

Greenpeace, and its independent road to sustainable growth



Student Name: Merel Mostert

Student Number: 10030999

Class: ES4e-4c

Dissertation supervisor: Mrs. Weijerman

Date of completion: 3 June 2014

Academy of European Studies & Communication Management

The Hague University of Applied Sciences

List of abbreviations

FSC: Forest Stewardship Council certified products.

ICCAT: International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas

NGO: Non-governmental organisation

NVDA: Nonviolent direct action

RSG: Responsible Sourcing Guidelines

TFT: The Forest Trust

WNF: Wereld Natuur Fonds

WWF: World Wildlife Fund

Executive summary

In this dissertation paper, the environmental organisation Greenpeace has been analysed. Greenpeace is an independent environmental non-governmental organisation and only accepts money from individual financial supporters and foundation grants. There has been a focus on changing the way the organisation has been operating for the last ten years. The independence and the use of social media are related to this change and explained as well.

In the second chapter, Greenpeace is explained organisationally, how it works, and what type of income the organisation has. The establishment of fundraising is also explained for this reason. The importance of this chapter is to show that Greenpeace is an independent organisation that does not accept money from governments or corporations, but only from individual financial supporters.

In the third chapter, the establishment of social media is explained, and why it is important for Greenpeace. The importance of this chapter is to explain how Greenpeace could broaden its horizons to reach more people and to get them more involved in the organisation. This is important for Greenpeace because the organisation wants to stay independent and needs to spread the word to get financial supporters on board.

In the fourth chapter, Greenpeace is compared with the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), which is another major environmental non-governmental organisation. The comparison is mainly focused on the organisations' different objectives. FURTHERMORE, similarities, collaborations, challenges, and criticisms, and the importance of social media for both organisations have been analysed. The importance of this chapter is to compare Greenpeace with an environmental organisation that does accept money from governments and corporations. It shows the advantages and constraints for both organisations.

In the last chapter, the changes Greenpeace and social media have made in the last 10 years are discussed. The importance of this chapter is to show what has changed for the organisation and also what has changed in social media.

In the conclusion, an answer is given on the fact if Greenpeace will stay an independent organisation. The road to its success to sustainable independent growth, and why it decides to work like this has been explained. Lastly, a personal opinion is given which states that Greenpeace will become more important in the future.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction 1**
 - 1.1 Background 1
 - 1.2 Problem Analysis 1
 - 1.3 Aim and research question..... 1
 - 1.4 Methodology 2
 - 1.5 Literature Review 3
- 2. General introduction about Greenpeace 5**
 - 2.1 The establishment of Greenpeace 5
 - 2.2 The organisation in the 21st century 6
 - 2.2.1 Core Values 6
 - 2.3 Fundraising methods of Greenpeace..... 7
 - 2.3.1 India: SMS fundraising 8
 - 2.3.2 Tele fundraising..... 9
 - 2.4 Conclusion..... 10
- 3. The use of social media by Greenpeace11**
 - 3.1 Social Media 11
 - 3.1.2 The development of social media. 11
 - 3.1.3 The Kimberly-Clark campaign 12
 - 3.2. Facebook..... 13
 - 3.2.1 Facebook Campaign 13
 - 3.3 Pinterest 15
 - 3.4 Twitter 15
 - 3.5 Social media campaign 16
 - 3.6 Changes in social media..... 17
 - 3.6 conclusion 17
- 4.0 Greenpeace and its independence, why different from other environmental NGOs?19**
 - 4.1 Non-governmental organisations..... 19
 - 4.2 Environmental NGOs: a case Study between WWF and Greenpeace 20
 - 4.2.1 Main objectives 20

- 4.2.2. Similarities..... 21
- 4.2.3. Differences..... 21
- 4.2.4. Collaboration 22
- 4.2.5 Challenges 23
- 4.2.6 Criticism..... 24
 - 4.2.6.1 Criticism WWF 24
 - 4.2.6.2 Criticism Greenpeace 24
- 4.2.7. Nongovernmental organisations and the use social media 25
- 4.4. Conclusion 26
- 5. Changes in Greenpeace and social media in the last 10 years27**
 - 5.1 Influence through social media 27
 - 5.1.2 Kit Kat campaign..... 27
 - 5.1.3 The impact of a social media campaign..... 28
 - 5.3. Changes in social media within Greenpeace 29
 - 5.4 Conclusion..... 30
- 6. Conclusion.....31**
- References.....34**

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Greenpeace is a non-governmental independent campaigning organisation that exposes global environmental problems, and promotes solutions to create a better and peaceful future (Greenpeace USA, n.d.). The organisation has been seen as the leading environmental non-governmental organisation worldwide, with offices over 40 countries (Greenpeace International, n.d. A). Greenpeace maintains its independence by not accepting any donations from governments or corporations. Therefore, the organisation completely relies on contributions, individual supporters, and foundation grants given to Greenpeace (Greenpeace International, n.d. A). The purpose of the organisation is to expose the ones who harm the environment, and to challenge governments and businesses when they fail to safeguard the environment and the planet's future (Greenpeace International, A).

1.2 Problem Analysis

Greenpeace is not the only environmental organisation in the world. To continue the work the organisation is trying to achieve, it is important to distinguish themselves from other NGOs. An NGO can be defined as a non-state, non-profit, voluntary organisation (The Free Dictionary Farlex, n.d.). An NGO is independent from government influence, and is not a part of, or controlled by government (NGO Handbook, 2010). Defining an NGO is fundamentally less important and more useful than understanding what an NGO does, who their members are, and where their money comes from (Simmons, 1998, p.85). According to Greenpeace, it states that the organisation is an independent organisation, which does not accept money from governments or corporations. It will be researched as to what sort of strategies Greenpeace uses, to keep this independence. The researcher will show why and how this organisation wants to stay independent. Finally, a future prospect for Greenpeace will be drawn, which will be focused on the fact whether or not the organisation will stay as an independent organisation.

1.3 Aim and research question

The aim of this research is to see how Greenpeace has changed its way of working in the last ten years and by whom and what has been influenced. Social media has become a new phenomenon since 2000 and Greenpeace has gained a strong connection with social media. The changes that have happened in the organisation and the changes in the use of social

media will also be explained and discussed, as well as the relationship Greenpeace has with social media. The final aim is to see if Greenpeace will stay an independent environmental NGO, which does not have to accept money from any government or corporation to continue with its work. However, if it cannot continue as an independent organisation, will this still be Greenpeace or does the independence make them a unique organisation? The main question for this research is:

“How has Greenpeace changed its way of working in the last 10 years, and will this change help them to stay an independent NGO?”

Several sub questions were made that will build up to eventually answering the main question:

1. How was Greenpeace established and when was its first experience with fundraising?
2. What is the relationship between Greenpeace and its use of social media?
3. How can Greenpeace be differentiated from other environmental NGOs, such as the World Wildlife Fund (WWF)?
4. What have been some major changes for Greenpeace and social media in the last 10 years?
5. Where will Greenpeace be in the future?

1.4 Methodology

To effectively achieve the aim of the thesis and answer the research question, it is essential to have basic knowledge and an overview of two main elements of the research: the organisation Greenpeace, and social media. The focus will be on studies dealing with both topics, together and separately. The studies are the most important sources because these provide an argumentative basis and proof for their opinion. Opinions in papers are less important because in most cases, they only give personal views on certain propositions.

The main method will be desk research. Qualitative desk research will be useful to see underlying opinions, reasons, and motivations about Greenpeace and social media. The qualitative desk research will help to give a detailed look at the problem, because of the use of interviews and group discussion forums. The quantitative desk research will be useful to quantify certain opinions, attitudes or behaviours to and from Greenpeace. It will help in

support of the formulation of facts, whereas surveys will also be helpful. In general, (online) environmental journals will be very useful for this research. The website of Greenpeace will be a main source. However, other academic sources are needed to confirm certain aspects of Greenpeace. It will be important to highlight both sides of the story from academic sources and journals. As a final part, interviews with Greenpeace and WWF have been used for certain areas. The interviews were already conducted by other writers.

1.5 Literature Review

Reviewing the literature on the topic of Greenpeace and its involvement in environmental world issues reveals a lot of different views, like how Greenpeace is interacting with governments and companies, and if it can be seen as positive or negative. In this research, it will focus on the work Greenpeace has done to stay independent from governments and corporations. The quantitative research will be used to research the effectiveness of Greenpeace's work. Qualitative research will be helpful to see what kind of studies/research papers have already been done about Greenpeace. The scope of the research will be very broad, where the use of journals and books are the main tools to conduct research. Media and social media will also be used for this research. Relevant information from Greenpeace's website, must always be checked and shown by another source. This can also be seen as the critical analysis of the literature. Sources can be subjective or can be supporting a personal opinion. In this paper it is important to show two sides of the story. The strengths and weaknesses of Greenpeace will also be discussed

In the second chapter, a general introduction about Greenpeace and an explanation about its main source of income and fundraising have been discussed which needed a variety of sources. Although, the main facts about the history and core values of Greenpeace have been used from Greenpeace itself, books have been written about Greenpeace. Focusing on the way Greenpeace started its fundraising, more sources than just Greenpeace were needed to confirm the correctness. In the third chapter, online journals have mainly been used to see how social media and Greenpeace were related together. Also, other online sources have been used to explain the differences of social media tools. In the fourth chapter, online academic sources have been used to compare Greenpeace with another environmental organisation, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF). In the fifth chapter, which is focused on the changes of Greenpeace in the last 10 years, information was mainly conducted by academic journals, and online books. As a last chapter, a future prospect of

Greenpeace has been conducted, where interviews and academic sources were used, to draw a conclusion on the fact if Greenpeace can stay as an independent non-governmental organisation in the future.

2. General introduction about Greenpeace

In this first chapter, the establishment of Greenpeace will be explained. Research has been done on why people thought Greenpeace was needed, and how the organisation was established. Research on the question of how Greenpeace has grown as a worldwide organisation has been done. There will be a focus on the history of fundraising tactics of Greenpeace and how these tactics have changed from the 1990s to 2000.

2.1 The establishment of Greenpeace

Greenpeace was established in 1971 in Canada. The United States had tested its nuclear bomb nearby the island of Amchitka, an island off the west coast of Alaska. After this first bomb, the United States had announced they would test its second bomb, which would be five times bigger than the first one (Erwood, 2011, p.9). In Vancouver, a small crew gathered together ready to stop the nuclear testing and wanted to sail to Amchitka to confront the boat (Erwood, 2011, p.10). The main goal of the crew was to prevent the US from more nuclear tests, but also to bear witness with the people to protest in a peaceful way (Brown & May, 1992, p.12). With a crew of 12 men, the vessel left Vancouver on 15 September 1971. However, on 30 September they were arrested by the coastguard cutter, USS Confidence, and ordered to sail away from the area (Brown & May, 1992, p. 14). On 6 November 1971, the USA detonated the second bomb. However, public opinion had turned and many people protested against the nuclear testing of the U.S. with boycott actions, which made it impossible for America to continue with these tests (Brown & May, 1992, p. 15). In February 1972, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission announced that the Amchitka test site would be abandoned and made into a wildlife refuge (Erwood, 2011, p.11). One of the founders of Greenpeace, Bob Hunter, read a book about warriors of the rainbow, which related to the people that would come together to save the world. They also named themselves Rainbow Warriors and used this story as their inspiration for their work and painted the colours of the rainbow on their ship (Brown & May, 1992, p.15). Soon after the victory of stopping the United States testing its nuclear bombs, Greenpeace tried to stop nuclear tests in the Pacific by France-Polynesia in 1972 (Brown & May, 1992, p.17). During this campaign, the Canadian David McTaggart, who lived in New Zealand, offered Greenpeace his help and sailed with his boat, Vega, to Mururoa to stop France (Brown & May, 1992, p.17). However, the boat was rammed by a French minesweeper, which brought the protest actions to an end (Erwood, 2011, p.23). Nevertheless, in 1973, David McTaggart returned with his repaired

boat. This time, David and his fellow crewmember, Nigel Ingram, were beaten by French military forces, not knowing that this was all photographed by another crewmember, Maria Horne (Erwood, 2011, p.23). The photographs showed the world what really happened, which caused worldwide outrage (Bok de, 1997, p.36). Eventually, in November 1973, France announced that they would only carry out underground nuclear testing (Bok de. 1997. p.36). This resulted in a second office of Greenpeace, which opened in New Zealand in 1974. After New Zealand, offices were opened in the United Kingdom and the United States in 1976, Australia in 1977, and France and the Netherlands in 1978. The main focus was to protest against nuclear testing in Alaska and the Pacific. However, soon Greenpeace's work expanded to encompass a wide range of environmental issues (Greenpeace New Zealand, 2014).

2.2 The organisation in the 21st century

Today, Greenpeace is one of the most well-known international organisations that prioritises global environmental campaigns (Greenpeace International, n.d. A). Greenpeace consists of an international office, which is based in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. It has 2.8 million supporters worldwide, with 28 national and regional offices in 41 countries around the world (Greenpeace Australia Pacific, n.d.). This non-governmental organisation does not accept any money from governments or big corporations. This organisation completely relies on financial support from individual donors that fund their work and foundation grants (Greenpeace Australia Pacific, n.d.). The international office of Greenpeace coordinates the worldwide campaigns and monitors the development and performance of national and regional Greenpeace offices (Greenpeace Australia Pacific n.d.).

2.2.1 Core Values

According to Greenpeace International, the organisation has set up core values which they share with every Greenpeace office in the world: (Greenpeace International, 2006).

- Personal Responsibility and Nonviolence

Greenpeace takes full responsibility for its actions and are committed to nonviolence. Personal action is based on personal responsibility.

- Independence

Greenpeace is totally independent from any government. It does not accept any money from governments or big corporations. Only individual donations and foundations grants are accepted.

- Greenpeace has no permanent friends or foes

Greenpeace has no permanent allies or adversaries. There is only one standard: the environment has to benefit from it. The organisation sometimes works together with other environmental organisations or groups, but will retain its independence.

- Promoting solutions

The organisation tries to eliminate environmental problems. Greenpeace develops and do research to solutions. It promotes other options and tries to let companies or governments make the right choices (Greenpeace International, 2006).

The second core value, the independence of Greenpeace, has been mentioned. This means that it is necessary for the organisation to find individual financial donors. That is why in 1993, Greenpeace members met each other in Austria to discuss new ways to find financial supporters. This idea later became known as 'street fundraising'.

2.3 Fundraising methods of Greenpeace

Before 1993, Greenpeace was funded by sending direct mail and advertisements to the media to ask for donations. Only in North America people went door-to-door asking for checks (Showcase of Fundraising Innovation and Inspiration-SOFII), 2011, B). In 1993, Greenpeace was facing tough times with receiving money. The main reason for this was the rise of new charities, such as the Aids Control Organisation in 1992 and UnAids in 1994 (Global HIV/AIDS Organizations, n.d.). These new organisations attracted the attention of the people and the mutual competition became increasingly difficult for Greenpeace, which already existed for 20 years now (Burnett, 2011). Greenpeace and the organisation had to think of new ways to stop the decline in receiving funding (SOFII, 2011, B).

As a solution, Daryl Upsall and Jasna Sonne, two fundraisers from Greenpeace International based in Austria, met to change their fundraising tactics. According to Ken Burnett, a writer,

publisher, and occasional fundraising consultant, he was commissioned by Daryl Upsall and Jasna Sonne to spread the message of Greenpeace to the world (Burnett, 2011). He was sent to Austria to join the team there. Austria became the country where Greenpeace introduced the monthly giving opportunity (Burnett, 2011). Daryl Upsall and Jasna Sonne realised younger and new people were needed who could give monthly donations to the organisation (SOFII, 2011, B). This is when Greenpeace developed the direct dialogue approach and the phenomenon of face-to-face fundraising for the first time (Institute for Fundraising n.d.).

Starting from 1993, Greenpeace decided that trained and paid staff were needed who could go on the street and talk to people, which was seen as “street fundraising”. These fundraisers approached prospective donors in public places, such as town squares, street corners, or beaches. At these places, new donors could sign a banking form where they could agree to give a monthly donation to Greenpeace (SOFII, 2011, B). The new idea of a functioning electronic banking system allowed the fundraisers to raise funds wherever they were (SOFII, 2011, B). At the end of 1995, Greenpeace Austria found 13,000 new regular supporters (Burnett, 2011). The direct dialogue, or face-to-face fundraising, became a worldwide success for Greenpeace and later also for other organisations. According to the showcase of fundraising inspiration and innovation, more than 70 percent of Greenpeace supporters are paying by monthly direct debit since 2011 (SOFII, 2011, B). The “trained and paid staff” means that, since the release of street fundraising, there were no longer volunteers working for Greenpeace, but paid staff members. A part of the donation from a financial supporter goes to the salary of the working staff for Greenpeace (Greenpeace International, 2013).

2.3.1 India: SMS fundraising

Another new way to reach more people was invented in 2005 by the R&D fundraising manager of Greenpeace India, Rahul Dayama (Boice, 2010). He came up with the idea to send a text message to more than 56,000 people with an interest in environmental issues. The text message read:

“Hi, don’t you wish your city was cleaner ‘n’ greener? Begin by planting a free sapling offered by Greenpeace. Reply GREEN to 6363 to get your free sapling. Sender Greenpeace’.”
(Boice, 2010).

The text message was sent to mobile phones in and around the region of Bangalore and Pune in India (Boice, 2010). The goal of this campaign was to increase the productivity from the paid fundraisers of Greenpeace and increase the financial support to the organisation (SOFII, 2011, A). Before the SMS-led generation campaign, Greenpeace India used the face-to-face method of fundraising. This method made it possible that 17 percent of people who were approached wanted to listen to the fundraiser and 10 percent would eventually sign up for financial support (Boice, 2010). With the new text campaign, the recruiter personally brings the sapling to the person who requested one. Then, the fundraiser would have an opportunity for a conversation and to ask if the recruiter would like to become a financial supporter for Greenpeace (Boice, 2010). It has been shown that the conversation rate rose to 25 percent (SOFII, 2011, A). It doubled the productivity of recruiters and it made it possible to increase the number of financial supporters, where a fundraiser could make three visits a day (Boice, 2010). However, there are no specific figures for how much this has raised. Many respondents turned into donors for Greenpeace and India has been seeking for more effective ways to reduce the travel time of the fundraisers, so that they could approach more people per day (SOFII, 2011, A). However, there are no sources available on how many financial supporters there are per country. There are no details about the number of financial supporters per country.

2.3.2 Tele-fundraising

Lastly, Greenpeace is also using Tele-fundraising teams in several countries where fundraisers call for donations. One of these countries is New Zealand. In New Zealand, Greenpeace uses the contact details from people who have signed petitions to call them and ask for donations (Hunt, 2013). Greenpeace New Zealand employs 50 fundraisers, where 20 of these are employed to call people at home and the other 30 are outreach campaigners, or street collectors (Hunt, 2013). They also have a small petition team, who stand on the street but focus on letting people sign petitions and collect personal data (Hunt, 2013). These fundraisers give clear information on any follow up where there will be a possibility they will be contacted (Hunt, 2013). Then, the 20 people that are employed to call, Tele-fundraisers, will use this data to call the people who have signed a certain petition (Hunt, 2013). From personal experience that I have gained during my time at Greenpeace New Zealand, there are two aims for the Tele fundraisers. The first aim of the Tele fundraising team is to call people and thank them for signing a certain petition. Secondly, the Tele fundraiser would then use the same skills as a street fundraiser to try and ask to become a financial supporter

of Greenpeace. However, Tele-fundraising seems to be much harder because there is a very short time period to build rapport with someone. There is no visual eye contact, and a Tele-fundraiser has to try to convince people with the tone of his/her voice and the message he/she is trying to tell.

2.4 Conclusion

Greenpeace was established in 1971, in Canada. Since then, the organisation has grown to one of the biggest environmental organisations worldwide, with 41 offices spread over the world. It has 2.8 million supporters and Greenpeace does not accept any money except from individuals and foundation grants. For core values, they focus on: personal responsibility, nonviolence, and independence. Greenpeace has no permanent friends or foes and Greenpeace seeks to find solutions. Since 1993, the word 'street-fundraising' has become a new phenomenon for the organisation, which was the first time paid staff would stand on the street to get new financial supporters on board. In Greenpeace's annual report in 2012, it shows that the gross income of fundraising was € 265 million, with a fundraising expenditure of €91 million worldwide, which is 34% of the total fundraising income (Greenpeace International, 2013). Greenpeace is always seeking for new ideas and ways to improve its fundraising strategies. The organisation tried an SMS fundraising strategy in India, which was very successful. Other Greenpeace offices have telephone teams, named Tele-fundraisers. Since individual supporters have been the only source of income, it can be stated that fundraising is very effective for the organisation. However, fundraising is not the only way to bear witness with people. That is why the next chapter will focus on Greenpeace and the use of social media.

3. The use of social media by Greenpeace

Since 2004, a new phenomenon started to make it possible to reach much more people than only to talk to them on the streets. This new phenomenon has been called social media. Although, it must be stated that social media did not become a replacement for fundraising. It is an extra tool used to reach more people to bear witness and spread the word of Greenpeace. The use of social media was an important step forward for Greenpeace. That is why in this third chapter, the relationship between Greenpeace and its use of social media has been researched. First, a brief definition of social media is explained and how it has been developed. Secondly, different examples of social media, which are mainly used by Greenpeace, are researched.

3.1 Social Media

According to the Cambridge dictionary, a main definition of social media can be stated as follows: *“Websites and computer programs that allow people to communicate and share information on the internet using a computer or mobile phone: Companies are increasingly making use of social media in order to market their goods”* (Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary & Thesaurus, n.d. B). Another definition from Margaret Rouse, who is the editorial director and author of the website ‘what is’ explained social media as follows: *“The collective way of online communications channels dedicated to community-based input, interaction, content-sharing and collaboration”* (Wigmore, 2012). Some examples of social media are: Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Wikipedia, LinkedIn, Reddit, and Pinterest (Wigmore, 2012). Greenpeace uses mainly Facebook, Twitter, and Pinterest. That is why there will be a main focus on these three social media tools.

3.1.2 The development of social media.

The first social media giant that was released was MySpace in 2003. MySpace is a social networking site that allows its users to create webpages to interact with other users (Business Dictionary n.d.). MySpace was one of the most visited websites in 2004 and 2005, which also surpassed Google. Nevertheless, this was only the beginning of social media. In 2004, Facebook was founded, which was followed by YouTube in 2005, Twitter in 2006, Pinterest in 2010, and Google+ in 2011. Facebook became the first main competitor to MySpace because it also offered accounts to businesses, such as Apple and Microsoft (Helga, 2013). Facebook became one of the most well-known and most popular social media

giants in the world with over 1.23 billion users worldwide (Helga, 2013). Twitter became another popular social media tool, which was officially launched in 2007 (Helga, 2013).

3.1.3 The Kimberly-Clark campaign

After MySpace and Facebook was YouTube, one of the other first tools that was seen as social media. YouTube is a website where people can watch and share videos with each other (YouTube, n.d.). This was also the first social media tool that Greenpeace started to use to target a company in 2004. According to Andrew Crane and Dirk Matten, two business school professors from Canada who did research about Greenpeace, Greenpeace led the way in the use of YouTube with the Kimberly Clark Campaign in 2004 (Crane & Matten, 2011).

Kimberly-Clark is among the world's largest paper-products manufactures. It is the manufacturer of Kleenex and Scott Toilet paper (Zabarenko, 2009). In 2004, Greenpeace stated that Kimberly-Clark's paper was from Canadian boreal forests, which contained 200-year-old trees (Schwartz, 2011). Although the company argued they only used environmentally-friendly products, Greenpeace argued that the company sourced up to 22% of its paper pulp from the Canadian boreal forests. (Schwartz, 2011). Since then, Greenpeace started off its campaign with strongly-worded press releases. The environmental organisation started to disturb meetings, launched blockades at the Kimberly-Clark offices, where activists also snuck into commercial shoots of Kleenex, and the organisation released aggressive YouTube videos in 2005 (Schwartz, 2011). The organisation also used the media, such as the newspaper, the New York Times, to add a print that told readers they were destroying the boreal forest every time they used Kleenex tissue (Zabarenko, 2009). However, the paper-products manufacturer still argued they only used sustainable practices for their paper and stated they did not do anything wrong. Ultimately, the YouTube videos were a new way of targeting a company. This led to more criticism against Kimberly-Clark from students and media, which started to highlight the company's destructive practices. Not until late 2008 the company decided to give in and started to cooperate with Greenpeace (Crane & Matten, 2011). With the help of Greenpeace, Kimberly-Clark fast-tracked its sustainability goals (Schwartz, 2011). After almost five years of campaigning, Kimberly-Clark promised to get all its wood that is needed for tissue products to be environmentally responsible sources and they have increased the use of recycled and certified fibre (Zabarenko, 2009). At the end of 2011, Kimberly-Clark pledged to stop sourcing non-Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified wood. Furthermore, 40 percent of the tissue fibre has

either been certified or recycled with more than 70 percent increase over 2007 (Schwartz, 2011). The company said that it would have reached its goals without Greenpeace. However, the cooperation with Greenpeace made it possible to become quicker environmental friendly, and other smaller companies soon followed (Crane & Matten, 2011). Kimberly-Clark was able to influence other companies to use more sustainable and environmental-friendly products. Since 2011, Kimberly-Clark meets twice a year with Greenpeace to discuss and review sustainability targets and discuss future innovations (Schwartz, 2011). It was since the Kimberly-Clark campaign, that Greenpeace started to develop new ways in the use of social media to get its message across and engage people in its campaigns against big companies (Crane & Matten, 2011).

3.2. Facebook

Another main social media tool to reach a big audience in a short time period is the use of Facebook. According to the Cambridge dictionary is Facebook a website where you can show information about yourself and communicate with groups of friends (Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus, n.d. A). Another explanation according to Margaret Rouse, from the 'what is' website is Facebook: *Another way for social networking where people can connect with each other, post photos or videos, or send messages and keep in touch with friends, family, and colleagues* (Dean, 2009). Greenpeace is one of the main users on Facebook, where they post different messages throughout the day.

3.2.1 Facebook Campaign

According to Sarah Phillips of the Guardian, Facebook was established in 2004, as a social-networking website for students from Harvard University (Phillips, 2007). As of 2006, the network was extended to educational institutions and other businesses (Phillips, 2007). In 2011, Facebook needed to build large data storage facilities to cope with the demand of data, which needed a lot of energy (Horn van, 2011). That is why in 2010, Facebook had announced to build its first data centre in Oregon, the United States. However, Greenpeace announced that Facebook was not using renewable energy to power its data centre, but powered its data by coal (Greenpeace International, 2011, B). That is when Greenpeace started a campaign against Facebook through the use of Facebook. It has used Facebook to raise awareness and engage the people to take action (Horn van, 2011). Greenpeace estimated that Facebook's reliance on coal was around 53.2 percent, just behind Apple who had 54.5 percent, and Google in third place with 34.7 percent. Greenpeace based these estimates on published figures for data-centre power consumption and electricity utilities'

reports of their energy sources (Sayer, 2011). In July 2010, Greenpeace posted a cartoon video on YouTube, which showed that Facebook was not using clean energy, but was in fact using coal. The video has been played half a million times, and many people started to join the Greenpeace Facebook-group to ask Facebook to use green energy (Greenpeace International, 2011, B). Then in October, thousands of people posted comments on Mark Zuckerberg's Facebook, the chief executive of Facebook, asking him to use green energy (Greenpeace International, 2011, B). This campaign continued in 2011, where the environmental organisation tried to set a world record on Facebook, with the most comments on a single Facebook page within 24 hours, which was called "the unfriend coal Facebook page" (Heimbuch, 2011). According to Facebook and Greenpeace, the non-governmental organisation had set a Guinness world record on Facebook with 80,000 comments in a single day on a single Facebook page in 11 different languages (Dubsky, 2011). Greenpeace posted a follow up of its "Make it Green" report. In this report, Greenpeace questioned different IT companies, such as Facebook, Google, Apple, and Amazon, how dirty and transparent their data is (Greenpeace International, 2011, A). Dirty was meant by how dirty the energy use of the companies was to run its data. Transparent was meant by how much the company showed what kind of energy it used. Greenpeace mainly tried to use the main websites of the researched IT companies, to see how transparent they are in the sense of its use of energy. Findings by Greenpeace shown in the report, have been explained by how reliable the source was, what kind of source it was, and where to find it (Greenpeace International, 2011, A). More campaigns from Greenpeace activists and supporters followed. Eventually in October 2011, Facebook announced it would move away from coal, and built a datacentre in Sweden to power its operations with clean and renewable energy (Meikle, 2011). Facebook chose Sweden because there it can use free cooling from the frigid local climate and it is close to the region of renewable hydropower (Greenpeace International, 2011, B). The campaign of Greenpeace took more than two years to convince Facebook to change the use of coal to the use of clean renewable energy for running its data (Meikle, 2011). As a last step, Facebook and Greenpeace announced in December 2011, that they would collaborate on the promotion of renewable energy on the grid and improve energy efficiency in data centres (LaMonica, 2011). As Stated from the Green Page of Facebook: "We will be working with Greenpeace to move everyone closer to a world powered by clean and renewable energy, and to use the Facebook platform to engage people on energy and environmental issues" (LaMonica, 2011). Greenpeace and Facebook have started to work

together since 2011, to move away from coal and to set an example for the IT industry to follow (Meikle, 2011). Since then, Facebook, Apple, and Google, have all installed solar or wind power systems to power a part of their data centre (LaMonica, 2011).

3.3 Pinterest

Pinterest is a second social media tool that Greenpeace is using. Pinterest says that it is a website where you can collect and organize the things you love, in the way of pictures, videos, and articles (Pinterest, n.d.). The idea is that people can “pin” or choose pictures that they are interested in, and everyone else can see this. T2 Social is a website made for business owners and marketing directors to show the importance of social media and create social media programs. According to Corey Padveen, the director of Global Social Business Strategy at T2 Marketing, Greenpeace uses Pinterest to upload photos to show people what the organisation is doing, but also what is going on in the world (Padveen, 2013). Greenpeace has around 6,000 followers and around 46 boards on Pinterest (Moth, 2013). The other idea of Greenpeace to use Pinterest is to extend campaigns online. Most of the boards from the environmental organisation that are used on Pinterest focus on a particular campaign or initiative. Greenpeace selects its images carefully to attract attention from followers for certain campaigns (Padveen, 2013). Campaigns are extended to the network to lead people to pages of specific campaigns and also links to the Greenpeace website (Padveen, 2013). The way that Greenpeace is using Pinterest is very important, and almost all the pins link back to Greenpeace’s own website (Moth, 2013). “Pinterest is a social media tool, where ahead planning, understanding the audience and keeping your goals in mind, are important factors to keep in mind” stated Corey Padveen (2013).

3.4 Twitter

A third popular social media tool used by Greenpeace is Twitter. Twitter is a social networking and microblogging service which allows informal collaboration and sharing of messages (“tweets”) (Twitter, n.d.). The social media tool has 241 million active users with 500 million Tweets sent per day in over 35 languages (Twitter, n.d.). Greenpeace uses Twitter, just like Facebook and Pinterest, on a daily basis to share its campaigns and thoughts. According to Ted Fickes, a writer of the mobilisation lab for Greenpeace and its allies, in 2012, Greenpeace Brazil had the largest Greenpeace Twitter account, with more

than 548,000 followers. In second place was Greenpeace International with 520,000 followers (Fickes, 2012).

3.5 Social media campaign

In 2011, Greenpeace began a Detox campaign to raise awareness about several clothing brands who have hazardous chemicals in the clothes they produce (Rudenko, 2014). On 14 January 2014, this campaign continued and Greenpeace launched its Detox Campaign by posting a 12-part Detox fairy tale campaign on its Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. Instagram is another way of sharing pictures and videos online. The campaign began when Greenpeace researched factories' water pollution in China, where the release of toxic chemicals were found (Culture of Resistance, n.d.). These chemicals of the textile industry that were shown have a long-term effect on the environment and devastating impacts on human and animal life (Culture of Resistance, n.d.). Greenpeace researched 12 international clothing brands which seemed to have dangerous chemicals in their clothing (Culture of Resistance, n.d.). The Detox fairy tale had been shared with over 2.5 million followers from Greenpeace International on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts (Greenpeace International, 2014, A). According to Juliette H¹, who is a digital mobilisation specialist at Greenpeace International, the organisation used social media in the way of a webpage, a photo-shoot, and also offline activities, which continued for days and weeks (Greenpeace International, 2014, A). This has gained lots of support and several clothing brands, which were targeted earlier by Greenpeace, have cleaned up their toxic habits (Greenpeace International, 2014, A). In the American business magazine 'Forbes', Laura Kenyon, the online marketing and promotions specialist at Greenpeace International, already stated in an interview with Jeremiah Owyang in 2010 that Greenpeace would continue with online campaigns (Owyang, 2010). "However, growth and change depends on the online networks and the available tools to grow and change" (Owyang, 2010). The support empowers the organisation and they hope to empower the supporters as well, when they need them to speak up for a better world (Owyang, 2010). "As we face the greatest threat to our planet, climate change, civil courage and the online spaces where it is expressed will be crucial" (Owyang, 2010). Since January 2014, 18 major global brands, like Levi's, Zara, and Mango,

¹ Writers on Greenpeace websites state never their full name. Only their first name and the first letter of their last name. that is why it is referenced like this.

have committed to detox and to phase out all dangerous chemicals by 2020 (Rudenko, 2014).

3.6 Changes in social media

Social media is changing constantly, due to newer tools, techniques or thoughts. For example, social media has changed for Facebook because it was first only meant for high school students. It was not until 2007, that the social media giant decided to open it up for businesses and organisations (Haesmeyer, 2011) Since then, social media has changed in the way of customisation which evolved to personalisation: it allows every person to create a page, where you can view what you want, and when you want it (Haesmeyer, 2011). When social media was released, many businesses waited with the interaction of social media because there was a lack of information. Businesses and organisations could not see the benefit of it (Latham & Merrill & Navetta & Santalesa, 2011). The new way social media offers is a two-way interactive experience. Consumers can interact directly and instantly with the organisation or business (Latham, 2011). Everyone appreciate it when a company, business, or organisation responds on Twitter or Facebook comments (Haesmeyer, 2011). As a third change is the newer possibilities of status updates through smartphones. News is spreading much quicker and businesses are becoming more widespread than ever (Haesmeyer, 2011). The social media of today has become a way for people to share their interests and thoughts with others in the way they like it (Haesmeyer, 2011). This change related to Greenpeace has mainly made it possible to reach much more people than they could do before. Greenpeace is an active user of Facebook and even had the most Facebook comments within 24 hours, which let it earn the Guinness World of Records (Scott, 2013). However, the downside of social media is that the opportunity to interact with anyone, anywhere, is too world-changing to ignore (Latham, 2011).

3.6 conclusion

Individuals can tell through online campaigning directly what they want or think through the different social media tools that are available. Kumi Naidoo, the executive director of Greenpeace International mentioned in an interview with CNN: "Digital protest is a powerful new way of speaking truth to power, of taking a stand and making a demand" (CNN, 2010). The executive director stated that Greenpeace will maintain a strong presence in social media using the latest tools and communication channels. Another reason why non-

governmental organisations use social media is because it is a great way to share information which can quickly be spread to interested communities (Padveen, 2013). The different examples of campaigns with different types of social media gave a clear example of the wide possibilities in social media. To give an example, it can be stated that Greenpeace is highly active on social media to reach people.

4.0 Greenpeace and its independence, why different from other environmental NGOs?

As a fourth chapter, Greenpeace will be described as to how it differentiates from other environmental non-governmental organisations, particularly the World Wildlife Fund. The comparison is mainly focused on the different objectives with different campaigns, but also similarities, collaboration, challenges and criticism of each organisation will be discussed. Research has been done on the fact of how Greenpeace is trying to stay independent and why.

4.1 Non-governmental organisations

Non-governmental organisations were first named by the United Nations in 1945, which were defined as non-profit entities, independent of governmental influences (Trinity College Dublin, n.d.). Most non-governmental organisations were created after the Second World War and the creation of the United Nations. There was a need for organisations which were neither governments nor member states (Trinity college Dublin, n.d.). According to Peter Willets, a professor of the London University, the most important role of an NGO is that they are independent from government influence, which means that it is not a part of, or controlled by government (Willets, 2006, chap 3.). According to the United Nations, NGOs are:

“Not-for-profit, voluntary citizen’s group, which is organised on a local, national, or international level to address issues in support of the public good. Task oriented and made up of people with common interests, NGOs perform a variety of services and humanitarian functions, bring citizens’ concerns to governments, monitor policy and programme implementation, and encourage participation of Civil Society stakeholders at the community level.” (Trinity College Dublin, n.d.)

Environmental non-governmental organisations have been described on the international relations website as followed: ‘environmental non-governmental organisations are organisations that deal with issues of the environment, including the depletion of natural resources, global warming and conservation (International Relations Online, n.d.).

In 2001, it was shown that around 40,000 international NGOs were operating, which does not even include national NGOs (NGO Handbook, 2010). While NGOs are stated as nongovernmental and independent from government influence, there are NGOs who accept

money from governments. Some non-governmental organisations are sometimes even entirely funded by a government (Willets, 2006, chap 3). The main reason for this is that these organisations have a security of a guaranteed budget to run their operational programs (Willets, 2006, chap 3). Government funding can be very controversial because a government sometimes supports an organisation purely to reach political goals instead of a nation's development goals (Folger, 2014). Most NGO activities are focused on human rights work, social advocacy, and the environment (Willets. 2006. chap 3). Non-governmental organisations can be distinguished in different activities, where the most common activities are between operational and campaigning NGOs (Willets, 2006, chap 10). These are also explained as small-scale changes that are achieved directly through projects. Large-scale change is promoted indirectly through influence on the political system (Willets, 2006, chap 10). NGOs often have things in common, for example, having the need to engage in fundraising, needing to have good relations with the media, needing volunteers, and organising special events (Willets, 2006, chap 10). To see the differences between environmental organisations, a case study between Greenpeace and the WWF was conducted.

4.2 Environmental NGOs: a case study of WWF and Greenpeace

Greenpeace is not the only environmental nongovernmental organisation which has spread worldwide. Another major environmental organisation along with Greenpeace is The World Wildlife Fund, also known as World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF). The reason why Greenpeace has been compared with WWF is because WWF is a more dependent organisation that accepts money from governments and businesses. In the following case study WWF and Greenpeace will be compared in different ways. Its goals, the origin, differences and similarities, challenges, and also criticisms about the organisations have been researched.

4.2.1 Main objectives

The main goal of Greenpeace is to ensure the ability of the earth to nurture life in all its diversity (Greenpeace International, n.d. A). Whereas, the aim of WWF is to stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature (WWF, n.d. B). The main aim of both organisations is to focus on future prospects and to preserve a sustainable green planet (Harvey, 2011). According to Harvard

Business School professor, Ramon Casadesus-Masanell, who did research on Greenpeace and WWF, stated in an interview with Sarah Gilbert that Greenpeace and WWF are both trying to promote a public good for the improvement of the natural environment (Gilbert, 2008).

4.2.2. Similarities

One of the main and most important similarities is that both organisations use the power of the media to draw attention for certain actions or activities (Gilbert, 2008). Another point the organisations have in common, according to professor Ramon Casadesus-Masanell, is that both organisations use a symbol to represent their organisations. WWF has a panda as the symbol of the organisation. Greenpeace's symbol is the rainbow warrior (Gilbert, 2008). Value is an important concept for the two environmental organisations. The value is seen when awareness increases and conservation projects are changing policies (Gilbert, 2008). Greenpeace sees achievements or victories as its value, as well as its goodwill and credibility. However, both organisations have clearly stated they do not do their work to have a profit objective (Gilbert, 2008).

4.2.3. Differences

The differences between both environmental organisations are rooted in their origins. First of all, Greenpeace started as a campaigning organisation, which was seen more as a movement instead of a charity (Gilbert, 2008). The organisation has mainly been set up by journalists, where the organisation used the media as a weapon against powerful governments to make a change in policy, which was supported by activists and scientists (Gilbert, 2008). This relates to one of the main tools that makes Greenpeace familiar with the people: the use of nonviolent direct action (NVDA). Greenpeace tries to reach its goals through action and to confront environmental abuse by governments and corporations worldwide who have the power to stop environmental abuse (Greenpeace UK, n.d.). Through these actions, Greenpeace is trying to raise awareness, so that the act will be brought to public debate (Wheeler, 2008). The main area of Greenpeace is the media, where the strategy is based on nonviolent direct action tactics (Furst, 2012). Most importantly, these nonviolent protests have been attractive to written and electronic media, where the message of Greenpeace is reaching a very broad audience (Furst, 2012). Greenpeace directs its actions to the ones who have the power to change environmental hazards, and these actions help to generate a broad public sympathy for the cause (Furst, 2012). On the contrary, WWF has been mostly running projects since the 1960s, and was supported by government

officials, scientists, and businesspeople. WWF was founded by the Dutch prince of the Netherlands Bernhard and former head of Royal Dutch Shell John H. Loudon (Hadley, n.d.). Since the beginning, the main objective of WWF has been to look for ways to work with governmental representatives (Hadley, n.d.). Whereas, Greenpeace was set up to encourage people to protest against governments (Gilbert, 2008). Another difference between the organisations is the sources of income. Greenpeace has only two sources of income, namely the individual financial supporters and foundation trusts (Greenpeace International, n.d. A). Greenpeace is totally relying on the willingness of the individuals to continue to donate every year (Gilbert, 2008). However, WWF has a broader source of income, with more than 50% from individual financial support such as Greenpeace, 17% from governments and public bodies, and another 10% from businesses and corporations (Harvey, 2011). Greenpeace has around 2.8 million supporters worldwide, whereas WWF has around 5 million supporters. David Nussbaum, chief executive of WWF UK, in 2011, stated that Greenpeace has a more combative aggressive approach than WWF. "We see a need to engage constructively with the commercial world. We use our influence with businesses." He said. (Harvey, 2011).

4.2.4. Collaboration

Although the NGOs have some differences, they sometimes work together on certain projects. On several campaigns, the organisations have much in common, such as the following:

- Stop climate change
- Fresh water program or "save the seas"
- Forests programs
- Sustainability programs

(Gilbert, 2008)

Researching both home pages of the two organisations shows the campaigns that each organisation is working on. On the website of Greenpeace, it shows that it has since broadened its projects further since its first campaign to stop nuclear power (Greenpeace International, n.d. C). Greenpeace focuses on stopping genetic engineering and to stop toxic pollution (Greenpeace International, n.d. C). On the website of WWF, it shows that the organisation also focuses on China for a global shift. With this focus, they are trying to help China to become more environmental friendly. WWF focuses on the Green heart of Africa,

smart fishing, and saving the tigers (WWF, n.d. A). The European Cetacean Bycatch Campaign website showed that Greenpeace and WWF cooperated on tuna fisheries in 2002, where both organisations were present on a Special Meeting of the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) (European Cetacean Bycatch Campaign, 2002). It is also shown on Antara, an Indonesian news agency website that Greenpeace and WWF cooperated in 2011 to save the Sumatran tigers and elephants (Wibisono, 2011). With this campaign, the organisations both want to save the forest environment, which is constantly facing deforestation (Wibisono, 2011). According to professor Ramon Casadesus-Masanell, WWF and Greenpeace sometimes team up together with other NGOs to offer joint press statements and to put pressure on governments and businesses (Gilbert, 2008). One of the main and first examples that can be used where Greenpeace and WWF worked together was on the 'Save the Whales Campaign', where they fought for a moratorium on whaling (Gilbert, 2008).

4.2.5 Challenges

Environmental NGOs can face many different challenges in pursuing their mission. One of these barriers can be a lack of understanding about their role in civil society (Alam & Mubarak, 2011). The need to access more diverse ways of fundraising is another example of a challenge for environmental NGOs (Alam & Mubarak, 2011). Finding new ways of fundraising also relates to the competition environmental NGOs have between each other. There are many environmental NGOs that are all promoting its way of working, which can make it harder for people to choose (Gilbert, 2008). Another challenge for NGOs in general is to create influence and impact in governments and businesses and to engage in policy development and implementation (Alam & Mubarak, 2011). A barrier that relates to the influence of governments is when countries agree to change their policy, while they do not do enough to check businesses if they are following the law, to become more environmental friendly (Gilbert, 2008). A specific challenge for Greenpeace is that the organisation has limited sources of income. This limitation can make it hard to continue growing, because they constantly need to think of new ways to find financial supporters, and also to keep the new financial supporters on board of Greenpeace (Gilbert, 2008). Whereas, a challenge for WWF is to challenge certain governments and companies that donate to the organisation. Nevertheless, WWF returned donations when it disagreed with the donor's environmental practices in the past (Gilbert, 2008).

4.2.6 Criticism

Opinions about the organisations are very broad and also criticism is common for both.

4.2.6.1 Criticism WWF

One of the areas where WWF is criticised is due to the main founders of WWF. The prince of The Netherlands, Bernhard of Lippe-Biesterfeld, was the first president of the organisation. However, researchers have shown that a few years before the foundation, the prince was one of the hunters that enjoyed killing the big five (Harvey, 2011). One of the following presidents was John Loudon, who was the former CEO of Royal Dutch Shell (Hadley, n.d.). According to representatives of independent German non-governmental organisations, such as Rettet den Regenwald (Save the rainforest); the WWF was an accomplice of corporations. WWF grants corporations a license to destroy nature, in return for large donations and small concessions (Glüsing & Klawitter, 2012). The German television network, WDR, made a film, 'The Pact with the Panda', where they show that the WWF is partly responsible for the increasing threat of the rainforest (Glüsing & Klawitter, 2012). Even though the WWF denied this, 3,000 supporters cancelled their membership after the release of the movie in 2011 (Glüsing & Klawitter, 2012). A last criticism of the organisation has been blamed for being sometimes "too cosy with businesses" stated in the Guardian (Harvey, 2011).

4.2.6.2 Criticism Greenpeace

Even though Greenpeace has 2.8 million supporters worldwide, there are also people that do not (partly) agree with how the organisation works. One of these reasons is that Greenpeace should focus more on tightening the government regulation of corporations instead of targeting certain businesses (Furst, 2012). Related to this is that the organisation has not always been considered as a serious environmental group from coalitions working in legal or legislative arenas, or collected money for weak campaigns (Kovarik, 2009). However, according to Greenpeace, this is because it is hard to pin down real change on agreements with businesses (Furst, 2012). This is also because the major trade world is holding closed-door and undemocratic meetings for Greenpeace, which makes it hard to have a say in the world trade that affects the environment (Furst, 2012). It would be easier for environmental organisations to target companies when countries make stricter environmental laws. This because it would mean that companies has to start to follow the law . Another criticism about Greenpeace is that the organisation is out of touch with mainstream environmentalism, because they focus too little on the political process (Furst, 2012). A third criticism is that one

of the co-founders of Greenpeace, Patrick Moore, stated that Greenpeace lost its way of interest with the fact that since 1985, Greenpeace have been more interested in politics than in science (Tadeo, 2014). A fourth criticism is that people see the organisation as an extremism organisation, with nonviolent direct actions that are too radical and do not have a real goal, only to harm a company or business (Gosselin, 2013). People state that the organisation has caused more harm than good (Furst, 2012). Nevertheless, other people state that the actions of Greenpeace do fare positively in the eyes of the public (Furst, 2012). A research study, which was conducted by the University of Washington in 2010, stated that a sociology doctoral student named Jon Agnone, showed that each environmental protest that had happened in a certain year had increased the amount of pro-environmental bills passed in Congress by 2.2 percent (Furst, 2012). This shows that social movements do have an impact on society and the environment. In the research report, it was also mentioned that nongovernmental organisations, such as Greenpeace and Amnesty International, are much more trusted by the public than global multinational companies such as Microsoft, for example. The main reason for this is because global multinationals are mainly focused on profit, whereas these NGOs are fighting for a cause or value they believe in (Furst, 2012).

4.2.7. Nongovernmental organisations and the use social media

Both organisations are very interactive with the use of social media. As already explained in chapter three, Greenpeace is using social media on a very high level. This also seems to be the case for WWF. According to Claire Carlton, who is the Social Media Manager for the WWF's climate policy campaign: "Social media have provided us with the opportunity to engage supporters and reach new audiences in a way we have not ever been able to in the past," (Catone, 2009). Also for this organisation, Facebook, YouTube and Twitter are the main social media tools they use. These tools allow them to increase engagement through posting status updates, sharing information, and linking back to the WWF website, but also to speaking directly to supporters (Catone, 2009). Through social media organisations, they can appeal to a newer and broader audience (Catone, 2009). WWF also has a special team that focuses on social media, on and offline. Claire Carlton admitted that it requires strong commitment and an understanding that it is a daily activity, which means they need staff to make sure that it happens (Catone, 2009). WWF is also doing research in the use of polls, to see what supporters and other people find more important than other aspects in the organisation. For Greenpeace, it has already been explained in chapter three, wherein the statement of the executive director of Greenpeace was: "Digital protest is a powerful new

way of speaking truth to power, of taking a stand and making a demand” (CNN, 2010). A strong presence in social media makes the organisation stronger in the way that more people will be aware of the organisation and its actions (CNN, 2010.) Another reason why non-governmental organisations use social media is because it is a great way to share information which can quickly be spread to interested communities (Padveen, 2013). Greenpeace and WWF are both using social media for the same reason: to get the message spread and to reach more people.

4.4. Conclusion

The non-governmental environmental organisations Greenpeace and The World Wildlife Fund have both common aspects as well as differences. First of all, the organisations have a similar focus on their campaigns in saving the environment, where they fight for a better and cleaner environment for everyone. Secondly, both organisations use a particular symbol that represents the organisations. Thirdly, the organisations use the power of the media to draw attention to certain actions and activities. As a last similarity, both have some main challenges, such as changing laws of governments to improve their environmental organisation.

For a main difference, both organisations were founded differently. Greenpeace has been set up as an organisation to encourage people to protest against governments. Whereas WWF looked for ways to work with governmental representatives (Gilbert, 2008). However, the main difference between the two organisations is the main source of income. Greenpeace only accepts money from individuals and foundation grants, whereas WWF also accepts money from governments and businesses (Gilbert, 2008). The advantage for WWF to accept money from governments and companies, is that they are spreading the risk of getting less money from one of the sources. The organisation is much bigger than Greenpeace, and has over 5 million members, which are located in more than 100 countries (WNF, 2014). Nevertheless, the tactic of WWF is different because they are trying to work together with businesses to change their policies, while Greenpeace will try to confront these businesses to change their policies. The opposite side for WWF is that they sometimes have to challenge a government or company that is funding the organisation (Gilbert, 2008). Both organisations receive criticism from outside about what the organisation does or how they work. As a final point, it can be concluded that both organisations use social media on a high level, because it is easier to reach a broader audience.

5. Changes in Greenpeace and social media in the last 10 years

This chapter has been focused on one of the most well-known campaigns of Greenpeace that became successful through the use of social media. An interview with the head of press of Greenpeace Germany was used, focused on the changes in social media within Greenpeace.

5.1 Influence through social media

As already explained in chapter three, one of the first successful stories of Greenpeace using social media was the Kimberly-Clark campaign in 2004. Since then, Greenpeace progressed and continued with the use of social media. This led the organisation to the use of Facebook in 2007, when the social media tool was launched for businesses and organisations (Philips, 2007). As a result of the first social media campaign of Kimberly-Clark, the tissue company announced in 2009 they were one of the industry leaders in sustainability (Greenpeace International, 2014, B). Since then, more improvement in the use of social media has been established, that is why another and later victory of Greenpeace was the Kit Kat campaign.

5.1.2 Kit Kat campaign

Nestlé is the world's leading nutrition, and health and wellness company, and is also the maker of Kit Kat. (Nestlé, 2014). In 2010, Greenpeace started off its campaign against Nestlé, with its focus on Kit Kat, to stop the company buying unsustainable Indonesian palm oil from the supplier Sinar Mas (Crane & Matten, 2011). Sinar Mas is a global supplier that was destroying the South-East Asian rainforest's, where orangutans were being threatened (Tiphereth, 2010). On 17 March, 2010, Greenpeace announced that research proved that Nestlé was buying palm oil from Sinar Mas. The environmental organisation proved this by satellite and photographic evidence from the activities of Sinar Mas in Indonesia (Greenpeace Canada, 2010). To attract more attention to the situation, Greenpeace released a YouTube video of the standard "take a break" Kit Kat ad. In the video clip, an office worker takes a Kit Kat and is chewing on an orangutans finger instead of a Kit Kat bar (Armstrong, 2010). The campaign took off globally where many people criticised Nestlé and bombarded the company on Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter. As a result, Nestlé asked YouTube to remove the video due to copyright concerns (Armstrong, 2010). Nestlé also deleted all the negative comments on their Facebook page or gave angry responses (Tiphereth, 2010). This led to the fact that Nestlé received over more than 200,000 emails and hundreds of phone calls (Enders & Lonescu-Somers, 2012). Nestlé did not really know how to handle all the

criticism, and consumers on Facebook accused the company's response to the criticism as a 'major social media fail' (Tiphereth, 2010). Greenpeace continued its campaign on and offline for three months, where it attacked Nestlé through social media (Hickman, 2010). After these three months, Nestlé announced that it would develop a plan to identify and remove any companies in their supply chain with links to deforestation (Hickman, 2010). Within these 10 weeks, more than 1 million people watched Greenpeace's ad on YouTube, and another thousands of people had posted comments on Facebook and Twitter against Nestlé (CNN, 2010). The campaign against Nestlé Kit Kat, led by Greenpeace, was seen as an example of the power of social media (Harrild, 2010). The story was also closely followed by media specialists and there was a large amount of commentary on blogs, with the effect of the vocal and influential NGOs (Harrild, 2010).

5.1.3 The impact of a social media campaign

One year after Greenpeace released its campaign against Nestlé, the environmental NGO showed the positive changes Nestlé had made. Since then, Nestlé works together with The Forest Trust (TFT) to implement a program to remove deforestation from all its products (Greenpeace UK, 2011). The nutrition company adopted the new Responsible Sourcing Guidelines (RSGs), which made supply-chain maps for almost all palm oil and a supplier assessment process that sees Nestlé working with suppliers to identify shortcomings, and to help them to become a no-deforestation supplier (Greenpeace UK, 2011). The tangible commitments from a company like Nestlé demonstrate the importance and the effectiveness of one of Greenpeace's most innovative, sustained, and well supported campaigns to date (Greenpeace UK, 2011). However, despite some developments from Nestlé and followed companies, other palm oil companies related to Sinar Mas continue to pulp millions of tonnes of the Indian rainforest every year. The Indonesian's rainforest is still disappearing on a high rate, which also endangers the habitat of the Sumatran tiger (Greenpeace UK, 2011).

After the very well-known campaign, Kumi Naidoo, the executive director of Greenpeace International, was interviewed by CNN. In the interview, Kumi stated that Greenpeace is well-known for taking direct action, but the key to its campaigning now is the collective power of the internet and social media (CNN, 2010). According to Kumi it is harder to target companies that do not sell a product to the public. "When you have a company that does sell a product directly to the public, you have a greater ability to leverage things more quickly (CNN, 2010). The combination between online marketing campaigning and the normal on-the-ground convincing activities made the campaign against Nestlé very successful (CNN,

2010). “To give it an emotional push, it can make it sometimes easier to reach a broader public”, stated Kumi Naidoo (CNN, 2010).

5.3. Changes in social media within Greenpeace

Sources about changes in the use of social media within Greenpeace are very rare. It should be stated that the following information is mainly conducted by an interview with the Head of Press of Greenpeace Germany.

The internet and social media have become an indispensable tool for many civil society organisations, like Greenpeace (Cokkececi, 2011). Since the creation of Greenpeace, certain and newer tools have come to the organisation that changed its way of working. “One of these major changes since the beginning of Greenpeace with nowadays”, states Volker Gaßner, head of the Press Greenpeace Germany, “is the greater visibility of our campaigns, and eventually a much closer contact with supporters thanks to social media (Krajsic, 2013). “Furthermore, online campaigning helps to reach out to much more people, for whom already thought about supporting the organisation, can now already support online” (Krajsic, 2013). Since the availability of social media, people can go on the internet and simply engage in the things they care about or are interested in (Barnard, 2009). For Greenpeace, this means that it is important to make sure all the information is online, with easy access, and is also easy to rapidly share (Krajsic, 2013). Greenpeace offices have special digital teams that focus on online and offline media. As a key responsibility, they create people-driven campaigns that are integrated with offline and online channels (LinkedIn, 2014). The aim of a digital team is to ensure they create people engagements activities in their campaigns in certain countries (LinkedIn, 2014). Digital team members design mobile campaigns that integrate with other digital channels (LinkedIn, 2014). This leads to the fact that social media platforms are an important source for the organisation. Through social media, the teams can analyse user’s reactions if people have shared certain things or not (Krajsic, 2013). Volker Gaßner stated that: “We need to involve our supporters actively in our online campaigns. When we show the success stories back to the community, people see that it was worth to participate“(Krajsic, 2013). Another change is that social media increases in political influence (Cohn. 2011). However, Greenpeace is not only focusing on their own social media, but also on spreading the word on channels of their enemies. “Twitter is a very important tool to spread news, because many journalists follow Greenpeace offices and other NGOs on Twitter to see what has been published” said Volker Gaßner. “in addition to

that, thanks to these new communication tools, it is also easier to contact other influencers for the organisation such as journalists and bloggers” (Krajsic, 2013). Social media has become one of the most important tools for Greenpeace to reach out to the public, and spread the word (CNN, 2010).

5.4 Conclusion

Greenpeace has had many achievements since their establishment in 1971 where a victory for Greenpeace is seen as a change that supporters helped to make happen (Greenpeace International, 2014, B). One of Greenpeace’s main victories through the use of social media and public attention has been the Kit Kat campaign. Kumi Naidoo stated in an interview with CNN that due to the reaction of Nestlé to remove the video of YouTube, Greenpeace gained much more support (CNN, 2010). Since Nestlé did not really know how to respond on the social media attack, the company gave impolite and rude answers to customers on Facebook and Twitter (Hickman, 2010). Eventually, Nestlé has changed its policy, and is now working together with The Forest Trust to implement a program to remove deforestation from all its products. Greenpeace has experienced major changes in the way to reach the public and spread its message. According to Volker Gaßner, this is a major change for Greenpeace. The greater the visibility of its campaigns can eventually lead to a much closer contact with supporters through social media (Krajsic, 2013). Next to that he stated that there is also more political influence than before, and motivated people are needed to put things in motion (Krajsic, 2013).

6. Conclusion

The core objective of this research was to find out whether Greenpeace has changed its ways of working in the last ten years, and if so, how. Greenpeace is the most well-known independent environmental organisation worldwide. The aim was to see how an independent organisation works. Social media is the new phenomenon that was established around 2000, and has become an essential tool for Greenpeace. Greenpeace faced some major changes when it comes to the organisation as a whole. Besides this internal factor, the organisation had to deal with external aspects like social media. The research indicates potential signs of opportunities with a powerful tool such as social media. The final aim was to see whether Greenpeace will remain an independent environmental NGO that does not have to accept money from any government or corporation to continue with its work. However, if it cannot continue as an independent organisation, would Greenpeace not miss its main goal, where they confront governments and businesses? The main question for this research was: *“How has Greenpeace changed its way of working in the last ten years, and will this change help them to stay an independent NGO?”*

Since the establishment of Greenpeace, the core objective of the organisation has been to work to get a more sustainable environment and planet. Greenpeace was facing tough times with generating income around 1992. The organisation decided to broaden its ways of income. The new phenomenon of street fundraising became a modern opportunity to raise more money. The idea was to train and pay staff to stand on the street to talk to people and ask for monthly donations. It was the introduction of the monthly giving opportunity which helped the organisation with many new financial donors for the long-term. Greenpeace is always looking for new or other ways to find individual supporters. One of these ideas was thought of in Greenpeace India, where they texted people to ask if they wanted to have a free sapling. When people answered ‘yes’, a fundraiser would bring the plant and then ask for monthly donations.

The different types of fundraising and the experience of social media within Greenpeace were discussed. The first well-known campaign through social media was the Kimberly-Clark campaign. Since then, Greenpeace progressed in the use of social media, and also started off a campaign against Facebook, through Facebook. It has been stated that Greenpeace will continue with online campaigns. However, grow and change depends on the online

networks and the available tools to growth and change” (Owyang, 2010). Greenpeace was also compared with another major environmental organisation, The World Wildlife Fund (WWF). The reason why Greenpeace has been compared with WWF is because WWF is a less independent organisation, because it also receives money from governments, businesses, and corporations. The main differences between the two organisations were focused on the fact that Greenpeace uses non-violent direct action (NVDA) to protest against governments. On the contrary, WWF looks for ways to work with governmental representatives.

Both organisations also receive some criticism. The main criticism about WWF is about the founders of the organisation. People state that WWF grants corporations a license to destroy nature, in return for large donations and small concessions. The criticism about Greenpeace is that it is sometimes more interested in politics than in science nowadays. Some find the organisation too radical. This causes more harm than good. Besides criticism, both organisations have stated they have gained a lot of benefits from the social media tools. Both organisations argued that social media has provided the organisations with the opportunity to engage supporters and to reach new audiences in a way that was not possible before. Lastly, the changes for Greenpeace and the use of social media have been discussed. At this point a recent happening related to social media can be highlighted: the Kit Kat campaign. Although Greenpeace is well-known for its direct action approach, the keys for its campaigns is the power of the internet and social media. The change of the organisation as a whole can be summarised by stating that the organisation has a better insight in its campaigns. Thanks to the personalized ways of communication, Greenpeace can strengthen its bond with individual supporters. This is because of social media.

It is hard to give a future outlook of an organisation that only exists from individual financial supporters and foundation grants. Nevertheless, Greenpeace is not an organisation that is trying to benefit from people’s money, but is trying to use it for the right cause: saving the environment and the planet. Greenpeace will never be an organisation that would accept money from a government or corporations. This is also because the organisation could not be Greenpeace anymore if it accepted that type of money. The nonviolent direct action (NVDA) and the campaign attacks against certain companies, or even governments, make the organisation unique. An organisation such as WWF cannot campaign against a certain company or government when it receives money from it, which makes them much less

independent. One of the main points that should be stated is that WWF has long been criticised for being corrupt, and using money for the wrong causes. However, even though some people state Greenpeace used money for weak campaigns that failed, there are no sources that show that Greenpeace would use supporters' money for the wrong causes. Greenpeace has changed its way of working in the sense that it is using social media in such an interactive way. This made the organisation much bigger and more well-known than it was before. Successful campaigns, such as the Kimberly-Clark campaign and the Kit Kat campaign, were mainly successful because people decided to speak up against these companies through social media. It should also be stated that there is rare information about the shortcomings of the organisation. This also has to do with the fact that it is not clear what Greenpeace sees as a shortcoming or not.

Personally, I think that Greenpeace will stay an independent organisation in the future. Even though the company received some criticism, the majority of people realise that an organisation like Greenpeace is necessary for this planet. Several times, Greenpeace activists have been convicted of breaking national laws, such as the case in Russia in September 2013. With this campaign, 30 Greenpeace activists were convicted for piracy and were imprisoned for three months. Nevertheless, the activists seemed to be innocent, and people world-wide started to support Greenpeace, the organisation that stands up for a cleaner and better planet for everyone. Greenpeace is needed to preserve a sustainable future, with a clean and healthy environment. The organisation benefits from the use of social media, which is now one of its strongest tools to target companies or businesses. Just like other organisations, Greenpeace will have to work hard to continue with its work, and to find financial supporters. Finding newer tools in the use of social media, or other tools to reach a broader audience to help to spread its message, will be a necessity. Nevertheless, I believe that this organisation will strive for a more sustainable future, even if they have to break more national laws to speak up for the environment. This makes the organisation unique and indispensable for now and in the future.

References

- AIDS.Gov. (n.d.). *Global HIV/AIDS Organizations*. Retrieved May 20, 2014 from the official website of the Federal Government:
<http://aids.gov/federal-resources/around-the-world/global-hiv-aids-organizations/>
- Alam Tanzeed. & Mubarak Razan Al. (2011). The Role of NGOs in Tackling Environmental Issues. *Middle East Institute*. Retrieved May 5, 2014 from the Middle East Institute website:
<http://www.mei.edu/content/role-ngos-tackling-environmental-issues>
- Armstrong, Paul. (2010, March 20). Greenpeace, Nestlé in battle over Kit Kat viral. *CNN*. Retrieved May 11, 2014 from the CNN website:
<http://edition.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/asiapcf/03/19/indonesia.rainforests.orangutan.nestle/>
- Barnard, David & de Gale, Matthew. (2009, May 20). NGOs and Social Media - Challenges and Opportunities. *The Southern African NGO Network (SANGONeT)*. Retrieved May 14, 2014 from the SANGONeT website:
<http://www.ngopulse.org/article/ngos-and-social-media-challenges-and-opportunities>
- Bendana, Alejandro. (2006, June). *NGOs and Social Movements, a north/south divide?* United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. Civil Society and Social Movements Programme paper number 22. Retrieved February 25, 2014 from the online version of the paper:
<http://www.rrojasdatabank.info/Bendana.pdf>
- Berg, Oscar. (2011, July 5). 3 Reasons Why Organizations Need to Increase Transparency. *Covering Customer Experience, Social Business & information management (CMS)*. Retrieved March 10, 2014 from the online CMS articles website:
<http://www.cmswire.com/cms/enterprise-collaboration/3-reasons-why-organizations-need-to-increase-transparency-011886.php>
- Boice, Jacklyn P. (May-June 2010). *Text for Leads. Best bets, best practices for your organisation*. Advancing Philanthropy 51. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from the Association of Fundraising Professionals website:
http://www.afpnet.org/files/ContentDocuments/AP_MayJune2010_BestBets.pdf

- Bok de, René. (1997). *Van Rainbow Warrior tot Mururoa*. Icarus/van Reemst. P. 36-42. Retrieved April 23, 2014 from the Hague Library.
- Brown, Michael & May, John. (1992). *Het verhaal van Greenpeace*. Dorling Kindersley. P 6.-24. Retrieved April 23, 2014 from The Hague Library.
- Burke, Shonali & Lasica, J.D.(2012, January, 12). How NGOs can use Social Media to create impact & eradicate poverty. *Civil Society Social Policy and development Division, DESA*. Retrieved February 27, 2014 from the socialbrite website: <http://www.socialbrite.org/un/>
- Burnett, Ken. (2011). *Facing up Face-to-Face fundraising*. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from the Ken Burnett blog website:
<http://www.kenburnett.com/Blogfacetoface.html>
- Business Dictionary (n.d.). *Myspace definition*. Retrieved May 15, 2014 from the business dictionary website:
<http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/Myspace.html>
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus. (n.d). Facebook. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved April 28, 2014 from the online Cambridge Dictionary:
http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/facebook_1?q=Facebook
- Cambridge Advanced learner's Dictionary & thesaurus. (n.d.). *Social Media*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved April 28, 2014 from the online Cambridge Dictionary.
<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/social-media?q=social+media>
- Catone, Josh. (2009, June 24). *How WWF is Using Social Media for Good #FindingTheGood*. Mashable. Retrieved April 3, 2014 from the online mashable website:
<http://mashable.com/2009/06/24/wwf-profile/>
- Chartier, Denis. (2006). Can we understand the role of NGOs in environmental politics without questioning the nature of the changes they propose and the scales they work at? *Graduate Journal of Social Science*. Vol 3. Issue 1. Retrieved February 7, 2014 from the Graduate journal of Social Science. <http://dpc.uba.uva.nl/cgi/t/text/get-pdf?idno=m0301a03;c=gjss>
- Cohn, Alicia M. (2011, June 16). Study finds social media increasing in political influence. *The Hill*. Retrieved May 15, 2014 from the hill website:

<http://thehill.com/blogs/twitter-room/other-news/166941-study-finds-social-media-increasing-in-political-influence>

Cokkececi, Erhan. (2011, May 10). How social media has helped Greenpeace. *Istrategy- The Digital Social Media*. Retrieved May 12, 2014 from the IStrategy website:

<http://istrategyconference.com/blog/how-social-media-has-helped-greenpeace>

Collins, Craig. (2010). *Toxic Loopholes. Failures and Future prospects for environmental law*. (1st edition). Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved April 2, 2014.

CNN. (2010, May 24). Social media can help save the planet, says Greenpeace boss. *CNN*.

Retrieved April 10, 2014 from the official CNN website:

<http://edition.cnn.com/2010/TECH/05/24/eco.greenpeace.nestle/index.html?iref=allsearch>

Crane Andrew & Matten Dirk. (2011, February 28). *Anti-corporate activism through social media: how Greenpeace is leading the way*. Retrieved February 6, 2014 from the online blog of the professors Crane and Matten:

<http://craneandmatten.blogspot.nl/2011/02/anti-corporate-activism-through-social.html>

Cultures of Resistance. (n.d.) *The Greenpeace Detox Campaign: Protecting the World's Rivers from Industrial Pollution*. Cultures of Resistance Network, to support people to take action around peace. Retrieved April 29, 2014 from the CoR Network website:

<http://www.culturesofresistance.org/greenpeace-detox>

Dean, Ashley. (February 2009). *Facebook*. Retrieved on February 26, 2014 from the what is website:

<http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/Facebook>

Del Mar, Maria Gálvez Rodríguez & Caba Pérez María delCarmen & López Godoy, Manuel. (2011, October 15). *Determining Factors in Online Transparency of NGOs: A Spanish Case Study*. Volume (2012) 23:661-683. International Society for Third-Sector Research and The John's Hopkins University 2011. Retrieved March 9, 2014 from the online journal of the International Society for Third-sector research and the John's Hopkins University:

<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.hhs.nl:2048/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=5&sid=cd25c30b-9bf9-4983-8f27-c50389f7c7f4%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4101>

Dubsky, Eoin. (2011, April 14). Greenpeace supporters set world record for most Facebook comments. *Greenpeace*. Retrieved, February 26, 2014 from the Greenpeace blog website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/Blogs/makingwaves/greenpeace-supporters-set-world-record-for-mo/blog/34254/>

Enders, Albrecht & Lonescu-Somers Aileen. (2012, December 3). How Nestlé dealt with a social media campaign against it. *Financial Times*. Retrieved May 11, 2014 from the Financial Times website:

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/90dbff8a-3aea-11e2-b3f0-00144feabdc0.html#axzz31P29TCRc>

Erwood, Steve. (2011). The Greenpeace Chronicles: 40 years of protecting the planet. *Greenpeace International*. Retrieved March 27, 2014 from Greenpeace international, the online version of the book:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/australia/en/about/history/The-Greenpeace-Chronicles-40-years-of-protecting-the-planet/>

European Cetacean Bycatch Campaign. (2002, November 2002). WWF and Greenpeace denounce decision on irresponsible management of tuna fisheries. Retrieved May 5, 2014 from the Euro cbc website:

<http://www.eurocbc.org/page338.html>

Fickes, Ted. (2012, July 24). Social Media Engagement FTW: Lessons from Greenpeace Brasil's growth. *Mobilisation Lab for Greenpeace and its allies*. Retrieved February 26, 2014 from Greenpeace International press releases website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/press/releases/Greenpeace-launches-Twitter-Fairy-Tale-to-give-toxic-nightmare-a-happy-ending1/> or
<http://www.mobilisationlab.org/social-media-engagement-ftw-lessons-from-greenpeace-brasils-growth/>

Folger, Jean. (2014, January 15). *What is an NGO (non-governmental organization)?* Retrieved February 24, 2014 from the Investopedia website:

<http://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/13/what-is-non-government-organization.asp>

Folger, Jean. (2014, February 15). *Does the federal government fund any NGOs? Which ones?* Retrieved March 17, 2014 from the Investopedia website:

<http://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/13/federal-government-fund-ngos.asp>

Funds for NGOs. (2010, June 8). *The Results of Social Media Campaigning: Lessons from Greenpeace's Kit Kat Campaigning for the Environment*. Retrieved April 2, 2014 from the

online website of Funds for NGOs:

<http://www.fundsforngos.org/all-listings/the-results-of-social-media-campaigning-lessons-from-greenpeaces-kit-kat-campaigning-for-the-environment/>

Furst, Benny. (April 2012). "Think Global - Act Local": A Descriptive Analysis of Environmental Protest Organization - The Case of Greenpeace Israel. Maryland University, Institute for Israel Studies. Retrieved April 4, 2014 from the online research paper of the Israel Studies: <http://www.israelstudies.umd.edu/files/Benny%20Furst%20Research%20Paper-%20April%202012.pdf>

Gilbert, Sarah Jane. (2008, September 8). HBS Cases: The Value of Environmental Activists. *Harvard business school*. Retrieved March 17, 2014 from the of Harvard Business School article, Questions and Answers with professor Ramon Casadesus-Masanell. <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/5797.html>

Global Policy Forum. (n.d.). Funding for NGOs. GPF. Retrieved February 25, 2014 from the Global Policy Forum website: <http://www.globalpolicy.org/ngos/introduction/31508-funding-for-ngos.html>

Glüsing Jens. & Klawitter Niels. (2012, May 29). Green Veneer: WWF helps industry more than environment. *Der Spiegel online*. Retrieved May 4, 2014 from the German newspaper der Spiegel: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/wwf-helps-industry-more-than-environment-a-835712.html>

Gosselin, Pierre L. (2013, October 14). *International Experts: Greenpeace An "Extremist Organization" ... "Often Uses Illegal Methods" ... Now "Getting Its Due"*. Retrieved May 5, 2014 from the No tricks zone website: <http://notrickszone.com/2013/10/14/international-experts-greenpeace-an-extremist-organization-often-uses-illegal-methods-now-getting-its-due/>

Grant Space. (n.d.). *What is an NGO? What role does it play in civil society?* Retrieved March 24, 2014 from the Grant Space, knowledge Base website: <http://www.grantspace.org/Tools/Knowledge-Base/Resources-for-Non-U.S.-Grantseekers/NGO-definition-and-role>

Greenpeace Australia Pacific. (n.d.). *About us-Organisation*. Retrieved March 30, 2014 from Greenpeace Australia Pacific website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/australia/en/about/how-is-greenpeace-structured/>

Greenpeace Canada. (2010). *Greenpeace Victories, 2010, Nestlé*. Retrieved May 12, 2014 from the Greenpeace Canada website:

http://www.greenpeace.org/canada/Global/canada/report/2011/08/success/DEF%2040_Victories_2010%20Nestle.pdf

Greenpeace International. (2011, A). *How we convinced Facebook to unfriend coal: Facebook Timeline*. Retrieved March 10, 2014 from Greenpeace International campaigns website.

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/campaigns/climate-change/cool-it/ITs-carbon-footprint/Facebook/>

Greenpeace International. (2011, May 24, B). *How dirty is your data? A look at the energy choices that power cloud computing*. Retrieved April 26, 2014 from the Greenpeace International website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/Global/international/publications/climate/2011/Cool%20IT/dirty-data-report-greenpeace.pdf>

Greenpeace International. (2013). *Annual report 2012*. Retrieved May 19, 2014 from the Greenpeace International website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/Global/international/publications/greenpeace/2013/GPI-AnnualReport2012.pdf>

Greenpeace International. (2014, A). *Detox campaign: Detox Timeline, the journey towards a toxic-free future*. Retrieved April 29, 2014 from the Greenpeace International website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/campaigns/toxics/water/detox/Detox-Timeline/>

Greenpeace International. (2014, B). *Greenpeace victories, 40 years of inspiring action*. Retrieved March 30, 2014 from the Greenpeace international website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/about/victories/>

Greenpeace International (n.d. A). *Transparency and accountability*. Retrieved March 15, 2014 from the international website of Greenpeace:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/about/our-core-values/transparency-and-accountability/>

Greenpeace International (n.d. B). *What we do*. Retrieved May 6, 2014 from the international website of Greenpeace:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/campaigns/>

Greenpeace New Zealand. (2014, December 20). *About us: The founding of Greenpeace*.

Greenpeace New Zealand. Retrieved April 3, 2014 from the official Greenpeace New Zealand website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/new-zealand/en/about/history/greenpeace-founding/>

Greenpeace, United Kingdom (n.d.). *Taking Action*. Greenpeace United Kingdom. Retrieved April 3, 2014 from the official Greenpeace website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/about/taking-action>

Greenpeace, United Kingdom (2011, May 25). One year after Nestlé committed to give rainforests a break, what has been achieved? Greenpeace United Kingdom. Retrieved May 12, 2014 from the Greenpeace website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/blog/forests/one-year-after-nestle-committed-giving-rainforests-break-what-has-been-achieved-20110525>

Greenpeace, United States (n.d.). *Mission Statement*. Greenpeace United States. Retrieved April 5, 2014 from the official Greenpeace website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/about/>

H. Juliette. (2014, January 28). How to Detox a fashion brand in 14 days, 6 cities and 10,000 tweets. *Greenpeace International*. Retrieved April 2, 2014 from the Greenpeace International blog website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/Blogs/makingwaves/burberry-detox-victory/blog/48027/>

H, Juliette. (2014, February 4). Greenpeace, 5 Facebook moments to remember. *Greenpeace International*. Retrieved April 1, 2014 from the Greenpeace International blog website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/Blogs/makingwaves/5-greenpeace-facebook-moments-to-remember/blog/48103/>

Hadley, Candida. (n.d.). *World wildlife Fund*. Globalization and Autonomy. McMaster University. Retrieved May 4, 2014 from the Globalization and Autonomy website:

http://globalautonomy.ca/global1/glossary_entry.jsp?id=OR.0048

- Haesmeyer, Dana Delapi. (2011, October 21). Four Ways Social Media has Changed in Five Years. *Social Media Today*. Rasmussen College. Retrieved April 1, 2014 from the Social Media Today website:
<http://socialmediatoday.com/rasmussencollege/383344/four-ways-social-media-has-changed-five-years>
- Harrild, Lucie. (2010, October 27). Lessons from the palm oil showdown. *The Guardian*. Retrieved May 11, 2014 from the online newspaper of the guardian:
<http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/palm-oil-greenpeace-social-media>
- Harvey, Fiona. (2011, September 14). Greenpeace and WWF anniversaries highlight wildly differing tactics. *The Guardian*. Retrieved May 4, 2014 from the official website of the Guardian:
<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2011/sep/14/greenpeace-wwf-anniversaries>
- Heimbuch, Jaymi. (2011, April 13). *Greenpeace Attempting Earns a World Record with Campaign to Get Facebook Off Coal*. Treehugger: Media outlet dedicated to drive a sustainability mainstream. Retrieved April 26, 2014 from the Treehugger website:
<http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/greenpeace-strikeattemptingstrike-earns-a-world-record-with-campaign-to-get-facebook-off-coal.html>
- Helga. (2013, February 7). Looking Back on 10 Years of Social Media. *Design Float blog*. Retrieved April 1, 2014 from the Design Float Blog website:
<http://www.designfloat.com/blog/2013/02/07/10-years-social-media-history/>
- Hunt, Tom. (2013, December 9). *Greenpeace defends fundraising strategy*. Stuff.co.nz. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from the stuff.co.nz national page:
<http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/9492084/Greenpeace-defends-fundraising-strategy>
- Hickman, Martin. (2010, May 19). Online protest drives Nestlé to environmentally friendly palm oil. *The Independent*. Retrieved May 11, 2014 from the online newspaper the independent:
<http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/green-living/online-protest-drives-nestl-to-environmentally-friendly-palm-oil-1976443.html>
- International Relations Online. (n.d.). *Environmental NGOs*. Retrieved May 2, 2014 from the official International Relations Online website:
<http://internationalrelationsonline.com/ngo-careers/environmental-ngos/>

Institute for Fundraising. (n.d.). *Information about Fundraising*. Retrieved March 20, 2014 from the institute for fundraising website:

<http://www.institute-of-fundraising.org.uk/guidance/about-fundraising/>

Institute for Fundraising. (n.d.) KWR fundraising: Introduction about Face-to-Face fundraising. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from the institute of fundraising website:

<http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCcQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.institute-of-fundraising.org.uk%2Flibrary%2Fintroduction-to-f2f%2Fintroductiontof2f.pdf&ei=qMxYU4XANIOZO4bygegP&usg=AFQjCNGR2eI4dCVFn-0PNXU2t9HxqyN5xw>

K. Laura. (2010, May 25). *Social Media can Save the Planet*. Greenpeace International. Retrieved February 25, 2014 from the Greenpeace International blog website:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/Blogs/makingwaves/social-media-can-save-the-planet/blog/11832/>

Krajsic Tatjana. (2013, November 8). Interview: How Social Media Strengthened Greenpeace (Part 1 of 2). *Lewis Public Relations Blog 360*. Retrieved February 6, 2014 from the Lewis PR website:

<http://blog.lewispr.com/2013/11/interview-how-social-media-strengthened-greenpeace-part-1-of-2.html>

Krupnick, Ellie. (2012, November 29). Chemicals In Fast Fashion Revealed in Greenpeace's 'Toxic Threads: The Big Fashion Stitch-Up'. *Huffingtonpost*. Retrieved April 29, 2014 from the Huffingtonpost online:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/20/chemicals-in-fast-fashion-greenpeace-toxic-thread_n_2166189.html

Kovarik, Bill. (2009). Greenpeace History. *Encyclopaedia of Science and Technology Communication*. Retrieved April 28, 2014 from the website of professor B. Kovarik's research papers:

<http://www.environmentalhistory.org/billkovarik/research/news-the-environment/greenpeace-history/>

LaMonica, Martin. (2011, December 15). Facebook and Greenpeace make peace on data centers. Retrieved, February 26, 2014 from the online news cnet website:

http://news.cnet.com/8301-11128_3-57343501-54/facebook-and-greenpeace-make-peace-on-data-centers/

Latham, K. & Merrill, T. & Navetta, D. & Santalesa R. (2011, April). Social media : The business benefits may be enormous, but can the risks- reputation, legal, operational- be mitigated? *Information Law Group & ACE insuring progress*. Retrieved May 15, 2014 from the ACE report:

<http://www.acegroup.com/us-en/assets/ace-progress-report-social-media.pdf>

Legal Leaks. (n.d.) *What is transparency? Is it the same as access to information? Legal Leaks: A guide for journalists on how to access government information*. Retrieved March 10, 2014 from the Legal Leaks website:

<http://www.legalleaks.info/right-to-information/2-what-is-transparency-is-it-the-same-as-access-to-information.html>

LinkedIn. (2014, January 23). Digital Marketing Manager Specializing in Mobile Marketing Finland. Greenpeace Finland on LinkedIn. Retrieved April 3, 2014 from LinkedIn:

<https://www.linkedin.com/jobs2/view/10655567>

Meikle, James. (2011, December 15). Facebook 'unfriends' coal and 'likes' clean power. *The Guardian*. Retrieved April 26, 2014 from the newspaper the guardian's website:

<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2011/dec/15/facebook-coal-clean-power-energy-greenpeace>

Moth, David. (2013, April 10). *10 charities and how they use Pinterest*. Econsultancy, achieve digital excellence. Retrieved April 29, 2014 from the econsultancy website:

<https://econsultancy.com/blog/62498-10-charities-and-how-they-use-pinterest#i.18gzkn2vvzfe3q>

Nevin, Tom. (2013, March 25). Greenpeace wants more independent power producers. Retrieved March 30, 2014 from the Business Day Live website:

<http://www.bdlive.co.za/business/energy/2013/03/25/greenpeace-wants-more-independent-power-producers>

- Nestlé. (2014). About us. Nestlé, good food, good life. Retrieved March 31, 2014 from the official nestle website:
<http://www.nestle.com/aboutus>
- NGO Handbook. (2010, January 21). What is a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) ? *NGO Handbook*. Retrieved March 17, 2014 from the NGO Handbook website:
http://www.ngohandbook.org/index.php?title=What_is_a_Non-Governmental_Organization_%28NGO%29%3F
- Niccolai, James. (2013, November 14). *Greenpeace tips hat to Facebook, Google for renewable energy use*. Good Gear Guide by PC world Australia. Retrieved, February 25, 2014 from the good gear guide:
http://www.pcworld.idg.com.au/article/531825/greenpeace_tips_hat_facebook_google_renewable_energy_use/
- NonProfit Tech for Good. (2013, September 23 September). *Five Social Media Best Practices for Small NGOs in Developing Countries*. Retrieved February 27, 2014 from the social & media blog for Nonprofits website:
<http://www.nptechforgood.com/2013/09/23/five-social-media-best-practices-for-small-ngos-in-developing-countries/>
- Owens, John. (2012, December 14). Greenpeace's John Sauven hails social media campaigning after Waitrose halts Shell plans. *PR week*. Retrieved February 26, 2014 from the online PR Week website:
<http://www.prweek.com/article/1164356/greenpeaces-john-sauven-hails-social-media-campaigning-waitrose-halts-shell-plans>
- Owyang, Jeremiah. (2010, July 19). *Greenpeace vs. Brands: Social Media attacks to continue*. Retrieved, February 26, 2014 from Forbes website:
<http://www.forbes.com/2010/07/19/greenpeace-bp-nestle-twitter-facebook-forbes-cmo-network-jeremiah-owyang.html>
- Ozzyman, J.H. (2007, July 18). *Greenpeace and the environmental movement*. Yahoo. Retrieved April 4, 2014 from the yahoo blog website:
<http://voices.yahoo.com/greenpeace-environmental-movement-440614.html?cat=4>

- Padveen Corey. (2013, August 15). *Social Media Case Study: Greenpeace. Greenpeace – among the more high-profile charities – recently took to Pinterest, and with some impressive results.* T2Social. Retrieved February 6, 2014 from the T2Social website:
<http://www.t2social.com/greenpeace-social-media-case-study/>
- Patterson, Thom. (2012, July 19). Is Greenpeace's prank on Shell oil a 'scam'?. *CNN*. Retrieved May 14, 2014 from the CNN website:
<http://news.blogs.cnn.com/2012/07/19/is-greenpeaces-prank-on-shell-oil-a-scam/?iref=allsearch>
- Pinterest. (n.d.) *What's Pinterest? About Pinterest.* Retrieved April 10, 2014 from the official Pinterest website:
<http://about.pinterest.com/nl>
- Phillips, Sarah. (2007, August 25). A brief history of Facebook. *The Guardian*. Retrieved April 28, 2014 from the online newspaper of the guardian website:
<http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2007/jul/25/media.newmedia>
- Roose Michael. (2012, January 1). Greenpeace, Social Media, and the Possibility of Global Deliberation on the Environment. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*. Vol 19. Indiana University Maurer School of Law. Retrieved February 7, 2014 from Academic Search Premier.
- Rudenko, Anna. (2014, January 15). Greenpeace revives Detox campaign against hazardous chemicals found in children's clothing. POPSOP, online journal on sustainability. Retrieved April 29, 2014 from the popsop website:
<http://popsop.com/2014/01/greenpeace-revives-detox-campaign-against-hazardous-chemicals-found-in-childrens-clothing/>
- Sayer, Peter. (2011, December 16). *Facebook unfriends coal, friends Greenpeace in clean energy campaign.* Social Networking Software, Mac world. Retrieved April 28, 2014 from the mac world website:
http://www.macworld.com/article/1164341/facebook_unfriends_coal_friends_greenpeace_in_clean_energy_campaign.html
- Scott, Cameron. (2013, April 13). *Greenpeace sets world record for most Facebook comments.* San Francisco Gate. Retrieved April 2, 2014 from the online blog SF gate website:

<http://blog.sfgate.com/green/2011/04/13/greenpeace-sets-world-record-for-most-facebook-comments/>

Schwartz, Ariel. (2011, January 18). *Exclusive: How Kimberly-Clark Ditched its Forest-Destroying Reputation and Embraced Greenpeace*. Fast Company. Retrieved April 28, 2014 from the Fast Company, the leading progressive business media brand website:

<http://www.fastcompany.com/1718476/exclusive-how-kimberly-clark-ditched-its-forest-destroying-reputation-and-embraced-greenpeac>

Social Issues Research Centre. (n.d.). *Tide turns against Greenpeace*. Retrieved April 1, 2014 from the SIRC website:

http://www.sirc.org/articles/tide_against_greenpeace.html

SOFII. (2011, A). *Greenpeace India: SMS lead generation. Showcase of Fundraising Innovation and Inspiration*. Retrieved March 27, 2014 from the SOFII website:

<http://www.sofii.org/node/178>

SOFII. (2011, B). *Greenpeace International: the reinvention of face-to-face fundraising*. Showcase of Fundraising Innovation and Inspiration. Retrieved March 27, 2014 from the SOFII website:

<http://www.sofii.org/node/226>

Smalley, Eric. (2011, December 15 December). *Greenpeace declares victory over Facebook data centers*. Retrieved April 1, 2014 from the wired website:

<http://www.wired.com/2011/12/greenpeace-declares-victory-over-facebook-data-centers/>

Soulati, Jayme. (2010, August 23). *Greenpeace's Social Media win has losers*. Retrieved March 25, 2014 from the social media today social networks blog website:

<http://socialmediatoday.com/soulaticom/167271/greenpeace%E2%80%99s-social-media-win-has-losers>

Steven Matthews. (1990, June 8). *Greenpeace on warpath, Case study: Greenpeace*. *Business Review Weekly*. Pp 48-53. Retrieved April 6, 2014 from the online version of the business review weekly:

<http://www.uow.edu.au/~sharonb/STS300/environment/case/artcase8.html>

- Switzer Cody. (2010, August 3). How Charities Can Face Down Troublemakers on Social Networks. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*. Vol 24, issue 8. Retrieved February 7, 2014 from Academic Search Premier.
- Tadeo, Maria. (2014, Friday 28). Greenpeace co-founder Patrick Moore tells US Senate there is "no proof" humans cause climate change. *The Guardian*. Retrieved May 6, 2014 from the online newspaper the guardian:
<http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/greenpeace-cofounder-patrick-moore-tells-us-senate-there-is-no-proof-humans-cause-climate-change-9159627.html>
- The Free Dictionary by Farlex. (n.d.). *Nongovernmental Organizations (NGO)*. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Retrieved April 10, 2014 from the Free Dictionary by Farlex website:
<http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Non-governmental+organization>
- Tiphareth, Gloria. (2010, November 25). *Measuring Social Media influence*. Social Media today. Retrieved March 1, 2014 from the social media today blog website:
<http://socialmediatoday.com/tipherethgloria/244227/measuring-social-media-influence>
- Tiphereth, Gloria. (2010, November 16). Greenpeace vs Nestle Kit Kat social influence case study. SlideShare News and Politics archive. Retrieved March 1, 2014 from the Slideshare website:
<http://www.slideshare.net/tiphereth/kt-influence-case-study>
- Trinity College Dublin. (n.d.). The role of NGOs. *Development Studies*. The University of Dublin, Trinity College. Retrieved March 17, 2014 from the University of Dublin website:
http://www.tcd.ie/Economics/Development_Studies/link.php?id=95
- Twitter. (2014). *About Twitter, company*. Retrieved April 29, 2014 from the official Twitter website:
<https://about.twitter.com/company>
- Wheeler, Brian. (2008, May 30). *The campaign group: Greenpeace*. BBC News. Retrieved April 3, 2014 from the BBC news website:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/7338875.stm
- Wibisono Kunto B. (2011, September 30). WWF, Greenpeace Indonesia save Sumatran tigers and elephants. *Antara News*. Retrieved May 5, 2014 from the Antara news website:

<http://www.antaraneews.com/en/news/76127/wwf-greenpeace-indonesia-save-sumatran-tigers-and-elephants>

Wigmore, Ivy. (2012 November). *Social Media*. Retrieved, February 25, 2014 from the online What Is. Website: <http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/social-media>

Willets, Peter. (2006). *What is a non-governmental organization?* City University London, Civil society networks in global governance. Article 1.44.3.7 non-governmental organisation. Chapter 3 & 10.

Retrieved May 1, 2014 from the official university London website:

<http://www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willets/CS-NTWKS/NGO-ART.HTM>

WNF (2014). *Jaarverslag Wereld Natuur Fonds 2012-2013*. Retrieved from the official Dutch website of WWF:

http://www.wnf.nl/nl/wat_wnf_doet/jaarverslag/

Wordpress. (2011, August 29). *How effective is Greenpeace?* Retrieved March 25, 2014 from the Green Wordpress website:

<http://advanceconsultingforeducation.wordpress.com/2011/08/29/how-effective-is-greenpeace/>

WWF. (n.d.). *WWF's mission, guiding principles and goals*. Retrieved May 4, 2014 from the official website of WWF:

http://wwf.panda.org/mission_principles_goals.cfm

WWF. (n.d.). *What we do, Global initiatives*. Retrieved May 6, 2014 from the official website of WWF:

http://wwf.panda.org/what_we_do/how_we_work/key_initiatives/

Yeomans, Matthew. (2012, August 3). Social media #fail: how Greenpeace let Shell off the hook over Arctic drilling. *The Guardian*. Retrieved February 25, 2014 from the online Guardian newspaper website:

<http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/social-media-fail-greenpeace-shell-arctic>.

YouTube. (n.d.). *About YouTube*. Retrieved April 3, 2014 from the official YouTube website:

<https://www.youtube.com/yt/about/>

Zabarenko, Deborah (2009, August 5). *Kimberly-Clark joins Greenpeace to protect forests*. Reuters.

Retrieved April 28, 2014 from the Reuters website:

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2009/08/05/us-kimberlyclark-idUSTRE5745AM20090805>

