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Introduction

In the 1990s, Russia's people entered a new era in environmental politics. These changes brought, and were partly caused by, transnational environmental organisations entering the dialogue. Such large organisations as Greenpeace, World Wildlife Fund, International Union of Conservation of Nature and others established offices in Russia, and began networking, thus influencing the lives and policies of people, businesses, domestic NGOs, and regional and federal governments. These organisations brought a new element to the public environmental movement and especially the dialogue surrounding public environmental policy. Unlike national NGOs, these well-established organisations had consistent and large financial resources because they are supported by Western grants, Western governments, and Western citizens. Along with this came enhanced opportunities—the transnational NGOs could concentrate their efforts on very distant and isolated regions of Russia. Such work was never before seen in Russia, and when Russian citizens, businesses, domestic NGOs, and the federal and regional governments encountered this new game, we see many interesting situations arising.

All of these organisations, both national and transnational, have forest programmes and work toward the creation of specially protected areas in Russia. This is a common priority, perhaps due to Russia's size, its unique forest ecosystems, and its large portion of totally undeveloped land. Preserving the Earth's remaining pristine sites is a declared goal of both national and transnational NGOs, and Russia contains about 25 percent of such areas in the world. In addition, Russia holds 21 percent of the Earth's entire timber reserve (WWF 2000). The goal of our chapter is to assess the activities of these organisations, how they interact with governments, businesses, and citizens, and how they influence the setting and implementation of public policy on forest use and preservation. Our theoretical approach will be in the framework of ecological modernisation (e.g. Mol & Spirtagren 2000). This process entails both the greening of industry through the introduction of environmentally sound technology and a societal balance between economic growth and ecological sustainability. In addition, there are changes in social practice and discourse that reflect a new and expanding ecological perspective.

In this chapter we will assess how the above-mentioned organisations, both national and transnational, catalyse this process in Russia. We will examine what different niches are occupied, how roles are divided, how the philosophy of their parent organisations abroad affect the action of the Russian branches, and their collaborations and tensions with federal and regional governments, business, and other organisations. And finally we will assess the perspectives and possibilities of the current beginnings of ecological modernisation in the historical context of Russian transformation.

First we will focus on short descriptions of the organisations under study. Then we will evaluate them as actors in environmental politics and draw conclusions on their effectiveness in ecological, political, and social change.

Descriptions of the Environmental Organisations Under Study

World Wildlife Fund

Nature conservation under the World Wildlife Fund began in 1961, and today Russia is one of ninety countries in which its operations can be found. The first WWF project in Russia was in 1991, followed by an official programme office in 1994. Since then, over twenty million dollars has been spent towards preserving Russia's natural environment, especially its forests. The WWF Forest programme works towards an approach to forestry that will ensure both human economy and biodiversity for the future. In the vision of WWF Russia, ten percent of Russia's most biologically diverse forests are to be designated protected, while the utilisation of the remaining forests is to become sustainable (WWF 2000, 2). In order to influence legislation towards saving virgin forests from felling, WWF provides ecological education to regional governments. It also works with timber
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enterprises to ensure that their operations are in line with current environmental policy.

In addition, WWF formed the Association of Environmentally Responsible Timber Producers of Russia, a group of seventeen timber companies all dedicated to sustainable forestry. WWF promotes forestry under the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), an international group for the certification of non-damaging forestry practices. Towards this same end, WWF establishes model forests in order to demonstrate sustainable forestry.

Concerning the effective implementation of Russian environmental policy, WWF helps to fight illegal logging. It supports activities aimed at discovering perpetrators and bringing them to court. In addition, WWF works with the U.S. Agency of International Development (USAID) to form fire-fighting crews. They patrol forests and educate the local citizens to ensure careful handling of fire. By 2000, WWF had seen its forestry programmes set up in over twenty regions of Russia (WWF 2000, 4). In addition, the years 1999–2000 saw WWF help to introduce legislation that protects 8 million hectares of Russian forests and timber resources (WWF 2000, 4).

**Greenpeace**

Greenpeace came to Russia in 1992. It has since worked toward new and stronger environmental legislation along with more effective implementation. Under Greenpeace's Forest Campaign, the main goals in Russia are forest preservation and sustainable timber utilisation. Greenpeace works on the basis that only independent and public control of forestry can significantly help the situation (Greenpeace 2000, 4). Accordingly, Greenpeace constantly publishes and freely circulates information among Russian citizens. These pamphlets explain the ecological importance of virgin forests, and include an inventory of their current state in Russia. Greenpeace also supports the right of citizens to have such scientific education and continuously updated and verifiable information (Greenpeace 2000, 3). In addition, Greenpeace reports to the public on any illegal actions uncovered in preserved forests by federal or regional governments or timber companies. It watches for over-cuts, clear-cuts and illegal cuts, investigates leskhozes8 and timber enterprises, and hopes to establish a system for the non-governmental implementation of forestry legislation. According to Greenpeace, such a public and voluntary monitoring organisation would allow the Russian public to influence decision-making concerning forests, as well as to prevent violations of Russian law (Greenpeace 2000, 3).

Greenpeace works with producers and consumers of Russia's timber products. As with WWF, Greenpeace contributes to the FSC's independent certification of Russian forestry companies. Overall, Greenpeace tries to ecologically educate and sensitize Russian citizens and timber companies as well as foreign consumers of Russian forest products. In this way, much of its efforts involve working with people rather than governments.

Greenpeace cooperates with other NGOs on field research for such issues as forest fires and locating virgin tracts. This information is then used to educate the public and contribute to legislative initiatives for the designated preservation of these areas. A major part of Greenpeace's work with introducing legislation for preservation is with the Convention on World Heritage. This international policy tool is used to conserve important natural and cultural areas, and Greenpeace claims it is now the most effective way of preserving pristine nature (Greenpeace 2000, 13). To date, Greenpeace has funded and assisted in adding seven of Russia's natural sites to the World Heritage List, submitted proposals for four more, and planned and organised several field trips to potential sites. Greenpeace follows this up by helping regional and federal governments plan and organise the potential preserves and national parks.

*International Union for the Conservation of Nature*

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) was founded in 1948 in Fontainebleau, France. In 1990, at the eighth General Assembly of the Council of the World Congress for Conservation of Nature its name was officially changed to World Conservation Union – IUCN. It includes 76 countries, 111 government organisations, 668 national non-governmental organisations, and 63 international non-governmental organisations. They have 954 members from 141 countries. In addition, there are around 400 private individual members from 35 countries. The Moscow office is for the whole former Soviet Union including the newly independent states. The government of the Russian Federation is a member, and so was the State Committee for Nature Protection before it was closed by Putin's restructuring of environmental administration in 2000.

Priority programmes include preserving biodiversity "hot spots", such as in the Russian Far East and Siberia, and sustainable forest use and agriculture. Within the forest programme, IUCN tries to create citizen...
involvement in forest management and public policy while maintaining regional interests in the management of the forests of Russia. They try to incorporate a holistic approach to combining forest use and nature conservation. IUCN Russia also works under the global IUCN programme on boreal forests. Throughout the world and in Russia, it is a major initiative facilitating government participation in world negotiations.

Socio-Ecological Union
The idea to create the Socio-Ecological Union came about in 1987: the actual union was established in 1988 in Moscow. This initiative was made mostly by people in the Nature Protection Corps, which was the biggest informal ecological organisation in the Soviet Union, with a thirty-year history. The goals and principles of the Nature Protection Corps were carried over and expanded: governance structures do not govern but help, upon request, in what is important; spreading information is a permanent priority, as is sharing experience and knowledge with all kinds of organisations. The SEU now functions as an association of organisations, each with its own priorities and budgets.

The main goals of their Forest Campaign include the preservation of unique forest ecosystems and the transition of the forest industry toward sustainable forest use. They have a number of related initiatives such as Plant Your Own Forest, revitalising broad-leaf forests, and finding and spreading information about the experiences of ecologically sound forest users in Russia. The campaign also has member organisations which work together to develop a civic movement with environmental goals and ideals. They publish and circulate information and help begining organisations working on forest preservation to find financing. SEU is also a member of the Forest Club, which includes Greenpeace and the Biodiversity Conservation Centre (a member organisation of SEU).

Biodiversity Conservation Centre
The BCC was founded in 1992 by the SEU. Since 1995, they have worked to influence politics in Russia, including legislation and its implementation. They work in conjunction with the natural resource sectors of the Russian economy. Since 1997, BCC has developed strategies for managing specially protected areas. It is a member of the Forest Club and works on joint research programmes with Greenpeace and SEU. The BCC forest programme studies and protects ecosystems and biodiversity in the boreal zone, and develops mechanisms and normative documents for a transition to sustainable and rational forest use. They also try to circulate information by regularly publishing a forest bulletin. Another major goal is to increase public awareness and include the public and business people in nature protection and charitable activity. Since 1995, BCC has organized the March for the Parks in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Central Asia.

Attempts by NGOs at Ecological Modernisation of Forestry and Paper Production

One way environmental NGOs in Russia try to promote an environmentally sound forest and wood product industry is by manipulating companies through the environmentally sound demands of their consumers. WWF promotes a system of independent certification for companies in Russia based on the international standards of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). This effort is concentrated in the northwest, where much of the forest industry is oriented toward exporting to Western European consumers. The demand for environmentally sound products has increased in recent years and WWF attempts to convince the companies that if they wish to remain competitive or expand their markets, then certification is necessary. As our respondents told us, promoting FSC certification through Russian consumers would be ineffective because Russians are not ready to pay 3-5 percent more for paper made from certified wood and other certified wood products (Interview 16). WWF is the leader in this certification process. It advertises the FSC demands to both consumers and producers and distributes information at meetings to logging companies and paper plants.

WWF also organized the Association of Ecologically Responsible Timber Producers of Russia, which consists of seventeen companies that are currently in the certification process or already certified. This association is a member of the Global Forest and Trade Network (GFTN). Thus by promoting certification for Russian companies, WWF is attempting to bring them into a global trade network which takes environmental factors into consideration.

The effort to work with business is sub-political in that it does not involve Russian legislation or its implementation. The organisation comes to these companies as a financial advisor, but with the extended goal of greening their operations. This approach has potential in that the concerns of both the organisations (ecological) and the companies (economic) are linked to the one process of certification. Many practical barriers exist, however, that limit its effectiveness. Based on our interviews and publications by WWF, we can see that many forest companies in Russia are interested in certification; the process, however, takes a long time and requires various expenditures. The auditing process is very thorough, including the inspection of not only operations but also the conditions of workers and such details as the conditions in the kindergartens of workers'
children. There is an intermediary company that helps to carry out financial auditing and its service is expensive in Russia and abroad. Additional costs accrue from necessary changes in technology and social conditions. Some companies do not have the capacity for such changes and their costs. There are also no fixed standards or prices for the certification process and the ease with which a company can become certified depends on its entrepreneurial abilities. According to one respondent, some companies manage to get their forest certified for ten cents per hectare while others pay a dollar per hectare (Interview 16). In the end, there is no guarantee for companies that their certified products will be in demand.

Moreover, small companies that are used to illegal logging enterprises are interested in fast cash and therefore not in certification, as it is a long-term business venture. This lack of foresight is a widespread hindrance to ecological modernisation and these companies continue to harm forests in Russia (Interview 16).

Many other criticisms see FSC certification as an imported tactic because it was used previously by WWF in Western Europe. Consequently, more radical environmentalists feel that the process may not be suited to the specifics of Russia’s situation. For instance, Western Europe does not have any extensive tracts of virgin forest, whereas Russia has many. The standards of certification are based on research conducted outside Russia and, hence, do not take such important peculiarities into account (Karpachevskiy 2001, 37–38). Many environmentalists also worry about the effective implementation of the FSC standards once certification is awarded to a company. So, even though they may support the programme in general, they question the effectiveness of certification as a sustainable method of forestry in Russia (Berry 2001, 18–19).

Another concern with the initiative is that it does not work as effectively through Chinese markets. Forests from the Far East and Siberia are heavily exported to Chinese consumers with little demand for environmentally sound forest products. Furthermore, competition there is not favourable to FSC certified companies because of extensive illegal logging. Russian NGOs discuss information campaigns in China, but as of now the certification process is rather useless (Lebedev et al. 2001, 40–41).

Overall, our research shows certification to be an effective tactic for preserving pristine nature in Russia. The project is in the beginning stages, but has good potential. Very active work on certification is now going on in the Komi Republic, the Arkhangelsk Region, and the Krasnoyarsk and Khabarovsk Krai. In the year 2000, in the Arkhangelsk Region, a certificate was given to a forest leased by the German company Holz Dammers, and in the Nizhegorod Region, the paper mill Volga assessed the possibility of certification for the surrounding leskhozes (WWF 2000, 6).

We do believe, however, that by including additional stakeholders, such as the Russian government, the certification process could be improved and its impact made more far-reaching. The process currently involves WWF, a non-governmental organisation, and companies, so such important aspects of protecting the environment and government policy are unaffected by it. WWF originally tried to include government in the dialogue but they ran into unforeseen and interesting barriers (Interview 16). Representatives of both government and the companies were invited to two informational conferences, but when the representatives of business heard the lengthy speeches of the government officials, they left the conference. Differences in organisational culture between governmental officials, business, and NGOs prevented a successful dialogue. WWF was forced to invite only foresters to the next conference. Although this was successful in attracting companies to the certification process, there was clearly no dialogue with the government. The first two conferences were planned as inter-sectoral dialogues, but in hindsight they can be considered as merely informational campaigns for non-profit organisations and government. The third one was strictly for business. So in the process of certification, WWF works directly with business companies; government and other NGOs are excluded. This extremely narrow stakeholder involvement may negatively affect the introduction of forest certification into public policy. Its ecological effects on the environment in Russia will also be limited.

WWF is a big organisation and promoting forest certification in various regions of Russia is its major niche. Smaller organisations of the Forest Club (Greenpeace, Biodiversity Conservation Centre and Socio-Ecological Union) work mostly with, and in some cases against, individual mills in their priority areas. This usually involves developing and spreading information that can be used by the forest industry. For example, Mr. Grigor’ev of the Socio-Ecological Union published a book on how forest enterprises can survive in a period of ecologization of European markets (Grigor’ev 2001). Besides guidelines on how to plan and update activities, the book analyses past experiences of the Russian forest sector and the problems that have resulted from illegal and environmentally dangerous operations. He retells this experience to other forest companies so that they do not repeat those mistakes. This is another mutually beneficial relationship between the non-profit sector and business.

SEU works closely with the mill at Svetogorsk. When International Paper bought the plant, according to the SEU interviewee, they greatly improved both its environmental record and working conditions. They take into account the advice of SEU and translated Mr. Grigor’ev’s book into English for their headquarters abroad (Interview 11). Even though they are
not going through official certification, it can clearly be seen that the company is working on improving its operations.

In a more oppositional case, Greenpeace fights proposals to build paper mills in natural areas. Their efforts helped hinder the construction of the Udovskiy paper mill, which was to be located near a specially protected area (Interview 5). They also work to reduce the harmful effects of a paper mill on Lake Baikal. This plant’s administration suggests different ways to green its operations while Greenpeace assesses each proposal and informs the Russian government about how each change will actually impact the environment. They have opposed every proposal as not green enough and advised the government to do the same. In this case, the NGO is acting as an independent consulting firm for the government. Greenpeace refuses to compromise with the company, and thus the plant continues to pollute and ecologically modernisation is not going through. The improvements fail even though money is available for change, an environmental movement is strong, and pressure from international NGOs exists.

Unlike Greenpeace, however, IUCN is willing to compromise with polluting industry. In the Murmansk Region, they established a network that involves businesses from Apatity, governments, the Laplandskiy zapovednik (nature reserve) and NGOs. IUCN convinced the polluting companies to improve their operations, including small technological advances in filters and storages. They formed an official coordinating council that consists of the vice governor and four administrators from six districts of Murmansk. In addition, a cooperative effort was set up between the company Severo-Nickel and the zapovednik to promote eco-tourism as well as environmental education to visitors. This project was short-lived, but contained many innovative ecological ideas. More radical environmental organisations, however, are not supporting such compromising initiatives and, consequently, they are not part of the coordinating council.

Organisations from abroad, such as IUCN, are experienced in creating environmental policy networks based on inter-sectoral partnerships. These policy networks are extremely effective driving mechanisms for setting and implementing public policy. The organisations bring their experience from the Western world to the Russian context and take the risk of working with poorly regulated and highly polluting Russian industries in a situation where laws are not perfect and hardly enforced.

### Establishment of Sustainable Businesses in Specially Protected Areas

There is frequent conflict between the preservation of natural territories and the local inhabitants of those areas who obtain their livelihoods from the land. One way in which organisations have tried to resolve this is through developing local sustainable businesses. Communities that live closely with nature, and pretty much on the subsistence level, are not familiar with the market economy and its laws, values, and opportunities. NGOs often work to provide the necessary information to citizens of Russia.

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) initiated such a project in several districts of the Kamchatka Region. They work with local populations near Bistrinsky National Park and others in the Koryak Autonomous Okrug to establish local businesses based on non-wood forest products. The business initiatives are based on the sustainable gathering and sale of wild herbal teas and wild mushrooms. These projects are environmentally beneficial on many different levels. They help the local populations economically, they protect the environment through sustainable harvesting, and they preserve the national heritage in the use of traditional wild edibles. IUCN conducts business training seminars with local inhabitants and distributes information on creating individual, family, or community businesses.

One obstacle to the effectiveness of these programmes is local suspicion, as the efforts of the NGOs are seen as free hand-outs by foreigners. According to a respondent from IUCN, many Kamchatka residents see Russians as a cause of their problems, so IUCN had to convince people in the region that they were not spies and simply wanted to maintain the local quality of life (Interview 9). They met with similar sentiment when a governor said “free cheese is only in mouse traps” (Interview 9). Such attitudes make consensus-building more difficult.

IUCN also encounters barriers concerning the economic feasibility of these business enterprises. The cost of legally certifying the product is 10,000 roubles per year. This, plus the costs of packaging, documents, and transportation, makes it extremely difficult to sustain. IUCN attempts to orient the business towards export to Western consumers in Alaska and Canada because they will pay higher prices than Russians. In addition, when coupled with eco-tourism to attract consumers, these businesses have the potential for ecologically modernising the relationship between these communities and the reserves.

The Biodiversity Conservation Centre (BCC) also helps to create sustainable businesses near specially protected areas, but as a part of their programme to improve the overall management of the areas. They operate according to the Seville strategy set forth at the International Conference on Biosphere Reserves organised by UNESCO in Seville in 1995 (Biodiversity Conservation Centre 2000). This approach promotes the management of specially protected areas as a balance between their
preservation and sustainable use by local communities. This project is very all-encompassing— it includes cooperation between the local residents, local businesses, environmental NGOs, and local and federal governments. To establish these local businesses, BCC uses a micro-crediting system. They first make an investment and then create a commission that includes various actors—representatives of regional administration and the reserve, the public, as well as candidates from a few local organisations. After a business is chosen and established, the BCC gets their initial investment back and then recycles it into new business start-up ideas. A respondent told us that this creates a continuous and very stable process of sustainable economic development (Interview 2). Souvenir production is a popular enterprise in that local inhabitants receive salaries and, in addition, ecotourists can take home memorable objects without taking them from nature. In the Altay Republic near Russia’s border with Mongolia and Kazakhstan, BCC set up a network linking local producers of honey to their distributors in Novosibirsk. They promoted this network further by personally certifying the honey through the Katunskiy zapovednik, where it was made.

A less successful initiative in the Tver’ Region illustrates the importance of the cooperation of the zapovednik administration. Here, where the central biosphere reserve is situated, problems arise due to the mentality of zapovednik workers. The zapovednik is very old and employs academic representatives of classical Russian science who see preservation as antithetical to any kind of economic development. These people are not interested in close collaboration with the reserve’s surrounding communities. The efforts of BCC are new to such classical preservation frameworks (Interview 2). Comparing this situation to that in the Smolensk and Kaluga Regions, in which the zapovednik administrations are flexible and initiate contact with local communities, we see the zapovednik administration as a necessary component in BCC’s efforts for inter-sectoral dialogue.

The federal government is another necessary actor. BCC helped to create a council in the Ministry of Natural Resources that brings together representatives of NGOs and tourism firms to discuss managing programmes of ecological tourism. In addition, BCC works with regional administrations, republic administrations, and committees on land use to help solve land-management issues. Our respondent claimed that communication is difficult because of different ideologies and different organisational cultures, and, by sometimes employing former government workers BCC can learn the language. They establish additional connections to the government by inviting and funding the travels and accommodations of government officials to meetings and conferences in specific regions. BCC even pays part-time salaries to some employees of the national parks or research reserves.

Perhaps, if the specially designated areas were not supervised by the government, this business-nature reserve network structure could be created solely through economic incentives. Since the government is, however, a necessary part of the chain, BCC uses unorthodox methods of opening beneficial dialogue. Foreign grants allow BCC to create such policy networks that fundamentally include the Russian government. On their own initiative, the Russian government would not help to promote the plan for biosphere reserves, but thanks to international processes of the global environmental movement, they became involved.

The Role of NGOs in Creating and Maintaining Specially Protected Areas

All international NGOs in Russia work for stronger legislation and implementation of designated preserved natural areas. There are a number of different routes that the organisations can take toward this goal. WWF is developing a concept that they call “eco-nets”, in which many isolated nature preservations are linked by interconnecting pathways. Their ecological studies show that the more sensitive organisms of Russia’s ecosystems cannot survive in small habitats, no matter how pristine. WWF is developing short- and long-term strategies for these projects and tries to educate reserve workers, the public and governments. An eco-net has already been completed in the Altay-Sayan region as well as in the southwestern part of European Russia. This and other efforts by WWF have increased the area of reserves and national parks in Russia by 25 percent. For the arctic region, the designated preserved area has been doubled.

By educating and working with the public, scientists, and government officials, WWF can introduce its new concept and term “eco-net” into vocabularies as well as public policy. This helps to increase awareness and disseminate new knowledge—two important parts of ecological modernisation. Similarly, BCC is developing new research methods to support its efforts in creating specially protected areas. They have helped map large areas of virgin forest in European Russia, but there are also many small virgin tracts which require more detailed, and expensive research. BCC is just beginning a campaign to collect and analyse the necessary data and then develop criteria for managing such forests. In the Leningrad Region, for instance, there are no large tracts of totally intact boreal forest because of intense harvesting in the past. This group of forests, however, still has a huge variety of valuable areas. Some spots may be virgin and contain
significant biodiversity, some may have historical value, and some may contain secret groves originally used by the Russian royalty. Current forest use overlooks these points and BCC is working to help create appropriate policy. This project is also currently going on in the Vologda, Kostroma, Nizhegorod and Kirov Regions.

Another route to preservation legislation is highly supported by Greenpeace Russia: working in conjunction with the World Heritage Fund. This international policy tool involves the preservation of unique natural and cultural areas in the 168 countries that ratified the Convention on the Protection of the World’s Cultural and Natural Heritage. According to Greenpeace’s goals, this work is done to give an additional guarantee of protection to the most important natural areas of Russia. The areas to be nominated must already have some regional or federal protection status. Greenpeace, however, feels that, in reality, current implementation practices in Russia are insufficient for preservation (Interview 5).

In order to nominate an area, Greenpeace does research, testing, and writes lengthy reports to submit to the World Heritage Centre in Paris. With the help of BCC and the Socio-Ecological Union (SEU), Greenpeace carried out extensive research in northwestern Russia to find the remaining tracts of virgin forest. This collaborative work involved using satellite imaging, topographical maps and field expeditions. The result was circulated among the public, scientific communities, businesses, foreign consumers, and in addition Greenpeace used it to work on nominating specially protected areas in the Murmansk and Arkhangelsk Regions to the World Heritage Fund. They try to raise support for their proposals by appealing to the public, the governments, and, perhaps most importantly, their grant-givers. As Wapner (1996) has said, “Greenpeace actions excite the eye”, and in this case, Greenpeace uses photo collections of the territories to gain such support.

Greenpeace is the leading NGO in Russia currently using the World Heritage Fund as an international policy tool, but it often networks with other NGOs, scientific institutions and administrations. They worked with WWF in the Kamchatka Region and were successful, although initially there were many conflicts (Interview 5). Furthermore, with the help of BCC, they nominated Komandorsky Island in the Russian Far East. IUCN is not involved in these projects because regulations do not allow them to do such work in their own territory. Their international office, however, is responsible for the final assessment of World Heritage areas throughout the world.

When Greenpeace chooses certain areas of Russia for nomination, the strongest deciding factor is which territories they have international financing for. Our respondent explained that if their financial supporters from abroad have priority regions, then Greenpeace Russia will put money, effort, and time into the nomination of these regions (Interview 5). Such transboundary processes can influence the pace of environmental improvement in Russia. Greenpeace also considers which territories are valuable in terms of biodiversity and which need protection urgently.

Even though Greenpeace usually works in the most troubled areas with big environmental conflicts, there have been no serious barriers with such nominations as the Katunskiy and Magadanskiy zapovedniki in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug, Wrangel Island in the Bering Sea, and the Lena River Delta in the Far North. Local administrations have no strong interests in the area and even support the nominations. If the areas are inscribed in the World Heritage List, they will receive such benefits as advertising, tourism, national and international image, and additional finances. Our respondent informed us that of the 168 countries that signed the World Heritage Convention, Russia is the only country in which Greenpeace is working on submitting nominations (Interview 5). Such scientific work is not consistent with their international image as radical environmentalists. It must be noted, however, that the employees of Greenpeace Russia were already established in scientific institutions before the international organisation hired them. Moreover, the unique circumstances of the Russian transition period create unique situations for environmental NGOs. The project on the World Heritage List, for instance, requires that Greenpeace work closely with the Russian government. This is a very surprising dialogue and sometimes administrations are very suspicious because of Greenpeace’s image. However, internationally funded organisations that wish to nominate territories cannot do so without the regional and federal governments. These organisations must, therefore, fund government officials to attend different conferences and conventions. In addition, the Russian government is rather weak and has no capacity for things like computers, printers, and internet access, so they must seek help from independent environmental organisations who receive funds from wealthy Western countries. The NGOs must research and prepare everything and help the governments with the internet and financing. Here we see how the process of ecological modernisation in Russia is heavily influenced by international convention.

As always, there are obstacles to Greenpeace’s success in the project on the World Heritage List. The restructuring of the Russian environmental administration on the federal level (see chapter 4.2 in this volume), concerning the Ministry of Natural Resources, was a problem because many contact persons lost their jobs. In addition, some administrators do not understand the process and its benefits, or they simply oppose preservation. Virgin forests in the Komi Republic were inscribed in the World Heritage
List in 1995 with little conflict. This is related to the fact that Komi’s forest industry is not developed. Mining and other resources have priority, so preservation of the forests did not affect business-as-usual. The Republic of Karelia, on the other hand, poses a greater conflict for Greenpeace’s efforts. This region has a strong forest industry that is oriented toward exporting to competitive international markets and also has a great deal of corruption by business and regional governments. One of our respondents called it a “museum of socialism” (Interview 4). Finally, considering Russia’s current situation, Greenpeace must worry about proper implementation of the World Heritage standards even after a territory is designated as protected.

Concluding Remarks

Globalisation and efforts toward ecological modernisation are occurring simultaneously throughout the world. In Russia, these processes are accompanied by truly unique social and economic situations, as well as an exceptional natural environment. All of the transnational environmental organisations analysed in this chapter are funded from abroad specifically to deal with these current conditions. Together with Western funding, they bring cultures, philosophies, attitudes, and values that have been nurtured in the Western experience. For example, WWF is a big foundation with big resources and, as many interviews show, they orient their efforts toward political success and showmanship. They target environmental issues such as big, beautiful endangered wildcats (the Altay-Sayan eco-net success) and rarely do they partner with other transnational NGOs. With WWF’s public relations and advertising campaign, they need to work on projects that will be under their logo and their leadership. Rather than going to Lake Baikal, which has a concentration of big NGOs, they go elsewhere and develop small, local networks. WWF does not actively seek cooperation with other NGOs. However, when they inadvertently cross paths, such as with Greenpeace in Kamchatka World Heritage, they manage to cooperate. WWF also usually seeks out areas where success is more assured. They do not work in regions such as Karelia, where huge violations take place.

Greenpeace works somewhat differently in the environmental arena in Russia. The basic strategy of international Greenpeace campaigns is to shock the public into ecological sensibility. They go to troubled areas and to corrupt officials and produce splashes in the media. However, Russia’s current state of affairs has called for a slightly different approach. Although banners have been posted on the federal Duma (Parliament) building and shock-videos depicting blatant violations have been released, Greenpeace Russia works more with research and information than sensation. And unlike WWF, which likes to monopolise programmes, Greenpeace is a member of the Forest Club. Other members such as the Socio-Ecological Union and the Biodiversity Conservation Centre are working closely with each other, but do not share funding.

It seems that each organisation has its own priority project – WWF works on forest certification, Greenpeace on World Natural Heritage, the Socio-Ecological Union on information gathering and dissemination, IUCN on small sustainable businesses, and BCC on broad management programmes for specially protected areas. Each organisation has its own niche in the complicated interaction between Russian forests and the associated policy. There is some overlapping, a little competition for funding, but the organisations cooperate at critical moments.

On the basis of this analysis it can be said that perhaps efforts toward ecological modernisation are coming at a good time to Russia in that social, economic, and governmental structures are not very rigid. The society is literally under construction, and so with the continuous introduction of new social practices, institutional designs, and societal and political discourses, international NGOs can truly have a big impact on the future of Russia’s people and forests.
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