Radically Nice:

An Analysis of the Institutionalization and Professionalization of Greenpeace Switzerland

Author: Julia Eisenring

Supervisor: Thomas Malm

Spring Term 2020

Department:	Human Geography, Human Ecology Division
Address:	Geocentrum I, Sölvegatan 10, 223 62 Lund
Telephone:	046-222 17 59

Supervisor:	Thomas Malm

Title and Subtitle	Radically Nice: An Analysis of the Institutionalization and Professionalization of Greenpeace Switzerland
Author	Julia Eisenring

Examination	Master's Thesis (Two Year)

Term:	Spring Term 2020

Abstract:

Observing the seeming incapability of nations to sufficiently deal with the borderless threat of climate change, many place their hopes on international environmental movements and organizations. However, various reasons drive many social movements to incorporate as NGOs (a phenomenon known as NGOization) or lead to existing organizations becoming even more institutionalized and professional. The latter happened with Greenpeace Switzerland, a branch of the well-known international environmental organization Greenpeace. Through qualitative interviews with long-term employees and volunteers of Greenpeace Switzerland, an understanding of their perspective on these changes is sought. Drawing on concepts and theories of Environmental History and Political Sociology, the findings are put into a wider frame of reference, trying to unravel how these changes might impact the NGO's capacity to create social change. On one hand, these processes might bring about more legitimacy to the organization, improve their relationship to other institutions such as governments and result in the organization gaining insider access to policymaking. On the other hand, they might negatively impact an organizations' willingness to cooperate with other environmental movement actors or actively engage their supporters in actions beyond financial donations. Furthermore, the changes might negatively affect volunteers' and employees' motivation to engage with the organization.

For Athena

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to thank all the people from Greenpeace Switzerland, who have always supported me in word and deed. Without their help this work could have never been written and I am honestly speechless about the friendliness and helpfulness that was shown to me during my internship and after. I especially thank all the people who have taken the time to participate in my interviews and shared with me their experiences and opinions. I furthermore want to thank my friends and family here in Sweden, but also home in Switzerland, who have listened to my endless rambles and complaints and always had good advice for me. An especially big thanks goes to my parents. Without their financial and mental support, I would have hardly been able to pursue this study. And lastly, I extend warm thanks to my supervisor, Thomas, who always cheered me up and guided me through the thesis writing process.

Contents

1 Introduction

The challenges we face in our present time are manifold: rising inequality, rising unemployment, bio-diversity loss and the fact that progressing climate change threatens virtually all life on earth as we know it are only few examples (Pollin 2018, Järvensivu et al. 2018). Despite decades of annual conferences filled with grand promises and hopeful treaties, global injustices remain, and annual greenhouse gas emissions keep rising. Indeed, governments do not seem capable, or willing, to address these issues sufficiently, neither nationally nor internationally. Still, political action will be needed to implement the necessary far-reaching measures. But history has shown that "governments will only take such action if there is intense pressure on them to do so" (Gunningham 2019: 195).

Gunningham (2019) believes that this pressure must come from grassroots social movement activism. Social movements are often seen as standing outside of the system, meaning outside of "traditional conventional, formally institutionalised politics" (Rootes 2007: 84). Rather than discussing and lobbying with politicians and company representatives *inside* the building, they are found outside, engaging in various kinds of protest such as demonstrations or blockades (ibid.). Participation is essential for movements. Civic participation, which is offered by social movements with their loose structures and flat or even absent hierarchies, is considered particularly valuable for democracy (Diani and Della Porta 2006). However, grassroots structures might lead to "endless debates, non-decisions, waste of resources and organizational instability" (Rucht 1995: 67). Therefore, some place their hopes instead on international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) to tackle the problem. Through their more institutionalized nature, NGOs often enjoy a privileged insider status and they are said to possess the expertise and financial means to implement positive social change (Lang 2012, de Moor 2018, Nester 2010).

These are also some possible reasons why grassroots movements might decide to incorporate and become NGOs, a process known as *NGOization* (Lang 2012)*.* The process through which the NGO is creating stronger ties with (decision-making) institutions and growing itself to become a large, established organizations is known as *institutionalization* (Longman Dictionary n.d.). Institutionalization often comes hand in hand with *professionalization*. An NGO might become more professional through paying for 'professional' employees with certain qualifications or adhering to standards, such as codes of conduct (Lexico n.d.). Although some do regard favorably the potential of NGOs to involve citizens in public affairs, NGOization and institutionalization are often seen as negative phenomena. It is questioned whether organizations that are now 'part of the system' can still meaningfully engage the public

and are able to create the change that is needed. Indeed, established NGOs have received a lot of critique for being mere 'protest businesses', more concerned with maintaining their income than actually achieving social change (Hensby et al. 2011). The following thesis is a case study on the process of professionalization and institutionalization of Greenpeace Switzerland, a branch of the international environmental organization Greenpeace. With 26 national and regional offices all over the world, Greenpeace is one of the most famous and influential international environmental NGOs (Greenpeace International 2016).

Since its founding in 1984, Greenpeace Switzerland has experienced an organizational change that is comparable to the changes that happened within Greenpeace International as well. Through its spectacular actions and creative fundraising strategies, the national office quickly grew their donor base. Consequently, what used to be a handful of radical, committed environmentalists and numerous volunteer activists has turned into a professional NGO with approximately one hundred employees and a well-structured regional network of volunteers and activists (Bühlmann 2014). Today, Greenpeace Switzerland is one of the most well-known environmental organizations in Switzerland.

1.1 Aim

Previous research has been conducted on the phenomenon of NGOization and institutionalization focusing primarily on the organizational changes and the possible implications on the democratic function of NGOs, interest groups or social movement organizations. However, not much research seems to have been done on how employees and volunteers have been affected by these changes – the people at the very heart of the organization. This is partially what I intend to achieve through this thesis: highlighting the personal experiences of long-term employees and volunteers. Furthermore, I will analyze how, in the course of the organizational changes, the strategies of Greenpeace Switzerland to achieve social change have also evolved.

Through this thesis, I intend to add to the pool of research on environmental movements and environmental movement organizations that looks at how environmentalism has changed over time. More precisely, I want to contribute to the research on institutionalization of resistance and the consequences of this phenomenon in terms of social change.

1.2 Research Questions

The following questions shall be answered through my research:

1. How have long-term Greenpeace Switzerland employees and volunteers experienced the changes within Greenpeace Switzerland over time?
2. What reasons for these changes do they identify?
3. What implications of these changes to they regard as important when it comes to Greenpeace Switzerland's aim to achieve a present and future that is ecologically and socially just?

1.3   Structure of the Thesis

In the chapter 'Theoretical Framework' I will present the theoretical framework that was used for the present thesis. The chapter is organized into two sections, which represent the two fields of study this thesis draws from: Environmental History and Political Sociology. The first part is about the history of environmentalism and more specifically, social movements. I will provide a short overview of the founding and early history of Greenpeace International and its development into a more formal organization. Furthermore, I will present the phenomenon of globalization to explain the need for international organizations. I will show the connection between globalism and capitalism and why they might be seen as the 'root cause' of environmental and social problems to be tackled by international organizations. In the subchapter 'political sociology' I will introduce the concept of institutionalization, professionalization and bureaucratization of resistance and the implications of these processes on political activism and civic engagement. I will also explain the concept of legitimacy of social movement organizations and how it is connected to processes of institutionalization and professionalization.

In the second part, 'Methods', I will present the qualitative case study as the methodological framework which guided this study as well as the method of qualitative semi-structured interviews, which was the main method employed to carry out the research. I will briefly explain the choices made for the material selection. Lastly, the limitations of the chosen research design are discussed.

Afterwards follows the main part of this thesis: The analysis. I will first present the findings of my interviews, retelling the history of Greenpeace Switzerland through my interviewees. I will then discuss these findings by setting them into a wider frame of reference before wrapping up the thesis by a conclusion.

2   Theoretical Framework

In this chapter I will present the theoretical framework that was used for the present thesis, drawing on the fields of environmental history and political sociology.

2.1 Environmental History

The present thesis explores the history of Greenpeace Switzerland, an environmental social movement organization. Therefore, environmental history is one of the theoretical pillars of this thesis. Environmental history, most basically, is about the relationship between humans and their environment over time (Hughes 2001). Although much of environmental history is concerned with how changes in the natural environment have shaped human action and vice versa, Hughes (2001: 4) notes that "environmental history is also a humanistic inquiry", as it may be concerned with how people *think* about nature and "express those ideas in folk religion, culture, literature and art".

2.1.1 History of Environmentalism and a Brief History of Greenpeace

Environmentalism in the global North has its roots in the conservation movement which started in the 19th century and was motivated by naturalists and explorers who wished to preserve the nation's forests and other natural resources. This was the time when the first nature reserves and national parks were founded in the United States and in Europe and the earliest conservation groups came into existence (Coglianese 2001). Soon the consequences of increasing but unregulated industrialization started to show and in the 20th century, several authors began to warn of environmental and social decay caused by unregulated industrial activity. In 1962, Rachel Carson published *Silent Spring*, warning of the long-term dangers of pesticide use. Her book was followed by others, including Stewart Udall's *The Quiet Crisis* and Ralph Nader's *Unsafe at Any Speed* (ibid.). These "messages of ecological alarm (…) found a receptive audience during the sixties, when there was broader social unrest over civil rights and the Vietnam War" (ibid.: 91).

The 1960s and 1970s were indeed decades of revolution and change in politics and society around the world. As Hensby et al. (2011: 811, emphases in original) explain:

> The increasingly *global* nature of certain political issues—be they environmentalism, human rights or terrorism—has given rise to a more *globalized* political awareness (…). For many authors (…) 'new social movements' have been its special and essential product. (…) [N]ew social movements are distinct from traditional party politics in that they engage directly with global political issues that transcend local and national interests.

The environmental movements that arose during this time can be considered part of these new social movements.

It is in this period of global unrest that the story of Greenpeace starts. In response to the Vietnam War and the Cold War, thousands of war veterans, draft evaders, hippies, and radical activists were protesting together against the US military-industrial complex in the US and Canada (Zelko 2017). Among these protestors were a Quaker couple and two journalists, especially concerned about the nuclear tests that the US were conducting on Amchitka Island off the coast of Alaska. Together with a few others, they created an informal group called the *Don't Make a Wave Committee* and sailed a fishing boat called the *Greenpeace* to stop the detonation of a bomb in 1971. The bomb was detonated regardless, but due to increased public protest, the US Atomic Energy Commission announced to give up nuclear tests on Amchitka a year later (Erwood 2011).

The Amchitka-campaign gave the group national recognition, and in 1972, the committee changed its name to Greenpeace. Focusing mainly on anti-nuclear protest in the first years, their scope widened in 1974 when they started to include campaigns against whaling and seal-hunting. Gradually, Greenpeace started to attract more attention and followers. In response to the anti-whaling campaign, numerous Greenpeace branches emerged throughout Canada and North America (Zelko 2017).

By 1978, Greenpeace resembled more a loose confederation of tribes, than the international organization it is today. Each branch had its own structure, internal culture, and "its own idea of what Greenpeace was or should become" (ibid.: 333). As a result, there was a growing friction between the different Greenpeace offices in the US and Canada. It escalated so that the Vancouver office, which saw itself as the leader over the other offices, filed a lawsuit against the US offices to make them either submit to their lead or give up the right to the Greenpeace name (ibid.).

Meanwhile, in Europe, Greenpeace activist and former businessman David McTaggart had helped set up Greenpeace offices in Paris and London. When he heard of the lawsuit, he feared that after their win, Vancouver would turn their attention to the newly emerging Greenpeace groups in Europe. McTaggart himself had developed a vision of Greenpeace as a more international, and most of all, professional organization. In his opinion, a certain level of centralization and hierarchy was necessary to continue the smooth functioning of the organization (ibid.). So, he boarded a plane and flew over the Atlantic. After a few months of negotiations, McTaggart eventually convinced the Canadian and American offices of creating Greenpeace International.

> Virtually overnight, the various Greenpeace tribes were merged together to create a
> European-dominated international organization with a large bureaucracy, a hierarchical,
> centralized structure, and with its headquarters based in Amsterdam (ibid.: 338).

On the one hand, the massive growth of Greenpeace demanded internal changes, such as an expansion of staff and increasing professionalization. Since the founding of Greenpeace International, there has been an almost constant tension between local activists, who desire to keep their autonomy and "operate according to the principles of grass roots, consensus-based democracy", and the staff at Greenpeace International, "who view environmental campaigns from a transnational or global perspective, and for whom professionalism and hierarchy are a given" (ibid.: 340).

Today, Greenpeace consists of Greenpeace International and 26 national and regional Greenpeace offices (NROs) (Greenpeace International 2016). The founding of Greenpeace Switzerland was initiated by Martina Zehner in 1984. Switzerland was the 15th national Greenpeace office (NRO) (Bühlmann 2014). Aside from the office in Zurich, there are several regional groups in different Swiss cities, which are independent from the Greenpeace Switzerland foundation and run by volunteers. Many of the volunteers participate in non-violent direct actions, but not all of them are activists. There are also Greenpeace activists who do not participate in the regional volunteer groups.

2.1.2 Globalization and Capitalism as the Root Cause of Socio-Environmental Crises

Global environmental change is closely related to globalization, which Nester (2010: 1) defines as the "ever more complex economic, technological, ethical, communication, transportation, psychological, cultural, legal, environmental, and thus, political interdependence embracing, in varying degrees and ways, everyone everywhere". Today, there are hardly any landscapes or seascapes left that have not in some way or another been impacted by human action (McNeill 2000). Many environmental issues have impacts across national borders, the most prominent being climate change (Nester 2010). However, not only do many environmental issues affect people across national borders, they are often interrelated with other socio-political problems such as poverty or racism (Bullard et al. 2008). The transnational nature of these issues results in nations being incapable of handling them on their own (Nester 2010). Thus, the hope lies on international organizations to "raise awareness on the global nature of problems" (de Moor 2018: 1081) and to provide the expertise and financial means to tackle these problems (Nester 2010).

Many see the culprit of today's social and environmental crises in global neoliberal capitalism (Bell 2015). Marks (2006: 204) believes that the wave of globalization which occurred after the end of the Cold War in 1991 meant the "expansion of (…) capitalism into every nook and cranny of the world". Presently, most countries in the world are following the economic doctrine called neoliberalism or neoliberal capitalism. Capitalism is a "social system based on the creation of surplus value (what we

can call, with some simplification, profit)" (Stoll 2014: 5). Capitalism has been criticized for exacerbating global injustice and environmental problems through the pursuit of endless economic growth and profit accumulation (Bell 2015). Neoliberalism as a version of capitalism is furthermore characterized by the privatization of public services, deregulation of industry and lowering of trade barriers.

First of all, capitalism is historically closely tied to colonialism. One of the most important "productive forces" is land, its "hidden mineral treasure, and its meadows, woods and water" (Luxemburg 2003: 250). So strong is the desire to own these "treasures" that the land, first in the Western countries and subsequently in countries of the Global South, has been forcibly taken from the people who have been living on and off that land for thousands of years, leaving them impoverished and dependent. The global structures of injustice that were created in the process of colonization prevail until the present day and are continuously fostered by global capitalism (ibid.).

Secondly, there is an "inherent need within capitalism, for companies to endlessly produce more and so as to maintain profits and be competitive against rivals" (Bell 2015: 2). Production and consumption continue to keep the system alive, "rather than meet social needs and enhance environmental well-being" (ibid.: 2). This is closely linked to the core belief within neoliberalism that economic growth, meaning the continuous increase in an economy's production of goods and services, is a measure for national welfare. However, economic growth always comes at a cost. Production is typically based on finite resources and produces excessive amounts of waste. Infinite growth is not possible on a planet with clear finite boundaries (Daly and Farley 2011).

Furthermore, the desire to make more profit encourages corporations to choose the cheapest processes, even if it comes at the cost of society and the environment. "This potentially means exploitation of people and the rest of nature in the form of low wages, casual work, unsustainable extraction, (or) irresponsible handling of waste" (Bell 2015: 2).

The expansion of the capitalist economy during the industrial revolution led to an acceleration in fossil fuel use. Factories, but also means of transport such as ships and airplanes for global trade, rely on the burning of fossil fuels. For Malm (2016: 241), the "fossil economy", an economy based on the burning of fossil fuels, is an "offspring of a distinctly capitalist economy". Stroll (2014: 3) considers global warming an "epochal crisis arising in tandem with hundreds of billions of dollars in worldwide petroleum profits, the greatest accumulation of capital in human history".

It is for all these reasons that capitalism might be regarded as the root cause of the social and environ-mental problems we are facing today. It also shows how intrinsically linked matters of environmental justice and social justice are and that it is not enough to consider them separately from each other. Issues such as climate change, unjust resource distribution or human rights violations can no longer be regarded as separate from each other but are all linked through the global capitalist system which perpetuates environmental destruction and injustice across national borders. This raises questions of the role of international organizations to tackle such interconnected problems and promote transbor-der collective action (Helfer 2006).

2.2 Political Sociology

Aside from Environmental History, this thesis also engages with theories from the field of Political So-ciology. Political sociology is a bridge between sociology and political science and addresses "issues of power and authority with a focus on state/civil society relation" (Patros and Stepan-Norris 2015: 472). The focus, unlike in political sciences, lies rather on the "civil society side of the equation" (ibid.: 472). Researching reform-oriented and revolutionary social movements as a challenge to the state is one of the main research areas within political sociology (ibid.).

Social movements are usually considered part of civil society. Civil society is most commonly concep-tualized as one of three sectors, along with the state and the market, which are all separate and inde-pendent from each other, though sometimes overlapping. The civil society sector is also sometimes referred to as the 'third' or 'non-profit' sector (Edwards 2014).

Diani and Della Porta (2006) identify three core features of social movements: First, social movement actors seek to promote or oppose social change through engaging in political and/or cultural conflicts. Secondly, individual and organized actors within a social movement are independent but connected through "dense informal networks" (ibid.: 21). And thirdly, social movements always create a collective identity. "Collective identity is strongly associated with the recognition and the creation of connected-ness. It brings with it a sense of common purpose and shared commitment to a cause (…)" (ibid.: 21).

According to Diani and Della Porta (2006), a social movement is an informal network and must be distinguished from organizations, who are coherent decision-making entities. However, social move-ments can include formal organizations. Such organizations are then referred to as "social movement organizations" (SMOs). This could include NGOs, bureaucratic interest groups, or, in special cases, even political parties. McCarthy and Zald, quoted in Diani and Della Porta (2006: 140), describe a social

movement organization as "a complex, or formal, organization which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or countermovement and attempts to implement those goals".

Greenpeace can be considered a SMO within the environmental movement (Hensby et al. 2011). Greenpeace's mission to protect biodiversity and prevent environmental pollution and exploitation (Greenpeace International n.d.) are not unique to the organization. Instead, these are the broad goals of the entire environmental movement, which Greenpeace belongs to. Furthermore, Greenpeace is part of a network together with other actors within the environmental movement, such as other formal organizations like the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) or Friends of the Earth, or less formal movements, such as the Friday's for Future Movement.

Social movements (either the whole movement or its sub-movements) might incorporate and become non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This process is known as *NGOization* (Lang 2012). Sabine Lang (2012: 13) defines an NGO as a

> (…) voluntary not-for-profit organization that is bound legally to be nonpolitical but can engage in noninstitutional politics, that generates normative claims about a common good, and that acts on these claims as a public expert in variously scaled civic spaces.

Incorporation often comes with increased bureaucratization to meet the stricter regulations that NGOs must adhere to (Perez et al. 2015). Some authors believe that bureaucratization and institutionalization are inevitable and simply part of the social movement life cycle (Alberoni 1984, Rawcliffe 1998). The processes of increased bureaucratization, professionalization and institutionalization might also continue once the NGO has been established.

According to the aforementioned definition, at the heart of every social movement and SMO lies social change. Social change means an alteration of the social organization, a transformation of existing norms and values (Diani and Della Porta 2006). This could mean a change in laws and policies, but social movements might also address allegedly harmful or unjust practices of private institutions such as corporations (Chong 2015). In order to achieve this social change, social movements or SMOs need to exert power. Power can be conceptualized in many different ways. This thesis draws from an actor-oriented power perspective. In this perspective, power is seen as being exercised by people, or actors, to achieve certain intentions. According to Robert Dahl (cited in Svarstad et al. 2018: 353) an "actor A exercises power over actor B, when A can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do". Greenpeace is understood as such an actor who has agency and is able to exercise a certain kind of power. Power in this perspective being connected to agency does not mean, however, that structures

are irrelevant. Rather, "the exercise of power by actors is seen as constrained as well as enabled by various types of structures" (Svarstad et al. 2018: 353).

The fact that social movements and most SMOs exert power without having been democratically elected raises questions of their legitimacy.

> In the normative sense, legitimacy refers to the conditions under which power is rightfully exercised. (…) In a purely empirical sense, by contrast, legitimacy refers to the conditions under which persons or institutions in power manage to gain acceptance and support from the people they rule over" (Steffek and Hahn 2010: 13).

For NGOs specifically, being considered legitimate enables them to successfully mobilize membership adherence, funding and public support (ibid. 2010). In her doctorate thesis, Erla Thrandardottir shows how Greenpeace UK specifically uses scientific knowledge to claim legitimacy. The fact that science eventually took a center stage in Greenpeace's legitimacy claims showed in the fact that the organization started to employ more scientists and professionals (Thrandardottir 2012).

Furthermore, in their aspiration to effect social change, NGOs are often driven by what they and many others perceive as noble, altruistic, progressive goals and claim to work for the common good. In this case, it is mostly the NGO's activity which legitimizes its use of power. However, this also means that "the political influence of NGOs and their capacity to find support hinges to a good deal on an impeccable reputation and consistency between what they practice and what they preach" (Steffek and Hahn 2010: 13). Public reports of organizations' misbehaviors and failure to live up their own high moral standards put this reputation at risk. Many NGOs have reacted to these challenges in the last few years by formulating codes of conduct or best practice (ibid.)

Social movements and SMOs have a range of different strategies through which they exercise power. Lang (2012) distinguishes between institutional and public advocacy. Advocacy, broadly defined, can be "any attempt to influence political decisions on behalf of an imagined or organized community. (…) Institutional and public advocacy stand for different ways to seek influence, different repertoires of action, and different communication practices" (ibid.: 22).

Public advocacy seeks to change policy by engaging broader publics. The strategies employed involve initiating public debates or mobilizing the media.

> In its 'thick' mode, public advocacy means employing strategies that allow for interactive communication with citizens. (…) In its more information-oriented 'thinner' mode, public advocacy might mean utilizing public space by putting up a billboard or running an ad asking citizens to sign on to a predefined campaign or to join a single public event (ibid.: 23).

The tools commonly used are public protest, mobilizing citizens and calling for action via traditional and new media. Activism, such as civil disobedience or other kinds of protest actions can be considered a form of public advocacy. According to Rawls (2005), civil disobedience is a public, non-violent and conscientious act against the law, usually done with the intention to bring about change in the policies or law of the government. He considers civil disobedience a public act, because it

> not only is addressed to public principles, it is done in public. (…) One may compare it to public speech, and being a form of address, an expression of profound and conscientious political conviction, it takes place in the public forum (ibid.: 366).

However, as mentioned before, civil disobedience does not only have to aim at changing the policies or law of the government. This form of activism might also be directed towards economic or social institutions (Chong 2015).

The media have played an important role in spreading NGO messages. In their selection process, media professionals are guided by so-called 'news factors', for example 'sensation' or 'negativity' (Kepplinger 1998). There is also a "preference among the media for environmental stories that can be presented simplistically in Hollywood blockbuster style – good versus evil" (Jordan and Maloney 2007: 79). Greenpeace has always used the logic of the media and designed its campaigns accordingly. By wrapping their protest actions in "simple black and white media sensitive fashion" and presenting themselves as the heroes in the fight against corporate greed and self-interest, they perfectly fit the media's logic of news selection (ibid.: 9).

Radical activism, especially civil disobedience, may generate media attention and thus can be a helpful tool for raising awareness about an issue that political institutions or corporations wanted to hide from the public. However, such actions can also negatively affect an organization's reputation and impede the willingness of institutions to cooperate with them on finding alternative solutions. According to Lang (2012: 4), NGOs whose message broadly aligns with government agendas are more likely to be invited to the table than NGOs with contentious or radical agendas.

15

Institutional advocacy is thus the strategy through which actors seek to influence decision making by "gaining some degree of insider status in institutions or in organizations that initiate, prepare, legislate, or execute policy change" (ibid.: 22). It is a more targeted way of influencing the decision-making progress and arguably less about raising awareness but more about implementing changes. Primary communication practices involve the sharing of expert knowledge, insider debate, and lobbying.

There has been extensive literature examining the power that (professional and institutionalized) NGOs have on the political process, asserting that "NGOs exert considerable power, mostly in a more indirect way" (Steffek und Hahn 2010: 4). It is this "soft power" that NGOs are often said to exert, by convincing others with arguments and information rather than force (ibid.: 4). NGOs also often have privileged access to the policy process (Lang 2010).

Indeed, one of the key functions of NGOs is framing issues and setting them on the political agenda. Through framing, NGOs select and highlight certain features of reality and obliterate others in order to tell a congruous story about a problem, its causes and remedies (Jordan and Maloney 2007). Once the issue is on the political agenda and perhaps has turned into a policy, the "group expertise allows effective monitoring of policy outputs and enables these organizations to hold governments to account" (ibid.: 8).

These two modes of public and institutional advocacy are not meant to be understood as either/or. Rather, they are the ends of a spectrum. Neither are they incompatible. SMOs might even use both modes simultaneously (Lang 2012). However, in order to be invited to sit at the table, NGOs might need to bring their message in "broad accordance with government agendas" (ibid.: 24). Institutionalization often comes hand in hand with professionalization. "In order to be effective participants in the realm of insider politics, environmental groups needed their own teams of scientists and economists, as well as lawyers. They also employed professional fundraisers, media consultants, and membership recruitment specialists" (Coglianese 2001: 101). This in turn might impede the NGO's use of public advocacy:

> too much critical public voice tends to jeopardize institutional leverage. NGOs navigate a trade-off between institutional effectiveness and public voice, and the dominant mode used to resolve this trade-off is to employ the latter only in a very limited way (Lang 2012:8).

16

3   Material and Methods

In this chapter, I will present the method used to collect and analyze the empirical material. First, I present the methodological framework, followed by a presentation of the method employed in more detail. Subsequently, I discuss my choice of material and how the empirical data was analyzed. Lastly, I briefly reflect on the limitations of the chosen research design.

3.1   Methodology

In the present thesis, a qualitative case study methodology has been applied. The aim was to better understand the changing organizational structure and practices of Greenpeace Switzerland as a result of internal processes as well as external changes. It is an intensive case study, meaning (to quote Erkisson and Kovalainen 2008: 119) that the aim was "to understand and explore the case from 'the inside' and develop understanding from the perspectives of the people involved in the case". The research questions were defined in dialogue with the empirical data obtained (cf. ibid.). Before conducting the first interview, preliminary questions were formulated but they became more specific during the research process.

For the collection and analysis of data, qualitative methods were used. Bryman (2016: 375) describes qualitative research as a "research strategy that usually emphasizes words rather than quantification in the collection and analysis of data". The emphasis lies on understanding the social world through examining how individual people interpret that world (ibid.: 375). In looking for understanding and meaning, I followed an interpretivist epistemological approach. I aimed to understand a very specific, contextualized environment, acknowledging that

> reality and knowledge are not objective but influenced by people within that environment (…) The underlying idea of the interpretivist approach is that the researcher is part of the research, interprets data and as such can never be fully objective and removed from the research (Brown 2017: n.p.).

This ties in to my positionality. Unlike in positivist traditions, where the researcher should remain neutral to the issue she is studying, I was not aiming for such impartiality. In the six months prior to writing this thesis, I was an intern at Greenpeace Switzerland. Experiencing Greenpeace from an insider's perspective was the reason I decided to examine the organization's history and its members more closely. I believe it has been an advantage to me that I have done this internship before conducting my research because it allowed me to become familiar with the context and "see as my interviewees see" (Bryman

2016 p. 493). Although I cannot claim impartiality and neutrality, I did, however, try to keep my own opinions and experiences to a minimum. I focused instead on the experiences and opinions of my interviewees.

3.2 Method

The main method that I chose to employ for my thesis was semi-structured qualitative interviews. I considered interviews the best method to explore people's motivations, experiences as well as their personal opinions in depth. By personally talking to people from within the organization, I could obtain a depth of inside-information I would otherwise not have been able to receive. In order to answer my research questions, I had a list of aspects I wanted to address and certain questions I wanted to be answered. The semi-structure, however, allowed me the flexibility to follow up interesting points that were brought up during the conversation, go deeper if I felt the need to, and also give the interviewee more space to give broader answers to the questions or develop ideas (cf. Denscombe 2010).

Since I interviewed people about their personal experience as (former) employees and volunteers of Greenpeace Switzerland, its past and present, the following thesis can furthermore be seen as an (environmental) historical research using the method of oral history. Oral history is a method of qualitative interview that emphasizes participants' perspectives (Leavy 2011). Because of the informal and fragmented nature of social movements and grassroot-like organizations, oral history might be especially useful when only limited documentary evidence exists or is accessible (Bosi and Reiter 2014). In accordance with this research method, the interviewees were asked to retell their story, their personal experiences over time, as employees and volunteers of Greenpeace Switzerland.

One interview was conducted in person, all the others via Skype or Zoom. Because I spent six months at the Greenpeace Switzerland office and therefore already had an understanding of the situation and the background, I do not think it was a problem. Skype offered flexibility and allowed me to write my thesis here in Sweden while interviewing people in Switzerland and Germany.

3.2.1 Ethical Considerations

Although I was not interviewing particularly sensitive groups of people, it is necessary to acknowledge the power imbalances that interview situations create. The interview is an instrumental, one-way dialogue (Brinkman and Kvale 2005). I decided the topic that the interviewee should talk about. I did present a broad overview to my interviewees over what I was looking for, but I did not tell my interviewees in what ways I would interpret their statements, or what my (theoretical) standpoint is, in general. I did not tell them how exactly I would use the information they gave me.

18

Furthermore, the interviews were conducted in the Swiss German dialect and afterwards transcribed by me into German. All the direct quotations were then again translated by me into English. Although I tried to stay as close as possible to the original statement, a certain alteration or loss of meaning seems quite unavoidable.

3.2.2 Analytical Process

In line with the interpretivist approach to this study, the interviews were analyzed by meaning interpretation. In this approach, analysis goes beyond what is said directly in the interviews to recontextualize the statements within a wider frame of reference. This allows for a deeper and more critical interpretation of the material (Kvale 2011). Instead of trying to fit the data into predefined codes, the interpretation of the data shaped the emergent codes during the process of analysis (cf. Bryman 2016: 573). The codes were not strategically predefined, meaning that no codebook was created. However, the identification of possible themes and codes was certainly grounded in theory as the process of reading existing theory and defining the theoretical framework of this thesis happened simultaneously to the collection and analysis of data.

The coding process happened in different stages (cf. Bryman 2016): After having read carefully through all the transcriptions, a first list of very broad and general codes was created based on theory and on a first impression of the data. Each code was given a color. The transcripts were then reread and passages that corresponded to one of the listed codes were highlighted in the corresponding color. If, during the process, a passage seemed relevant but did not fit any of the listed codes, a new code was created. After this first round, the first codes were re-evaluated and, if necessary, renamed, deleted or new codes were added to the list. The transcripts were then re-read once more, until the codes seemed to accurately reflect the data at hand. The final codes were the following:

- Personal motivation to join
- Presumption of other people's motivation (to join or to leave)
- Organizational change (description)
- Reasons for changes
- Personal experience of changes
- Role of Greenpeace
- Present day challenges

This condensing of the data allowed me to then write my analysis.

3.3 Choice of Material for Data Collection and Data Analysis Method

Greenpeace Switzerland was chosen as the case for this study for several reasons. Firstly, I am from Switzerland. This means I am familiar with the political and cultural background, which also plays a role in how Greenpeace Switzerland works as an organization. Secondly, Greenpeace Switzerland is an important NRO in the international Greenpeace structure. Switzerland is a very wealthy country, with Swiss citizens donating millions of Swiss Francs every year for charity. In 2011, Greenpeace Switzerland was the third most important financial contributor amongst the 29 Greenpeace NROs that existed back then (Kälin and Villiger 2012). Thus, Greenpeace Switzerland has significant weight internationally. Lastly, as has been mentioned before, I have done an internship with Greenpeace Switzerland in the public fundraising department. This made it much easier to get access to interviewees and place their statements into context.

In total, I have conducted six interviews. To include different perspectives, three current employees of Greenpeace Switzerland, two former employees and one volunteer have been interviewed. The interviewees were sampled partially strategically, as I intentionally selected people who had started their engagement with Greenpeace as early as possible (at least ten years ago but preferably much earlier). The reason for this was because I wanted to understand the changes within the organization over time, from the beginning until the present day. Thus, it was also important for me that people still had at least a connection to Greenpeace Switzerland and were also familiar with recent changes that have been happening within the organization. However, because several more people fit this condition than I could have interviewed in the limited timeframe, convenience sampling decided who got picked inside this predefined pool of possible interviewees.

Due to anonymity, I did not use participants' name or age in my study. However, since most of them have been engaged already in the 1980s and '90s, I can say that none of the participants are under age 30. Half of my interviewees were women, the other half were men.

Interviewee[1]	About the Interviewees
Charlotte	Charlotte joined the organization in the early 1990s. After leaving an unsatisfying corporate job, she went on an exploration to find more meaningful work. Having spent time in her childhood on farms, growing up close to animals and plants, as well as having been politically active in her youth, she was led to work in the environmental

---

[1] For reasons of anonymity, all the names of my interviewees have been changed.

	field, and eventually, to Greenpeace. She is still currently an employee of Greenpeace Switzerland.
Henrik	Henrik joined the organization in the late '80s as a climate campaigner, even though he had no prior knowledge in this area. Shortly after he started his work as a campaigner, he was asked to take over the position of CEO. After several years as a CEO of Greenpeace Switzerland, he took up a position with Greenpeace International, where he worked until his retirement.
Peter	Peter started as a Greenpeace volunteer in the 1980s. Because he was passionate about learning and education, he took a position with Greenpeace Switzerland to do school and youth work. Coming from the volunteer side of Greenpeace, hands-on practical work and creating "real change" is especially important to him. Peter recently took up a position with Greenpeace International.
René	René joined Greenpeace in 2008. After a failed attempt to set up his own business, he was looking for a meaningful job. René is still currently an employee at Greenpeace Switzerland.
Elianne	Elianne joined a Swiss regional Greenpeace volunteer group in the late 1990s, because of her love for nature, but also because she had a desire to create change hands-on. She has participated in various regional as well as national direct protest actions over the years. She is still currently part of the same volunteer group in Switzerland.
Marlies	Marlies started to work for Greenpeace Switzerland in the mid-1990s. Like Charlotte, she previously had a position in a company that left her unsatisfied and she was looking for a job that would allow her to be her authentic self. She, too, is still currently an employee at Greenpeace Switzerland.

3.4   Other Material

In addition to my interviews, I also included the Greenpeace International Framework into my analysis. This six-page document summarizes the Greenpeace International Framework, the long-term strategy of Greenpeace International for the coming years (Greenpeace International 2016). Since Greenpeace International has significant influence on the regional offices, it is understandable that their global strategies also impact the strategies of the NROs. The information in this document was not only used in my analysis, but also the basis of one of my interview questions about the changing role of Greenpeace Switzerland over time.

3.5   Limitations to the Research Design

Due to the limit of time, choices had to be made in terms of focus and material selection. This in turn means that the present study has certain limitations. First of all, only six people were interviewed, and the focus of this study lies on Greenpeace Switzerland specifically. All the Greenpeace NROs are very different, not only in terms of how they are organized, but also in the way they communicate or campaign. Therefore, what is true for one branch and its people might not be for another branch. For these reasons, the opinions voiced by the participants cannot be considered representative for the whole organization, and they might not even be representative for Greenpeace Switzerland. In future research, it might be valuable to include more voices, especially of volunteers as well, or compare the results of this study to Greenpeace offices in other countries.

It furthermore needs to be acknowledged that oral history, as a spoken account, is a reflection of the personal opinions and experiences of the interviewees and is thus subjective (Reti n.d.). Therefore, it would have been beneficial for this study to include additional material besides the interviews, for triangulation. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the initial plan to visit the social archive in Zurich could not be realized. Various reports, protocols, or other documents on the history of Greenpeace Switzerland could have been accessed there that are not available online.

Thirdly, the present study specifically selected people that had joined the organization at least ten years ago. For comparison, it would be interesting for future studies to interview people who have recently joined the organization and explore their motivations to do so and how these people evaluate the role of Greenpeace Switzerland in today's society, as their views might differ from people who have been with the organization for a long time.

And lastly, all of the people interviewed still had a connection to Greenpeace in some way. Although all of them also reflected critically on the organization, it is understandable that they all still regard the organization more or less favorably. Further research might focus instead on people who have left the organization completely, their reasons to do so, and how they assess the organization's changes and the resulting opportunities and challenges.

4   Findings and Analysis

In accordance with the intensive case study design of this thesis, the findings will be presented in a story-format, narrating the changes that have happened over the years within the organization from

the beginning to the present time (cf. Eriksson and Kovalainen 2008). Oral history, too, is often presented as a storytelling (Leavy 2011). Afterwards, different aspects are going to be discussed in more detail. Even if no generalization is possible on the basis of the qualitative data, an attempt will be made to place the results in a wider context of NGOization and institutionalization of resistance.

4.1 Findings

Back in the early 1990s, Greenpeace Switzerland was what Erla Thrandardottir (2012: 160) calls a "grassroots style NGO with ad hoc management". There were only around 15 employees and the office consisted of two connected apartments. "(A)t that time it was still a bunch of radicals", Henrik says. "Nobody was a scientifically educated employee or anything like that. But they were all highly committed people". Charlotte remembers: "It was a family, back then. (…) We cooked together almost every evening (…). And sometimes people would even sleep there. (…) It was pretty special".
According to Charlotte, it was "chaotic, everyone did what they wanted, a little bit of everything". Participating in direct actions was a condition of employment. This versatility and freedom were aspects of her work she particularly enjoyed. But she also mentions how challenged she felt, especially in the beginning, because everyone was very self-responsible.

Henrik tells a similar story. Only six months after he started his work as a climate campaigner, he was asked to take over the position of CEO. Managing the other employees was a demanding task.

> The motivation to save the world is of course a very powerful one. So, you don't want anyone to tell you which method you should use when you yourself know so well how it should be done. (…) It was all about codetermination. We discussed and decided everything together around the table (…). After six years, I was exhausted (Henrik).

Yet both Charlotte and Henrik mention that they were able to unleash an incredible amount of creativity. Henrik sounds proud when he recounts the campaigns they had done and how their constructive projects had brought them international recognition. Charlotte explains: "With few people who had a say and an opinion, we had, of course, a completely different speed and agility than we have today".

According to Henrik and Marlies, the organization used to be a "secretive, closed community". Because their confrontational actions relied on a surprise effect, it was necessary that not many people were in the know. The fact that only very few people were involved in the campaign planning, and even the activists were seen as executors rather than participants, resulted in Greenpeace Switzerland being "defamed as undemocratic and authoritarian" (Henrik). The organization also had a bad reputation for working with illegal methods. Charotte says that back then, people had problems finding another job

23

when they had Greenpeace on their CV. She herself says that joining Greenpeace was a "post-pubescent reaction, a place for me to vent". Henrik describes the former strategy of the organization like this:

> We identify the problem (and) with the help of science we analyze (…) how it could be solved. And we conduct a power analysis and (…) determine where the bad guys are, and where the good guys are (…). Then we go out and do the fierce stunts and the big actions. And they are attractive enough for the media to come and act as multipliers to get the message out.

To him, much of Greenpeace Switzerland's strength in the first 20 years came from keeping their campaigns simple. It was never about proposing an alternative model for how the world should be organized or criticizing the underlying structures that enabled these problematic outcomes. "We said 'stop nukes! Stop toxics! (…)' We didn't say 'What does this mean for society? What does it mean for the jobs? (…) We only ever said: 'This detail here, get rid of it!' (Because) it made campaigning easy". However, Peter and Henrik both regret that Greenpeace has in the past protested more against the "symptoms", than trying to unravel the cause of environmental and social problems, which they both consider to be the neoliberal capitalist economic system. "The majority of our first actions were all 'end-of-pipe'", mentions Henrik. "We always said: 'Down there, that's where the toxics come out, so we close the lid so that it can't get out'. We didn't go into production and said: 'It shouldn't be produced up there in the first place'". Furthermore, although the NRO has always participated in international campaigns, Charlotte says the attention used to be much more on national issues like chemical waste in Basel and Jura, Swiss nuclear energy, or genetic engineering at Swiss universities.

Charlotte, Henrik, Elianne and Marlies see the reason for Greenpeace Switzerland's increased professionalization mainly in the growth of the organization's donor base. The growth in supporters required the organization to more than double their staff and divide work. Marlies argues: "With 30-40 people, you can still improvise, but at some point, that was no longer possible". More donors also meant more responsibility. Charlotte explains:

> with the increase in donations came sudden new challenges, therefore we just had to work more structured. (…) (We had to) show that we treat our employees correctly and handle our money responsibly. I don't think that anyone ever asked about how Greenpeace invests their money. Today, we really have to comply 100% with what we criticize on the outside.

Greenpeace Switzerland's increased professionalization is reflected in the people working for the organization. In the early days, the focus would have been on selecting people who were highly committed to the movement, but not necessarily the most professional employees. Marlies, too, remembers that twenty years ago, there were still a lot of "wayward, original personalities". She thinks they were great for Greenpeace Switzerland's campaigns but with the growth of the organization as well as the changing environment it became increasingly difficult because these people did not stick to any rules or conditions and working with them was very chaotic. "And then, I think, it kind of hit the fan. And then we had an OD (organizational development). I have the feeling that we got much more moderate. We had more agreeable people then, but with much less drive". Charlotte believes a great part of Greenpeace's spirit was lost with those people, who "were just so intrinsically motivated, that they did a lot in the name of Greenpeace" but felt too constrained by the new regulations and guidelines. She says, today Greenpeace rather selects professionals, who can more or less identify with the Greenpeace values, but not necessarily come from the movement. Henrik says: "Suddenly, there were more scientists than activists".

Additionally, there were legal challenges that required Greenpeace Switzerland to become more professional. Marlies mentions: "The possibilities to shut us down have increased". Elianne explains that corporations were becoming more resourceful in using the legal system to their advantage. What used to be considered simply trespassing is now accompanied by costly claims for damages. Furthermore, there is always a risk for Greenpeace to lose its tax exemption. According to Charlotte, this happened once in the canton of Aargau. She says: "(T)his obviously had a huge effect, because some people stopped donating to us because they could no longer deduct their donation (from their taxes)". As a result, Greenpeace had to become more careful. Suddenly, there needed to be risk assessments. Today, Greenpeace Switzerland has its own legal advisor. Having frequently participated in direct actions herself, Elianne especially noticed the change. In the beginning, the volunteers were very independent. "I am exaggerating now, but we could do more or less whatever we wanted and sign it with Greenpeace. (…)". Over time, there was more and more control. They had to fill out forms, get permits. She says there was even a fear in the beginning that the voluntary work might become irrelevant.

Aside from a process of professionalization, Greenpeace Switzerland also became more institutionalized. Henrik explains that the old strategy of winning over the media as multipliers, mainly through spectacular actions, no longer worked as well, because other organizations started to apply similar strategies. Marlies remembers that journalists used to arrive in droves when Greenpeace Switzerland

made an action. "And already fifteen years ago this started to change drastically, because there were more and more other players who started to do the same kind of actions (…). It was increasingly difficult to get into the media with these actions. According to Henrik and Charlotte, Greenpeace was most successful when it came to raising awareness on environmental issues. Henrik explains: "Whaling, dumping toxic waste into the North Sea, if nobody talked about it, we brought it up. (…) Today, the issues are on the table. (…) Now the question is, how do we solve these issues?" Thus, Henrik describes the increasing institutionalization of the organization as a change "from a very radical organization to one that (actually) wanted to change things, and not just do the big stunts". Voluntary work and direct action are still an important pillar of Greenpeace's work. However, Marlies, Henrik and Peter mention that Greenpeace Switzerland has started to put solutions in the center of their campaigning. Peter, especially, emphasizes that for protest-actions to be effective, they must be embedded in a long-term strategy which aims at disrupting the root-cause of environmental and social problems (the unsustainable growth-addicted economic system). He believes that protest should be used as an instrument to reach the solution. Consequently, new strategies such as lobbying and positioning themselves as "experts" have opened up new doors for the organization. Elianne says:

> Greenpeace has become a (…) point of contact. There is experience. (…) If something happens, the Swiss Television comes and asks Greenpeace, for example, 'what do you say to this issue?'. And I don't just think that's bad. It shows you are being taken seriously and it offers a new opportunity to place your demands and opinions. That has changed. In the beginning it was the young rebels and now (we) are a (…) partner, someone to ask for information.

Henrik, René and Elianne all think that today, Greenpeace Switzerland is an institution. The organization has become an important player in the political business and the environmental movement. René believes that Greenpeace Switzerland has become more serious and places more emphasis on science. In his opinion, the organization has gained the trust of "relevant stakeholders, politics, authorities, business".

However, the increasing institutionalization did not come without conflict. Henrik remembers that back in the day, when the first CEO of Greenpeace International went to the World Economic Forum in Davos "there was an outcry: 'What are we doing there? We are the opposition; we are against that!' (…) But change happens with the means of the opponent, it cannot be avoided. And that was the big discussion". Elianne, too, describes the conflict that the institutionalization caused for the activists:

You got to find a balance. You can't just become 'tame', because then you are no longer what you are. (…) The activists (…) wanted to do spectacular (actions) and suddenly (those responsible in the office) said 'no, you can't do that!' And we thought 'huh? But we're Greenpeace!'

Peter also sees a dilemma between being embedded within the system while working to disrupt the system: While a decline in economic growth might be good for the environment, it also means that people donate less money to the organization.

It is also important to mention the influence that Greenpeace International had on the NRO. Henrik explains how the different national offices (NROs) used to be much more independent. Today, the NROs are obliged to partake in the international campaigns. That, however, has an impact on how the national offices need to structure their campaigns so that the international and national campaigns are well connected. In 2016, Greenpeace International published a framework, which is supposed to "guide and prioritise Greenpeace's work for a green and peaceful world". In this framework, the organization acknowledges that

from climate change to inequity, armed conflict to social injustice, the great challenges of our time are not only urgent, they are intimately linked. From the power structures that make them possible to the mindsets that make them acceptable, they are interwoven and must be changed together (Greenpeace International 2016: 2).

In recent years, Greenpeace Switzerland's campaigns have become more internationally oriented. Today, the NRO's two main campaign areas are climate change and single-use plastics. Both issues are relevant for Switzerland, but they are even more relevant on a global scale. Specifically the recent international banking on climate change campaign which Switzerland significantly contributed to, can be seen as an example for this new strategy: Rather than directly attacking fossil fuel companies, Greenpeace targeted instead banks and insurance companies who finance these fossil fuel corporations and who thus indirectly foster climate change.

Peter, Henrik and Marlies also emphasize that with the increased desire to achieve solutions came the awareness that this could only be accomplished in cooperation with other actors in the movement. Marlies says:

Today, it's much more (…) about collaboration. A lot has been improved. (…) It has always been said 'we need to distinguish ourselves from the WWF', and a lot of energy

was invested into this. Until it became clear that we can only tackle climate change to-
gether.

But there are also challenges that come with increased networking. Charlotte explains: "For example, when our climate campaign builds up and finances the Climate Seniors Association, but the Green-peace logo doesn't appear anywhere (…) (people) no longer know what we are doing". Henrik, too, says: "That's the big danger in the strategy. When we are networking, it's always 'the NGOs' that act. You are losing your specific brand; you are a part of the whole movement". Peter is more optimistic.

I am convinced that together (…) we can achieve concrete solutions, that this can actu-
ally be sold very well. We once said we would do a collaboration with the WWF. (Our
donors) were happy, there have not been fewer donation. (…) The main thing is that we
really achieve something. (…) And I have the feeling that you only have the strength
when you work together.

Because Greenpeace Switzerland is dependent on donations, the organization must constantly legiti-
mize their work to their donors. René and Marlies both believe that it is mainly the images of spectac-
ular actions from the past that people still have in their minds today. And that many people do not actually know what Greenpeace is doing today. With a more solution-oriented and collaborative ap-
proach, explaining Greenpeace's work is becoming even more difficult. René explains:

If you don't stop something directly, some dirty outlet from a chemical plant, then you
are working on a level where you don't really know exactly what contribution you are
actually making. And neither do the people out there.

Although he believes that Greenpeace Switzerland has made important contributions to environmen-
tal regulations and policies in the past, he is also critical about the organization's impact. Donating money to an environmental organization might be nothing more for people than an "indulgence trade" where they donate money to the organization in order not to feel guilty for flying "to Bali once more, because we are doing something for the environment now!"

Marlies also blames the difficulties to communicate Greenpeace's impact on today's flood of infor-
mation. It is much easier to attract people's attention with pictures of extraordinary protest actions. In contrast, "the image of the conference, how we are lobbying (…) is so unattractive". Charlotte also sees a reason in the increasing complexity of issues that makes communication more difficult, for ex-
ample when talking about Greenpeace's climate campaign:

Greenpeace is an enemy-oriented organization and we always choose the big ones: Nestlé, Syngenta, Monsanto, (…). But the climate doesn't have a brand. (…) I think it is so difficult to get people to support Greenpeace for the climate. There are only very few people who understand the difficult connections and want to support us (Charlotte).

To Henrik, the increased institutionalization and professionalization were inevitable and even necessary. To him, "the movement must become more rational in order to be effective". He also believes that in becoming more professional and structured, Greenpeace became more efficient in pursuing their goal. However, he also thinks this process of rationalization resulted in a loss of emotionality that characterized Greenpeace's early campaigns. René, Marlies and Charlotte share this opinion. To René, hanging banners is not particularly bold anymore and he would wish for a "creative boost". Charlotte, too, says she thinks "the majority of our actions are quite repetitive, and I also find them a bit boring at times". Peter and Henrik see it as a dilemma between regarding the organization as a machine, with input-output and seeing it as a living organism, with people. Peter does not think that the "machine thinking" is completely wrong. Indeed, he believes that certain areas of work must be standardized, such as finances, for example. Other areas, on the other hand, might require more creativity and, in these areas, people might need more freedom to create.

This struggle between an increased professionalization and institutionalization of the organization on one hand, and trying to preserve the high intrinsic motivation of the employees and volunteers on the other hand, the conflict between the organization as a "machine" and an "organic, living being" resulted in a number of restructurings of Greenpeace Switzerland over the years. Marlies says: "I have a feeling that every seven years Greenpeace has had to undergo a restructuring (...). (P)eople said that the management must go, everything must change. And then everything changed, and it was still not right".

René and Peter think that most of these restructurings were of "cosmetic nature" – Except for the reorganization that started in 2017. Greenpeace Switzerland is currently changing its former hierarchical structure to a so-called 'self-organization', with less hierarchy and more holacracy, where power is distributed horizontally, rather than top-down. In the holacratic system, employees choose or create certain roles that they want to take on. Marlies values the clarity that comes with this new system.

(The) role clarification process (…) required to sort out your job and re-orientate everything back to the purpose. (...) (Now I) really know quite clearly 'I'm responsible for this, but I'm not responsible for that anymore'. And that's very liberating (…) and clarifying.

Charlotte, on the other hand, has mixed feelings about the new organization model. While she appreciates the increased independence of employees to make decisions, she also experiences the new role system as quite restrictive. The changes that happened over the years also impacted her relationship to the organization. She still enjoys her job and the work environment. But what used to feel like a home to her has turned into "just a workplace". René, Marlies and Elianne are more hopeful. For them, this "cultural change" takes Greenpeace Switzerland in just the right direction. Elianne concludes: "I do have a feeling now that we are gathering momentum again. People are very motivated. It all makes sense after a long time of finding and re-organizing ourselves. And it's also good to tread new paths".

4.2   Discussion

It is clear from my findings that Greenpeace Switzerland has become more institutionalized, professional and bureaucratic over the years. As my interviewees describe, the strategies that the organization uses to bring about social change have also diversified. In its early years, Greenpeace Switzerland mainly pursued the strategy of activism with the goal to raise awareness on various issues. All employees had to take part in the non-violent protest actions and the organization had a rather shady reputation. Today, Greenpeace Switzerland is an "established institution". And although the protest actions are still an important part of the organization's strategy, institutional influence through lobbying or expert interviews in the media have "opened up a new door" for the organization.

The difficulties of navigating between challenging the system through often somewhat illegal protest actions while still being embedded in the system are reflected in my interviews as well. Many of the changes were reactions to the organization's changing environment. Higher legal and financial risks, as well as increasing demands to meet their own high moral standards required a professionalization and bureaucratization of the organization's work (Steffek and Hahn 2010). This resulted in frequent conflicts, not only between the employees but also between the staff and the volunteers. What Lang (2012) considers a trade-off between institutional and public advocacy might be seen when Elianne explains how she experienced uncertainty about the volunteers' role within the organization and whether they would eventually become "irrelevant".

The changes that Greenpeace Switzerland underwent are not unique to the organization. Although Greenpeace Switzerland has been an NGO from the beginning, the organization's changes are comparable to the broader phenomenon of NGOization. Sabine Lang (2012: 32) argues that civil society is becoming "NGOized": There has been a boom in non-profit organizations in the past fifty years all over the world. Explanations for this occurrence differ depending on political and social contexts and types

of NGOs, as well as the theoretical lens through which this phenomenon is examined (ibid.). Following a bottom-up argumentation, the expansion in NGO formation is considered a societal response to socio-economic factors such as democratization, economic development, and integration in the global economy. According to this perspective, NGOs arose as a societal challenge to the state from below (Reimann 2006). From a more structural, top-down approach, the explosive growth of NGOs in the past few decades is explained through the "ways in which states, international organizations, and other structures have actively stimulated and promoted NGOs from above" (ibid.: 46). And yet another perspective considers organizational dynamics "such as the professionalization of social movements (…) as contributing to the expansion of the nongovernmental sector" (Lang 2012: 14-15).

NGOization is often considered a problematic phenomenon. Edwards (2014: 32) describes it as the "worldwide professionalization of the non-profit sector in a technocratic sense, and a gradual distancing of associations from their social base". Analyzing the democratic legitimacy of Greenpeace International, Michael Roose (2012: 348) thinks that "the bureaucratic structure weakens the organization's ability to foster activism and to respond to grassroots environmental concerns".

While social movements are seen as highly participatory and a particularly valuable form of social engagement, especially larger NGOs are dismissed as bureaucratic 'protest businesses' that seek to maintain themselves mainly through aggressive marketing rather than achieving campaign goals (Hensby et al. 2011). Because NGOs are embedded in the neoliberal capitalist market economy, in order to survive they must raise the funds necessary to sustain their operations (Lipschutz and McKendry 2011). Critics argue that large, high-profile organizations mainly attract so-called 'chequebook members' who merely support the organization with financial donations instead of actively participating in the campaigns. These authors do not consider donating money a meaningful form of participation or a 'genuine' form of civic participation (Jordan and Maloney 2007).

Even though Greenpeace Switzerland does have an important voluntary network with highly active members, it can be argued that their marketing strategies are directed more towards those who will pay rather than towards those who will participate (Hensby et al. 2011). Furthermore, as René mentioned, donating money to environmental organizations can be seen as a "trade in indulgences", whereby one pays money to the organization while continuing to act in an environmentally harmful manner. However, this picture seems to be too simplistic. It may also be argued that people who donate money to an organization most likely identify with the organization's actions or values to a certain extent. And it is quite imaginable that at least some of the supporters also orientate their lifestyle

directly towards these values. A donation to Greenpeace will then not be considered a mere trade in indulgences but as an extended expression of environmental concern, alongside other, more personal, or even political actions.

Another point of criticism is that institutionalization leads to a watering-down of the organization's original goals and values (Hensby et al. 2011). Lang (2012: 4) explains that NGOs whose message broadly aligns with government agendas are more likely to be invited to the table then NGOs with contentious or radical agendas. Such a 'conservatization' of the organization can also be observed within Greenpeace Switzerland, which has, according to Elianne, Henrik and Marlies, become much more "nice and well-behaved" over the years.

Especially the fact that SMOs are increasingly prioritizing business interests has an impact on their relationship with other groups in the social movement (Jordan and Maloney 2007). Today, this seems to be of more relevance than ever. In order to effectively tackle such interconnected, multifaceted, global issues as climate change or global injustice, cooperation among different civil society actors is not only desirable but indispensable: "Civil society gains strength when grassroots groups, non-profit intermediaries and membership associations are linked together in ways that promote collective goals, cross-society coalitions, mutual accountability and shared action-learning" (Edwards 2014: 29). Unfortunately, however, business interests and the fear of losing their brand hinders the organizations' incentive to network and cooperate with other actors. Rather than seeing other movements and organizations as fellow activists, they are treated as competitors (Hensby et al. 2011). This is especially problematic, because important grassroots social movements might be marginalized by big business-like organizations that attract all the attention and resources (ibid., Edwards 2014). This does not mean that no cooperation is happening at all. There are several examples of how Greenpeace Switzerland has worked together with organizations such as the WWF or with youth movements. Yet if it were not for economic interests, these coalitions could potentially be much stronger.

Indeed, in a globalized world, "new forms of cooperation are called for" (Giddens 1991: 226). If the goal is to find sustainable and just solutions for global problems and effectively tackle their "root cause" – global neoliberal capitalism –, then cooperation not only between different actors of civil society, but across different institutions seems important. When all social groups are involved in the decision-making process and have an interest in the outcomes, solutions are more likely to hold (Edwards 2014). "While governments, firms and families are not part of associational life (…), they must be part of building the good society because they influence both social norms and achievements, and

the political settlements that translate them into public policy" (ibid.: 56). A certain degree of institu-tionalization might thus be needed for successful problem solving. Henrik, too, acknowledge that "the movement must become more rational in order to be effective". Successful governance and practical problem-solving require developing shared interests, a willingness for compromise and the ability to see oneself in those who are different (Edwards 2014).

Alberoni (1984) argues that a social movement becoming an institution is not so problematic as long as the core values of the movement remain at the center of the institution. It is the people that live the values of the organization through their personal commitment to the cause. Thus, if members' intrinsic motivation is not kept alive, meaning when they belong to the organization for functional reasons only, that is when the institution declines. It is not enough to simply declare certain values to the outside. Only if these values are felt and lived by the people who make up the organization, the employees and volunteers, then the values are sustained. Thus, Greenpeace Switzerland continuously walks the line between efficiently running an organization and maximizing its impact on the outside world and keeping members intrinsic motivation alive to conserve the core values of the organization. And while some of my interviewees indeed say that the changes within Greenpeace have led to a loss in their motivation, others appreciate the increased understanding of and control over their responsi-bility. Indeed, bureaucracy should not be too hastily dismissed. "One can argue that the basic principles of bureaucracy – rationality, regulation, specialized roles and tasks, auditing – remain crucial in order to keep the myriad practical matters of any large organization routinely running" (Hensby et al. 2011: 816).

The latest organizational change that Greenpeace Switzerland is currently undergoing, as it moves away from hierarchy towards a more self-organized holacratic system, is perceived by almost all of my interviewees as a very hopeful development. First of all, hierarchies are reduced, and power decen-tered through a new model of circles (instead of teams) and roles that give each employee more re-sponsibility. Secondly, the new structure of meetings is hoped to make the organization faster and more flexible and allow for more spontaneity, which might also revive the creative spark that Green-peace Switzerland has apparently lost over the past couple years.

5   Conclusion

The present case study of Greenpeace Switzerland sought to analyze the ways in which the organiza-tion changed over time and the implications these changes had on how the organization aims to create social change.

Recounting the history of Greenpeace Switzerland, an environmental movement organization, this thesis has been first and foremost a study in environmental history. Six qualitative oral history interviews with long-term employees and volunteers of Greenpeace Switzerland were conducted. The interviewees were asked to retell their stories, their motivations, and opinions and how they personally experienced the changes within Greenpeace Switzerland. Following the oral history approach, the findings were presented in a story-format. Furthermore, the historical phenomena of globalization and neoliberal capitalism were included into the theoretical framework and again referred to in the discussion, focusing on the problematic socio-environmental impact of these phenomena. This was done, one the one hand, to explain why some of my interviewees consider neoliberal capitalism the root cause of socio-environmental global problems. And, on the other hand, it was included to examine how processes of organizational growth, institutionalization and professionalization impact the way the Greenpeace Switzerland tackles these challenges.

Exploring concepts such as institutionalization and the legitimacy of NGOs, Political Sociology was the second theoretical pillar of this study. However, this thesis has ultimately been a research in Human Ecology. Firstly, it has been examined how the changes within Greenpeace Switzerland influenced the organization's culture and, in turn, employees' and volunteers' motivation. Secondly, this thesis looked at how organizational change influences the power that social movements and NGOs exert to achieve social change. And thirdly, the implications of greater institutionalization and professionalization were analyzed for the environmental organization's ability to tackle global socio-environmental issues like climate change.

My interviews showed that Greenpeace Switzerland has in fact become more institutionalized, professional, and bureaucratic over the years. This phenomenon can be observed in many social movements and non-governmental organizations over time. The increased institutionalization and bureaucracy were perceived by my interviewees as both positive and negative. On one hand, most of my interviewees saw these changes as necessary for the organization to continue functioning. The new image of Greenpeace Switzerland as a scientific expert more than just a troublesome rebel has opened up new doors for the organization to place their demands. Some of my interviewees also expressed gratitude for the increased clarity and structure. On the other hand, for some of my interviewees these changes resulted in a loss of "emotionality", meaning a loss of passion, excitement and creativity. They believe the organization has lost some of its edge. There seems to have been a constant struggle within the organization between achieving the rational structure needed to efficiently run a large organization and keeping the employees' and volunteers' intrinsic motivation and creative freedom alive.

However, not just the organizational structure of Greenpeace Switzerland has changed over time, but also their strategy to achieve a present and future that is ecologically and socially just. In earlier years, the organization mainly relied on non-violent direct action to raise awareness on perceived environmental threats. In recent years, however, Greenpeace International's focus has shifted. Most people are aware today of the social and environmental crises we are facing on a global scale. Now, the challenge is to solve these issues. The decision of Greenpeace International to focus more on solutions as well as networking, understandably also influences Greenpeace Switzerland, who has ratified the international long-term campaign programme.

Furthermore, in 2017, Greenpeace Switzerland has started a profound restructuring, moving away from rigid hierarchies towards a new model of self-organization and holacracy. My interviewees express hope towards this development. According to them, Greenpeace Switzerland seems to be heading in the right direction with this new organizational model. However, such deep cultural change takes time to be properly implemented. Therefore, it remains to be seen whether the new organizational structure will bring the changes the employees desired as well as the impact it will have on Greenpeace Switzerland's future campaigns.

Bibliography

Alberoni, F. (1984) *Movement and Institution*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bell, K. (2015) 'Can the capitalist economic system deliver environmental justice?', *Environmental Research Letters*, 10(12) [online]. Available at: https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/10/12/125017 (Accessed 16 May 2020).

Bosi, L. and Reiter, H. (2014) 'Archival Research and Oral History in Social Movement Research' in Della Porta, D. (ed.) *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 117-143.

Brinkman, S. and Kvale, S. (2005) 'Confronting the Ethics of Qualitative Research', *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 18(2), pp. 157–181.

Brown, N. (2017) *Epistemology* [online]. Available at: http://www.nicole-brown.co.uk/epistemology/ (Accessed 12 May 2020).

Bryman, A. (2016) *Social Research Methods.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bühlmann, C. (2014) *Rede zum 30-jährigen Geburtstag von Greenpeace Schweiz* [Online]. Available at: https://www.cecile-buehlmann.ch/?page=4.5.46 (Accessed 13 May 2020).

Bullard, R. D., Mohai, P., Saha, R., Wright, B. (2008) 'Toxic Wastes and Race at Twenty: Why Race Still Matters after all of These Years', *Environmental Law*, 38(2), pp. 371-411.

Chong, D. (2015) 'Political Protest and Civil Disobedience' in Wright, J.D. (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences.* New York and Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 421-426.

Coglianese, C. (2001) 'Social Movements, Law, and Society: The Institutionalization of the Environmental Movement', *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 150(1), pp. 85-118.

Daly, H. E. and Farley, J. (2011) *Ecological Economics: Principles and Applications.* Washington, DC: Island Press.

Denscombe, M. (2010) *The Good Research Guide*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Diani, M. and Della Porta, D. (2006) *Social Movements: An Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Edwards, M. (2014) *Civil Society*. Cambridge: Polity.

Eriksson, P. and Kovalainen, A. (2008) *Qualitative Methods in Business Research.* London: Sage Publications.

Erwood, S. (2011) *The Greenpeace Chronicles. 40 Years of Protecting the Planet* [online]. Amsterdam: Greenpeace International. Available at: https://issuu.com/greenpeaceinternational/docs/greenpeacechronicles (Accessed 17 May 2020).

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Greenpeace International (2016). *The Framework* [online]. Available at: https://storage.googleapis.com/planet4-international-stateless/2018/12/22cf06f9-framework-summary.pdf (Accessed 27 April 2020).

Greenpeace International (n.d.) *Our Values* [online]. Available at: https://www.greenpeace.org/international/explore/about/values/ (Accessed 17 May 2020).

Greenpeace Switzerland (n.d.). *Über uns* [online]. Available at: https://www.greenpeace.ch/de/ueber-uns/ (Accessed 16 May 2020).

Gunningham, N. (2019) 'Averting Climate Catastrophe: Environmental Activism, Extinction Rebellion and coalitions of Influence', *King's Law Journal*, 30(2), pp. 194-202.

Helfer, L. R. (2006) 'Understanding Change in International Organizations: Globalization and Innovation in the ILO', *Vanderbilt Law Review*, 59(3), pp. 649-726.

Hensby, A., Sibthorpe, J. and Driver, S. (2011) 'Resisting the 'Protest Business': Bureaucracy, Postbureaucracy and Active Membership in Social Movement Organizations', *Organization*, 19(6), pp. 809-823.

Hornborg, A. (2007) 'Introduction: Environmental History as Political Ecology' in Hornborg, A., McNeill, J. R. and Martinez-Alier, J. (ed.) *Rethinking Environmental History*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press, pp. 1-24.

Hughes J. D. (2001) *An Environmental History of the World: Humankind's Changing Role in the Community of Life*. London: Routledge.

Järvensivu, P., Toivanen, T., Vadén, T., Lähde, V., Majava, A. and Eronen, J. T. (2018) *Governance of Economic Transition: A Scientific Background Document for the UN Global Sustainable Development Report 2019* [online]. Available at: https://bios.fi/en/economic-transition-governance-a-scientific-background-document-to-the-un-global-sustainable-development-report-2019/ (Accessed 17 May 2020).

Jordan, G. and Maloney, W. A. (2007) *Democracy and Interest Groups*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kälin, U. and Villiger, H. (2012) Greenpeace Schweiz [online]. Available at: https://www.findmittel.ch/archive/archNeu/Ar507.html (Accessed 12 May 2020).

Kepplinger, H. M. (1998) 'Der Nachrichtenwert der Nachrichtenfaktoren' in Holtz-Bacha, C., Scherer, H., Waldmann, N. (ed.) *Wie die Medien die Welt erschaffen und wie die Menschen darin leben*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien, pp. 19-38.

Kvale, S. (2011) *Doing Interviews*. London: Sage Publications.

Lang, S. (2012) *NGOs, Civil Society, and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Leavy, P. (2011) *Oral History: Understanding Qualitative Research.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lexico (n.d.) *Professionalization* [online]. Available at: https://www.lexico.com/definition/professionalization (Accessed 01 June 2020).

Lipschutz, R. D. and McKendry, C. (2011) 'Social Movements and Global Civil Society' in Dryzek, J. S., Norgaard, R. B. and Schlosberg, D. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 369-383.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (n.d.) *Institution* [online]. Available at: https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/institution (Accessed 01 June 2020).

Luxemburg, R. (2003) *The Accumulation of Capital*. London: Routledge. (Originally published in: (1913) *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals.* Vienna: Vorwärts-Verlag).

Malm, A. (2016) 'Who Lit This Fire? Approaching the History of the Fossil Economy', *Critical Historical Studies*, 3(2), pp. 215-248.

Marks, R. B. (2006) *The Origins of the Modern World: A Global and Ecological Narrative from the Fifteenth to the Twenty-first Century*. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

McNeill, J. R. (2000) *Something New Under the Sun: An Environmental History of the Twentieth-Century World*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Moor, J. de (2018) 'The 'Efficacy Dilemma' of Transnational Climate Activism: The Case of COP21', *Environmental Politics*, 27(6), pp. 1079-1100.

Nester, W. R. (2010) *Globalization: A Short History of the Modern World.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Patros, T. and Stepan-Norris, J. (2015) 'Political Sociology' in Wright, J.D. (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences.* New York and Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 472-479.

Perez, A. C., Grafton, B., Mohai, P., Hardin, R., Hintzen, K. and Orvis, S. (2015) 'Evolution of the Environmental Justice Movement: Activism, Formalization and Differentiation', *Environmental Research Letter*, 10(10) [online]. Available at: https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/10/10/105002 (Accessed 16 May 2020).

Pollin, R. (2018) 'De-growth vs. a Green New Deal', *New Left Review*, 112, pp. 5-25.

Rawcliffe, P. (1998) *Environmental Pressure Groups in Transition*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Rawls, J. (2005) *A Theory of Justice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Reimann, K. D. (2006) 'A View from the Top: International Politics, Norms and the Worldwide Growth of NGOs', *International Studies Quarterly*, 50, pp. 45-67.

Reti, I. (n.d.). *Oral History Research and Resources* [online]. Available at: https://guides.library.ucsc.edu/oralhist#:~:text=What%20is%20Oral%20History%3F,adding%20to%20the%20historical%20record. (Accessed 08 June 2020).

Rootes, C. A. (2007) 'Social Movements and Politics', *African Studies*, 56(1), pp. 67-95.

Rucht, D. (1995) 'Ecological Protest as Calculated Law-Breaking: Greenpeace and Earth First! In Comparative Perspective' in Rüdig, W. (ed.) *Green Politics Three*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 66-89.

Steffek, J. and Hahn, K. (2010) *Evaluating Transnational NGOs: Legitimacy, Accountability, Representation.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stoll, S. (2014) 'A Metabolism of Society: Capitalism for Environmental Historians' in Isenberg, A. C. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Environmental History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Svarstad, H., Benjaminsen, T. A. und Overå, R. (2018) 'Power Theories in Political Ecology', *Journal of Political Ecology*, 25(1), pp. 350-425.

Thrandardottir, E. (2012) *What Makes NGOs Legitimate? An analysis of Amnesty International UK's, Greenpeace UK's and Cafod's legitimacy claims in the UK national context*. PhD thesis, Manchester: University of Manchester.

Wapner, P. K. (1996) *Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Zelko, Frank (2017) 'Scaling Greenpeace: From Local Activism to Global Governance', *Historical Social Research*, 42(2), pp. 318-342.