

Advisory Editorial Panel

Morris Janowitz
University of Chicago

Lewis A. Coser
State University of New York, Stony Brook

Amatai Etzioni
Columbia University

William A. Gamson
University of Michigan

Allen D. Grimshaw
Indiana University

Jerome Laulicht
University of Pittsburgh

Roger W. Little
University of Illinois, Chicago Circle Campus

David Riesman
Harvard University

Louis Schneider
University of Texas

Mayer Zald
Vanderbilt University

SOCIAL PROCESSES IN
INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS

A Reader

Edited with Introductory Notes by
LOUIS KRIESBERG

1968
JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC.

NEW YORK • LONDON • SYDNEY • TORONTO

25. U. S. AND U. S. S. R. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Louis Kriesberg

The study of international non-governmental organizations can be useful for the understanding of the conditions for international peace² and for the sociology of organizations. International non-governmental organizations, hereafter called NGO's, typically are associations of voluntary organizations from several nations. At present, there are about 1,500 NGO's in existence.³ The names of some of the NGO's indicate their diversity: the International Chamber of Commerce, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the Women's International Cycling Association, the Scandinavian Society of Anesthesiologists, and the International Union of Health Education.

Analyses of NGO's can indicate the extent to which a world society exists and cast light upon the actual and potential role of NGO's in the development of a world society. NGO's may contribute to the conditions that underlie world political institutions and their effective functioning in several ways. Members of NGO's may develop perspectives that are broader than national ones.⁴ NGO activities may ameliorate the material and social conditions that underlie certain international conflicts. They may foster the development of international interest groups which cross-cut national boundaries. Formulas for settling international conflicts may be developed in NGO's and then used in governmental organizations or international law. NGO's may develop structural arrangements for handling conflicts among their own members that can be utilized by governmental organizations. On the other hand, NGO's may simply reflect and reinforce international divisions as they are expressed in regional and other alliances and political groupings. More fundamentally, NGO's may be essentially trivial, transitory,

SOURCE. This paper is being published for the first time in this form in this book. A shorter version was published under the title, "How a Plowing Contest May Ease World Tensions," in *Trans-action*, 5 (December, 1967), pp. 36-39.

epiphenomena with little impact upon the conditions relevant for the effective operation of world organizations. Or they may simply reflect the governmental conditions and have little independent effect upon the governmental order or the social conditions underlying the political structure.

In any case, the study of NGO's can be useful for the understanding of the conditions related to international peace. In addition, since NGO's are voluntary organizations which differ in many ways from national voluntary organizations, their inclusion in the realm of sociological analysis can aid our understanding of voluntary associations and formal organizations in general. A comprehensive analysis of NGO's would require an immense research effort. Nevertheless, considerable information about NGO's has been collected by the Union of International Associations and is published in the *Yearbook of International Organizations*. The data for the present analysis has been drawn largely from the 1962-1963 edition of the *Yearbook*.

THE QUESTION AND SOME HYPOTHESES

In this paper I will consider one important question pertaining to NGO's and the world community. To what extent do particular national differences affect the membership, structure, and activities of NGO's? The answer to the question will suggest some of the limits of the role which NGO's can play in fostering a world community.

Several ideas from the study of voluntary associations are pertinent in seeking an answer to the question. We may begin with the premise that among potential members of an organization, it is those whose common, like, or complementary interests outweigh their conflicting interests who will join together in an organization.⁵ On the basis of that premise, we would expect that nations which have few like, common, or complementary interests and have many conflicting interests are least likely to be represented in many of the same organizations. Furthermore, the organizations in which they do participate will be those which involve like, common, or complementary interests rather than conflicting ones.

Actually, of course, nations are not members of NGO's. Since national associations or even individuals may be members, the selection may not be representative of the nation. Particular religious, political, or economic groups join together because they perceive certain common or complementary interests with similarly situated or oriented persons in other nations. An analysis of national differences in terms of the nationality of members of the NGO's therefore is a crude indicator of actual national differences in interests among members. Nevertheless, most NGO's are concerned with activities that have relevance for occupational roles.⁶ This sets some limits to the self-selection of national members and makes economic differences among nations a relevant national characteristic. Significantly, too, the

fact that most NGO's are formed in terms of members' occupational roles indicates that such roles involve experiences and interests which can be shared and even collectively aided across national boundaries. These ties are among the most fundamental in the development of a world community.

The interests of the members are only one side of the equation. Membership depends upon the characteristics of the organization as well as upon the interests of potential members. We must consider what it is that participation in the organization requires of its members and what benefits they may derive. Several plausible hypotheses about the consequences of different balances of interests among members upon organizational structure and activities can be suggested. First, it may be hypothesized that if members have many conflicting as well as some like, common, or complementary interests and yet are members of the same organization, the organization will operate in a fashion which minimizes demands upon the members even if this means that little is received by the members. On the other hand, it may be hypothesized that participation for such members must yield a great deal of benefits to them, making membership attractive, even if this entails making relatively high demands. A third hypothesis is that special structural arrangements will be developed to insulate possible conflict while maximizing possible benefits. Finally, one may hypothesize that organizational requirements are so dominant that if members with many conflicting interests do share membership, this will have little effect upon the structure and activities of the organization. Since the balance of interests may differ in different types of organizations, testing these hypotheses among different types of NGO's will permit further specification of the hypotheses.

THE FINDINGS

Membership of associations from the United States and from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the same NGO's is used to indicate a high ratio of conflicting interests to common, like, or complementary ones.⁷ The use of this indicator has particular political significance, but in the context of the present analysis, it is the set of like, common, complementary, and conflicting interests that is important. Thus the differences in the organization of the economies of the two societies limit the similarity and commonness of interests in the economic sphere. The similarities in scientific activities, on the other hand, make probable some like and complementary interests, if not common ones. Differences in political ideologies and international power positions entail conflicting interests; the extent to which this colors other spheres of potential NGO members' interests is problematical. In general, it would seem that common interests are not as probable as are like or complementary ones. This is indicated by the stated

objectives of NGO's with and without joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. representation. One NGO objective is the promotion of social or material status of the members or representing the members in relations with other organizations. Among NGO's in which the U.S. and U.S.S.R. both participate, only 7 percent claim this objective; among NGO's in which the U.S. but not U.S.S.R. participates, 20 percent make this claim; among NGO's in which the U.S.S.R. but not the U.S. is represented, 54 percent state this objective; and among NGO's in which neither the U.S. nor the U.S.S.R. participate, 37 percent state this objective.

The first expectation we will examine concerns the likelihood that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. will tend not to participate in the same NGO's. Among the NGO's for which information is available, about one-third restrict membership to some geographic area. Among the remaining NGO's, 21 percent have members from both the U.S. and U.S.S.R., 50 percent from the U.S. but not the U.S.S.R., 3 percent from the U.S.S.R. but not the U.S., and 26 percent have members who are from neither the U.S. nor the U.S.S.R. This does not support of the first expectation. It is true that only one out of five of the organizations which are not regionally restricted have U.S. and U.S.S.R. members and that the U.S. is more often represented in NGO's without the U.S.S.R. than ones with U.S.S.R. members.⁸ But if the generally high U.S. level of participation in NGO's and the very low U.S.S.R. level are considered, the U.S. and U.S.S.R. are each more likely to be in NGO's with the other country than in NGO's in which the other is not represented.

These findings can be interpreted in several ways. First, the relative proliferation of associations in the United States must be considered. The number and variety of American associations means that there are more potential members of NGO's in the U.S. than in the U.S.S.R. Furthermore, the relative freedom of association in the U.S. facilitates the self-selective quality of membership which in turn facilitates associational membership in NGO's.⁹ Moreover, in addition to the fact that there are fewer Soviet associations, their international participation is affected by Soviet governmental policy.¹⁰ Furthermore, potential members within the Soviet bloc are fewer than in the non-Soviet bloc. Nevertheless, these findings suggest that even if there are conflicting interests among potential Soviet and American members, at least in certain spheres of activity, there are also common, like, and complementary interests. Indeed, they suggest that for potential Soviet members, membership with American associations offers particular attractions.¹¹

The issue is clarified when we consider the types of NGO's in which the U.S. and U.S.S.R. are represented. Joint membership varies with the type of organization. One can compare the proportion a given type of organization constitutes in the various categories of national representation. For example, NGO's which are made up of workers, as in trade union organizations, are a major type of NGO. There are few such NGO's, however, in which both the U.S. and the

U.S.S.R. are represented.¹² Professional and trade union organizations constitute about 10 percent of the NGO's in which the U.S. but not the U.S.S.R. is represented, 14 percent of the ones in which the U.S.S.R. but not the U.S. participates, and 17 percent of the NGO's in which neither the U.S. nor the U.S.S.R. is represented; but such NGO's constitute only 1 percent of all the NGO's in which both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. participate. The pattern for NGO's in the-area of commerce and industry is similar: 11, 4, 18, and 2 percent, respectively. On the other hand, in science and scientific research, the percentages are quite different: 4, 0, 2, and 18 percent, respectively.

On the basis of the framework outlined earlier and in order to permit detailed analysis, the NGO's were divided into three types in terms of their potentiality for consensus. The types are intended to reflect varying degrees to which the international community, and particularly the U.S. and U.S.S.R., share goals and beliefs about the means to reach the goals. Thus Type 1 includes NGO's concerned with technology, science, medicine, or sports; consensus is presumably relatively high in these areas. Type 2 consists of the social or economic NGO's such as employer or profession, trade union, commerce and industry, social and political science, law and administration, or bibliographic NGO's; in these, consensus is presumably moderate. Type 3 includes NGO's dealing with matters about which consensus is presumably low; NGO's concerned with philosophy or religion, international relations, social welfare, education and youth, and the arts are included. In classifying NGO's, their categorization in the *Yearbook of International Organizations* was utilized; see note 2 of Table 1.

It is likely that in areas in which consensus is high, issues are viewed as technical matters. Where consensus is low, value differences are likely to be prominent. In the latter case, the mode of handling the issues is likely to involve bargaining, log-rolling, and other political methods rather than the means used in technical matters. Nevertheless, as will be discussed later in the paper, the extent to which an issue is viewed as a technical or as a value matter is not inherent in the issue. It depends, in part, upon the context and handling of the issue. Organizational arrangements may affect the context and style of handling issues; they may even be structured so that the issues are viewed as relatively technical matters. This mode of adaptation may be used particularly in organizations which have members with many conflicting interests relative to like, complementary or common interests. Consequently, the level of consensus and the degree to which organizations deal with technical or value issues, although empirically related, may be analytically distinguished.

One of the previously mentioned features of NGO's can mitigate the significance of an area of interest having low consensus. National representation in an NGO can consist of self-selected associations or associations with specially selected individuals. This is particularly likely in organizations involved in highly value-related activities. In the case of Types 1 and 2 NGO's, however comprehensive national

associations are likely to pre-date and be formed independently of the NGO so that such self-selection is less likely.¹³ Nevertheless, even in such NGO's self-selection of various kinds can occur. For example, during the immediate post World War II period when the World Federation of Trade Unions included Communist and non-Communist trade unions, the American Federation of Labor was not a member; the Congress of Industrial Organizations, however, was a member. Even within NGO's without Communist representation, self-selection of membership can occur which reduces potential dissensus and conflict among members. Thus the U.S. Farm Bureau withdrew from the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, largely because of policy differences over the role of governments in agriculture; other U.S. farm organizations remained members.¹⁴ In the case of the International Chamber of Commerce, instead of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American member is the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce. The U.S. Council was established at the close of World War II and consists of members who are heavily involved in international trade.

On the whole, the findings presented in Table 1 are consistent with the expectation that the U.S. and U.S.S.R. are most likely to be represented in organizations concerned with matters of presumably high consensus. About half of the NGO's in which they both participate are in the science, health, etc., category, while among the organizations in which they both do not participate, only about one-fifth are concerned with such matters. The lack of any real difference in the participation of American and Soviet associations in NGO's of presumably low consensus compared to those of moderate consensus may be due to the self-selective factor discussed above. In any case, it does appear that joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. representation is most likely in NGO's engaged in areas of activity in which American and Soviet associations are particularly likely to share similar goals and beliefs about reaching them. In such organizations, representatives of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. would tend to have like, complementary, and even common interests, while conflicting interests would be relatively few.

The second set of issues to be explored in this paper is the possible effect of joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation upon the structure and activities of NGO's. Actually, these issues are not independent of the likelihood of both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. being represented in the same organizations. Certain organizational arrangements or levels of activity may be conducive to American and Soviet joint representation. As a matter of fact, it is true that Type 1 NGO's, compared to other types, are less likely to have their own paid staff or a large staff, to have more than two levels in the organizational structure, or to have frequent meetings of the general membership. Do these characteristics of Type 1 organizations contribute to the attractiveness of such organizations for joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. representation? Or does the joint participation of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. induce such modifications in NGO's and the concentration of U.S. and U.S.S.R. membership in Type 1 organizations help account for such characteristics of Type 1 NGO's?

TABLE 1. Type of NGO by Type of National Participation¹

Type of NGO ²	Type of National Participation			
	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. but not U.S.S.R.	U.S.S.R. but not U.S.	Neither U.S. nor U.S.S.R.
Science, health, etc.	53	22	18	18
Economic, social, etc.	28	41	43	56
Religion, art, international relations, etc.	19	36	39	26
Totals (%)	100	99	100	100
(N)	(192)	(451)	(28)	(241)

¹In this table, and in all the following tables, NGO's which restrict membership to any geographic area are excluded.

²The science, health, etc. type includes NGO's classified in the *Yearbook of International Organizations* under: technology; science, scientific research; medicine and health; sport, touring recreation. In the economic, social, etc. type are included NGO's classified in the following fields of activity: employers, profession; trade unions; commerce and industry; economics and finance; agriculture; transport, communications; law and administration; social and political sciences; and bibliography, press. In the religion, art, international relations, etc. type are NGO's classified in the following categories: philosophy, religion; international relations; politics; social welfare; education and youth; and arts, literature, cinema.

First we will examine the kind of activities which the organizations report conducting. Nearly all organizations report the facilitation of the members' activities as an organizational aim. We coded several ways in which this was reported to be done. One way is the exchange of information and establishment of personal relations through congresses, institutes, and exchange visits. Since nearly all organizations report these activities, they are of little relevance to our purposes here. Three other kinds of activities are of more pertinence: (1) engaging in joint efforts such as coordinating research or other work of members, (2) providing services for members such as libraries, abstracting services, and training programs, and (3) developing common standards or agreements about nomenclature and uniform codes. Obviously, these activities vary in frequency among the different types of organizations. But more pertinent to our present interest, within each type of NGO, those in which both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are represented are more likely to report such activities than are organizations in which either or both countries are not represented (see Table 2). However, among the Type 1 organizations, there is no difference in reports of joint efforts of service to members between NGO's with both U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation and NGO's in which either or both countries are not represented. Presumably, the organizational requirements

TABLE 2. Percent of NGO's Reported to Engage in Specified Activities by Type of National Participation, and by Type of NGO

Activity	Science, Health, etc.		Economic, Social, etc.		Religion, Art, International Relations, etc.	
	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.
	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
Engage in joint efforts	46	44	72	58	56	38
Provide services for members	14	16	42	25	47	27
Develop common standards or agreements	40	22	34	23	12	4
(N)	(101)	(147)	(53)	(328)	(34)	(233)

are more important for these matters than whether or not the U.S. and U.S.S.R. are both represented in the same Type 1 organization. Since the organizations in which the U.S. and U.S.S.R. are both represented tend to be ones with a large number of members and such organizations tend to report engaging in these activities more than do NGO's with few nations represented, it is necessary to control for number of nations represented. Holding constant the number of nations represented, we find that in some kinds of activities, among the small organizations, there is no longer any difference between NGO's with and without joint participation of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. Nevertheless, on the whole, it appears that their joint participation is not accompanied by a lessening of activity, but often by a higher level of activity.

Other information from the *Yearbook of International Organizations* can be used to test this inference. The level of organizational activity is in part indicated by the size of the organization's staff and this is reflected in the size of the budget. The size of the staff in voluntary associations has significance in addition to the level of organizational activity. A large staff is likely to mean that staff persons or the executive secretary of the organization has relatively great power in the organization's policy formation.¹⁵ The delegation of such power to staff persons is not likely in organizations which have few common and many conflicting interests. Therefore it is to be expected that in NGO's with both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. participating, the staff and budget will tend to be small or nonexistent. On the other hand, we have already noted some evidence that NGO's with both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. represented tend to have higher levels of organizational

activity than other NGO's—or at least no lower levels. Consequently, we have discrepant expectations about the relationships between national representation in NGO's and the size of the organizations' budget and staffs.

Budgetary information is lacking for many NGO's. Among the NGO's for which information is available, NGO's with and without joint representation of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. do not appear to differ in the size of their budgets. If we hold constant the number of nations represented in the organizations, a suggestive difference is revealed. The comparison can only be made among the larger NGO's because of the small number of cases for which information is available among the smaller NGO's. Among the large NGO's there is a tendency for those with joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. representation to have medium-sized budgets (between \$10,000 and \$49,000) rather than very large or very small budgets. The pattern for staff size is similar. Overall, staff size also does not differ markedly among NGO's with and without U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation. When the number of nations represented in the NGO's is held constant, however, some suggestive differences are again revealed (see Table 3). Among the NGO's of presumably high or moderate consensus, those with joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. representation are slightly less likely than other NGO's to have very large staffs. Among the large NGO's with presumably low consensus, those with or without joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. representation are equally likely to have large staffs. First of all, it is clear that the sphere of organizational activity would affect the size of the staff: staffs are relatively small in NGO's concerned with science, health, etc. Whether or not there is joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. representation is not a major determinant. This may be due to what is in this context conflicting implications of staff size: a high level of activity and delegation of decision-making. Before making any concluding references, it is necessary to examine other findings.

The preceding discussion was based upon the supposition that NGO's with joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation will not have centralized decision-making. One indicator of this characteristic available from the *Yearbook* is the number of levels in the organization. Presumably, the larger the number of levels, the more centralized is decision-making and the greater is the delegation of authority by the members. In the case of voluntary associations, the argument is that rank and file direct participation in decision-making is less where several levels exist than where few exist, except that a general membership and only an executive committee may also indicate relatively high delegation of authority by the rank and file members.¹⁶

Within each type of NGO, organizations with or without U.S. and U.S.S.R. joint representation are equally likely to have three or more levels (see Table 4). Holding the number of nations constant, there is still no difference except among small Type 2 NGO's and large Type 3 NGO's; in these types, NGO's with U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation tend to have only one or two levels (there are too few cases to permit comparison among small Type 3 NGO's). There is a slight tendency, moreover, for NGO's without both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. as participants to have

TABLE 3. Size of NGO Staff by Number of Nations in NGO, by Type of National Participation, and by Type of NGO

Size of Staff	Twenty-Five or More Nations Represented				Twenty-Four or Fewer Nations Represented							
	Science, Health, etc.		Economic, Social, etc.		Science, Health, etc.		Economic, Social, etc.		Religion, Art, International Relations, etc.			
	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.				
None	59	46	27	31	31	35	67	61	56	47	—	45
Volunteers or other organizations ^a	13	20	20	8	19	8	13	21	22	15	—	24
1-2	17	22	20	15	9	11	20	7	11	19	—	15
3-9	9	8	18	16	19	19	0	4	11	9	—	9
10 or more	0	3	9	24	22	21	0	2	0	4	—	3
Some, but number not given	1	1	5	6	0	6	0	5	0	6	—	5
Totals (%)	99	100	99	100	100	100	100	100	100	99	—	101
(N)	(86)	(65)	(44)	(93)	(32)	(105)	(15)	(84)	(9)	(235)	(4)	(129)

TABLE 4. Number of Levels in Organization by Type of National Participation, and by Type of NGO

Number of Levels	Science, Health, etc.		Economic, Social, etc.		Religion, Art, International Relations, etc.	
	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.
	Only general membership	7	7	0	6	3
2 levels	67	62	65	61	60	57
3 levels	20	25	35	27	37	30
4 or more levels	3	1	0	2	0	3
Executive committee only	3	5	0	4	0	6
Totals (%)	100	100	100	100	100	101
(N)	(99)	(146)	(52)	(325)	(35)	(233)

four levels or to have only an executive committee, except among NGO's with potentially high consensus.

If delegation of authority is somewhat less likely in NGO's with both U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation, then general membership meetings might be expected to be substituted. Yet frequent general membership meetings may be relatively difficult if the members have few common, like, or complementary interests and many conflicting ones. As a matter of fact, we find that NGO's with both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. represented have less frequent general membership meetings than do other NGO's (see Table 5). Among the NGO's with potentially low consensus, surprisingly, this pattern does not hold. Presumably, the self-selection of constituent organizations is an important factor here. Among these NGO's, those with U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation are particularly likely to either have few or many general membership meetings. Holding constant the size of the NGO's does not alter these relationships.

The findings thus far, taken together, have some puzzling inconsistencies. Joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation does not seem to decrease the activities conducted, but the development of a large staff to implement the activities may be inhibited. In part, this may be due to the avoidance of delegating authority to a staff and a secretary-general. Similarly, an elaborated number of organizational levels may be inhibited; but frequent general membership meetings are not substituted to compensate for this structural arrangement. These inconsistencies in the findings

TABLE 5. Frequency of General Membership Meetings by Type of National Participation, and by Type of NGO

Frequency of General Membership Meeting	Science, Health, etc.		Economic, Social etc.		Religion, Art, International Relations, etc.	
	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.
	No general meetings	5	8	0	5	3
1 every 5 years or less often	3	4	14	5	18	6
1 every 4 years	23	11	14	5	12	10
1 every 3 years	24	20	23	17	3	19
1 every 2 years	20	20	27	21	26	23
1 a year or more often	24	37	22	46	38	35
Totals (%)	99	100	100	99	100	99
(N)	(95)	(143)	(49)	(311)	(34)	(217)

are partially resolved when we consider one other organizational characteristic: the number of committees in the NGO's.

Despite the jokes and satire about committees and their proliferation, committees can be a useful device for organizations. In the context of the present analysis, an important utility lies in the possibility that they tend to transform problems from issues to be decided by political bargaining and negotiation to technical matters to be decided by consensus among experts. This can be made clearer if we consider what the differences are between technical and nontechnical issues. As noted earlier in the discussion of consensus and dissensus, the distinction, in large measure, depends upon the persons trying to solve the issue and how they try to handle it. The distinction is not inherent in the issue or content area. If the mode of reaching a decision involves log-rolling and bargaining and the style of the discussion involves polemical debate, the issue will be seen as nontechnical and political in a fundamental sense. Certain conditions makes such elements more or less prominent. If the participants have clear constituencies who can hear the discussion, if there are many constituencies represented, and if the issues are phrased in such broad terms that, at least for the participants, basic value differences are connected to the substantive issue, then the issue is not likely to be viewed as a technical one.

The establishment of committees can affect these conditions. Thus committees meet in relative privacy and all phases of the discussion are not heard by the constituents. Members of a committee may be selected because of their specialized knowledge—their “expert” qualities; this enhances the likelihood that they will discuss the issue in technical terms and feel independent of a definite constituency. A small committee limits the number of constituencies involved in the discussion. Handing problems to a committee usually means first dividing the problem into some of its components and this makes each component seem relatively technical. Most fundamentally, the processes in a committee meeting regularly can help transform an issue. A few persons, meeting regularly and frequently, can develop rules of discussion and common understanding. The shared understandings diminish value differences.¹⁷

The number of committees NGO's have is highly associated with whether or not the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. both participate in them. Within each type of NGO, if the U.S. and U.S.S.R. both participate, the NGO is much more likely to have committees and many of them compared to other NGO's (see Table 6). Furthermore, it should be noted, this organizational characteristic does not vary among the different types of organizations; it is true that large NGO's tend to have committees and more of them than do small NGO's. Nevertheless, even holding constant the size of the NGO, those with joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation tend to have committees and many of them. The establishment and proliferation of committees, then, may be an important organizational device to minimize and channel potentially disruptive consequences of joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation in NGO's.

TABLE 6. Number of NGO Committees by Type of National Participation, and by Type of NGO

Number of Committees	Science, Health, etc.		Economic, Social, etc.		Religion, Art, International Relations, etc.	
	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.
None	52	75	47	64	50	69
1-6	14	5	9	10	11	8
7-10	7	1	4	4	3	2
11 or more	9	1	11	3	6	2
Some, but number not given	18	18	28	19	31	19
Totals (%)	100	100	99	100	101	100
(N)	(101)	(148)	(53)	(328)	(36)	(237)

CONCLUSIONS

The political and economic characteristics of a nation affect the extent to which its voluntary associations join the same NGO's as do associations from particular other nations. In the cases examined in this paper, the similarities and differences between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. do seem to have affected the type of NGO in which they both are represented. NGO's pertaining to substantive issues about which members of the two countries are likely to have consensus are most likely to have joint representation. Even in NGO's concerned with issues of relatively low consensus, the self-selection which freedom of association makes possible presumably facilitates joint participation. In addition, complementarity of interests may be of great significance in joint representation when consensus is low.

The NGO's concerned with science, technology, medicine, and sports are considered to deal with matters about which the U.S. and U.S.S.R. have relatively high consensus. Significantly these NGO's tend to have a lower level of activity and less centralized decision-making than do NGO's concerned with social or economic or with moral or political matters. Effectiveness in the latter spheres would seem to require more concerted action than in the former spheres. Such requirements may be an additional factor encouraging joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation. These findings indicate some of the limits which national differences set to the role that NGO's can play in the development of a world community.

On the other hand, these same findings have another meaning. For many aspects of the organizations under study, whether or not the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are both represented in the same NGO has relatively little consequence. Any given aspect or characteristic of an organization is affected by, and itself affects, a multitude of other organizational characteristics and environmental conditions. Herein, of course, lie some of the hopes attached to the joint participation of associations from different nations. If organizational processes unrelated to the conflicting interests of sets of organization members have relatively great importance, then the possibility of forming stable and effective organizations cross-cutting national political boundaries is increased.

In this paper, the analysis has focused upon the consequences of joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. participation in NGO's. We noted that such joint participation seems to be associated with an increased probability of NGO's reporting engaging in a variety of activities. The inference was drawn that in order for members with many conflicting interests relative to common, like, or complementary interests to participate in the same NGO, the NGO must provide attractive benefits. This inference is supported by the indication that among NGO's concerned with issues about which the U.S. and U.S.S.R. are most likely to have consensus, whether or not the U.S. and U.S.S.R. jointly participate has the least consequence.

In order for an organization, at least a voluntary association, to provide many benefits to the members, the members must make high contributions to the

organization. One such contribution may be delegation of authority to the leadership or staff of the organization. Presumably, if both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. are represented in the same NGO, there would be some reluctance to do this. Indeed, we found some evidence of this in regard to the number of levels in the organization, size of staff, and size of budget.

The implied inconsistencies in the above findings were resolved by the findings in regard to the structural elaboration of NGO's. The implementation of activities does not seem to be accomplished by an increased frequency of general membership meetings which might compensate for limiting staff size or hierarchal differentiation. This form of adaptation, indeed, may be the source of additional strains with both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. represented. The analysis revealed that joint U.S. and U.S.S.R. representation is usually associated with infrequent general membership meetings. The proliferation of committees appears to be an important organizational arrangement which resolves many of the inconsistencies and dilemmas discussed. Committees can help de-politicize issues and help transform them into technical matters. Committees can also provide a basis for organizational integration different from hierarchal differentiation, federalism, or collective union of sentimental attachments or like interests. The proliferation of committees can be a kind of *functional differentiation*. Just as many NGO's embody a functional differentiation within the world community, cross-cutting national boundaries, so can divisions based upon particular sets of problems within an organization cross-cut national differences among the membership. This kind of differentiation provides an alternative basis for organizational integration.

These findings have implications for the study of organizations in general and of the role of NGO's in the building of world community. Attention to organizational arrangements such as functional differentiation points to the ways in which organizations can be integrated and maintain their activities to some extent independently of the characteristics of individual members of the organization. The empirical findings also indicate that the international exchange which participation in NGO's can provide may be limited by some of the adaptive arrangements that may help to preserve and perhaps promote the life and effectiveness of NGO's.

In short, characteristics of potential members of an NGO affect whether or not they will belong to an NGO and whether or not they belong is affected by certain characteristics of the NGO. Some of the organizational characteristics, moreover, are affected by the composition of the organization's membership. The impact of the membership composition upon the NGO, in turn, is also dependent upon many other aspects of the NGO and its environment. Some of these mutual relationships are further illustrated in Table 7. Clearly, in each type of NGO, those which report engaging in some joint activities by the members are much more likely to have committees than are other NGO's. Furthermore, among NGO's engaging in joint membership activities, those with both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. represented

TABLE 7. Percent of NGO's Having Committees by Engaging in Joint Activities, by Type of National Participation, and by Type of NGO

Type of NGO	Engage in Joint Activities		Do Not Engage in Joint Activities	
	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.	U.S. and U.S.S.R.	Not U.S. and U.S.S.R.
Science, health, etc.	89 (44)	52 (63)	16 (51)	5 (77)
Economic, social, etc.	68 (38)	50 (189)	13 (15)	17 (138)
Religion, art, international relations, etc.	78 (18)	53 (87)	25 (16)	19 (144)

are more likely than other NGO's to have committees. This pattern is particularly marked among NGO's concerned with science, health, etc. Committees, then, do seem to be a way of getting organizational tasks done. This way is particularly appropriate when members have many conflicting interests relative to common, like, and complementary ones. This adaptive arrangement is particularly likely in organizations in which members tend to view issues as technical matters.

Despite the crudity of the measures used, some clear findings have emerged from the analysis. The implications of the findings, both for the study of organizations and for the role of NGO's in a world community appear significant enough to warrant further research. Such additional research is needed to specify and test the findings and interpretations presented in this paper.

NOTES

1. The research reported upon here was made possible by a grant from the Syracuse University International Organization Research Program, funded by the Ford Foundation. Alphonse J. Sallett assisted in the coding of the necessary information. An abridged version of this paper was presented at the American Sociological Association meetings, 1966.
2. For example, see William M. Evan, "Transnational Forums for Peace," in Quincy Wright, William M. Evan, and Morton Deutsch (eds.), *Preventing World War III: Some Proposals* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962); Lyman C. White, *International Non-Governmental*

Organizations (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1951); Ernst B. Haas, *The Uniting of Europe* (Stanford: University of California Press, 1958); Louis Kriesberg, "German Businessmen and Union Leaders and the Schuman Plan," *Social Science*, 34 (April, 1960), pp. 114-121; Peter H. Rohn, *Relations Between the Council of Europe and International Non-Governmental Organizations* (Brussels: Union of International Associations, 1957); J. J. Lador-Lederer, *International Non-Governmental Organizations and Economic Entities* (Leyden, Netherlands: A. W. Sythoff-Leyden, 1962). Also see G. P. Speeckaert, *Select Bibliography on International Organization 1885-1964* (Bruxelles: Union of International Associations, 1965).

3. In the 1962-1963 edition of the *Yearbook of International Organizations*, published by the Union of International Associations, Brussels, Belgium, more than 1700 international organizations are listed and over 1500 are non-governmental. In order to be listed, the organization must (1) have members (with voting powers and who are active) from at least three countries; (2) be nonprofit; (3) be active within the preceding two years; and (4) derive financial support from more than one country.

Certain types of organizations are excluded: movements without any definite structure, international institutes whose activities are primarily limited to teaching or training, fan clubs, fraternity and university clubs, and trusts or foundations. In addition, if there is insufficient information, the organization is not listed. (From personal communication by A. Judge, Research Secretary, and G. P. Speeckaert, Secretary General, Union of International Association, June 8, 1964).

For purposes of the analysis reported upon here, other international non-governmental organizations were excluded: NGO's which are confederations of other NGO's, or sections of other NGO's, or whose membership consists only of exile groups. The number of NGO's remaining is 1470. Furthermore, NGO's for which information about the nations which participate is not given are excluded from much of the analysis reported in this paper.

4. For an analysis of the consequences of interaction within international governmental organizations, see Chadwick F. Alger, "Personal Contact in Intergovernmental Organizations," in Herbert C. Kelman (ed.), *International Behavior* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), pp. 523-547; for a discussion of the contributions of international non-governmental sociological associations, see Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Ruth Leeds, "International Sociology as a Sociological Problem," *American Sociological Review*, 27 (October, 1962), pp. 732-741.
5. This premise is consistent with the point of view of MacIver and Page, when they write: "An association is likely to be formed wherever people recognize a like, complementary, or common interest sufficiently enduring and sufficiently distinct to be capable of more effective promotion through collective action, provided their differences outside the field of this interest are not so strong as to prevent the partial agreement involved in its formation." Robert MacIver and Charles H. Page, *Society* (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1949), p. 437.

Like interests exist when persons have similar goals and the attainment of those goals by some persons does not necessarily diminish their attainment by others. *Common* interests exist when persons have goals whose attainment is shared so that some persons cannot approach that goal without the others doing so. *Complementary* interests exist when two or more persons each have resources which the other values sufficiently to make possible a mutually satisfactory exchange. *Conflicting* interests exist when two or more persons

have goals such that as one attains his, the other's attainment is diminished. This may be the case if they have the same or different goals. What is critical is that one or both parties is unable to exchange compensating resources with the other party or is unwilling and finds it unnecessary to do so. My use of these terms is similar to that of MacIver and Page, *op. cit.*, p. 440.

For an important discussion of the ambiguities in the relationship between national similarities and differences as a basis for the formation of international organizations, see Amitai Etzioni, *Political Unification*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), esp. pp. 19-27.

6. Within the United States, voluntary associations are even more overwhelmingly organized in relationship to occupational activities. The distribution of types of organizations at the national level, since they in large measure constitute the market of potential members in NGO's, sets some limit to the distribution of types of NGO's. For data on types of voluntary associations in the United States, see *Encyclopedia of American Associations* (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company) and Sherwood Dean Fox, "Voluntary Associations and Social Structure," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Social Relations, Harvard University, 1952. An accurate comparison of the types of national and of international associations is impossible without a common set of categories and coding of the associations. Nevertheless, the rank order of the percentage of various types of organizations in the U.S. and among the NGO's is probably similar.
7. A more precise measure of the balance of interests among members would require information about the associations which actually belong to the NGO's. Such a measure, however, would obviate the possible significance arising from national differences in general. Even using national representation as a measure could be variously done. Instead of the joint participation of two particular nations, nations could be grouped in terms of many different criteria and the relative proportion of each type of nation represented in the NGO could be used as a measure.
8. The People's Republic of China (Communist China) is represented in very few NGO's, probably about 3 percent of those which are not regionally restricted. This probably reflects the Chinese government's policy, but also the level of associational proliferation and contact with voluntary associations in other countries.
9. Recent disclosures of support for international activities by the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States testifies to the importance of NGO's. Such financial aid also indicates that in many cases it is difficult to make a perfectly clear distinction between governmental and non-governmental organizations, even in the United States. See, for example, Sol Stern, "A Short Account of International Student Politics and the Cold War With Particular Reference to the NSA, CIA, etc.," *Ramparts*, 5 (March, 1967), pp. 29-38.
10. For example, before World War II, Soviet international sport participation was limited to the Red Sport International. Only after the war did the Soviet policy change and participation in sport activities with "bourgeois" sporting organizations begin. By 1952, the Soviet Union had joined practically every international sport federation. See Henry W. Morton, *Soviet Sport* (New York: Collier Books, Crowell-Collier Publishing Co., 1963), pp. 65-102.

Changes in Soviet and foreign policy after Stalin have probably led to an increased Soviet participation in NGO's. Soviet participation in the United Nations Specialized Agencies, especially UNESCO, is an indicator of these changes and probably was accompanied and followed by representation in various NGO's.

For an account of Soviet policy in regard to sociology and the initial participation of Soviet sociologists at meetings of the International Sociological Association, see "The Social Sciences in the U.S.S.R." *Soviet Survey*, No. 10 (November, 1956), pp. 1-19.

11. An explanation of this attraction is suggested by Galtung. [See Johan Galtung, "East-West Interaction Patterns," *Journal of Peace Research*, 2 (1966), pp. 146-176.] He reasons that interaction between the top levels of two interacting social systems is more frequent than is interaction between the lower levels of the two groups or between the top level of one group and the lower levels of the other group. Smoker's analysis of international non-governmental organizations lends support to this hypothesis. [See Paul Smoker, "A Preliminary Study of an International Integrative Subsystem," *International Associations*, 17 (June, 1965), pp. 638-646.] The data in this paper have not been organized to test the above-stated hypothesis. Nevertheless, the reasoning and evidence of Galtung and Smoker help account for the finding reported here. The U.S. and U.S.S.R., as leaders of their respective blocs, have an interest in interacting with each other, if there is to be any interaction between the two blocs. As leaders, they have some like interests.
12. From 1945 to 1948, many Communist and non-Communist trade unions belonged to the World Federation of Trade Unions. In 1949, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions was founded without Communist trade unions. For an account of the international labor movement, see Lewis L. Lorwin, *The International Labor Movement* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1953).
13. The distinction between NGO's formed by the confederation of pre-existing national units or by the establishment of national units by a parent organization is an important one. In many organizations, some combination of both sequences can be found. The consequences for the structure and authority system in these organizations is likely to differ. For analyses of the consequences of such differences within national voluntary associations, see, for example, Seymour M. Lipset, "The Political Process in Trade Unions: A Theoretical Statement," in Morroe Berger, Theodore Abel, and Charles H. Page (eds.), *Freedom and Control in Modern Society* (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1954), pp. 82-124; and David L. Sills, *The Volunteers* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957), esp. pp. 2-8.

Even when the national components pre-date the establishment of the NGO, another process may facilitate more consensus at the international level than an analysis of the characteristics of each national organization would lead one to expect. In the case of organizations established to meet the needs of the national members, the international activities may be peripheral to the concerns of the rank-and-file members and even of the organizations' leadership. In some such cases, at least, the staff persons or officials involved in international organization relations may have considerable freedom of action and be selected or self-selected because of their concern with international relations in general or because of their compatibility with the style and direction of the NGO.

Furthermore, leaders may share concerns and develop common understanding with leaders of other organizations which are not shared with their own rank and file members. See Louis Kriesberg, "Societal Coordination by Occupational Leaders," *PROD*, III (September, 1959), pp. 34-36.

14. *New York Times*, March 26, 1959.
15. Sills, *op. cit.*, Lipset, *op. cit.*, and Bernard Barber, "Participation and Mass Apathy in Associations," in Alvin W. Gouldner, *Studies in Leadership*, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), esp. pp. 492-493.
16. In a bureaucratic organization, with authority flowing from the top down, a large number of levels may be considered to indicate decentralization rather than centralization. Many levels, holding the size of staff constant, would indicate dispersion of decision making. As Peter Blau has pointed out to me in a personal communication, this conceptualization underlies the treatment of a low ratio of managers to non-supervisory officials as an indication of centralization in the paper, Peter M. Blau, Wolf V. Heyderbrand, and Robert E. Stauffer, "The Structure of Small Bureaucracies," *American Sociological Review*, 31 (April, 1966), pp. 179-191.
17. Haas analyzes the role of committees in the formation of consensus in an international governmental organization with a legislative structure. He also points out some of the limitations of the resulting consensus. Ernst B. Haas, *Consensus Formation in the Council of Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960). Also see Theodore Caplow, *Principles of Organization* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964), pp. 248-249.