CSD Center for the Study of Democracy

An Organized Research Unit

University of California, Irvine

This paper pursues an ambitious goal to examine the extent to which environmental groups cooperate globally. The literature on international environmentalism has increasingly stressed the development of cooperative networks among environmental NGOs, the sharing of environmental information and resources, and the development of a global civil society within the environmental movement (Lipschutz 1996; Young 1994; Wapner 1996; Prinzen and Finger 1994). We want to determine the actual extent of this global environmental network, and the implications for international environmentalism.

In order to study this topic, we examine the responses of 248 environmental groups included in the 1998 Global Environmental Organizations Survey (GEOS). As we will document, the responses to our questions yield valuable insights into the extent to which groups cooperate nationally and internationally, and the nature of this cooperation. In addition, we provide an initial explanation for the crossnational variation in groups' responses to our questions.

The Theoretical Backdrop of the Study

The need to consider seriously the global dimension of ecological issues is underscored by the growing public concern with ecological issues on a global scale (Dunlap et al. 1993). Perhaps the most surprising-some might say perplexing-finding emerging from recent international environmental opinion studies is the degree of support for environmental protection in the developing world. Most of these studies indicate that there is virtually a global consensus on the need to protect the environment (Dunlap et al. 1993). For example, people in Nigeria or China are as likely as the Dutch and the Danes to perceive ecological problems as a pressing matter (Worcester 1993). In addition, a surprisingly large proportion of individuals in less affluent nations endorse increased government spending in order to protect the environment (Dalton and Rohrschneider 1997). Public concern is not limited to the government's purse; people are willing to have their taxes increased so governments can spend more on environmental protection. Surprisingly, the basic patterns holds regardless of the nation's economic development level.

Paralleling an apparently spreading global consciousness about environmental protection, the environmental movement itself is developing a global presence. Initially, environmental groups were active in advanced industrial democracies (Dalton 1994; Lowe and Goyder 1983; Dunlap and Mertig 1992). Environmental NGOs stage public events that attracted attention to

---

Russell J. Dalton is a professor of political science at the University of California, Irvine and Robert Rohrschneider is a professor of politicaal science at Indiana University, Bloomington.

environmental issues, mobilized public support, and often embarrassed policy makers. They lobbied behind the scenes in order to accomplish modest changes in policies. Or they attended international conferences-such as the seminal 1972 Stockholm Conference--in order to influence the shape of the emerging international environmental regime. While the specific activities and goals of these environmental groups varied, together they formed a formidable opponent to entrenched economic interests (Dalton 1994).

Increasingly, the activities of environmental groups have expanded beyond the advanced industrial democracies. At the international level, a growing number of international organizations[2] have formed in recent decades to lobby international systems to focus on the threat of environmental degradation, both at the level of the UN (Meyer et al. 1997) and the European community (Rucht 1996). For example, while there were fewer than 40 international environmental organizations in 1945, the number has increased exponentially and now encompasses approximately 200 organizations (Meyer et al. 1997; Smith 1997). Some analysts claim that the activities of international organizations have changed international environmental protection rules, such as those governing the disposal of radioactive nuclear waste in world oceans (Ringius 1997).

Another development has been the formation of multinational environmental groups, with branches in several nations and interconnected planning and activities. The World Wildlife Fund, for example, was first established in 1961; today WWF claims a worldwide membership of 4.7 million with national affiliates in 27 nations, including Brazil, Indonesia, Malaysia and Pakistan. Greenpeace is a much more contentious and assertive part of the environmental movement; it now lists more 42 national affiliates around the globe, including groups in China, India, Mexico, New Guinea, Russia, Turkey and the Ukraine. The Friends of the Earth network claims national affiliates in 60 nations. In addition, the indigenous environmental movement has seemingly taken root in less developed nations, such as the development of groups in Brazil to protect the rainforests, or local problems stimulating group formation.

Evidently, then, a global environmental movement is forming. Given these developments, many scholars have suggested the emergence of a Transnational Social Movement on environmental issues. James Rosenau, for instance, claims "[social movements] have evolved as well-springs of global governance in recent decades.Social movements are thus constituent parts of the globalization process" (1998: 42). Others have trumpeted transnational social movements as the basis for a new pattern of global civil society and communitarian democracy (Lipschutz 1996; Wapner 1994; Archibugi et al. 1998).

According to the "strong thesis" of global movements, the rapid modernization of societies and the growing globalization of the economy have created incentives for environmental organizations to transcend nation-state boundaries. Before the onset of these developments, movements focused on activities within nations because national governments were primarily responsible for developing solutions to grievances (working conditions, women's rights, etc.). Because of the nature of these grievances and the national locus of authority, it was logical for movements to stay within national borders to advocate policy change. And given the technological means available to movements, it was necessary for them to limit their activities to the territory of nation-states. Movements thus formed primarily within national boundaries.

The onset of modernization and globalization supposedly change the broad framework within which the environmental movement operates (Held 1998). The strong version of the global movement thesis suggests that environmental movements must reach beyond the nation-

state. Modernization creates a sophisticated communications and transportation infrastructure that facilitates international exchange.3 Thus modernization on a global scale means that the environmental problems in one region of the world are quickly known across the globe. The destruction of the Amazon rain is no longer removed from citizens' experience in other nations of the region or in other regions of the globe.

Relatedly, globalization means that pollution is increasingly difficult to redress with nation-specific solutions (Wapner 1994; Rosenau 1990, 1998). Because air pollution, for example, does not stop at national boundaries, inter-governmental agreements are needed in order to improve environmental conditions. National governments alone cannot develop the policies to ensure air quality, to protect the rivers and seas that cross national boundaries, or to protect the populace from other pollution effects of neighboring nations. In addition, in the last decade there has been an increasing awareness that many urgent environmental problems-global warming, ozone depletion, and biodiversity protection--are really global in scope and require a global solution. Thus, international agreements are a prerequisite for environmental protection. Increasingly, then, the locus of responsibility for policies designed to redress grievances shifts from the national to the international level.

The global movement thesis argues that these forces lead to an increasing commonality of interests among environmental groups in different nations. They meet each other at international environmental symposiums, they communicate on the internet, they share their experiences, and they begin to work together on common interests. Friends of the Earth in London, for example, works with Brazilian groups on a campaign to protect the Amazonian rainforest. Environmental groups in Russia and the Ukraine network with Western groups that can provide them with expertise on nuclear pollution issues that are especially problematic in their nation. Environmental groups that are trying to block an economic development project seek international allies who can help them lobby the World Bank or other loan guarantors. Slowly, a global civil society is supposedly developing within the environmental movement.

The hard evidence in support of a global civil society within the environmental movement is somewhat ambiguous, however. Despite frequent claims of this development, much of the evidence remains anecdotal and descriptive. It is clear that many NGOs attend international environmental summits, from Stockholm to Kyoto, but attendance at an international meeting does not necessarily translate into sustained cooperation. The literature is filled with reports on examples of cooperation across national borders, but scholars are less likely to write about cooperative efforts that failed (or those possible cooperative activities that never developed).

Furthermore, one of the most prominent movement analysts, Sidney Tarrow (1998) has been fairly sanguine about the effectiveness of the transnational environmental movement that has emerged thus far. We know from the social movement literature that NGOs must be primarily concerned about their domestic constituency, since this is normally their primary source of funding and political support. According to Tarrow, one lesson of the social movement literature is that movements succeed primarily if they "take root among pre-existing social networks in which relations of trust, reciprocity, and cultural learning are shared" (Tarrow 1996: 16). To members of an environmental group in Frankfurt, protection of the Amazon forest may seem less pressing than steps to clean up the Rhine.

In addition, Tarrow (1998) is also quite critical of the simplicity of the "strong thesis" in arguing for international actions to protect the environment. Tarrow's maintains that international

environmental organizations-those that lack a clear identifiable national base-are more likely to succeed if they are supported by a dense network of national environmental organizations. This is because the odds for success are enhanced if national movements pressure national governments into activity at the international level. The UN will be less forceful in pushing for environmental legislation if national governments do not feel the pressure of domestic environmental groups. Tarrow points to the difficulty that the labor movement in Western Europe faces in negotiating with multi-national organizations. If well-developed unions face difficulties in dealing with a strong international competitor, then one may expect environmental groups to be even more challenged in achieving global regulations of the economy. In short, a well-developed transnational movement should, according to Tarrow, be grounded in a strong network of national organizations.

This paper attempts to determine whether a global network of cooperation has developed among environmental groups. Are environmental groups cooperating globally as the transnational movement thesis suggests? We expect that groups will cooperate-this is not a simple yes/no question-but the question is the degree and nature of group cooperation? Is cooperation limited to advanced democracies or does it include groups from lesser developed parts of the world; in which ways do groups cooperate? What explains any differences in group cooperation? These are the questions the next section begins to address.

The 1998 Global Environmental Organizations Survey

Although there have been many systematic empirical studies of environmental groups, nearly all of these studies have been conducted in advanced industrial democracies (Lowe and Goyder 1983; Dalton 1994; Rucht 1989; Diani 1995). For the OECD nations we have extensive information on the important national environmental groups, their members, their issue interests, and even their staffing and budgetary resources. When one goes beyond the OECD nations, however, the information on environmental NGOs is much less extensively researched. Sometimes there are reports on the environmental movement in a single nation, but more often the literature only contains a report of a specific environmental campaign or the experience of a single environmental group. For instances, Lipschutz's (1996) influential book on environmentalism and global civil society is based on studies of environmental groups in three cases (California, Hungary and Indonesia).

Our goal was to provide a first systematic assessment of the interests and activities of environmental organizations that reached beyond the OECD nations. We began by compiling a list of the major environmental NGOs in the OECD nations, which was a relatively simple task based on prior research and an extensive series of published environmental directories. We then repeated this process for environmental groups in the nations of Latin America and Eastern Europe. Because discussions of global environmentalism often focus on North/South issues that involve Latin America, and because the democratic rights necessary to develop NGO exist in this region, we saw Latin America as the prime area for the formation of environmental groups in the developing world. The former communist nations of Eastern Europe and the CIS provide another natural basis of study on whether environmental groups were developing in these nations, and whether extensive international aid had connected these groups to the international network of environmental NGOs. In addition, we purposively selected other nations in East Asia that might have significant environmental movements.[4] We used a variety of environmental handbooks and

internet sources to compile a sampling base of environmental groups in 59 nations on five continents.

We developed a four-page mail questionnaire that addressed several issues: the environmental interests of the group, their evaluation of the environmental performance of various national political institutions, their use of various types of political activity, and information on the organizational characteristics of the group. Many of these questions replicated our earlier research on European environmental groups (Dalton 1994). In addition, we included several questions that inquired into the international and transnational activities of each group-the focus of the research presented here.

The questionnaire-in either English or Spanish-was mailed to environmental groups in two mailings during 1998. The database began with 698 groups; 51 questionnaires were returned by the post office because the group no longer existed or did not have a forwarding address.5 We received a completed questionnaire from 248 environmental groups representing 55 nations. This generates a response rate of 38 percent, which we consider a low estimate of the actual response rate among significant national groups. We say this because the information on environmental groups in developing nations is less reliable, and the environmental movement is more highly fragmented into small and fluid groups. For instance, our database identifies 40 prospective environmental groups from Brazil, but only 11 for Germany. We received responses from 6 of the German NGOs (54%) but from only 7 of the Brazilian groups (18%); the smallest of the German mass-membership groups we surveyed has 110,000 members and the largest of the Brazil membership groups has only 20,000 members.

It is our impression that response rates are limited in OECD nations because groups are frequently surveyed (as we were told in one acerbic response). In contrast, many NGOs in developing nations seemed surprised and pleased to be included in GEOS. These groups obviously experience less research-fatigue than OECD groups; but many NGOs in developing nations also lack resources and many others have ceased to exist. We believe that the effective response rate for our survey, if such factors could be accurately estimated, would be over 50 percent. Thus, we feel that the 1998 Global Environmental Organizations Survey provides a reasonable basis for making initial estimates about the behaviors and orientations of environmental groups in a near-global scale.

The Interests of Environmental Organizations

Our analyses follow a multistep approach. We begin by examining the extent to which international environmental problems are a concern to national environmental NGOs, because this would presumably stimulate international cooperation. Then, we turn our attention to the actual degree of international interaction and cooperation among environmental groups. Finally, we attempt to explain the crossnational patterns of action that we observe.

Issue Concerns

One potential explanation for the development of a global community is a shared interest in international environmental issues. Groups that are concerned about matters such as global warming or depletion of the ozone layer are presumably more likely to turn to international environmental action and cooperation with other national environmental groups to pursue a

global solution to these problems. In contrast, groups focusing on domestic nature and wildlife issues might be more concerned with national political activities and national networks. In the past, this issue area has been the predominant focus of nature conservation organizations which advanced the environmental cause by protecting limited areas of unspoiled land (Bramwell 1989).

The 1998 GEOS asked group representatives a series of questions about the importance they attached to various environmental problems:

"Here is a list of environmental issues that may be affecting the world as a whole. Could you indicate how important this issue is to the activities and political concerns of your group?"

We listed six different environmental domains (Table 1). We designed the question to tap differences between primarily nationally-centered wildlife issues (protecting nature or the preservation of particular species) versus prototypical international issues such as the ozone layer and global warming. We expect that groups which are mainly concerned with global warming issues would be disproportionately engaged in international activities.

Table 1. What Problems do Environmental Groups Focus on?

Issue	North America	Latin America	Western Europe	East Europe	Pacific Rim	Asia
Water Polution	50.0	73.4	53.8	50.0	42.3	72.2
Natural Areas	95.0	93.8	71.3	84.0	80.8	90.9
Local Wildlife	77.8	83.1	58.2	70.8	68.0	81.8
Global warming	60.0	50.8	56.4	9.1	53.8	50.0
Loss of Ozone	27.8	33.8	26.7	50.0	30.8	30.0
Global biodiversity	90.0	73.8	63.0	68.0	73.1	72.7
(N-of-Cases)	18-21	61-65	91-96	22-25	25-26	9-11

Note: Entries are percentages of groups saying that a problem is either the highest priority or very important.

In displaying the results for this paper, we combined groups by region in order to make the results more interpretable. We distinguish between six regions. The North-American

category consists of groups from the US (mostly) and Canada. Latin America, Western Europe, and East Europe are self-explanatory labels (see the appendix for exact nations). The Pacific Rim contains groups from Australia, Japan, and New Zealand. Finally, Asia contains groups from Turkey, India, South Korea, and China.

Environmental NGOs are interested in a fairly wide range of issues (Table 1). The protection of natural areas and the protection of local wildlife attract wide attention across regions-two-thirds or more consider these to be the highest priority or very important for their group. Many groups are also concerned with water pollution, ranging from 42 percent in the Pacific Rim to 73 percent in Latin America. All in all, these "domestic" issues are clearly part of the priority agenda for most environmental NGOs.

Three other issues-global warming, loss of ozone, and global biodiversity-were designed to tap the international dimension of ecological problems. A fairly large percentage of groups claim to focus on global warming. With the exception of Eastern Europe, where only 9 percent of groups list this as a central concern, a majority in the other regions indicate this is very important to their group. The fairly high percentage is expected in affluent regions, such as North America (60 percent), western Europe (56 percent) and the Pacific Rim (54 percent). But similar percentages emerge in Latin America and Asia. Global biodiversity is also an important issue to most environmental groups. Only concern for the diminishing ozone layer fails to generate a majority of concern across regions.

Overall, two distinct issue dimension emerge as NGOs' primary focus in these analyses.6 The domestic environmental dimension clearly is the primary focus of a majority of groups in most regions; but an international dimension occupies significant attention in most regions of the world.

National versus International Focus

While the preceding analyses suggest that there is a distinct dimensionality to the focus of groups, it is unclear whether the type of issue determines the arena for policy action. For example, a group may be concerned with global warming and it may decide that this problem warrants a reduction in CO2 emissions within the group's own nation. Thus, while a group is ultimately concerned with an international issue, it may lobby for solutions primarily at the national level. Likewise, a group may be concerned with wildlife issues which initially suggest a predominant focus on a nation's natural resources. At the same time, if groups perceive the globalization of the economy to be a threat to wildlife issues in remote areas, it would lead to action on international issues, such as a focus on the destruction of forests in Latin America and South East Asia. In short, the issue focus may suggest a group's geographic perspective, but this alone cannot be taken as evidence for groups' orientation toward political action.

To assess the international orientation of environmental NGOs, we asked groups the following question:

> "To what extent is your group primarily concerned with national environmental issues versus issues of an international or global nature? Please select the most appropriate description based on the following categories."

Groups adopt various perspectives along the national-international continuum (Table 2).

For example, in North America (almost exclusively groups from the U.S.), 40 percent of the groups focus more on international issues than on national issues. The percentages in this category are lower in Western Europe and the Pacific Rim, but even here the international dimension constitutes a substantial element in groups' ecological activism. In contrast, the national dimension is the predominant focus in Eastern Europe and Latin America. In Asia, no group adopts a primarily international orientation. Similarly, most groups in Eastern Europe have a primary focus on national issues (60 percent).

Table 2. The Geographic Scope of Groups' Issue Focus

***Group focuses*:**	**North America**	**Latin America**	**Western Europe**	**East Europe**	**Pacific Rim**	**Asia**
Primarily on national issues	15.0	49.2	24.7	16.0	36.0	27.3
More on national than international issues	30.0	8.2	34.4	44.0	28.0	27.3
Equally on national and international issues	15.0	34.4	21.5	36.0	28.0	45.5
More on international than natioal issues	15.0	8.2	6.5	4.0	4.0	0.0
Primarily on International issues	25.0	0.0	12.9	0.0	4.0	0.0
(N-of-Cases)	18	61	93	25	25	11

Note: Entries are percentages selecting each option.

The transnational movement society appears to be more common in the advanced industrial democracies, while environmental NGOs in the lesser developed parts of the world focus on local issues. The analyses in Table 3 suggest that a partial explanation may be the type of issues that concern environmental groups. NGOs that are more concerned with global warming and the loss of ozone say their group is generally oriented toward international issues (A positive sign indicates that groups focus mainly on national issues; see footnote 6 on index construction). The major exception to this tendency are the US groups where issues interests are not related to the national-international dimension. Conversely, there is some tendency across the regions for groups with a focus on protecting natural areas and local wildlife to base their activism primarily on national issues.

Table 3. The Link between International Issue Focus and Geographic Scope

Region	Global	National
North America	-.01	-.16
Latin America	.39	-.04
Western Europe	.33	-.41
East Central Europe	.19	-.63
Pacific Rim	.51	-.21
Asia	.49	-.55

Note: Entries are pearson's correlation coefficients between groups' issue focus and an international issue focus. See footnote 6 for details about the construction of the global and national indicators. A positive sign indicates that an issue orientation correlates with greater international orientation.

Transnational Cooperation

The preceding section suggests that environmental groups are surprisingly global in outlook. Attention to common global environmental concerns, such as ozone depletion and global warming, provides a potential basis for transnational action by environmental NGOs. In addition, national groups may even collaborate on the basis of domestic environmental concerns of each nation, such as ornithological groups cooperating on issues of bird protection, or groups concerned with chemical wastes sharing technology across borders. One important question therefore is whether such international collaboration occurs, and in which ways.

The 1998 GEOS contained a battery of questions on the transnational actions of environmental groups:

> "How active has your group been in international environmental activities?
> During the past 2-3 years, how often has your group participated in the following activities?"

We asked groups about the activities listed in Table 4. These data reflect considerable cooperation across national boundaries. The first four items in the table tap general involvement in international exchange, such as meeting with groups from other nations to exchange information or coordinate activities, or participating in international conferences, or dealing with an international agenda. In nearly all of these areas, a majority of environmental NGOs in each region say they are fairly active in exchanging information and in coordinating their activities with groups or agencies from other nations. For example, 81 percent of North American groups often or sometimes met with groups from other nations to exchange information, and this percentage is even higher in most other regions.

Table 4. A Global Environmental Network

Activity	North America	Latin America	Western Europe	East Europe	Pacific Rim	Asia
1. Met groups from other nations to exchange information	81.0	89.2	89.6	92.0	76.9	100.0
2. Met groups from other nations to coordinate activites	66.7	67.2	76.0	75.0	57.7	70.0
3. Attend international conferences	81.0	80.6	82.3	87.5	69.2	100.0
4. Dealt with an international agency	76.2	72.7	53.7	39.1	46.2	77.8
5. Received money from groups/agency outside own nation	21.1	64.6	26.6	83.3	7.7	54.4
6. Provided money to groups/agency outside own nation	40.0	3.2	29.5	21.7	11.5	0.0
7. Received technical resources from agency/groups outside nation	61.9	80.6	56.3	70.8	46.2	72.7
8. Provided technical resources from agency/groups outside nation	71.4	63.6	69.5	43.5	57.7	33.3
(N-of-Cases)	19-21	62-65	90-96	22-26	90-96	

Note: Entries are percentages of groups which engage in an activity often or sometimes

The next four items in Table 4 are designed to determine the possible asymmetries in transnational actions. For instance, we asked groups whether they gave money or received money from a group or agency outside their nation, or whether they gave or received technical resources from an external source. There is a very high level of technical exchange among

environmental groups-on both the provision and receipt of such support. But there is also an expected asymmetry to this exchange. If we take the simple difference between the provision and receipt of information, the balance is positive in North America (+1), Western Europe (+14) and the Pacific Rim (+12)-meaning these groups say that they are more likely to supply technical assistance than to receive assistance. The balance tends to be negative for groups from the developing world: Latin America (-14), Eastern Europe (-27) and Asia (-39).

The imbalance of transnational interactions is even clearer for funding. American environmental groups, for example, are about twice as likely to say that they have provided funds to an external actor (40 percent) as to have received external funding (21 percent). Western European groups are also a net exporter of funds. In contrast, groups in the developing world acknowledge their acceptance of external funding; the provide/receive imbalance is quite uneven: Latin America (-62), Eastern Europe (-61) and East Asia (-54).

In order to uncover the patterns in these activities, we examined the interrelationship among the various activities of groups. Factor analyses identify three different types of activities.7A first factor consists of attending conferences, or meeting groups to coordinate activities or to exchange information (indicators 1-3 in Table 4). A second pattern consists of receiving money or technical resources. A third pattern is to supplying these resources to other groups.

Table 5 displays the extent to which groups engage in each of the three types of activities. Groups from all regions communicate about their activities with other groups or international agencies. For example, 48 percent of North American groups scored high on communicative activities, closely followed by European groups (44 percent) and groups from East-Central Europe (44 percent). Groups from the Pacific Rim and Asia are less likely to engage in international communication.

Table 5. The General Nature of Group Activities

Region	Communicator (a)	Recipient (b)	Supplier (b)
North America	47.6	10.6	30.0
Latin America	38.1	50.8	3.2
Western Europe	43.8	12.8	21.3
East Central Europe	43.5	41.7	8.7
Pacific Rim	23.1	7.7	7.7
Asia	33.3	54.5	0.0

Note: See endnote 7 for details about the construction of these three indicators. Entries in the Communicator colum are groups who are in close contact with groups from other areas (categories 3 and 4). Entries in the Recipient and Supplier columns represent the percentage of groups coded 2 or 3 on the respective indicator.

The other two variables summarize the extent to which groups exchange resources (either money or technical resources). Here, we find a clear pattern whereby groups from affluent regions (North America, Western Europe, and the Pacific Rim) tend to be on the giving end while groups from less affluent nations are more likely to receive resources. About a third of North American and one fifth of groups from western Europe supply resources to other groups. Transfer of technical and financial resources is thus practiced by a distinct minority of groups. At the other end of these transactions, a substantial number of NGOs from Asia (54.5 percent), Latin America (50.8 percent) and East-Central Europe (41.7 percent) report that they have received either technical or financial support from groups outside of their nation.

These patterns of group activism probably reflect a significant transfer of resources across regions-primarily a transfer from the developed world to environmental groups in less developed nations. In a mail questionnaire we could not probe to determine which groups were supplying resources to which groups. But we did use another question to determine whether cross-national exchanges were with neighboring nations, within the region, or of a broader international scale (Table 6). When asked about the scope of their international activities, a majority of groups in every region indicates that their contacts involve both groups from neighboring countries and groups from outside their region. What is noteworthy is that many groups-especially among American NGOs-say that most of their contacts are with groups outside of their region. While the response categories do not permit us to pinpoint with greater precision the geographic focus of various groups, this response pattern suggests that these activities contain a genuine international component.

Table 6. The Geographic Scope of Group Activities

Group has:	**North America**	**Latin America**	**Western Europe**	**East Europe**	**Pacific Rim**	**Asia**
No international contacts	0.0	4.6	2.2	0.0	8.0	0.0
Contacts mostly with groups in neighboring countries	4.8	12.3	23.1	20.8	16.0	9.1
Contacts with groups in neighboring countries and outside region	61.9	63.1	65.9	70.8	72.0	90.9
Contacts mostly with groups outside region	33.3	20.0	8.8	8.3	4.0	0.0
(N-of-Cases)	21	65	91	24	25	11

Note: Entries represent percentages.

Predicting Group Activities

It is clear that there is a substantial amount of international interaction among environmental NGOs. Most participation in an international communications network, involving conference participation and meeting with others in the environmental community. In addition, some groups are providers of information and resources, and other groups are recipients of such support. Our final goal in the paper was to examine the variations in these patterns: to determine which factors lead groups to partake in these international exchanges.

Interests. A rational-actor model of interest group activity would make the direct prediction that the issue interests of environmental NGOs should guide their participation in transnational activities. We expect groups concerned with global issues will be more involved in transnational action, and groups that explictly say they are concerned with international issues (Table 2) are more likely to be involved in transnational networks.

Resources. The social movement literature has generally stressed the importance of resources in explaining the behavior of social movement organizations (McCarthy and Zald 1977; Zald and McCarthy 1987). Often this research has stressed how groups are influenced by their need to mobilize resources. In our case, a resource explanation is even more direct. We should expect that environmental groups with substantial resources are more likely to possess the ability to attend international meetings and to participate in transnational actvities, and are more likely to provide a source of resources for less endowed environmental groups.

Ideology. The two previous figures treat green NGOs as simple rational actors, but we know from prior research that ideology is also important in structuring the behavior of social movement organizations (Dalton 1994). In terms of transnational action, we would hypothesize that groups with a social change orientation would be more likely to participate in the international community to seek support from other progressive environmental groups and foundations. To test this hypothesis, we included a 10-point scale that assesses the environmental orientation of the group, distinguishing groups that feel that fundamental change is required to protect the environment.[8]

Region. Finally, as we have discussed above, regional influences can shape the international activity of an environmental group. In part, regional differences exist in the interests, resources and ideology of green NGOs. In addition, we might expect that there are specific features of the regional condition that spur or impede international activity. For example, Latin American groups may be drawn into international activity because of the emphasis on global environmental issues that directly impinge on the region.

Table 7 presents the results from three regression analyses, explaining our three measures of international cooperation: communication, recipient of resources, or supplier of resources. The strongest predictor in each case is the annual budget of the environmental group.[9] Groups with greater financial resources are more likely to communicate with groups outside their nation, and to provide resources to other environmental groups. Surprisingly, the more affluent groups are also more likely to receive resources from international sources-their participation in the international community means they both share their resources and they garner additional resources from other sources.

An international issue focus also prompts a group to be more involved in international activities. This relationship seems self-evident, but in further analyses (not shown) we found that this relationship does not appear for Latin American and Asian NGOs. Thus, an international issue focus in underdeveloped nations does not necessarily lead groups to pay greater attention to international issues. At the same time, it seems to matter little whether groups focus on specific domestic-oriented or global-oriented issues. The global and domestic issue indices are only weakly related to the type and nature of groups' participatory activities.

Table 7. Predicting Patterns of Action

Predictor	Communicator	Recipient	Supplier
Interests			
International interest	.291*	.229*	.167*
Global issue interest	.021	.077	.142*
Domestic issue interest	.054	.198*	.199
Group Resources			
Budget (in US dollars)	.424*	.251*	.412*
Environmental Ideology			
Economic reform needed	.207*	.210*	.115
Region			
North America	-.148*	-.065	.014
Pacific Rim	-.157*	-.008	-.041
East Europe	.190*	.328*	-.039
Asia	.036	.170*	-.115
Latin America	.171	.526*	-.132
South Africa	-.018	.123	-.011
R-square	.306	.381	.336

Note: Table entries are standardized regression coefficients; an asterisk denotes coefficients significant at .05 level. The reference category for the regional dummy variables is Western Europe.

Equally the impact of interests, ideology is also related to international activity. A reformist environmental orientation increases participation in the international community. Groups that believe environmental protection requires fundamental economic changes are more likely to participate in international communications, provide resources to other environmental groups, and receive resources from other groups. These results suggest that groups with a reformist ideology are more likely to seek allies from other environmental groups and international foundations and agencies.

Regional patterns of action sometimes differ from what we found for the bivariate analyses, once we control for the other predictors. For instance, groups from North America and the Pacific Rim are less likely to be international communicators once the other variables are taken into account. At the same time, NGOs from East Europe, Asia and Latin America are more likely to receive resources even when controlling for their resource base and issue interests. This pattern underscores the strong resource flow within the environmental movment from the developed world to the developing nations. Regional differences in supplying resources to other groups tend to be very small once other factors are taken into account.

Conclusion

Much has been written in the social science literature about the globalization of politics during the past decade-and especially the globalization of the environmental policy area (Lipschutz 1996; Wapner 1994; Young 1994). This research adds to this discussion by providing evidence on the actual patterns of international action by a broad international sample of environmental NGOs.

There is an active network of environmental groups that interact across national and even regional boundaries. At the same time, there are often asymmetries in the patterns of international action. Environmental NGOs in more affluent nations are more likely to engage in communication and to supply resources-funding and information-to groups in less affluent nations. As others have observed with anecdotal examples, there is a substantial North/South exchange within the international environmental community. Our study of environmental NGOs illustrated this pattern, but it is likely even more apparent if the role of private foundations, governmental aid, and other such support from the OECD nations were calculated into the equation. The financial and information resources of environmental groups in the developing world is significantly dependent on transfers from the North.

We can suggest several reasons for these patterns. It seems natural that groups from advanced industrial democracies possess a greater resource base, and thus are in a better position to provide financial and technical support to environmental NGOs in the developed world. But we believe other factors besides simple affluence are at work as well. Groups in advanced industrial democracies operate under more favorable structural conditions than groups in lesser developed nations. The socio-political contexts in the OECD nations provide a well-developed infrastructure that groups can utilize to mobilize resources and political support (the mass media, sophisticated communication technologies, a cognitively sophisticated public, and related factors). NGOs in lesser developed nations are often faced with undemocratic systems whereas action autonomous of the state is tolerate, and action that challenges the state is suppressed. A recent case study of environmental protest groups in Russia and the United States graphically illustrated this contrast (Dalton et al. 1999). Environmental issues may not be product of affluent

democracies, but the development of an active environmental movement to advocate these issues is more likely in an affluent and democratic political climate. In addition, the ideological correlates of environmental action vary across the globe (Dalton and Rohrschneider, 1997). In western democracies, environmental concerns are related to a New Environmental Paradigm which views industrial economies as a main source for pollution problems, and such ideological orientations spur international action as we have shown. In contrast, environmental concerns in lesser developed nations often lack this ideological base which lessens both the domestic mobilization potential of the movement and the integration of environmental NGOs into the international community.

The existence of international networks for communication, the sharing of information, and the sharing of resources among environmental NGOs is a first step in the development of a transnational social movement. Tarrow's (1998) skepticism of the efficacy of this movement may still be justified and we find many of the optimistic pronouncements about the development of a global civil society are exaggerated. Still, the building of a network of information and resource sharing is an important step in the development of an international environmental community. Especially in the developing world, the aid provided by NGOs, foundations and government agencies in the developed world is necessary to at least even partially address the economic and political disadvantages that face these groups. Even aid from OECD environmental groups may be insufficient to enable indigenous environmental groups to protect tropical rainforests in Latin America and Southeast Asia, for example, but without aid from the North these would truly be hopeless causes.

Furthermore, to the extent that international cooperation among environmental groups provides a model that other social movements are also utilizing (e.g., Archibugi et al. 1998; Mayer and Tarrow 1998), there may be even a broader basis for a developing transnational society. And the cumulative impact of resource and information sharing within these networks may help both with the specific policy challenges being faced by developed nations, as well as the broader challenges of developing democratic cultures and political practices.

Endnotes

1. The 1998 Global Environmental Organizations Survey (GEOS) was conducted with a grant from the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation at the University of California, San Diego. We want to acknowledge their generous support of this research. We would also like to thank Kevin Wallsten and Miki Caul for their research assistance on this project. A previous version of this paper was presented at the ECPR joint sessions in the workshop "Environmental Protest in Comparative Perspective," Mannheim, 26-31 March 1999.

2. International environmental organizations as defined by Meyer et al. (1997) have member organizations from at least three nations. They would include groups such as the International Organization for Human Ecology and the International Fur Trade Federation.

3. Some scholars also argue that modernization creates the economic and population pressures that generate environmental problems on a global scale.

4. We consciously decided not to include African nations or Mideastern nations in our study. In large part, this was because the lack of effective democracies in most of these nations limited the development of

environmental NGOs.

5. One of the complications of an international mail survey is the uncertain reliability of the postal system in some nations. For instance, approximately half of these returns came after the second mailing, suggesting that many undelivered questionnaires were not being returned, since presumably these groups also did not exist a few months earlier during the first mailing.

6. This conclusion was confirmed by a factor analysis. This analysis suggested two dimensions: 1) interest in protecting local wildlife and protecting natural areas, and 2) interest in global warming and the loss of ozone. The other two indicators-global biodiversity and water pollution-yield ambiguous factor results and are therefore excluded from the construction of the following two indicators: "Global" is an additive index of the warming and ozone indicators and ranges from 2 (measuring strong concern with both issues) to 8. "National" is an additive indicator of wildlife and nature and also ranges from 2 (measuring strong concern with both issues) to 8. We will use these measures of domestic and global issue interests in the analyses below.

7. We factor analyzed the participation indicators for the pooled groups. These analyses generally produced one powerful first factor which explains 46.5% of the variance. The rotated solution suggests the three factors described in the text. We constructed three separate indicators (as opposed to one overarching one) in order to examine the scope and sources of various activities across regions and groups. The communicator indicator is an additive index of items 1, 2, and 3 in table 4 and ranges from 3 (many contacts with other groups) to 12 (no contacts with other groups). The Recipient indicator (based on items 5 and 7 in table 5) ranges from 2 (a group supplies both types of resources) to 8.

8. The question read: "Some groups believe that the environment can be protected effectively only if societies fundamentally change the way their economies work. Other groups believe that it is possible to protect the environment without fundmantally altering the economic system. Where would you place the philosophy of your group in this debate?" (Respondent then marked a 10-point scale where a "1" indicates that groups believe the economic system has to be revamped and a "10" indicates that groups believe no changes in the economic system are required).

9. We are exploring whether other resources, such as the size of membership or the size of the staff, also affects transnational cooperation. These results are complicated because there is less consistency in the measurement of these variables across groups; for instance, some of our NGOs are not membership groups. Initial analyses suggest these other resource measures have weaker effects than the budget variable.

References

Archibugi, Daniele et al. 1998. Re-imagining Political Community. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bramwell, Anna. 1989. Ecology in the 20th Century. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dalton, Russell. 1994. The Green Rainbow: Environmental Interest Groups in Western Europe. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dalton, Russell and Robert Rohrschneider. 1997. "The Greening of the Globe: Sources of Environmental Attitudes on Five Continents." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.

Dalton, Russell, et al. 1999. Critical Masses: Citizens, Environmental Destruction, and Nuclear Weapons Production in Russia and the United States. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Diani, Mario. 1995. Green Networks: A Structural Analysis of the Italian Environmental Movement.

Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
Dunlap, Riley, et al. 1993. Health of the Planet Survey. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Institute.
Dunlap, Riley and Angela Mertig. 1992. American Environmentalism: The U.S. Environmental Movement, 1970-90. Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.
Fisher, Duncan. 1993. The Emergence of the Environmental Movement in Eastern Europe and its Role in the Revolutions of 1989. In Environmental Action in Eastern Europe, ed. Barbara Jancar-Webster. Armonk, NH: M.E. Sharp.
Held, David. 1998. Democracy and Globalization. In Daniele Archibugi et al., Re-imagining Political Community. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Lipschutz, Ronnie. 1996. Global Civil Society and Global Environmental Governance. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Lowe, Philip and Jane Goyder. 1983. Environmental Groups in Politics. London: Allen and Unwin.
McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald. 1977. Resource Mobilization and Social Movements. American Journal of Sociology 82: 1212-41.
Meyer, David, and Sidney Tarrow, eds. 1998. The Social Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
Meyer, John, et al. 1997. The Structuring of a World Environmental Regime, International Organization 51: 623-51.
Princen, Thomas and Matthias Finger, eds. 1994. Environmental NGOs in World Politics: Linking the Local and the Global. London: Routledge.
Ringius, Lasse. 1996. "Environmental NGOs and Regime Change: The Case of Ocean Dumping of Radioactive Waste." European Journal of International Relations.
Rosenau, James. 1998. Governance and Democracy in a Globalizing World. In Daniele Archibugi et al., Re-imagining Political Community. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Rosenau. James. 1990. Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Rucht, Dieter. 1989. Environmental movement organizations in West Germany and France. In Bert Klandermans, ed. Organizing for Change. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
Rucht, Dieter. 1996. "The Impact of National Contexts on Movement Structures: A cross-movement and cross-national comparison," pp. 185-204 in Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, eds., Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Skrentny, John. 1993. Concern for the Environment: A Cross-national Perspective. International Journal of Public Opinion Research 5: 335-353.
Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. Fishnets, Internets and Catnets: Globalization and Transnational Collective Action. In Michael Hanagan et al. Challenging Authority. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Wapner, Paul. 1996. Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics. Albany: SUNY Press.
Worcester, Robert. 1993. Public and Elite Attitudes to Environmental Issues. International Journal of Public Opinion Research 5: 315-334.
Young, Oran. 1994. International Governance: Protecting the Environment in a Stateless Society. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Zald, Mayer and John McCarthy, eds. 1987. Social Movements in an Organizational Society. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.