

---

# Friends of the Earth International

---

Keith Suter



## A Movement within the Movement

This article examines Friends of the Earth International (FoEI). Given its diversity, FoEI is perhaps a ‘movement’ within the environmental movement. Its federal style of governance is very different from (say) the more centralized Greenpeace. While FoEI is the set of initials for the international headquarters (based at Amsterdam in the Netherlands—<[www.foei.org](http://www.foei.org)>), it can also be seen as the totality of the Friends of the Earth groups around the world. To get a more accurate assessment of Friends of the Earth, the second, broader approach is the one used in this article: ‘FoEI’ is used to describe the entire movement, and ‘Friends of the Earth’ refers to a particular grouping within that movement.

The article begins with an overview of FoEI as an organization and a summary of its history. It then looks at the list of FoEI campaigns and makes some assessments of the organization. It concludes with some challenges confronting FoEI. In essence, the entire environment movement in 2002 has progressed since 1972; although the threats to the environment remain clear, just what should be done about them is not so apparent.

## Organization

FoEI is an environmental non-governmental organization (NGO), with observer status at several intergovernmental organizations (such as FAO, IMO, UNEP, and the International Whaling Commission). Its objectives are: to protect the Earth against deterioration and to repair damage inflicted upon the environment as a result of human activity and negligence; to preserve the Earth’s ecological, cultural, and ethnic diversity; to increase public participation and democratic decision making in the protection of the environment and the management of natural resources; to achieve social, economic, and political justice and equal access to resources and opportunities on a local, national, and international level; and to promote environmental sustainable development on a local, national, and global level.

FoEI membership is based on national member groups

and affiliated NGOs. Each national member group is an autonomous body with its own budget (which also makes contributions to the FoEI Secretariat). There is a total of 66 national groups in 64 countries and one territory. Within the national groups there are about one million members world-wide, thereby making FoEI one of the world’s largest environment NGOs. There are also 12 affiliated NGOs.

The FoEI International Secretariat has nine professional staff and four volunteers. The Secretariat handles a budget of around EUR 1,167,000 (2002), which comes from national member groups and philanthropic bodies in Europe and the USA. The FoEI Secretariat co-ordinates the movement’s activities at the international level. The agenda is very broad, with campaigns and projects running on energy/climate change, mining, wetlands, international financial institutions, genetically modified organisms, forests, ecological debt, desertification, Rio+10, transnational corporations, and environmentally sustainable trade. FoEI has also maintained its interests in such long-standing subjects as Antarctica and maritime issues. This range of issues would permit the organization to claim to have one of the most ambitious agendas of any environment NGO.

FoEI has a wide range of activities and techniques. It is engaged in rallies and demonstrations; it lobbies governments, political parties, corporations, and unions; it uses the Internet, the media, and community education programmes to convey information. One of the reasons why people get attracted to the organization is the wide variety of forms of participation it offers.

## History

FoEI was created by the late David Brower (1912–2000), an American environmental activist.<sup>1</sup> Brower was a determined, passionate, abrasive, single-minded defender of the environment who was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize three times (1978, 1979, and 1989). In 1952 Brower (a former World War II combat soldier) became the Sierra Club’s first executive director, at a time when the club was a group of about 2000 wealthy Californians interested in

hiking, photography, and picnics. He transformed the organization into one that campaigned to save the environment. In Brower's time the membership went up to 80,000 members nation-wide with assets of over \$US3 million. The increase in funding and members was attributed to Brower's innovative use of unorthodox advertising campaigns showing the ravages of economic exploitation on animals and the environment. Although these were then novel approaches, they are now standard techniques. Brower opposed the creation of two additional dams in the USA's Grand Canyon. The Sierra Club won the argument and so beat the government agencies in favour of the dams. The government retaliated by removing the club's tax-exempt status, in order to damage its financial basis. Under US law, organizations that receive such status can devote only a limited part of their time and resources to influencing government policy. Brower continued his campaigns by taking on nuclear power and the big energy utilities. This means that he was also an early opponent of nuclear power (something which is now commonplace among the environment movement, not least FoEI).<sup>2</sup> In May 1969 Brower was removed by the Sierra Club board because he was seen as too controversial and he was offending potential donors (such as those in the nuclear power industry).

Fired with zeal to do even more to protect the environment, Brower that same year immediately formed Friends of the Earth. Ultimately, his passionate style became too much for that organization as well, and so he was driven out of it in 1984. There were complaints about his chaotic style of working and his interfering in the day to day operation of the organization. (Brower then formed a third organization—Earth Island Institute—and continued campaigning on environmental matters right up until his death.)

Friends of the Earth was created as a new type of environmental NGO: aggressive, skilled in using the media, politically active, and drawn from a cross-section of the community. The new organization had a broad political aim: protecting the environment in its widest possible sense. It also had the capacity to become an international organization concerned with the bigger issues of the environment. While it began in the USA, it soon developed separate local branches around the world. By January 1971 FoEI had acquired its international status through the participation of delegates from European countries. This internationalization enabled it to be accepted onto the roster of NGOs recognized by the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), thereby permitting FoEI to have 'observers' at UN conferences (with the right to watch proceedings but not to vote and with no automatic right to speak).<sup>3</sup>

The organization's popularity was due to the nature of

the cause. There was a genuine concern about the state of the world, and many people were worried about the direction in which current trends were heading. The first Earth Day (in which the organization was heavily involved) took place on 22 April 1970, and 20 million Americans took part in demonstrations and seminars. Another indicator of the increasing concern about the environment was the popularity of such books as the Club of Rome's *Limits to Growth*, published in early 1972.<sup>4</sup>

In June 1972 the United Nations held the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. Peter Stone was then a UN official helping to organize the conference. His resulting book<sup>5</sup> recalled the assistance that the new organization gave to the conference with its publications. These included the free daily magazine issued during the conference called *Eco*—the first of many such editions of this lively, *ad hoc*, irreverent publication. FoEI was one of the most active of the approximately 300 NGOs that attended. It had made its mark among a crowded field of NGOs.

## FoEI Campaigns

As at April 2002, FoEI had 12 broad campaign areas, grouped under three headings. The first six are on 'safeguarding Earth'. On climate change, FoEI is committed to the substantial reduction of global greenhouse-gas emissions and to increasing the use of alternative energy to combat the dangerous consequences of global warming. It believes that only through an equitable distribution of the Earth's finite resources, based on renewable energy, energy efficiency, and sustainable consumption patterns, can we avoid disastrous changes in climate and provide a better quality of life for all people.

On genetically modified organisms (GMOs), FoEI is allied to the sceptics, who doubt that GMOs will be as safe from contamination as predicted by GMO corporations. FoEI questions both the need for GMOs (when there are other, less capital-intensive farming methods available) and the wisdom of relying so heavily on corporations supplying the organisms.

On forests, FoEI is committed to the conservation of all remaining forest ecosystems and to the restoration of forest ecosystems. FoEI emphasizes the important—if neglected—role that forests play in maintaining the health of the planet: from keeping the water clean, to combating global warming, to maintaining the rich biodiversity of the planet.

On desertification, FoEI has publicized the dangers arising from the conversion of productive rangeland or cropland into desert through intensive land use (such as overgrazing) and the role that climate change is playing in

eroding the quality of cropland. It has called for more sustainable and equitable approaches to land use.

On Antarctica, FoEI was one of the founder members in 1978 of the Antarctic and Southern Oceans Coalition (ASOC). ASOC now includes 240 NGOs in 50 countries and has observer status at intergovernmental conferences on Antarctica. It continues to campaign to protect the continent's biological diversity and pristine wilderness, including the surrounding oceans and marine life.

Finally, on maritime affairs, FoEI is particularly concerned about pollution at sea and the avoidance of over-exploitation of marine resources. It is an observer at the International Maritime Organization in London.

The second group of campaign areas are described as 'resisting economic globalization'. On international financial institutions (IFIs), FoEI has targeted the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and regional development banks (such as the Asian Development Bank). FoEI had three broadly defined objectives: IFIs should stop lending money for fossil fuel (oil and gas) and mining projects; there should be greater civil society control over IFIs (which tend to be run by international bureaucrats, hardly accountable to politicians in their member countries, let alone the general public); and there should be a break-up of the 'Washington Consensus' (an economic philosophy based on reducing government intervention in the economy, with more scope for the market system of economics and transnational corporations to operate).

On transnational corporations, FoEI sees their thirst for profits as a major cause of many environmental and social problems and so has urged that they should have greater social accountability. FoEI was one of the first environmental NGOs to recognize that saving the planet would require more attention to controlling transnational corporations. Unlike Greenpeace, which is entering into some dialogue with some transnational corporations, FoEI remains hostile to them and is insisting on far greater corporate accountability.

Finally, on mining, FoEI has argued for a radical reduction in the production of raw materials and a shift in worldwide consumption patterns. Mining and drilling have caused a range of social and environmental problems.

The third group is labelled 'finding solutions'. On trade, environment, and sustainability, FoEI has said that it is possible for trade to be harnessed as a positive force in the development of sustainable societies. However, this requires equity among countries, peoples, and generations, a reduction in resource use and consumption, and increased trade with local communities and regions, with guarantees that trade rules will not weaken environmental protection. There should also be greater public participation in decision making.

In its ecological debt campaign, FoEI has called for the recognition and payment of this debt. This is somewhat different from the international NGO Jubilee 2000 campaign for the relief of debt that is owed to northern banks by developing countries. FoEI has argued that the production and consumption patterns that drive northern economies cause environmental deterioration all over the world, and it has said that it is unjust that the richest 20 per cent of the planet's population should consume 80 per cent of the planet's natural wealth. The extraction of this natural wealth for industrialized countries has also caused social and environmental damage in the South. FoEI wants rich northern governments to recognize that poor southern countries are owed an ecological debt and that the debt has to be repaid. In particular, it is necessary to restore areas in southern countries affected by the extraction of natural resources and export monocultures so that local and national communities are able to recover their capacity for self-sufficiency. There should also be the repatriation of cultural and natural heritage and the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction and toxic substances that threaten the life of the planet.

Finally, FoEI has said that it is producing a 'radical and comprehensive' document to go to the World Summit on Sustainable Development in September 2002. Its early assessment of the conference's preparations was hostile, with documents on its website suggesting that the conference would not achieve much.

To conclude, here are three observations about FoEI's campaigns. First, this is an impressive range of issues. But how deep do they go? In other words, the campaigns contain many aspirational points, but it is not clear under each one just how effective FoEI actually is. On Antarctica, for example, there is little happening because there is little to happen: mining has been stopped but the exploitation of living resources proceeds. Meanwhile, media and governments are no longer so concerned about the continent.

Second, the list provides an infrastructure; even if there is little happening at this very moment, it is there for when it is needed. Taking the example of Antarctica, there may be an increase in government and media interest if the current rate of global warming continues and there is a consequent melting of the ice sheet. The media and concerned individuals will know where to go because FoEI has maintained the issue on its list of campaigns.

Finally, the highly devolved nature of FoEI's organization may be seen in the way that almost every campaign has a different website contact person in each country. FoEI is not a highly centralized organization with a large international secretariat; rather, it relies on its colleagues in national sections.

## Assessing FoEI

What, therefore, can be said about FoEI overall? First, it has survived. Environmental issues go in cycles, and some NGOs fold during the downturn in the cycles. But FoEI has kept going for over three decades, during which time many other environmental NGOs have collapsed. Its organizational culture of youthful energy and creative demonstrating has helped draw and maintain supporters, not least when the public's attention has been diverted to other matters (such as the need to fight economic downturns).

All political issues move in cycles. There are times when environmental issues have a particular 'salience' in the media. 'Salience' refers to 'the sense of urgency attached to doing something about a particular matter or issue'.<sup>6</sup> For example, the US political scientist M. J. Peterson has applied the term to the rise and fall of public concern about environmental issues, in particular Antarctica (a matter in which FoEI has been involved for much of the organization's life, notably as 'observers' at governmental conferences).<sup>7</sup> Environmental issues have risen and fallen. The concern over Antarctica is a good example of what was a major issue in the 1980s and is far less of one in 2002. But FoEI is probably as strong now as it has ever been in terms of global membership numbers and finances. It has been able to tailor its campaigns to fit the emerging issues (or even to help create those emerging issues).

This continued existence is all the more amazing given FoEI's diverse campaign agenda. Professional marketing companies would advise an organization to concentrate on just a few key topics. But FoEI has opted for a very broad-based approach—and it has still managed to survive. It has not fragmented over disagreements between members over what should be covered, and it has not disappeared because it has spread itself too thinly trying to cover a lot of issues.

Second, FoEI has expanded the geographical spread of its membership. It is not an obviously US organization—it has a truly global, multicultural style. The Sierra Club, by contrast, remains very much an American NGO, based in the USA, with US members and mostly US interests. There is no problem with this form of national identity, of course, but FoEI's global image shows that it has been able to maintain Brower's original vision for it.

Besides having national sections in the USA and Western Europe, the organization has set up some national sections in developing countries and, in the past decade or so, in Eastern Europe. There is also Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME), whose projects include transboundary ecosystems, such as the Dead Sea basin, the Gulf of Aqaba, and the Eastern Mediterranean. FoEI has shown that it can find a home in a variety of political cultures.

It is interesting to note the speed with which FoEI took advantage of the end of the Cold War in 1990–91. The Sustainable Europe Campaign (SEC) network, organized by Friends of the Earth Europe, links 30 countries across greater Europe, from Ireland to Russia and Georgia, and from Scandinavia to Malta, in action research and campaigning to promote sustainable production and consumption. SEC, which began in 1992, is assessing what sustainable development means in practical terms and how this can be achieved. It is based on three principles (which in themselves show a broad definition of 'environment'): the need for (1) measurable progress towards sustainable production and consumption, that is, the Earth's carrying capacity; (2) balanced opportunities for development among all countries, including equal access to the world's resources; and (3) total quality of life rather than just materialism as a guiding force in public policy and values. The intention is to take the campaign's outcomes to other consumer societies, such as those in the USA and Japan.<sup>7</sup>

Also worth noting is the advantage that so many NGOs in developed countries (and to an increasing extent in developing countries) have received from the Internet and e-mail.<sup>8</sup> These technologies have considerably enhanced the ability to communicate at great speed across national boundaries, in particular in sharing information and preparing for co-ordinated campaigns.

Third, FoEI has maintained the vision of an active, broad-based membership. There is no one standard FoEI activist or member. Members are recruited for what they can contribute to the work. For some, it could be financial donations, while others may have more time but less money available and so serve as a volunteer. FoEI's flexibility enables people to do what they can.

Similarly FoEI's campaigns are characterized by flexibility and agility. The organization knows how to get media coverage. Indeed, Peter Stoett, in his study of the international politics of whaling, notes the ability of FoEI to attract media coverage to whatever cause is underway. For example, at a particularly tense time at the International Whaling Commission in 1979, FoEI held a demonstration that attracted 12,000 people in London and received more than 300 mentions in the media in a month. It was equally skilled in publicizing the dangers of the UK's nuclear energy policy, and to publicize the lack of progress on recycling there was a mailing of empty beverage cans to the British prime minister. Stoett writes admiringly that this 'type of media blitz has occurred with similar success rarely'.<sup>9</sup>

Fourth, FoEI has been good at 'global', 'national', and 'local' campaign themes. Indeed, it has been able to make good use of 'thinking globally and acting locally'. Another FoEI campaign has been that of saving the rainforests of

Sarawak, Malaysia, and working with the indigenous peoples there, the Penan. Al Gore, later US vice-president, recalled the time when he was a senator that the Penan sent a delegation to the USA, with the help of FoEI. The delegation alerted Gore to their plight—which he compared with the plight of peoples persecuted by the World War II Axis countries (Germany and Italy).<sup>10</sup> The US environmental lawyer Bruce Rich has been very critical of the World Bank and the exploitation of tropical rainforests. He has identified Friends of the Earth Malaysia as a good supporter of the Penan and a harsh critic of the World Bank's development projects in Sarawak.<sup>11</sup> Meanwhile, as an example of a local campaign, there is the publication by John Button for FoE-UK and FoE-Australia on the very basic issues of 'how to be green' in the home, in the garden, in eating, in looking after one's health and children, at work, and in transport.<sup>12</sup>

Finally, FoEI has taken a very broad definition of what are 'environmental' issues. As the preceding survey has shown, the organization has been involved in a variety of campaigns. Ramachandra Guha and Juan Martinez-Alier, writing from the point of view of developing countries, have been critical of the set of environmental values that underpin the campaigns of NGOs from developed countries, which they believe do not give enough attention to social justice issues, especially poverty. Thus, in the North there is the saying 'no humanity without nature', while in the South the phrase is 'no nature without social justice'.<sup>13</sup> FoEI endeavours to blend both. Indeed, with some of its national sections in the South, the movement is well aware of perspectives other than the northern ones.

Thus FoEI was part of the anti-MAI coalition and opposed some of the policies of the World Trade Organization (WTO). The Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) was drafted in secrecy by the club of developed countries in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) as a basic treaty to facilitate international investment. The intention was to create a 'level playing field' so that foreign corporations could invest as easily in a national project as the local companies; there could be no governmental reserving of projects for domestic companies. FoEI was among the network of NGOs that obtained drafts of the document and throughout 1998 and 1999 stimulated a public debate over the MAI's implications. The NGOs created the controversy and alerted the media to the secret agreement. Eventually the OECD governments withdrew the document. It was a great success for the NGOs.

## Where to for FoEI?

This review ends with four speculations on the future of FoEI. The speculations apply generally to the environment movement, but FoEI is particularly vulnerable because it has defined 'environment' so broadly.

First, is there a risk that the environment movement is winning battles but losing the war? FoEI is just over thirty years old, and its lifetime encompasses much of the lifetime of the modern environment movement. A great deal has been achieved in those three decades. There are now national ministries of the environment, international environmental treaties, the UN Environment Programme, international conferences, and local, national, and international 'plans of environmental action', and citizens and the mass media are far more aware of environmental issues than ever before. FoEI was in at the beginning of this process—it predates almost all the items listed in the previous sentence—and it can claim some credit for the progress that has been made.

But we are still talking about an 'environmental crisis', and there is scientific speculation that the planet will encounter some major environmental problems (such as climate change). What has gone wrong? Individual battles have been won but overall the war is still being lost. There has not been, for example, a fundamental shift in the behaviour of people around the globe. Indeed, the signs are pointing the other way: there continues to be a consumerist society and there are rising expectations in all countries (no politician has yet become a head of government on an environment-protecting ticket, and all politicians promise continued economic growth). There is popular American support for President Bush's opposition to the Kyoto Protocol, China has ambitious programmes for its economic development (very much on the Western industrial model, with the inevitable problems of pollution, etc.), and there are similar economic programmes in India.

Somehow people are aware that there are environmental problems, but they are fatalistically resigned to carrying on with life almost as usual. The risk to FoEI—and all other environmental NGOs—is that public support will drift away as people become reconciled to living with environmental problems rather than taking the drastic actions necessary to prevent them.

To take an example from another field: alcoholism. Various national and local NGOs have been created during the past century or so to combat this problem. More people still die from alcohol in most societies than from narcotic drugs, and alcohol has decimated many indigenous peoples. But public opinion has become reconciled to living with the problems it causes rather than taking drastic steps to curb them. Those of us involved in anti-alcohol NGOs are now seen as quixotic participants in a

lost cause. Could FoEI go the same way as people learn to live with environmental destruction?

Second, there is still—after three decades—no specific environmentalist ideology. FoEI has been very active in particular campaigns. It probably regards itself as more active in campaigns than any other environmental NGO. But while the activities are there, there is no basic, uniting belief system that underpins them. This may become more of a problem as FoEI increases its geographic spread and takes on an increasingly diverse range of national/local sections. What will hold all the national sections/local branches together? Diversity can be a great strength—but it can also be a great weakness.

Third, given FoEI's lack of an agreed political ideology, there is the problem of assessing where the organization falls in terms of the distinctions made by Andrew Dobson of the UK's University of Keele between 'environmentalism' and 'ecologism': 'environmentalism' argues for a managerial approach to environmental problems, secure in the belief that they can be solved without fundamental changes in present values or patterns of production and consumption, whereas 'ecologism' holds that a sustainable and fulfilling existence presupposes radical changes in our relationship with the non-human natural world, and in our mode of social and political life.<sup>14</sup> Dobson notes that the queen of England does not suddenly become a 'political ecologist' simply by having her fleet of limousines converted to lead-free petrol.

According to these definitions, FoEI would presumably see itself as a believer in ecologism. But it has not been effective in conveying that ideology—or in achieving major breakthroughs. Indeed, FoE-UK is one of the groups examined by Dobson as an example of how difficult it is to follow through with the latter ideology. He notes the problem FoE-UK had in the 1980s in its campaign to remove CFCs from aerosols. Although this was successful, the green political activists said that FoE-UK should have campaigned against all aerosols. By campaigning for CFC-free aerosols, FoE-UK was still condoning self-indulgence, vanity, and wholly unsustainable patterns of consumption.<sup>15</sup> In other words, FoE-UK was seen as too moderate by the greens. Ironically, Jonathan Porritt, one of the UK's best-known environmental campaigners, was both director of FoE-UK and a spokesperson for the Ecology Party. Indeed, Porritt is quoted as saying that, having written two general election manifestos for the UK Ecology Party, he 'would be hard put even now to say what our ideology is'.<sup>16</sup>

Works unite and teachings divide. People can be drawn together to focus on a common task (such as cleaning up from an oil spill) because there is a major job to be done. However, if, after the oil spill has been cleaned up, people

are invited to explain why they were willing to assist in the work, there would be divisions of opinion and possibly an end to the friendly atmosphere. Some may have environmental reasons, others financial motives, and others religious grounds, etc. As long as the attention is on the common task, then there is co-operation. It is therefore easier for FoEI—and all other environmental NGOs—to keep the focus on the task rather than on the motivations. Thus avoiding matters of ideology enables the organization to keep going. If some members really thought through what would be required to deal with environmental problems (such as having no aerosols at all), then they might decide to learn to live with those problems. But if there is no clear vision, how do you know if you are winning (or losing)?

Finally, of which 'Earth' is FoEI a friend? Arne Naess of Norway has popularized the distinction between the 'shallow' and 'deep' ecology movements.<sup>17</sup> This has stimulated a debate over what 'Earth' environmentalists are setting out to save: the interests of humankind or, more generally, all life on the planet? I suggest that most people who support the environment movement are out to save themselves first; saving other species is incidental to that main task. Thus some people are active in saving whales but are willing to eat fish or meat. This is a variation of the 'environmentalism'–'ecologism' tension examined above. If FoEI is too radical, it could lose some of its members. But if it is not radical enough, it may not save the Earth.

To sum up, FoEI has been one of the world's most active environmental NGOs. It has achieved a great deal. But it has some large challenges ahead of it. The challenges are not unique for FoEI and apply in general terms to most of the other parts of the environment movement. FoEI's special vulnerability derives from its policy of defining the environment so broadly and trying to deal with so many issues.

## Notes and References

1. Brower's death brought forth various tributes on the Internet. This section has drawn upon: 'The Arch-Druid Passes', *CounterPunch* (7 November 2000), <[www.counterpunch.org/brower.html](http://www.counterpunch.org/brower.html)>; Daniel Coyle, 'The High Cost of Being David Brower', *Outside Mag* (December 1995), <[www.outsidemag.com/magazine/1295/12f\\_high.html](http://www.outsidemag.com/magazine/1295/12f_high.html)>; 'David Brower Dies', *Friends of the Earth – US News Release* (6 November 2000), <[www.foe.org/act/browerrelease.html](http://www.foe.org/act/browerrelease.html)>; 'A Tribute in Quotes', *Earth Island Journal*, 16:1 (2001), <[www.earthisland.org/eijournal/](http://www.earthisland.org/eijournal/)>; and Clara Y. Milt, 'David Brower', *Internet Obituary Network*, <<http://obits.com/browerdavid.html>>.
2. See Michael Flood, Robin Grove-White, and Keith Suter (1977), *Uranium, the Law and You: A Comment on the Individual, the State and Nuclear Power* (Sydney: FOE Australia and British FOE).
3. See Sally Morphet (1996), 'NGOs and the Environment', in Peter Willetts (ed.), *The Conscience of the World: The Influence of Non-*

- Governmental Organizations in the UN System* (London: Hurst), 116–46.
4. Donella H. Meadows, Dennis L. Meadows, Jorgen Randers, and William W. Behrens (1972), *Limits to Growth: Report to the Club of Rome* (London: Pan).
  5. Peter Stone (1975), *Did We Save the Earth at Stockholm? The People and Politics in the Conference on the Human Environment* (London: Earth Island), 52, 55, 133, 135–8.
  6. M. J. Peterson (1988), *Managing the Frozen South: The Creation and Evolution of the Antarctic Treaty System* (Berkeley: University of California Press), 10.
  7. Michael Carley and Ian Christie (2000), *Managing Sustainable Development* (London: Earthscan Publication), 281–5.
  8. For example, see Jenny Pickerill (2001), 'Environmental Internet Activism in Britain', *Peace Review* [London] (September), 365–70.
  9. Peter Stoett (1997), *The International Politics of Whaling* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), 16, 95–6, 191.
  10. Al Gore (1992), *Earth in the Balance: Forging a New Common Purpose* (London: Earthscan Publication), 284–5.
  11. Bruce Rich (1994), *Mortgaging the Earth: The World Bank Environmental Impoverishment and the Crisis of Development* (London: Earthscan Publication), 133–4, 162.
  12. John Button (1989), *How to be Green* (Sydney: Random House).
  13. Ramachandra Guha and Juan Martinez-Alier (1997), *Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South* (London: Earthscan Publication), 21.
  14. Andrew Dobson (2000), *Green Political Thought* (London: Routledge), 2.
  15. *Ibid.*, 205.
  16. *Ibid.*, 13.
  17. Arne Naess (1989), *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

