næss presented his experience with working with transnational companies, and said: “You can not defeat a trans-national company, except for at the local level”. Næss did not elaborate on this, but the implication is that a local community or local activists can be equally strong or stronger than a transnational company in a local struggle. This reflects the slogan ”Think globally, act locally” from the environmental movement in the seventies, which was picked up in the discourse on the environment again when the World Commissions report Our Common Future was launched in 1987. All environmental problems have a spatial and therefore local ingredient. This is true for logging operations, industrial companies and for the consumption carried out by the earth’s population. Since they are local (and spatial), the solution is ultimately local activities. I asked the informers if they felt that they could influence politicians. Several of the informers, especially from PiM and Gaia, responded that this is not possible on a federal level. To put it in the words of one informer from PiM; “No, it’s impossible, but possible on a local level” (PiM, Apatity). The results from the fieldwork support this claim. Even very small ENGOs can have success and exercise influence on society, at least at the local or regional level.

\textsuperscript{12} There are to my knowledge no minutes from this session. A link to the programme can be found at the web page of the Estonian Green Movement (2007).
5.2 Success as a function of kind of organisation.

I will now investigate if kind organisations are interrelated to success. I will first classify the ENGOs according to kinds of organisations. Then I will show that the two specialist ENGOs are most successful in political work, while the participation oriented are more successful in spreading information and strengthening the organisation.

The ENGOs are classified according to four criteria. These are the openness of the ENGO towards participation, type of members, scope of the ENGOs work and their main strategy or way of working. Green Cross and Ecology of the North are insider –specialist ENGOs. Both have restricted membership and are to a great degree closed for new members. All the members have special skills. Members in Ecology of the North are journalists or work in the local or regional administration, while members in Green Cross are mainly pensioned administrators or professors (or other scientific personnel) employed at the university or college. Both organisations claim to work mainly by holding roundtables with participation from the local or regional administration, although it must be noted that data on Ecology of the North are not reliable. The Green Cross has also been very successful in cooperating with the administration and has arranged an expedition on the Dvina River in order to investigate the state of the environment. This trip sponsored by the Oblast, and representatives from the administration participated.

The BCC-Kola is a narrow-issue specialist ENGO. The organisation claim to seek more members, but it has no apparent strategy towards that end, apart from some small posters at the College in Apatity. Membership is open for all in theory, but restricted in practise. Only members with special skills are really wanted. BCC-Kola focuses only on conservation of biodiversity, and directs most of its interest to protect old growth forests. This is a very narrow scope compared with other ENGOs in Northwest Russia. The work that BCC-Kola carries out is highly specialised and requires special skills and contacts in the administration and among the national and international forestry companies. It seems that contacts in the administration are vital for success in establishing new reserves.

PiM and AETAS (and Terra Incognita) are participation-oriented ENGOs. There are no special restrictions on membership, apart from an age limit. Members and chapters are
relatively free to work with the issues they themselves consider interesting, and this is reflected in a wide number of issues being addressed, from the problem of stray dogs to nuclear energy and safety. All organisations have a very active strategy for reaching out to people and get more members, and to educate the members they already have. The main way of working is to focus on spreading information, strengthening the organisation and educating members.

Some ENGOs have features that fit in more than one kind of organisation. SPOK and Gaia are the hardest to classify. Both can be classified as insider specialists and participation oriented. For SPOK I have solved this by focusing on the main activity of the ENGO. It is a student organisation, and is more open for participation than BCC-Kola. However, most of SPOK’s activities require highly skilled work, such as mapping of old growth forest, discussions on the criteria for mapping, and to provide input to a board set up by the regional administration to make more eco-friendly forestry. The activities do not encourage broad participation, which is reflected in the current member base (5-10 persons). The low number of members, and the little interest for attracting new members demonstrated by the informers also supports that SPOK was not a participation oriented ENGO.

Gaia is harder to classify, as it is a kind of hybrid between the narrow issue specialist and the participation oriented. It is a foundation, and does not have members in a normal sense, although it encourages participation. According to one of the informers, the goal of Gaia was to “give environmental education and information to people in all ages. Further, the goal was to develop the environmental movement in Kola, that is a movement independent from the government” (Interview, Gaia Murmansk). This goal is a strong argument for that the ENGO is mainly a participation-oriented ENGO. A summary of the classification of each ENGO according to kind is given in table 5.1.
Table 5.1 Classification of kinds of ENGOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGO-kind</th>
<th>ENGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The insider-specialist Ecology</td>
<td>Ecology of the North Green Cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The narrow issue specialist ENGO</td>
<td>BCC-Kola SPOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation oriented</td>
<td>AETAS PiM Gaia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1 Success and kind of ENGO.

Different kinds of ENGOs have different kind and degree of success. ENGOs can have success in various fields. I distinguish between three kinds of success: political success, organisational success and success in spreading information. These distinctions are discussed in chapter 2.

When looking at political success, the most successful ENGOs are those who rely on close contact with the government and participation in government processes. The narrow-issue specialist ENGOs have been able to establish nature reserves, participate in the definition of forestry practice, and enter into dialogue with forest companies. The insider-specialist kind ENGOs are also able to have significant success, as they receive funding from and enter into participation with the administration. The above indicates that success can be understood as a function of kind of organisation. The relation between success and kind of organisation is summarised in table 5.2.

When looking at organisational success it is the participation oriented ENGOs that are most successful. The relation is clear, as the participation oriented ENGOs are the only to put effort into expanding and setting up more chapters. They are also more interested in capacity building, and educate their members on more and broader issues than the narrow issue specialist kind ENGOs. The insider specialists are not interested in capacity building at all. This is to some extent intrinsic in the definition. Closed ENGOs are not looking for new members, and the specialists have less need to educate themselves. This is however not a
threshold preventing the two specialist kind ENGOs to expand. They can still look for specialists in other scientific or geographic areas, and could successfully grow by setting up new working groups or clubs in the region. Capacity building in ENGOs is important as activism and campaigning in an ENGO requires many skills. Scientific knowledge is only one skill, educating the members in issues such as cooperation, media work, other environmental problems or campaigning and tactics could potentially strengthen all three kinds of ENGOs significantly.

When it comes to information work the picture is more complex. All ENGOs seems to have rather similar access to media, according to what they say themselves. The difference is that the participation oriented ENGOs reach out via other channels as well, by having stands and handing out leaflets, holding lectures or programmes at schools and other activities in the local community. The larger member base in the participation oriented ENGOs, and the focus on spreading information through the members helpful in this context. One would expect the specialist- ENGOs to be more successful in using the media on the basis that these organisations are more professional, but there are no real significant differences in the use of mass media indicating this. When I asked the informer from Green Cross about access to national media he replied that: “We are a local group, [it is] not a goal for us. But we have been in national papers.”. (Interview Green Cross Arkhangelsk). This also underscores the point also the two specialist kind ENGOs has need for capacity building in order to fully utilise their potential.

Table 5.2 sums up the relation between kind of organisation and success. The two specialists –kind ENGOs are most successful in political work, while the participation oriented ENGO is most successful in spreading information and in organisational issues. This indicates a relation between success and kind of organisation. A weakness with table 5.2 is that it is difficult to compare success between the ENGOs. BCC-Kola has had significant success in one limited policy area. It is probably easier to pool resources in one area, than working simultaneously with many different political issues. However, only having success in one field can also bee seen as a weakness. By focusing on only narrow issues the ENGO leaves work with on other environmental problems to others (if any). Unchecked forest fires, illegal
logging, air pollution or climate change may damage newly established nature reserves and destroy the work of the ENGO. This is not fully reflected in table 5.2.

**Table 5.2** Kind of ENGO and interrelation with success, ranked after political success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of NGO</th>
<th>ENGO-Name</th>
<th>Political success</th>
<th>Organisational success</th>
<th>Information success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrow issue specialist</td>
<td>BCC-Kola</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow issue specialist</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider Specialist</td>
<td>Green Cross</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider Specialist</td>
<td>Ecology of the North</td>
<td>Medium/High*</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation oriented</td>
<td>Gaia</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation oriented</td>
<td>PiM</td>
<td>Low/medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation oriented</td>
<td>AETAS</td>
<td>Low/medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This data for Ecology of the North are not reliable.

I have chosen to consider success in the political field as more valuable than success in informing society and strengthening the organisation. Success in this field (such as protection of an area or change of forestry practise) is closest to the purpose of the ENGOs since they are making a concrete difference. Some ENGOs are very active in informing and education people about environmental problems, while others do not consider this as important. Some ENGOs also focus on expansion as an important way of influencing society, both by capacity building or by reaching more people. Organisational success and success in spreading information is an essential part of the framing process in social movement theory. The lack of emphasis on these issues by some of the ENGOs should raise some concern since framing is what “legitimate and motivate collective action” (MacAdam 1996:7), such as participate in ENGOs or care about the environment.
5.2.2 Success as a function of kind of organisation, summary and sub-conclusion.

The three kinds of organisations have different kinds and degree of success. The two specialist-kind ENGOs are most successful in political work, while the participation oriented are more successful in spreading information and strengthening the organisation. Some of the interrelation between kind of organisation and organisational success is explained by the definition of the kinds of organisations, but the two specialist-kind organisations have significant potential for success in spreading information and in organisational issues.

A problem with this argument is to explain Gaia, which is having success in all three areas, and this is an argument to investigate the two other independent variables.

5.3 Success as a function of policy tools and policy strategies.

The preceding chapter argues that success is interrelated with kind of ENGOs, and that different kinds of ENGOs have success in different areas. ENGOs use policy tools to influence society, and policy strategies in order to expand and strengthen the organisation. By looking at policy tools and strategies, a more detailed account of success of the keys to success may be obtained. This can help explain Gaia relatively high success in working with the administration, which is not in line with the other trends in table 5.2.

5.3.1 Information

Almost all ENGOs in the material say that spreading information about the environment is important, and that there is a general lack of information about environmental issues in the population. Success can to a certain degree be measured in how many people that are reached, as the first step to influence is to get peoples attention.
**Distribution**

This tool is used in order to influence or change the way people think and act. All ENGOs use distribution of information in their work. Several of the ENGOs hand out leaflets, arrange seminars or lectures or make their own publications. BCC-Kola has produced a TV-Documentary (Bystrøm et al 2000), and some of the ENGOs have or have had web pages, but access to the internet was limited in this area in 2001. The most successful ENGOs in distributing information to the public are Gaia, PiM and AETAS, although AETAS’ position is due to its cooperation with PiM. Gaia reaches a lot of schoolchildren and teachers through the SPARE project, and probably also parents and other relatives. Through Green Trips PiM and AETAS reach out to many students and pupils. They are also able to distribute information through their member bases to friends and family. This sounds naïve, but using such networks to spread information are also used as a tool for marketing products. The other ENGOs in the material had few activities aimed at reaching many people, or put little effort into the information-distributing activities they actually carried out.

**Mass media**

Media access is a potentially powerful tool in that it can reach many people. Degree of success is measured by how often the ENGOs are mentioned in mass media. NU subscribes to a service that logs all articles (including letters to the editor) in written media within Norway about NU and publish a total annual count. This is called “Klippetoppen”, and is published in the internal magazine and on its web page. In 2005 the local club in Kongsberg “won” with 124 hits in newspapers. About 70 local chapters had one or more registered hit. I did a short survey of some years from 1992 to 2006, and it shows that typically 50-70 clubs had articles in the newspaper, and that the best club had between 100 to 250 hits per year (Natur og Ungdom 7/92, 6/95, 7/97 and 7/00; Natur og Ungdom 2007). The local chapters usually rely on the local newspaper and occasionally the regional paper, such as Laagendalsposten and Drammens Tidenede for the local chapter in Kongsberg. For a local chapter to be mentioned 200 times a year it has to appear in writing several times a week.

Russia has fewer newspapers than Norway, so we cannot directly compare, but the results from Norway indicate the potential. Most of the Russian ENGOs use the regional or local media. Some ENGOs claim that they have good access to local newspapers (Interviews
SPOK and BCC-Kola). When asked to quantify, “good access” was from some articles per year to one article per month, and only access to local TV. This quite similar to the other ENGOs. The Northwestern Russian ENGOs have a potential for growth in media use. More media-training and better strategies for appearing in media could help realise this potential. So far no ENGOs are very successful in using media.

**Lobby.**

Lobbying is hard to measure, and some of these contacts are very informal. Many of the lobbying activities are paired with contacts with the administration. Lobbying seems to be a difficult process, as several of the ENGOs complain about having lost all contacts in the election, and that they have to rebuild networks or contact persons. Only PiM does not lobby. Green Cross, BCC-Kola, SPOK and Gaia use lobbying with some success, meaning that they have access to politicians. Data for Ecology of the North is not reliable. AETAS have used lobbying, but their contact has lost his network.

### 5.3.2 Participate and contest the Government.

Participating and contesting of the Government is the second most used tool. Some ENGOs do not participate in such processes, but others have been quite successful in cooperating with the local and regional administration. Fewer ENGOs contest the government, but those that do seem to achieve the most striking results.

**Participation in Governmental processes**

Success is the ability to have access to the administration, and to use this access to generate acceptance, funding or cause the administration to act. The informer from SPOK reports that this is hard to achieve: “We can call, and get a meeting, but I do not know about listening” (Interview SPOK).

I consider SPOK, BCC-Kola, and Green Cross most successful users of this policy tool, as they are able to actually get funding for projects, achieve protection of forests, influence the way logging of forest is carried out, and initiate or participate in roundtables, advisory boards etc. Gaia is also successful, especially in Apatity and with its energy efficiency project. The
SPARE project, which is an information activity, is also requiring acceptance from the administration. Establishing a relation between the use of tools by the ENGOs and the actions of the administration is questionable, as additional forces may push for the same goal. I have accepted the ENGOs own understanding off the situation. The picture provided from all Russian and Nordic ENGOs and the TRN mainly consistent.

**Judicial tools.**

Two ENGOs have used the law, or tried to use the law. Success indicates the ability to use the law and achieve a desired result. The usage is very limited. The Green Cross has tried to take judicial measures in order to use tax money from Kotlas pulp and paper mill to stop pollution, but were not successful.

“We tried to prove that tax money from the Kotlas plant should not go back to the paper plant. Its hard to use the law. Very hard to prove that people get ill from environmental toxins. (…)It’s a problem that people know there is a lot of pollution, but there are so many other things to care about. And the director at the Solombola (another paper plant [my comment]) is the major in Arkhangelsk“ (Interview Green Cross Arkhangelsk).

I have no other information about the legal actions from Green Cross, but the scenario sounds realistic. I personally discussed discharges from the pulp and paper industry with the director from the Regional committee for nature in Arkhangelsk in 1999. Viktor Kuznetsov pointed to that discharges from the Solombola mill was past the legal limits, but that they could do very little since: “The plant can not afford to buy a new purification system. The town cannot afford to lose 1600 jobs or the income from the plant” (Wilhelmsen 1999).13

The BCC-Kola has threatened to take judicial action. In the words of the informer:

“A large forest company destroyed an area with rare lichens. If we take them to court, they must pay a big fine. But we do not, we make them protect the area instead. We use the law as “blackmail”” (Interview BCC-Kola).

The informer insisted that this tactic worked, but there is no other information in the material about this. This is perhaps to be expected, as openness may spoil the deal.

---

13 My re-translation to English.
Contesting the Government.
Several of the ENGOs are contesting the local government. Degree of success depends on actual, concrete effects. Several ENGOs have been successful using this tool.

Development of (counter-) expertise is important for BCC-Kola and to some extent for SPOK. This expertise is double edged, as it can be turned against the administration, or used to offer assistance and cooperation. Some ENGOs go a step further and actually carry out projects that could (or should) be the responsibility for the Government. The best and most direct example is Gaia, which after having commissioned a report about windmills was unable to get KolaEnergo (the electric power and grid monopolist) to build a windmill. Gaia and the NSCN went ahead and set up a company that bought a windmill. As delivering electricity to the net without permission is illegal, a businessperson (who had a resort in the forest) agreed to use the energy. (Interview Gaia, Interview NSCN). Other examples are making deals with logging companies on how and where they cut forest, or complete proposals for protected areas. The ENGOS make the protection plans without any government assistance, and deliver a finished product with maps with lists of rare species and clear boundaries are handed over to the government.

Ecology of the North claimed to work with FSC-certification, and this activity should qualify as contesting the government. About 500,000 hectares is FSC-certified in Arkhangelsk (FSC, 2005). There is no other data indication such participation in the material. The national FSC initiative in Russia is lead by Greenpeace in Moscow. I will disregard this activity of Ecology of the North in my assessment of Ecology of the North’s success.

---

14 This activity could also classify as a physical policy tool, but the main purpose of the project appears to be to show that windmills are possible despite what the Administration and KolaEnergo says. Supplying energy and thereby solving a local problem is a side effect and not the real purpose.

15 There was a conference about High Conservation Value Forests: from Global Concept to Regional Systems of Forest Management December 2005 in Arkhangelsk. SEU, BCC and AETAS participated. HCV-Forests are one very important factor within the FSC –certification system. Ecology of the North did not participate (Kulikova 2005).
5.3.3 Physical tools

I will evaluate success of physical tools by looking at the scale (or size) and frequency of the activities. Small demonstrations with almost no media coverage or setting up a few benches in parks as AETAS do will make a very small impact on society. This tool is not used very much, and when it is employed it is on a small scale. Few of the groups use physical tools. Few ENGOs arrange demonstrations, and the demonstrations that are carried out are usually small and take place rarely.

When it comes to improving the local environment AETAS, PiM and Gaia are carrying out activities. Typical activities are making benches, ask people not to burn garbage, starting programmes for worm composting and planting trees. All activities take place on a very small scale and are usually not carried out very often. The effect seems to be quite limited. Planting some trees will have very little impact in the gigantic Russian forests and urging people to stop burning waste will probably have limited effect, as these small organisations can only reach a very limited number of people. It could be argued that composting and producing vegetables can have effect for the people who are participating, but again few are doing this. The information-effect from such tools should not be underestimated.

5.3.4 Economic tools

Consumer campaigns
The ENGOs in the material rarely or never use economic tools. Such tools can be used to pressure companies to seize or change an activity. Success is simply when pressure yields an intended result.

There is little use of consumer campaigns in Northwest Russia. The ENGOs in the area are too small or lack the organisational capacity that is needed for carrying out such campaigns. The only example of this policy tool is within the large forest campaign organised through the TRN. SPOK has managed to stop logging in several moratorium areas, but other parties (FNL, Greenpeace etc) mainly carried out the contact with the companies and the customers in Europe. This is illustrative for this tool. This kind of pressure usually works best on a
large scale. Small ENGOs will not have the capacity to make any difference, as the target for the campaign must believe that not complying with the demands will lead to economic loss or damage. Networks of ENGOs or big organisations have better ability to carry out such campaigns.

The Norwegian Rainforest Foundation is not a large ENGO, but has campaigned against use of tropic wood in garden furniture in Norway, and has had some success. Several outlets have stopped selling some types of wood, mainly due to aggressive campaigning from the foundation. This shows that small ENGOs can use economic tools, with the reservation that the Rainforest Foundation participates in a large international campaign, and that the target for the campaign is national companies and consumers. There is no trace of any environmental consumer campaign inside Russia in the material. Probable causes are the general poor economic situation in the investigated area, and perhaps that industries of key interest for ENGOs have been export oriented.

Green Cross claim to fund or work for funding of other ENGOs, but there is no other information available that supports this claim.

5.3.5 Policy strategies and capacity building.

Setting up new local chapters or educating the members can be important steps towards reaching the goals of the ENGO. The material indicates that there is a clear difference between the ENGOs in their approach to policy strategies and that the clubs who focus on using policy strategies have more members and chapters.

Green Cross and Ecology of the North are contempt with the structure of the ENGO as it is, and do not carry out any activities to change it. BCC-Kola, Gaia and SPOK are in a middle position. The BCC-Kola and SPOK want more members, and claim to try to reach new members by handing out leaflets and similar activities at the universities. The kind of work the BCC-Kola does require skills, so it is to be expected that they have problems with attracting new members. SPOK has some of the same problems, and most of the members are biology students. Both the informer from the FNL and from SPOK argues that the field
trip attracts many new members, and that participation on the field trips is much higher than the membership base. Gaia does not have members, but has many active (volunteer) persons working on various issues. PiM, AETAS (and Terra Incognita) carry out many activities aimed at attracting new members and setting up new clubs.

When it comes to capacity building, we see a similar picture. Green Cross and the Ecology of the North and BCC-Kola build on the expertise that the members already have. SPOK is in a middle position. The summer camps and fieldtrips are also capacity building and teach various skills to participants. Gaia also works with capacity building, especially within energy saving and LA21 projects. PiM and AETAS put a lot of effort into this, and arrange seminars on environmental topics, have summer camps, and special activist-seminars. Terra Incognita carries out similar activities.

5.3.6 Success and policy tools and policy strategies, summary and sub-conclusion.

Table 5.3 shows a link between kind of ENGO, use of policy tools and success. The different kinds of ENGOs have affinity for different policy tools. The main pattern is that the two specialist-kind ENGOs are more successful in working with governmental processes. This is probably due to their ability to participate with the administrations, and their high level of knowledge and skills in some environmental issues. The participation oriented ENGOs have more success in using policy strategies, and are the only one to use physical policy tools. This may be because they are not able to work with the administration, and therefore have to try to use other tools to reach their goals.

The exception to this general pattern is Gaia, which is successful in using all types of tools and policy strategies except for economic policy tools. Gaia has been able to work with the administration and both participate in and contest governmental processes without having being experts with special skills in narrow issues. Gaia has instead made itself important by obtaining skills and contacts, and by using external specialists to produce reports and documentation.
Use of information tools and policy strategies are important part of the framing process. These tools are most effective in convincing people that environmental issues are important, and that it is necessary to act. By looking at policy tools and strategies it becomes clearer that the participation oriented ENGOs are the most active in using framing. Future growth of the ENGOs and expansion of the ENGOs power and ability to have success will ultimately rest on the framing process. Ignoring the importance of policy strategies and information tools is a risky strategy. Table 5.3 shows that the two kinds of specialist oriented ENGOs relies mostly on participation with the government in order to reach concrete goals, such as protection of forests. This strategy is dangerous in the longer run, as no successful framing will gradually reduce the power of the ENGOs.
Table 5.3 Summary of kinds of organisation and relation to use of policy tools or strategies and success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy tool or policy tool strategy</th>
<th>Kind of ENGO.</th>
<th>Name of ENGO using specific policy tool.</th>
<th>Most successful ENGOs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Insider specialist</td>
<td>Green Cross Ecology of the North</td>
<td>Gaia, PiM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow issue specialist</td>
<td>SPOK BCC-Kola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation oriented</td>
<td>AETAS Gaia PiM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow issue specialist</td>
<td>BCC-Kola (SPOK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation oriented</td>
<td>Gaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical tools</td>
<td>Participation oriented</td>
<td>GAIA AETAS PiM</td>
<td>Gaia, AETAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic tools</td>
<td>Narrow issue specialist</td>
<td>(BCC-Kola)* (SPOK)*</td>
<td>BCC-Kola and SPOK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy strategies</td>
<td>Narrow issue specialist</td>
<td>(SPOK)*</td>
<td>PiM, Gaia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation oriented.</td>
<td>GAIA AETAS PiM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Limited level of success, or success through participation in international campaigns

** Limited data, non-confirmed information.
5.4 Networks as explanation for success?

All ENGOs in the material take part in national and international networks. The investigation of use of policy tools indicated that some ENGOs were able to participate with local and regional governments because of old networks. Some of the Russian ENGOs have very close links with Nordic ENGOs; others have good networks within Russia. Some of these connections are so strong that they can explain both kind of organisation and use of policy tools.

5.4.1 International networks

Nordic ENGOs have played an important role for several of the Northwest Russian ENGOs. Nordic organisations have been crucial in establishing ENGOs, or have influenced strongly on already existing ENGOs. PiM, SPOK, Gaia and AETAS cooperate closely with Nordic ENGOs. Gaia and PiM were established by NU and the NSCN, and they have remained in close contact with each other. SPOK started to cooperate with the Finns shortly after the organisation was founded, and has been heavily influenced, to such a degree that the informers complain about the lack of strategic help from FNL: “We had a campaign with them. Now we have contact with (X.X) who is a birdwatcher. (...) He can’t help. We need help from other people“ (Interview, SPOK)\textsuperscript{16}. SPOKs success would not have been possible without scientific and financial help, and assistance in campaigns from FNL.

BCC-Kola and Green Cross are in the middle. The BCC-Kola centre has been set up more or less without Nordic help, but has received financial, strategic and political help through TRN and SSNC. Green Cross does not have any Nordic partners. It functions as an independent ENGO, but the activities and kind of organisation is in line with the Green Cross Charter (Green Cross International 2001) Ecology of the North was established without help from Nordic ENGOs. Table 5.4 summarise intensity and kind of cooperation with Nordic ENGOs.

\textsuperscript{16} X.X refers to the FNL-contact person. Birdwatcher is a negative loaded description, indicating that this person is mostly interested in at looking at birds (or fungi and lichens) than carrying out other work such as strategic planning and political campaigns.
Cooperation has historically mostly been one way, with assistance flowing from Nordic countries to Russia. One informer from the Kola branch of GAIA has summarised this by describing how environmental groups in Russia had to go to Sweden to have a meeting in 1996, but were now feeling strong enough to host a meeting themselves.

“In 1996 there was a big meeting in Luleå, where we chose direction: Communication, Forest, Industry / Energy”. In 1999 we tried to further develop cooperation but we failed. We will make a new meeting in Murmansk in 2001 in the autumn to discuss cooperation” (Interview, Gaia Murmansk).

BCC-Kola and BCC-Moscow use of the TRN network is an unusual example of the opposite, as they have used the TRN to reach their own goals and have even exported skills to the Nordic countries.

Many of the ENGOs have received different kinds of assistance. I distinguish between expert-, financial-, technical- and strategic assistance. Financial assistance is money in the form of donations, grants or equipments/resources. Such funds usually come from Nordic Governments via Nordic ENGOs or from project funding from other sources such as the Norwegian Barents Secretariat with help from the Nordic ENGOs. This is the case for Gaia, SPOK, PiM and AETAS. BCC-Kola also receives some funding through the TRN. Sometimes real expertise is exported, such as detailed knowledge about environmental issues. Examples are classes in biology, lectures about global warming or construction of windmills. PiM, SPOK and Gaia are the main receivers of expert help, but also SPOK has received expert assistance via FNL. The other ENGOs relay on their own expertise.

Technical assistance provides skills that are important for an NGO. This can be accounting or computer maintenance, but also NGO specific skills such as arrangement of seminars, printing of flyers, logistic issues or cooking for large groups. Some Scandinavian NGOs also spend a lot of time trying to transfer the knowledge of how to function as democratic, non–elitist member based NGO. This includes transferring of skills such as rules for discussions and decision-making, training on decision-making, and focus on gender issues. Again, Gaia, SPOK and PiM receive such assistance. AETAS does not receive such assistance in any large degree, a reason for this can be the short period that the ENGO has cooperated with NU, or that it is afraid to loose its independence, and be assimilated by PiM.
Finally, strategic assistance is advice regarding which areas to focus on, and how to run political campaigns, but also assistance in making a functional strategy for member growth. Green Cross and Ecology of the North are the only ENGOs not to receive such support from Nordic ENGOs. Green Cross receives strategic assistance from Green Cross International. The BCC-Kola has used the TRN network in order carry out strategic planning.

Table 5.4. Kind and strength of cooperation with Nordic ENGOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian NGO</th>
<th>Partner(s)</th>
<th>Kind of cooperation</th>
<th>Intensity of cooperation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AETAS</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>Strategic and financial.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Growing intensity founded without outside help but now integrating with PiM and NU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC-Kola</td>
<td>TRN and indirectly SSNC.</td>
<td>Strategic, financial and some expert help.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>TRN is a network, but has provided strategic, technical services, expert services and funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIA</td>
<td>NSCN (SPARE) and NU.</td>
<td>Strategic, expert, technical and financial help.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Close relations, significant transfers of money and Norwegians often in Russia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Cross</td>
<td>Green Cross International</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>No cooperation with Nordic ENGOs, but help through Green Cross international and international donors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology of the North</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>No cooperation with Nordic ENGOs, financial help from other European Countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PiM</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>Strategic, technical, expert and financial help.</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very close relations, significant transfers of money and knowledge. Norwegians in Russia for long periods and Russians often in Norway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>FNL, formerly WWF.</td>
<td>Strategic, financial, technical, expert</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Little cooperation in 2001, but very close in the past. Shamed FNL for not being active enough in strategic work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.2 National Networks

Most of the ENGOs have national networks. We can distinguish between networks with other ENGOs, and networks with politicians and bureaucrats. BCC-Kola has the best networks with other ENGOs in Russia, and is together with Gaia members of SEU (Interview Gaia-Murmansk, Interview BCC-Kola, SEU 2007). BCC-Kola is also a member of the TRN and the Russian “Forest Club”, which is an informal network for Russian ENGOs working with protection of forest, and has its own network through BCC. Gaia has a certain omni-presence due to its goal of supporting civil society and ENGOs. It has strengthened its network via the work with collecting signatures for the two referendums. PiM has the smallest network, which mainly consists of contacts with Gaia and the BCC in Apatity.

Having a network inside the local and regional administrations can open many doors, and help speed up government processes. Professors, scientists other specialists and (former) government employees have much better access to the administration, and the administration will listen and consider acting on advice from such sources, and perhaps fund projects. This is partly because of the authority connected to being a specialist. Being a (former) employee in the administration seems to work the same way. This factor can explain some of the success with participation and contest policy tools for Green Cross and for BCC-Kola. The participants in these ENGOs are scientists / professors and (former) employees in the administration. Skills and knowledge base that the active members in Green Cross, BCC-Kola and to some extent SPOK already have through their education or profession will come in addition. This is hard to match for the local or regional administrations. The ENGOs use the skills to cooperate with the government, and to contest it. This “counter-expertise” is difficult to ignore for the administration, and may force it to listen, accept proposals or at least respond. Gaia and to a much lesser degree PiM have chosen another approach, which can generate the same result. Instead of recruiting scientists, they choose to educate themselves, or hire external experts. Gaia has commissioned external experts from the Kola Science Centre to map the conditions for wind power on Kola, while PiM has taken samples and written a report on PCB-contamination (Klescheva et al 2002).
BCC-Kola, Green Cross and Ecology of the North claim that old networks give them access to the administration, and provide an understanding on how things work. Other informers also point out that networks are very important. The fieldwork revealed that SPOK and Gaia were trying to establish local networks. This is a different approach, as they come from a position with limited national networks. This has been rather effective especially for Gaia that has had success in influencing and using the administration to supply services for some of the LA21 projects (energy saving in central heating, composting and so on), and cooperated with schools and the administration in the SPARE project.

5.4.3 Success as a function of networks, summary and sub-conclusion.

The use of national and international networks is summarized in table 5.5. I have demonstrated that networks are very important for the ENGOs, and that international and national networks are important for understanding their success.

PiM and Gaia were founded by Norwegian ENGOs, and the international networks has been very important for the organisation, in deciding structure of the organisation, how they work and what they work with. SPOK and AETAS was founded without international networks, but were contacted at a later stage by Nordic NGOs, and this new relation changed both ENGOs profoundly. Green Cross and BCC-Kola rely on their own national networks. These networks are provided via skills and (former) positions of the members, and were present when the ENGOs were founded. Both ENGOs have the possibility to cooperate with the main office in Moscow. There is also a difference between the two in that the BCC-Kola can draw on help via SEU and the “Forest Club”, and help via the TRN.

In many cases, the national or international networks were already present when the ENGOs were established. Different types of networks are interrelating with both different types of success and different kinds of organisations, thus having effects on both the dependent and independent variable.
5.5 Discussion. What explains success?

I have established that success can be explained by three variables; kind of organisation, policy tools and strategies and use of networks. The most important independent variable is networks. This is because networks come first in time and since they influence kind of organisation, use of policy tools and policy strategies as well.

5.5.1 Three types of success.

ENGOs are a new kind of organisations in Northwest Russia. Some of the ENGOs have existed for only a few years, the oldest in the material is from 1992. I have divided success into political success, organisational success and success in spreading information. The ENGOs with most political success are those that are able to contest and challenge the government, namely the narrow issue specialists, the insider specialists and Gaia. This is because the networks of these organisations have enabled them to enter into contact with the local and regional administrations. The participants in Green Cross already had their network when the ENGO was founded, and this allowed them to work with the administration. Green Cross is designed to work closely with the elite, or in the organisations own words; “GCI serves and collaborates with existing groups in the environmental movement, as well as business and governmental circles in a spirit of co-operation”(Green Cross 2003:2). BCC-Kola used old networks in their contact with the regional administration, but is also able to use its networks with other Russian ENGOs and with foreign ENGOs through the TRN to enter into position vis-à-vis the regional administration. SPOK did not have any good networks (although it was founded after a Druzhina conference) until it was contacted by WWF-Finland and then FNL. Cooperation with the Finns changed SPOK, and strengthened the ENGO to the point where it was starting to be heard. SPOK was however also able to establish its own new networks with other organisations. It is not possible to properly assess Ecology of the North as data is not reliable for this organisation.

The organisations with most political success have less organisational and informative success. This relation may be caused by the ENGOs with high political success being contempt with only having success in one issue. The participation oriented ENGOs lack of
political success can be explained their lack of national networks (and lack of a certain type of international networks). These kinds of networks are crucial in that they allow for use of the most effective policy tools, participate and contest. This restricts the use of the most efficient tool for the participation oriented ENGOs, and attention is therefore focused elsewhere.

Table 5.5 shows the relation between types of success, networks, kind of organisation and use of policy tools and strategies. It also point to the relation between international networks and success, and illustrates that the organisations that lack national networks are also those who have the closest international cooperation. BCC-Kolas use of international networks is important for political success, but BCC-Kola have approached foreign ENGOS through the TRN as an equal partner. This approach towards international networks is different from the approach from participation oriented ENGOs. International networks were important in the formation of Gaia and PiM. AETAS (and SPOK) changed scope and activities fundamentally when it started international cooperation. Without the Nordic contacts, these organisations would have been different. In the case of Gaia, PiM and AETAS, the international cooperation has been so strong that choice of policy tools and focus on policy strategies will mirror, or be strongly influenced by the Nordic partner. This explains PiM and AETAS interest in using policy strategies and distributing information tools, as this is a copy of NUs work in Norway. A similar effect can be seen for Gaia, as the NSCN is behind many strategic choices and projects. This kind of directional international cooperation can even to some extent explain SPOK’s forest field trips, as this is a copy of FNLs work in Finland. The effect from the donor-role of the Nordic ENGOs is important in this aspect.
Table 5.5. Relation between ENGOs, organisation, networks, policy tools and success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGO-Name.</th>
<th>National networks</th>
<th>Internat. networks</th>
<th>Kind of ENGO</th>
<th>Main use of policy tools and policy strategies</th>
<th>Kind of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecology of the North</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Insider specialist.</td>
<td>Participation and information.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Cross</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC-Kola</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Narrow issue specialist.</td>
<td>Information, participation and economic.</td>
<td>Political / Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaia</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Participation oriented.</td>
<td>Information, physical, participation* and policy strategies.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AETAS</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PiM</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational/Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only Gaia.

Figure 5.1 shows the relation between the three independent variables and success. Networks come first in time, allow for the use of certain tools, and for certain kinds of organisations. An international network shapes what the ENGOs work with and how it is organised. Networks will therefore have direct effects on the dependent variable, and indirect effect through both kind of organisation and use of policy tools and strategies.

Figure 5.1. Schematic relations between networks, kinds of ENGOs, policy tools and policy structures and success.
Gaia represents a weakness to the theory. Gaia is strongly influenced by international networks, and had very limited national networks when it was founded. Nevertheless is it able to use a very broad cocktail of policy tools and policy strategies, including participate and contest policy tools. It has a high level of skill, but work with many different issues. Gaia, and especially Gaia in Apatity, are not themselves specialists or experts working on a narrow issue, but concerned citizens that have learned to use experts and knowledge to reach their goal. Gaia is perhaps the most successful ENGO in the material, in the sense that it is able to have success with the most classes of tools, and has all three types of success.

The difference between Gaia and the other participation oriented ENGOs is that it has been able to develop relations and networks locally and regionally, in spite of its strong international networks, and this has enabled it to use participate or contest policy tools. Simultaneously it has established a presence in many different environmental debates, focused on use of information and even carried out capacity building and empowerment of activists and participants.
6. Conclusion

Through the analysis I have demonstrated that success for ENGOs in Northwest Russia is dependent on three variables: kind of organisation, use of policy tools and policy strategies and finally networks. Network is the independent variable that is most important in determining success. National and international networks interrelate with success, but are also having effect on kind of organisation and use of policy tools and strategies. National and certain types of international networks open channels to politicians and to the local and regional administrations, which makes it possible for the ENGOs to exercise influence. This effect influences on which policy tools and strategies the ENGO chooses to use or is able to use, while at the same time affecting the kind of organisation. Organisations which have strong national networks from the beginning are closed and not interested in expanding. International networks have a similar effect. International networks will influence strongly on the kind of organisation, while at the same time influence policy tools and policy strategies used by the ENGOs.

The importance of networks is probably specific with regards to geography and time. The results from the investigation should be valid also for other ENGOs inside Russia, as the political situation was more or less the same for the entire Federation, and maybe for some ex-Soviet countries as well. An unknown factor is the influence from non-Russian partners in other areas of Russia. Networks are probably important in other countries as well, but the data from this investigation does not support use of this theory elsewhere. Time is important since all the ENGOs in the material are so young, and since 2001 was a special period with Russia still in transition. The direct and especially indirect effects from networks can decline with time, so caution should be taken when using networks as an explanation for success in 2007 or in the future.

With time the ENGOs will change, learn and grow. Learning from successes or failures may with time change the ENGO. This is a natural process. Success and failure are teaching crucial lessons, and success or failure can cause the organisation to establish new networks, use new policy tools, or change its form. Figure 5.5 should therefore not be understood as
static. Gaia, the oldest and perhaps most successful ENGO in the material is an example of this process.

6.1 Lessons learned.

When I started this project, I wanted to see if ENGOs could adapt to and work successfully in different political climates. Northwest Russia was a good place to start. I knew the area fairly well in advance, and it had a small, manageable but active ENGO-community. Time and space was also important. Northwest Russia is near Norway, and travelling is easy. Timing seemed to be good. The ENGOs in Russia were all rather new, but had been able to work for almost ten years. I hoped that this had allowed for testing, adoption and adjustment of ENGO-activities.

The purpose of the project was to focus on success, and not exclusively on policy tools. During the fieldwork I started to realise that the ENGOs relayed heavily on national and international networks, but also that there were distinctively different kinds of organisations. Based on the theory on social movements and by using elements from theories on use of policy instruments by governments, I started to define a theoretical framework. During this work I also realised that success could be divided into three different kinds, viz. political, organisational and informative. I ended up with an approach that was more accurate in pinning down conditions for success. A focus on policy tools or kinds of organisations alone would not have uncovered the importance of networks.

In hindsight it would have been interesting to look at two additional aspects for understanding success. Relying on international networks also has a negative side effect. Cooperation with Nordic ENGOs have strong influence on the Russian organisations, to such a degree where important issues such as which topics to work with or how to organise the ENGO is influenced by, or even decided by, the Nordic ENGOs. This may leave the Russian organisations unable to tune their activities according to important issues in the Russian political debate. This can make them miss “easy victories”, work with very unpopular topics or use unpopular and inefficient policy tools. The directional cooperation between Nordic and Russian ENGOs could therefore potentially be seen as inhibit for success. Hønneland
and Jørgensen (2006:126) also points to this potential weakness. There is no strong indication for international cooperation as a weakness in the material, but as the investigation was not designed to look for this aspect, the data is limited. Ecology of The North and Green Cross have no Nordic partners, but both cooperate with other international partners. These are usually programmes set up by the European Union, or large foundations, such as the DOEN Foundation, MacArthur Foundation or Rockefeller foundation. The BCC-Kola also receives such funding. This type of funding usually goes to fund specific projects, and is more specific than the more general support that is donated via Nordic ENGOs, which in the case of PiM and AETAS for instance funds an office. Most ENGOs are able to extract a certain overhead from project funding, but stringent regulations regarding bookkeeping does not allow for large deviations of funds. Since Russian ENGOs have very limited access to other funds this actually implies that the European Union and International foundations to a certain degree decides what issues Russian ENGOs work with. Further investigations on effects of international networks on the ENGOs would therefore be interesting.

I did not interview any politicians or representatives from the regional or local administrations, though I have carried out interviews with bureaucrats in Arkhangelsk in 1999. This was a choice taken early in the process. I wanted to focus closely on the activities of the ENGOs, and not on environmental politics or administrative processes as such. This decision is the other aspect I would have reconsidered today. By interviewing bureaucrats and politicians it could have been possible to shed more light on how ENGOs use their networks to obtain success, and to further investigate the preconditions for entering into a position where politicians and administrators are willing to listen and even act on advice or demands from ENGOs.

6.2 Future trends for Russian ENGOs?

During the work with the thesis I have discovered a significant variation in emphasis on the framing process, and this is an interesting topic for further investigations. Social movement theory focuses on opportunities, mobilising structures and the framing process. The analysis of success of ENGOs in Northwest Russia shows that the emphasis on framing varies
considerably between the ENGOs. The power of ENGOs ultimately rests on what people (or governments or businesses) believe is important and on moral and ethical issues or fundamental ethical systems on what is wrong and what is right. I call this the power base of ENGOs. A successful framing process may strengthen or expand the power base. I argue that the long-time success of ENGOs is dependent on the ability to maintain and expand the power base, that is, success will in the long run depend on winning people’s hearts and minds. The framing process is described in chapter 3.

ENGOs must have a power base in order to use policy tools and have success. Policy tools and policy strategies are capabilities, or ways of applying the power base. The analysis of success and especially of the relation between success vis-à-vis policy tools and strategies shows that some ENGOs have been able to be successful even if the national power base is limited. One way is to draw on a powerbase abroad, and use international pressure or consumer campaigns. Another approach is to ignore grassroots work and approach politicians and the government directly via networks.

So far, the BCC-Kola, Green Cross and SPOK have been successful in approaching the administration to protect biodiversity. By relying on “the force of the best argument”, superior knowledge and skills and assistance from abroad they are able to convince the administration. However, even the best argument is limited by the power base, as it only works as long as the administration will agree that maintaining biodiversity is important, or that protection is necessary for reaching this goal. This process will also hold true when using a power base abroad. German consumers will get tired from countless requests from Russian ENGOs not to buy certain products. And if they do not, perhaps other countries with less emphasis on protecting biodiversity will buy the products?

Information policy tools and policy strategies differ from the other tools in that they also aim at maintaining, expanding and strengthening the power base, that is work with the framing process. Figure 6.1 illustrates this relationship. It describes ENGOs use of policy tools and strategies and shows the framing process as effects of these tools and strategies on the power base. Only through these tools is it possible to reach and teach people about environmental problems and effects, raise awareness and provide alternatives. As there is normally no
action without any effect, all use of policy tools and policy strategies should be expected to have some informative impact.

**Figure 6.1** Relation between ENGOs, policy tools and policy strategies and the power base (framing process).

The effect from all policy tools will fade if the ENGOs fail to build and maintain the power base (unsuccessful framing). The successful function of organisations such as the BCC-Kola, Green Cross and SPOK are dependent on other parties maintaining and expanding the power base. This is why groups such as PiM, AETAS, Gaia and even Terra Incognita have a special importance. By educating the general population and by expanding the member base and training members or participants, they are paving a fundament for future use of policy tools. PiM and AETAS are not the most successful in using policy tools in the short run, but may turn out to be the fundament for future existence and activities of ENGOs in Northwest Russia.

NU and the NSCN have worked since before the end of the Soviet Union in order to establish a civil society in Russia. Both ENGOs have significant experience in setting up local branches and clubs, strengthening the capacity of their active members and carrying out
political work in all levels of society. Finnish and Swedish NGOs have also been involved in similar work with the ultimate goal of establishing and strengthen ENGOs civil society in Russia. This strategy has been backed and financed by Nordic Governments.

Almost ten years of work by skilled Nordic ENGOs have not produced overwhelming results. A lot of knowledge and resources have been poured into Russia, but the process of helping the growth of an environmental movement (or a civil society) is slow. In 2007, six years after my fieldwork, the situation appears similar. An article in Putsj, the magazine of NU, describes PiM and AETAS, and states that the ENGOs now have 350 members (Martiniussen 2007). This is a significant growth measured in percent, but attracting about 200-250 new members in six years in an area with a population close to two millions is not impressive. Is it possible that international networks slow down the growth of ENGOs in Russia? Could international cooperation restrict and prevent success and growth? Since 2001 the Russian Federal Government has been criticised for clamping down on ENGOs, and for making it difficult to receive funding from abroad (Hønneland and Jørgensen 2006:146; McMahon 2005). From the perspective of the Russian federal government it may look as if ENGOs (and probably other NGOs as well) are financed and even partly run by other countries. In this light it is more understandable that the Russian Government are taking steps to restrict the power of ENGOs.
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Personal communication

Attachment I: List of organisations.

Russian ENGOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Kind of NGO</th>
<th>County/Country</th>
<th>Who was interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AETAS</td>
<td>Youth, but open for all.</td>
<td>Arkhangelsk, Russia</td>
<td>Chair + 2 volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaia</td>
<td>Adult, open for all.</td>
<td>Murmansk/Apatity, Russia</td>
<td>Secretary + Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Adult, but only open for “experts” or activists.</td>
<td>Apatity, Russia</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Adult, but only open for “experts” or activists.</td>
<td>Moscow main office, Russia</td>
<td>Volunteer + Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priroda I Molodezh</td>
<td>Youth, open for all.</td>
<td>Murmansk/Apatity, Russia</td>
<td>Chair + Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Incognita</td>
<td>Youth club, open for all.</td>
<td>Arkhangelsk, Russia</td>
<td>Deputy chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology of the North</td>
<td>Adult, closed for new members.</td>
<td>Arkhangelsk, Russia</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>Students, open for all.</td>
<td>Karelia, Russia</td>
<td>Chair + deputy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Cross.</td>
<td>Adult, openness in question.</td>
<td>Arkhangelsk, Russia</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this list several other groups have been contacted but not formally interviewed. Valuable help has come from the Taiga Rescue Network Head office, from SEU Moscow, and from the Garant Centre, a Resource centre for NGOs in Arkhangelsk.

Scandinavian NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Kind of NGO</th>
<th>County/Country</th>
<th>Who was interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natur og Ungdom</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Russia secretary x2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svenska Naturskyddsföreningen</td>
<td>Adult/ All</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Hired staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faltbiologerna</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Volunteer (central board).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF-Finland</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Info coordinator / campaigner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Nature League (LL)</td>
<td>Youth +</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Russia secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norges Naturvernforbund</td>
<td>Adult/ all</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Russia contact person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRN-Russia / SEU</td>
<td>Network, all who sign platform</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia and Jokkmokk, Sweden</td>
<td>Coordinator for European Russia TRN and member of SEU, information coordinator (TRN).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment II: The questions

1. Name of informant
2. Name of NGO, and informant’s position
3. About the organisation:
   - Number of members
   - How old is your organisation
   - Do you have any formal (written down) history?
   - Do you have a formal platform, is it written down?
   - Do you have a web site?
   - Do you have any written information about your NGO in English/French/German
4. What is the purpose or goal of the NGO?
5. Ask informant: tell me, in your own words, what you and your NGO doing?
6. What kind of policy tools are you using?
   (How do you try to change the world so that it fits better to your vision or goal)?
7. Do you feel you have access to: bureaucrats, politicians, and private companies?
   (Access defined as; can you get in contact, and will they listen to you, and if they
   listen, can it possibly have any effect?). If yes answers, tell me how and how often
   there is contact.
8. Access to population? (Does the public now of you, can you reach the public, do you try to
   reach the public, and if yes how?). Access to newspapers (local, federal) TV (local,
   federal) radio (local, federal) If yes, how often?
9. Do you have strategy for member growth, do you want more members?
10. Do you have a vision for a future society?
11. Why are there no big ENGOs in Russia?
12. What do you think is the main obstacles or problems for the work of your NGO?
13. How are you financed?17
14. Do you feel influenced from the west?

17 Added later, not asked PiM. In retrospective this question sounds strange. Experience is however that this was a question
   that trigged response immediately, without explanation.
Attachment III: List of policy tools in use by the ENGOs.

*SPOK.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Publishes publications (non periodicals), and carries out activities such as lectures for children and students. Stands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Some use of local media, (some articles per year).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gathering of information</td>
<td>Gathering of information by performing field trips into forests in order to perform inventories of biologically valuable old growth forest. A total of nine expeditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>Have some contact with administration and politicians at republican level. The FNL-informer is more optimistic about the lobby-capacity of SPOK than the informers from SPOK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate or contest government.</td>
<td>Formal participation</td>
<td>Limited participation. Some contact with deputies in the Republic Duma in order to make better forest law. Some contact with a Republic level working group working on forestry law. Works with making suggestions for new standard for forestry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Have cooperated in mapping and defining areas for protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical tools</td>
<td>Direct actions</td>
<td>Have not carried out direct actions, but have plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic tools</td>
<td>Consumer campaign</td>
<td>Takes part in larger pan-European consumer campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy strategies</td>
<td>Capacity building.</td>
<td>Little works appears to be invested in developing the NGO structure. They have plans to secure money for an office first. The expeditions (a bit like summer camps) are also a tool to recruit members. Also have plans for getting more members. Carries out some activities at the university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AETAS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Hands out leaflets, hold lectures in schools, direct contact with people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Some articles in local written media (1-5 per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gathering of information</td>
<td>Gathering of information by taking samples of possible contaminated PCB oil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>Limited, some contact with administration. Lost contact with politicians after election.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participate or contest government.</strong></td>
<td>Formal participation</td>
<td>Have participated in programme for presenting ideas to government. Feels exclude, and that their ideas were “stolen” by the administration. Summer camps for homeless children have been financed by the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving local environment</td>
<td>Tree planting, construction of benches in parks, stop local garbage burning project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy strategies</strong></td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Limited. A plan for activities after funding for office is secured is planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase member base</td>
<td>Lectures in schools and the handing out of leaflets, partly with the aim of increasing member base.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Gaia.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Produce their own publications for schools, contacts people in local society and arrange seminars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Use local media, including television.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>Contact with administration and politicians. Even federal contacts in department responsible for teaching. Started and participated in letter / fax-campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate or contest government</td>
<td>Formal participation</td>
<td>Arranged public hearings, and worked for / distributed information about energy efficiency. Some projects have been stopped by authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Programme to build a windmill. Electricity is public services in Russia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical tools</td>
<td>Direct actions</td>
<td>No, plans one to participate in one action in 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving local environment</td>
<td>Programme for compost and kitchen gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy strategies</td>
<td>Capacity building.</td>
<td>Yes. Tries to establish groups that can work on various environmental issues (energy, organic farming). Plans programme for consolidation and integration of the environmental movement. Teaches and trains members through seminars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase member base</td>
<td>Yes, by setting up groups that works with specific issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Terra Incognita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Hand out leaflets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Contact people in local society and arrange seminars / roundtables about environmental topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Use local media, including television.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate or contest government</td>
<td>Formal participation</td>
<td>Does not do lobby or political activity in a normal sense, but have good contacts with the administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical tools</td>
<td>Direct actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving local environment</td>
<td>Tree planting and “anti-plastic” campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic tools</td>
<td>Consumer campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy strategies</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Yes. Have a strategy for member growth. Arrange a variety of activities, expeditions and camps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase member base</td>
<td>Yes, use activities and leaflets to attract members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Green Cross

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Teach about the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Arrange seminars and roundtables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather</td>
<td>Carries out investigations into environmental problems and produces reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>Well connected with the administration. Members belong to local “elite”. Extent of lobby activities difficult to measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate or contest government</td>
<td>Formal participation</td>
<td>Formal participation through roundtables and letters to the administration, and by arranging the government supported field trip on the Dvina river. Have also tried to use the law against discharges from the Kotlas pulp and paper plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical tools</td>
<td>Direct actions</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving local environment</td>
<td>Claims to support other ENGOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic tools</td>
<td>Consumer campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy strategies</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>None apart from general teaching of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase member base</td>
<td>Answers that current member base is sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Claims to support other ENGOs in the area financially.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BCC-Kola

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Arrange seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Hand out leaflets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Have a web page through BCC-Moscow. Use local media, TV (a few occasions) and newspapers. Only local media. Have produced TV-films.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather</td>
<td>Carries out and organises investigations and produces reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>Has some connections (1-2 meetings annually with politicians on oblast level, more frequent on local level). Closer contact with oblast administration (“all the time”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participate or contest government</strong></td>
<td>Formal participation</td>
<td>Formal participation through roundtables and letters to the administration. Have threatened to use law against illegal logging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Carries out inventories in the forest. Defines areas for nature protection. Direct contact with logging companies and workers in order to prevent logging in specific areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical tools</strong></td>
<td>Direct actions</td>
<td>One. Have threatened twice with use of actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving local environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic tools</strong></td>
<td>Consumer campaign</td>
<td>Participates in a European campaign with consumer campaigns in Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy strategies</strong></td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase member base</td>
<td>Have no plans for expansion of member base but wants more members, no apparent strategy for training of members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ecology of the North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Produce their own publications, and a forum for journalists wring about the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Arrange roundtables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Use local / regional media. Are to some extent journalists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather</td>
<td>Fact finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>No formal lobby apart from roundtables, but some of the members have good personal contacts in the regional administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate or contest government</td>
<td>Formal participation</td>
<td>Formal participation through roundtables and letters to the administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Started working with creating FSC-criteria’s for sustainable logging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical tools</td>
<td>Direct actions</td>
<td>Not since campaign against nuclear power plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving local environment</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic tools</td>
<td>Consumer campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase member base</td>
<td>Does not want to increase number of members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Prioroda i Molodezh (PiM)

#### Use of policy tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Produce their own publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Arrange internal seminars which are open for everyone, and holds lectures in schools about environmental issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Use local / regional media, 1-5 articles per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather</td>
<td>Fact finding (PCB-campaign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>No formal lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate or contest government</td>
<td>Formal participation</td>
<td>No formal participation detected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical tools</td>
<td>Direct actions</td>
<td>Use direct actions such as demonstrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving local environment</td>
<td>Campaign against stray dogs and campaign against illegal logging of new year trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic tools</td>
<td>Consumer campaign</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy strategies</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Many activities. Monthly “discussion club” in on environmental issues (Apatity club), internal seminars on environmental topics and internal seminars directly aimed at capacity building, summer camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase member base</td>
<td>Lectures in schools, handing out leaflets, inviting non-members to seminars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 These seminars are a copy of NUs “Treningsleir” or activist training course, remodelled to work in Russia. It includes media training, self confidence building, discussion techniques, planning techniques etc.