Saunders, Clare. "Environmental Movements or Networks?." *Environmental Networks and Social Movement Theory*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013. 22–44. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472544490.ch-002>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 13:10 UTC.

Copyright © Clare Saunders 2013. You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

2 Environmental Movements or Networks?

This chapter, along with Chapter 3, sets the context of the book. It opens with a discussion of definitions of pressure and interest groups and social movements to make explicit what might be meant by the term ‘environmental movement’, and why I prefer instead to use the term ‘environmental networks’. This is followed by an attempt to theoretically map out the possible ideological, strategic and spatial divisions within environmental networks. Finally, I look at survey results to see what sorts of organizations within environmental networks might be considered to be part of the environmental movement. In this book, I draw heavily on Diani’s (1992a) consensual definition of a social movement (more on this, below), which is praiseworthy, even if one might suggest some slight modifications. Diani’s definition is especially useful for those new to the study of social movements, to help them understand the parameters of the concept of a social movement. Nonetheless, one should always bear in mind that not all scholars use Diani’s definition as a benchmark for what they refer to as social movements.

Defining movements

It is never easy to define or delineate social movements because theorists between and sometimes even within different theoretical branches of social movement theory use the term differently (Milton 1996: 79). To roughly illustrate how the concept is differentially used, I draw on different uses of the concept by the archetypal resource mobilization theorist and the typical new social movement theorist. Resource mobilization scholars frequently use the term to refer to organizational and at least internally institutionalized social movement organizations – in other words, organizations that have a formal structure. In this sense, a social movement can be considered to include organizations that others might call pressure groups. On the other hand, for some new social movement theorists this would be an anathema. New social movement theorists tend to prefer to use the term to denote informally organized horizontal networks of activists and consequently, give much less emphasis to the organizational dimension (see Chapter 6). Similarly, some political process theorists require that the components of a social movement are not

externally institutionalized – that the organizations within a movement lack a close relationship to the government by virtue of being too immature or radical – whereas others will include organizations that have a close association with government. Because of these stark differences, I begin this discussion of what it means to be a social movement by comparing definitions of social movements according to the degree of internal *and* external institutionalization insisted upon.¹

Early movement theorists (pre-1960s, for example, Turner and Killian 1957) saw social movements as non-institutionalized in both senses – that is, as fairly disorganized entities (internal) engaging in unconventional behaviour and having little access to policymaking circles (external). Thus, they contrasted them with pressure groups, which have been considered to be more organized and to have greater access to the polity. To some extent, this distinction between social movements and pressure groups stemmed from faith in the pluralist system in the United States, which hinged on a belief that rational² bodies could gain access to democratic decision-making processes. Less organized groups that lacked access and engaged instead in extra-institutional protest were regarded as separate from ‘pluralist’ politics, and misleadingly, but frequently, regarded as harbingers of irrational collective behaviour.

As social movement theory has developed (see Chapter 1) there has been a recognition that semi- or non-institutional protest activity can be rational *and* contribute to democracy. Gamson (1990: 138), for example, notes how the ‘old duality’ between institutional and non-institutional protest activity ‘has been superseded by “simply politics”’, recognizing that both social movement organizations and pressure groups seek to directly and indirectly influence policy (Goldstone 2003). Indeed, the idea that outsider groups can contribute to rational policymaking has recently been recognized by Labour Party leader Ed Miliband, who, in his address to the TUC rally in March 2011, alluded to the success of British suffragettes. The suffragettes appear to have been behaving rationally when viewed from the vantage point of the present day, but were deemed irrational by many at the time they were active. Indeed, modern day climate change activists justify their use of extra-institutional actions with reference to the alleged rationality of historically successful social movements that have used direct action, including the suffragettes and the civil rights movement. Inspired by the suffragettes, Climate Rush activists, for example, have adopted the slogan ‘well-behaved women rarely make history’.

In practice, some environmental movement scholars, rather unhelpfully, use the terms ‘social movement organization’ and ‘pressure group’ interchangeably and seemingly indiscriminately. Rawcliffe (1998), for example, talks of ‘environmental pressure groups’ in reference to many of the same organizations that Rootes (2007) calls environmental movement organizations. As if to purposely confound, the term

environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOS) is also thrown in (Princen 1994; Biliouri 1999). I prefer to avoid the use of the term NGO because it is 'slippery' and 'over-used' – arguably, on both counts, even more so than the term 'social movement' (Saunders and Andretta 2009). To avoid confusion, I have adopted the more general term of 'environmental organizations' to refer to the individual groups that comprise environmental networks.

But what do others mean by the terms 'pressure groups' and 'social movement organizations'? Although the terms have frequently been used as synonyms, as shown in the previous paragraph, earlier scholarly work presented them as distinct entities. Turner and Killian (1957) and Smelser (1962), for example, view pressure groups as institutionalized and therefore as fodder for political scientists rather than for social movement scholars. But is it useful to make such a distinction between social movements and pressure groups?

According to Stewart, a pioneer in political sociology, pressure groups have two central characteristics – being formally organized and seeking to influence policy (Stewart 1958: 1). Confusingly, the terms 'pressure' and 'interest' groups are often treated as synonyms, while some regard interest groups as a specific subtype of pressure group, distinguished from cause groups.³ Wilson (1990: 8) is among those who use the term 'interest group' as a synonym for pressure group. He distinguishes interest groups from social movements according to the degree of institutionalization:

By requiring that for something to be an interest group, it must have an institutionalised existence, I distinguish interest groups from social movements (which need only have the most rudimentary linkages).

The purpose of this statement is to allow easy distinction between social movement organizations and interest groups. But where should one draw what seems to be a rather arbitrary line between rudimentary linkages with the polity, and constructive engagement? Is this really an important distinction to make between organizations fighting for the same cause? And in which pigeonhole do we put groups using a mixture of institutional and non-institutional tactics? The non-institutional view of social movements would imply that organizations like Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace and World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)⁴ are not part of an environmental movement because of their relatively involved level of engagement with the policymaking process, and formally organized structures.

Putting large influential groups outside of a study of environmental networks is inappropriate, not least because they set the environmental agenda and shape public perception of environmental issues by virtue of the press coverage they obtain. But such inclusion might upset a number of scholars who insist on a non-institutionalized

approach. Yet in practice, what is often referred to as the environmental movement is certainly at least partially institutionalized (see Rootes 2007). Groups that were once considered radical, like Friends of the Earth, have become respected interlocutors in some decision-making circles. Now a semi-institutionalized entity, Friends of the Earth was, in 1970, merely a small group of activists excluded from formal political participation because of its radical viewpoint. Does that really mean that we should no longer view it as a social movement organization?

In the orthodox view, which insisted that social movements be non-institutional, an organization like Friends of the Earth would be promoted to the status of pressure group once it had taken on the characteristics of such, leaving behind the domain of social movements to find its place in the realm of 'proper' politics. I would argue that whether it is a pressure group or a social movement organization is somewhat immaterial – its role in environmental campaigning makes its inclusion in a study of environmental networks crucial.

Doherty's (2002) definition of what he calls the 'Green movement' emphasizes that organizations that are part of a movement must be at least externally non-institutionalized. Doherty adapts Diani's (1992a) definition of a social movement, which suggests that movements are semi- or non-institutionalized networks of organizations and individuals that share a collective identity, engage in collective action and have a common opponent. But Doherty's emphasis on the non-institutionalized element allows him to stress that to be part of the 'Green movement', organizations must engage in action outside of political institutions and challenge the basic principles upon which society is organized. On this basis, organizations like the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) and the Wildlife Trusts are excluded because (among other disqualifying factors) they do not engage mostly in non-institutionalized protest or challenge the social order. However, since Doherty wrote his book, the RSPB has been actively involved in protests, for example, against a proposed airport at Cliffe, Kent, and in the annual climate change marches that have taken place in London since 2006. Yet one might still question whether the RSPB has ever actually challenged the social order.

Nevertheless, these days, many social movement scholars consider social movement organizations to be entities that incorporate both non-institutionalized social movements and interest group politics (including see also McCarthy and Zald 1977; Diani 1992a; Dalton 1994; della Porta and Diani 1999; McAdam 2002: 282–3) (see Table 2.1). Burstein and Linton (2002), for example, regard social movement organizations and political organizations as part of a continuum without formal divisions. And for Diani and Donati (1999: 134), there are four main types of organization *within* a social movement including the 'public interest lobby' (i.e. a pressure group). Della Porta and Diani (1999: 16–19) similarly agree that pressure

Table 2.1 Pressure groups, non-institutionalized and modern concept of social movement compared

What is a social movement?				
Characteristics	Pressure groups	→	Modern concept of social movement	← Non-institutionalized social movements
Organization	Formal/ bureaucratic	→	Both types of organization	← Informal, non-hierarchical and participatory. OR atomized individuals
Demands	Small scale change – usually related to specific interests of members	→	Both types of demands	← Radical social change
Issues	Not system challenging	→	Both types of issues	← System challenging
Strategy	Conventional/ insider	→	Both types of challenges	← Unconventional/ outsider
Network links	None	→	Must have network links	← Sometimes

groups and even political parties can be part of a social movement if they are linked through formal or informal networks to other movement organizations. However, they exclude them if specific organizations are the main source of participants' identities, assuming that this weakens loyalty to the movement as a whole (Diani 2003: 302–3). This may be problematic because it clashes with common usage of the term 'environmental movement'. For example, it assumes that a stalwart Friends of the Earth activist, who identifies only with Friends of the Earth, is not part of the movement and may well inappropriately exclude many activists who are active members in its local groups. Likewise, it might exclude a keen Climate Camp activist who identifies solely with the Camp.

In all, it appears that the terrains of political scientists and sociologists have merged and the divide between pressure groups and social movements has

become increasingly viewed as an artificial construct. It could be argued that the qualifying factors in the distinction between a movement organization and an isolated pressure group are the existence of network links and a shared agenda. This modern conception of a social movement (cf. Snow et al. 2007) bridges the divide between pressure groups and social movements (Table 2.1). Yet we must remember that use of the term 'social movement' does not necessarily guarantee that scholars are always referring to the same class of phenomena. Occasionally, one sees scholars mistakenly referring to single organizations as if they are social movements. As Diani (1992b) states:

In fact, social and political phenomena as heterogeneous as revolutions, religious sects, political organizations, single-issue campaigns are all, on occasion, defined as social movements.

Environmental networks

Given the quandary many movement theorists have got into over defining 'movements', it is perhaps not surprising that McCormick (1991: 29) used the term 'environmental lobby' instead, which he says is 'made up of individual environmental "interest groups"'. However, it is more constructive for the purposes of this book to view the object of study as 'networks'. The term 'lobby' is too restrictive because it excludes non-institutionalized environmental organizations and those that are not directly political. As identified above, the term 'movements' is equally, if not more, problematic because of the many different ways in which movements have been defined. Furthermore, this term is not necessarily suitable for the object of study in this book because some scholars insist that it evokes challenging the social order and/or insist on the use of protest as a key strategy, thus missing out conservation organizations and do-it-yourself groups.⁵ Lofland (1996: 3), for example, suggests that social movement organizations 'are associations of persons making idealistic and moralistic claims about how human personal or group life ought to be organized that, at the time of their claims making, are marginal or excluded from mainstream society'.

Using the word networks also avoids use of awkward terms like environmental NGOs, environmental pressure groups and environmental movement organizations, eco-activist groups and so on, which among them have created a quagmire of confusion. To avoid confusion, I call all of these entities simply 'environmental organizations'.

Focusing on networks rather than movements also allows us to zoom in on the dynamics of temporary coalitions and what have been called, sometimes inappropriately, 'not in my back yard' (NIMBY) groups. Environmental organizations

often form temporary coalitions against particular infrastructural developments, for environmental improvements or challenging a particular industrial sector (see Chapter 3). While these do not necessarily display social movement dynamics (see Diani and Bison 2004), they still reveal interesting patterns of interaction.

NIMBY groups are not universally considered part of the environmental movement. But Castells (1997: 173) includes them because of their focus on 'establishing control over the living environment on the behalf of the local community'. Strictly speaking, NIMBYs are local activists who claim a positive attitude to a development *per se*, but express aversion to it being located close to home (Wolsink 1994). Thus, they can work *against* the aims of a broader movement.

However, as Wolsink (2006) warns, it is dangerous to fall in to the trap of misrepresenting all local campaigns as NIMBY, or of viewing true NIMBY campaigns as inconsequential. Often, it is through NIMBY campaigns that activists begin to learn about the issues and controversies surrounding particular locally unwanted land uses (LULUs) (Carter 2001), and during this process they may begin to network with others and change from being egotistically NIMBY to genuinely NIABY (not in anybody's back yard). The result is a 'scale-shift' in local campaigners' discourse, whereby there is a significant 'change in the number and level of coordinated contentious actions leading to broader contention involving a wider range of actors and bridging their claims and identities' (McAdam et al. 2001: 331). In other words, NIMBYism can transform into broader campaigns. This is what has been found regarding contention over the siting of waste facilities (Rootes 1999, 2003a; and on roads protests (Robinson 1999)). Shemtov (2003) has found that friendship networks help NIMBY groups to expand their goals, whereas links with local political elite tend to keep NIMBY campaigns parochial. Therefore, while true NIMBY groups might not be part of an environmental movement or part of a broader environmental network, their interactions with other organizations can facilitate their transformation from NIMBYs to NIABYs. This makes them interesting to study from an environmental networks' perspective.

Environmental networks, then, consist of formal and informal organizations with a common concern to protect or preserve the environment, using a wide variety of tactics, from conservation work and conventional lobbying through to sabotage and forming, living in and maintaining eco-communes. They consist of organizations that are networked: the organizations within the networks share information, and collaborate with one another.

If Bosso (1995: 102) is correct to assert that it is wrong to view what is commonly called the environmental movement as a single movement, due to its various ideological and practical dimensions as separate movements, then the concept of environmental networks is useful to capture the plurality of movements he refers

to. But Carter (2001: 134), on the other hand, concludes that there is enough unity to conceive of a single environmental movement due to shared concern about the environment, and the 'creative tension' that exists between organizations. The only way to see whether environmental networks really do constitute an environmental movement is to cast the net widely and then filter down on the basis of criteria for measuring the presence or absence of movement dynamics. A focus on environmental networks allows us to answer the empirical question of whether there are one or several networks/movements. I address this after delineating the boundaries of environmental networks.

Delineating the boundaries of environmental networks

Numerous attempts have been made to define the boundaries of the environmental movement. Lowe and Goyder (1983: 3) and Doyle and Kellow (1995) adopted an extensive definition including environmental organizations and the 'attentive public' (i.e. those sympathetic to the movement), while Rawcliffe (1998: 14) limits his definition to those committed or involved. Both definitions are empirically problematic because of the tendency to 'make the political personal' (Mooers and Sears 1992). Almanzar et al. (1998), for example, pose that engagement in pro environmental behaviours (such as recycling, energy conservation and green consumerism) are behavioural expressions of allegiance to and therefore participation in the movement. This is one reason why Haenfler et al. (2012) suggest a shift towards thinking about lifestyle movements so much as political ones. Furthermore, multitudes of people may be sympathetic to the movement, but not participate. The politics of the personal is one reason that, for Byrne (1997: 11), 'the environmental movement is perhaps the most extreme example of blurred boundaries'. That is not to say that defining movement boundaries is easy for any supposed social movement. The boundaries of the women's movement, in particular, have been heavily contested.⁶ For practical, yet not entirely unproblematic purposes, this book focuses mostly on networks of active environmental organizations. Data collection would become unwieldy and unfocused if it considered all individuals with any form of movement allegiance.

To follow tradition in the study of environmental activism in Europe, organizations similar to those ruled out in the Transformation of Environmental Activism project have been excluded (see Rootes and Miller 2000; Rootes 2007). These include: natural science/technological groups; national or local governmental institutions; scientific associations; commercial organizations (and subgroups); and animal rights groups that do not explicitly mention the environment on their web pages. While in some European nations animal rights and anti-hunting organizations are considered to be environmental organizations, this is not the case in Britain. Rootes

(2000) shows that, on the basis of press reports in the *Guardian*, only 5 per cent of reported animal rights/welfare protests in Britain coincided with an environmental one. Rootes and Miller (2000) present network findings from a comprehensive survey of national environmental organizations, which similarly demonstrate the weakness of the connection between environmental and animal rights organizations.

For the Transformation of Environmental Activism project, building conservation organizations were also excluded. However, because the research on which this book is based focuses on an urban area with a proliferation of amenity societies and some well-established urban conservation associations, it was considered inappropriate to ignore them. It is also interesting to discover their position relative to other actors that constitute environmental networks. Building conservation organizations were surveyed, but their questionnaire responses were only analysed if the organizations considered themselves to be part of an environmental network and if they provided network data.

The fuzzy fringes of the environmental network (cf. Saunders 2003) overlap with what has been called the global justice movement, most especially its anarchistic elements and Do it Yourself (DIY) culture – often regarded as ‘anarchism in all but name’ (e.g. Purkiss 2000: 97). Pepper (1996: 45), for instance, claims that ‘most radical greens are influenced by anarchism’. Epstein (2001) indicates that youth involved in the anti-globalization movement are mostly demanding human rights and environmental justice. To deal with these fuzzy fringes, radical anarchist groups and single-issue groups (e.g. transport groups, anti-incineration groups) have only been included in the study if they consider themselves to be part of a network of environmental organizations.

Spatial dimensions and ideological strands of the environmental networks

Environmental organizations that comprise environmental networks operate at a variety of levels – from very local guardians of single parks (e.g. Friends of Greenwich Park), to transnational organizations with worldwide influence (e.g. Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace and WWF). It is possible to make a useful distinction therefore, between the following types of environmental groups based on their sphere of operation:

- 1 Local – concerned with the environment at a particular site, within a street or, at the most, a borough. Examples include groups that steward a local park or nature reserve (the many Friends of . . . Park groups in London), or campaign against a LULU. This category also includes local chapters of national environmental organizations, such as Greenwich Greenpeace.

- 2 Regional – representing the interests of at least two boroughs. An example is London Wildlife Trust.
- 3 National – concerned with national environmental politics throughout England/Britain. The main national environmental organizations are the National Trust, the RSPB, WWF, Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace. Most of them are also part of international networks, but it is beyond the scope of this study to consider the international dimension.

It is also useful to look at environmental ideological and tactical distinctions between environmental organizations. Following other literature on environmentalism, I suggest that, theoretically at least, it is possible to distinguish three *main* subtypes of environmentalism – conservationism, reformism and radical environmentalism. In contrast to other literature (e.g. O’Riordan 1981 [1976]; Dalton 1994), I argue that attempts to categorize environmental organizations into these camps should consider both ideology/beliefs *and* the loci of their challenges and strategies. While I look briefly at ideology in Chapter 6, strategies are emphasized in the analysis offered in Chapter 5. Later in this book, I show that the ideologies of environmental organizations are not easily distilled into three camps (Chapter 6), but strategies are much easier to distinguish (Chapter 5).

Let us begin by focusing on conservation organizations. Although there are precursors to nineteenth-century conservationism (Lowe 1983) and the 1970s manifestation of ‘new’ environmentalism (Grove 1990; Clapp 1994), these eras are generally considered significant milestones in the development of modern environmentalism (Dalton 1994: 27–39). The nature conservation movement began as a middle-class concern, initially fighting species loss and later concerned with urban sprawl and associated loss of countryside. As a result of its diverse history – stemming from, among other things, the clashing interests of hunting (Green 1981: 42) and humanitarianism – conservation organizations express ‘a plurality of values’ including preservationists and utilitarian/amenity groups (Green 1981: 42) and hence, ‘not a little ambivalence’ (Lowe 1983: 349).⁷ Despite this, what conservationist groups do have in common is emphasis on ‘the protection and preservation of flora, fauna and habitats perceived to be under threat’ (Byrne 1997: 129). Often included in this category are groups like the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), the RSPB and the Wildlife Trusts. They share commitment to protection of natural countryside, but not necessarily the wider environment (Table 2.2). National conservation groups usually exhibit characteristics of archetypal insider-interest groups – showing respect for the established social and political order, having consultative status, and being conservative in both demands and political orientation (Atkinson 1991: 19). The words ‘countryside’, ‘conservation’ and ‘nature’ appear less frequently if at all in the

Table 2.2 Aims and objectives of conservation groups

GROUP	AIMS and OBJECTIVES
Campaign to Protect Rural England	'We . . . care passionately about our <i>countryside</i> and campaign for it to be protected and enhanced for the benefit of everyone. <i>The countryside</i> is one of England's most important resources but its <i>beauty, tranquillity and diversity</i> are threatened in many different ways' (Campaign to Protect Rural England, CPRE website 2004).
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	'The RSPB is the UK charity working to secure a <i>healthy environment for birds and wildlife</i> , helping to create a better world for us all . . . (RSPB website 2004).
Wildlife Trusts	'The Wildlife Trusts partnership is the UK's leading conservation charity exclusively dedicated to <i>wildlife</i> . Our network of 47 local Wildlife Trusts and our junior branch, Wildlife Watch, work together to protect <i>wildlife in towns and the countryside</i> . . . The Wildlife Trusts lobby for better protection of the UK's <i>natural heritage</i> and are dedicated to protecting wildlife for the future' (Wildlife Trust website 2004).

Note: Italics are added to highlight conservation organizations' emphasis on nature and wildlife.

manifestos of political ecology organizations. As a result, conservationist groups might be considered too conventional to be considered part of a movement. Yet a network approach allows us to see the extent to which they interact with their more radical counterparts.

Conservation organizations are usually thought to be distinct from a new breed of environmental organization that emerged in the 1970s. During that decade, links were increasingly made between industrial expansion and environmental degradation. Political ecology (Atkinson 1991; Doyle and McEachern 1998) emerged as a critique of unsustainable consumption patterns, which were (and are still) regarded as having drastic global ramifications. Stimulated by visions of eco-crises put forward in publications from ecologically minded intellectuals such as Carson (1962), Ehrich (1968) and Meadows et al. (1972), the need for a New Ecological Paradigm (NEP) (Catton and Dunlap 1978, 1980) and a social movement to promote it were realized. For its realization the NEP requires fundamental change in the social and political order based on decentralized radical self-management of communities in line with a holistic environmental ethic. This formed the ideological

backbone of the environmentalism that emerged in the 1970s, including, most prominently, Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace. The Friends of the Earth International website provides a good example of the range of social, political and global issues which political ecology addresses (Table 2.3), contrasting significantly with the nature-based focus of conservationism.

As a result of these two quite distinct waves in the development of environmentalism, commentators have distinguished between two main ideologies. Frequently cited is Dobson's (1990: 1) distinction between *environmentalism*, which seeks a 'managerial approach to environmental problems'; and *ecologism*, which holds that 'radical changes in our relationship with the natural world' are required to achieve sustainability. Like other similar distinctions (for instance Dalton's 1994 differentiation between *conservation* and *political ecology*), the categorization sometimes seems forced, resulting in artificial divisions because organizations do not always neatly correspond to ideal types. Most typologies imply a polarization of environmental attitudes, with conservationism as conservative (with a small 'c') and seeking to protect the environment as an aesthetic or amenity resource, and political ecology as a polar opposite – being radical and seeking fundamental change. In reality, many political ecology groups deal with nature conservation issues, while traditional conservation groups like WWF (Medley 1992) and the RSPB are becoming increasingly concerned with sustainable development (Rootes 2006).

These typologies also need modifying because they imply that political ecology groups are radical, which, in practice, is often only true in relation to their beliefs (see also Chapter 6). It is now recognized that groups with very similar ideology and goals may adopt drastically different strategies (Carmin and Balser 2002). Many groups with a radical ideology, including Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace believe that fundamental change is desirable. However, they consider that it can only be instituted through incremental, rather than radical, change. Therefore, they frequently, pragmatically target businesses and governments. In this respect, it is important to differentiate them from direct action networks (Doherty 1999; Doherty et al. 2007). Some have called the rise of direct action networks (Rootes and

Table 2.3 The remit of political ecology: The mission statement of Friends of the Earth International

We are the world's largest grassroots environmental network and we campaign on today's most urgent environmental and social issues. We challenge the current model of economic and corporate globalization, and promote solutions that will help to create environmentally sustainable and socially just societies. ([//www.foei.org/en/what-we-do](http://www.foei.org/en/what-we-do), last accessed 30 Nov 2010)

Saunders 2007) a third wave of environmentalism, which is also characterized by groups campaigning against LULUs and coalitions (Bosso 1997 in Carter 2001: 141). The radical element of the new wave makes political ecology appear moderate. While political ecologists call for fundamental societal change, they do not necessarily ideologically oppose the state as do some radicals. Neither do they 'engage in forms of action designed not principally to change government policy or to shift the climate of opinion, but to change environmental conditions around them *directly*' (Seel et al. 2000: 2). Earth First! literature, in contrast, makes it clear that there is 'no compromise in defence of Mother Earth' (Brower 1990, ix, xi) (Table 2.4). In practice though, many Earth First!ers in the United Kingdom steadfastly refuse to engage in violence against other human beings. These developments also suggest that Dalton's (1994) hypothesis that ideology is the key variable to distinguish between types of groups⁸ requires modification. Despite ideological similarities, Friends of the Earth and other political-ecology-inspired organizations have vastly different action bases. Therefore, to avoid confusion, any typology needs to consider both ideology and strategy.

Before delving a little further into how the ideologies of the main types of environmentalism outlined above differ, it is necessary to clarify what might be meant by ideology in this context (Barker 2000: 64). Although often used to outline how society's hegemonic dominant ruling class' ideas are produced and become translated by the masses into 'constitutive values' (Heberle 1951: 12), what I am concerned with in this book is ideology at the organizational level. This refers to the way environmental organizations interpret reality and their cultural system of meanings. With reference to social movement studies, Snow (2004: 396) conceives of ideology as 'a cover term for a relatively stable and coherent set of values, beliefs and goals associated with a movement . . .'. Yet this definition only works if it is restricted to the group rather than applied at the movement or network level, because movements and networks can, and do, incorporate a multitude of

Table 2.4 Radical environmentalism: An example from Earth First! Literature

Earth First! formed in 1979, in response to an increasingly corporate, compromising and ineffective environmental community. It is not an organization, but a movement. There are no 'members' of EF!, only Earth First!ers. We believe in using all of the tools in the toolbox, from grassroots and legal organizing to civil disobedience and monkeywrenching. When the law won't fix the problem, we put our bodies on the line to stop the destruction. Earth First!'s direct-action approach draws attention to the crises facing the natural world, and it saves lives. (www.earthfirstjournal.org/section.php?id=1, accessed 30 Nov 2010).

ideologies, environmental networks especially so. According to Tucker (1989: 34), there are two main aspects of social movement ideology: debunking the claims of opposing groups, and defining how the state of affairs should preferably be run. For a more rounded outline of the ideology of types of environmentalists, I have added main issues of concern and perceived causes of environmental problems (Table 2.5).

Clearly these ideal types generalize about environmentalism and cannot fully reflect the diversity of organizations. Pepper (1983), for instance, is able to convincingly delineate at least four types of eco-anarchism, which is already a subtype. Nevertheless, such distinctions are useful as analytic tools. Dalton is, of course, right to suggest that 'pure, ideal-types [of environmentalists] exist only in the minds of social scientists' (Dalton 1994: 49). Just because it is possible to distinguish three waves of environmentalism does not guarantee that each of the three categories is a homogenous entity. For instance, the political ecology camp has internal conflict over the role that overpopulation has played in the environmental crisis, and the extent to which population control should be the solution (Kenward 2002). Similarly, among the radicals, deep ecologists have been satirized by social ecologists for their misanthropic tendencies (Devall 1991; Bookchin 1994; Gerber 2002).

A typology of strategies

The strategies used within environmental networks are diverse, ranging from radical (sometimes violent) confrontation to more moderate/conventional approaches – involving consultation, dialogue and compromise with authorities (Young 1993: 23), but also incorporating practical projects and cultural challenges. The latter are especially important fields of action for direct action and DIY networks (Melucci 1996; Doherty 2000). Most typologies of social movement strategies focus disproportionately on protest, ignoring the extreme forms of insider and outsider action such as acting as consultants/negotiating with government ministers, and the practical projects undertaken by DIY activists (Purdue et al. 1997; McKay 1998).

At the simplest level, environmental organizations can be classified according to the extent that they are 'insiders' or 'outsiders' (see Chapter 5); and according to the type of relationship that they have with the polity. The former distinguishes organizations by the actions that they use, the latter by the type and extent of contact that they have with official institutions. Insiders are viewed as legitimate, are widely consulted by the government and have access to the executive, whereas outsiders are those lacking access to the political system (Grant 1995). The types of actions associated with insiders, thresholders (those that use a mixture of insider and outsider strategies) and outsiders are shown in Table 2.6. Lhotka et al. (2008)

Table 2.5 A typology of environmentalist ideologies

Element of Ideology	Type of Environmental Ideology			
	Conservative		Radical	
	Conservationist	Reformist	Ecologist	Radical Environmentalist
Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nature protection• Emphasis on nature reserves and wilderness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tangible, often small-scale issues• Locally based, or issues that can be tackled piecemeal	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• National and global issues• Mixture of urban and rural environmental issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• National and global issues• Urban and rural environmental issues
Problem attribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exploitation of nature• Interwar industrial development and loss due to urban sprawl	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Poor town/ country planning decisions• Failure to cost environmental externalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consumerist society• Over-consumption	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Domination of nature and society by an elite (artificial power structures)• Global capitalism
Perceived solution	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Practical conservation• Setting aside and managing reserves	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• More careful planning decisions• Technocratic innovation/ ecological modernization	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decentralized power• Participatory democracy• Restructuring of society piecemeal	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Autonomy• Anarchy• Revolution• Sense of urgency
Examples	RSPB, Wildlife Trusts	NIMBY or LULU groups	Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace	Earth First! Reclaim the Streets

Table 2.6 Campaigning activities and categorization of strategies

Category of Protest	Activities
Insider	Petitions, leafleting, press conferences, letter writing, researching and reporting, education and training, government consultee, LA21 involvement, procedural complaints, litigation, public meetings
Thresholder	Media stunts, marches, rallies, demonstrations, cultural performances and/or a mixture of insider and outsider activities
Outsider	Boycotts, disruption of events, blockades/occupations, ethical shoplifting, ecotage, adbusting, social events, practical conservation

use different labels but the same logic to categorize their sample of environmental organizations as neutral, intermediate and activist.

However, this ignores the differences between those that focus on the political system and those that seek self-directed change. Whereas reformists might be seeking to influence political institutions directly or indirectly, radicals often seek direct change through legal or illegal direct action and DIY or practical projects (Table 2.7). It is important to include all types of strategies to prevent accusations of state-centricity (see Chapter 8).

Groups from differing ideological persuasions share similar fields of action. In particular, radicals and conservationists both engage in practical grassroots localized projects, although radicals also engage in civil disobedience and direct action. Ecotage, for instance, involves sabotaging construction equipment used in the building of ecologically damaging developments, damaging computer files of environmental 'villains' during an office occupation, or ethical shoplifting to remove ecologically damaging products from supermarket shelves to prevent manufacturers profiting from environmental damage. What is distinct about political ecologists is that despite their radical ideology, their activity is typically geared towards influencing or reforming already existing institutions. While Friends of the Earth has a radical ideology, its strategy of seeking to force 'incremental change within an existing social order' (Weston 1989: 208) places it firmly in the reformist camp.

Radicals see the reformist approach as ineffective, comparing it to a hospital with only an emergency ward (Devall and Sessions 1985: 3) and are differentiated from other activists by focussing their efforts on self-directed autonomous change by means of direct action and practical projects. Thus, the key defining words are, for

Table 2.7 Typology of strategies

Directed at Institutions		Self-Directed Change	
Institutional	Indirect-Institutional	Direct Action	DIY/Practical Projects
Consultees	Marches	Ecotage	Practical conservation
Lobbying	Rallies	Occupations	Local exchange trading schemes
Negotiating	Vigils	Ethical shop lifting	Permaculture groups

conservationists – *conserve* (whether practically, or seeking changes in legislation), for political ecologists/reformists – *campaigning for change*, and for radicals – willingness to engage in *civil disobedience* or *alternative life-styles* (italicizations are from O’Riordan’s [1981 (1976)] five-fold classification of environmentalists which also includes service groups). This demonstrates that while ideology might shape environmental organizations’ strategies, it seems not to be, as Dalton (1994: 15) suggests with reservations, the main ‘reason and logic’. Dalton’s (1994) notion of ideologically structured action, which proposes that environmental organizations and activists select actions that fit their ideology, assumes more coherence than really exists, ignoring practical constraints that prevent ideology from dictating behaviour (Klandermans 2000; Snow 2004: 396, see also footnote 8). For reformists, pragmatism is the key; for radicals, direct action is the answer.

Thus, pragmatic reformists may seek positive relationships with government and/ or their local councils, whereas radicals will shun such associations. Thus, I have developed a set of idealized relationships that environmental organizations may have with various levels of governance, which I explore in more depth in Chapter 5.

- 1 **Positive** – the government/council frequently seeks the environmental organization’s advice.
- 2 **Ambivalent** – the government/council is friendly, but the environmental organization itself initiates contact.
- 3 **Contingent** – government/council receptiveness depends on the issue(s) or department(s) involved.
- 4 **Negative** – the organization unsuccessfully attempts to influence the government/council, or has become blacklisted.

- 5 No relationship** – the environmental organization has no relationship with government/council. It prefers alternative campaign targets or does not work at that level (e.g. local amenity societies are unlikely to have a relationship with national government because much of their work seeks to influence the local council instead).⁹

These five types expand upon the insider-outsider dichotomy used in the study of pressure groups, including institutional relationships that fall between the poles of the continuum. But which of these many different types of organizations that have been discussed above can be said to be ‘in,’ and which might be deemed ‘out’ of the environmental movement?

Who is part of the environmental movement?

Although an interesting academic exercise – even if just to ensure that the nature of the research object is clearly defined – not all activists regard it worthwhile to set movement boundaries. For many environmentalists, their primary concern is to improve the environment, and, for them, this often means collaborating with community groups, churches, elderly peoples’ groups and, at times, anti-war and human rights organizations. Activists prioritizing other issues also work across movement boundaries. Inter-issue networking is especially evident in environmental direct action networks (Doherty et al. 2007). For Torrance (then Greenpeace Networker, now Sustrans Policy Manager):

I don’t think it’s about building a wall around the environmental movement . . . it’s more like a Venn diagram of interlaced circles . . . a kind of natural ecological system . . . There are relations with the peace movement, animal rights, environment, human rights, development movement etc. . . . it’s unhealthy and not constructive to think who’s in and who’s out . . . Why not have just one social change movement? (interview June 2003)

The organizational types listed by Torrance are, in at least some strands of their work, fighting for related causes and therefore in real-world terms could be conceived of as part of a movement broader than environmental. Diani and Bison (2004) dealt with this in their study of civic organizations in the United Kingdom, by studying networking among organizations typically associated with a range of movements. And the broader literature on intra-movement interaction addresses the fact that networks extend beyond the remit of single movements. For example, Rose (2000) addresses the links between labour, peace and environmental movements; Ferree and Roth (1998) and Roth (2003) consider links between labour and women’s movements; and Bystydzienski and Schacht (2001)

have edited a collection that includes studies of interaction across many social movements. Consequently, Reinelt (1995), writing from the perspective of the women's movement, argues that it is problematic to exclude organizations that sit on the boundaries of movements. However, there are good reasons to focus on what has been purported to be a single movement: it prevents us selecting examples from across movements in support of a particular theory, allows us to question whether a movement exists or not and gives more focus to any discussion of political opportunities (see Chapter 5).

To see whether the environmental organizations I surveyed might be said to be social movement organizations, I look at their responses to four boundary demarcation questions. Do they consider themselves to be part of the movement? Do they have a main aim to protect or preserve the environment? Do they self-identify as part of a network of environmental organizations? And do they engage in at least some non-institutionalized activity?¹⁰ (see Table 2.8). I find that, similar to Martin's (1990) research on feminist organizations, environmental organizations do not easily fit into ideal types, and that a variety of organizations exist within the milieu.

Overall, data shows high correspondence between the four boundary demarcation criteria and environmental organizations' own perceptions of whether they are a part of an environmental movement. Only nine organizations consider themselves part of the environmental movement, yet they also claim that their organization is *not* part of a network. These include one countryside protection organization, two working on food, farming or gardens and one working to protect a single species. A further two are transport organizations. There is not a single category of organizations that fails to meet the characteristics of social movement organizations. The most marginal are amenity societies, which are among the least likely to engage in non-institutionalized activity.

Of the 29 nature conservation organizations surveyed, many met all four criteria, perhaps suggesting that Doherty (2002) was a little too restrictive in his definition of the 'Green movement', which excluded conservation organizations on the grounds that they do not explicitly challenge the social order.

Despite high correspondence between boundary measures, there are important anomalies. While residents' associations have rarely been considered to be part of the environment movement, most of those that gave survey answers indicate the strong place of residents' associations in (local) environmental networks. Residents' associations in urban areas appear to have a strong input into local decision-making concerning the environment. Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents' Association and Longford Residents' Association, located close to Heathrow airport, both noted their primary concern for the environment, which was motivated by the threat of a new runway. Both had engaged in non-institutionalized activities including

Table 2.8 Boundary demarcation data by organizational aim type

Aim of Organization	Considers itself part of the environmental movement	Main aim to protect or preserve the environment	Part of a network of environmental organizations?	Some non-institutionalized activity?
	YES	YES	YES	YES
Air Pollution (2)	2	2	2	2
Amenities (34)	29	26	28	18
Anarchy (1)	1	1	1	1
Animal Rights (1)	1	1	1	1
Class (3)	1	1	1	1
Building Conservation/ Urban Landscapes (3)	3	3	3	2
Countryside Protection/ Conservation (29)	25	26	24	21
Energy (1)	1	1	0	1
Food/Farming/ Gardens (6)	6	6	4	6
Forests (1)	1	1	1	1
Land Rights (1)	1	0	0	1
Multi-issue (31)	26	26	25	24
Networking (2)	1	1	1	1
Single Species (12)	9	8	8	7
Transport (14)	13	10	11	10
Waste (3)	3	2	3	1
Non-environmental (5)	0	2	1	1
TOTALS YES	123	117	*114	99
NO	26	32	35	50

Note: * The analysis presented in the rest of the book is based on the 114 organizations that said they were part of a network *and* provided network data.

demonstrations, media work, public meetings and leafleting. While approximately three-quarters of amenity and residents associations considered themselves as having a main aim to protect or preserve the environment, 81 per cent perceived themselves to be part of the environmental movement and part of a network.

The case was less clear-cut for transport organizations. These include anti-airport expansion, anti-road groups, and those campaigning for better public transport, cycle lanes and walking conditions. Hillingdon Ramblers' Association responded, and answered all four questions in the affirmative, noting countryside protection and access to rights of way as key concerns. Sweeting, then coordinator of the Hillingdon Commuters' Association (and also of Hillingdon Friends of the Earth), claimed that although she is motivated by environmental concerns, the majority of the Association's members joined for the purpose of seeking improvement in their journeys to work, and not for environmental reasons. Rail Future's ambiguous connection to the environmental movement is similar. According to John Pitcher, organizer of the Kent Division of the London and South Eastern branch of Rail Future:

Rail Future is on the edge of the environmental movement . . . I am in it for the right reasons but others are [in it] because their commuter train to London is always late, and others still have barely graduated from train spotting. Yet others welcome new airports because they usually promise new railway stations as crumbs! (personal correspondence January 2003)

Another interesting anomaly was the refusal of London Sustainability Exchange (LSx) to answer the questionnaire. Judging by its name, and information on its website (www.lsx.org.uk/), one would assume that it would consider itself to be part of an environmental network and that it would self-identify with the movement. Interestingly, Starr (2000) also regards the sustainability movement as distinct from the environmental movement. Chris Church of the Community Development Foundation argues along the same lines because of the tendency of the two types of environmentalism to work in relative isolation from each other (personal correspondence August 2003).

Environmental networks and environmental movements

Networking, then, is central to definitions of social movements and seems to cohere closely with environmental organizations self-perception as part of an environmental movement. But exactly how networked should organizations be to be considered part of an environmental movement?

Diani (1992a), in his 'emergent consensual' definition of social movements, argued that the network links between organizations (and individuals) can be informal or highly structured, frequent or infrequent, intense or cursory. These links, he suggested, mostly involve the sharing of information, expertise and materials, and are what lead movements to develop 'broader senses of meaning' (1992b, 8).

However, if the links are infrequent, brief and relaxed, they may amount to little more than a friendship between two people who may not share interests, and will not necessarily give the movement a sense of unity through shared meanings. The link could feasibly constitute just a brief consultation of a webpage, which, only at a stretch, would sufficiently network individuals. Moreover, the cursorily linked people could be engaging in completely non-compatible forms of action and have vastly different ideas regarding the need to protect or preserve the environment. Such cursory information sharing is a very weak network dimension, partly because it is informal and could be infrequent. I consider it too weak to measure meaningful networking – and especially to measure a social movement dynamic – because most people at best only skim read the information they receive. Rosy White, the Campaign to Protect Rural England Senior Development Officer, for example, said in an interview (in October 2003) that: 'Well, as a fairly typical member of these organizations, I don't read the stuff [received from other organizations] properly and possibly for not until about six months later'.

Within organizations, information from other organizations tends to get stockpiled, while the work demands of their own organizations and routines of everyday life are prioritized. Activists will not necessarily find information from other groups particularly informative or useful. According to Waugh (Volunteer Coordinator, London Wildlife Trust, interview, June 2003), much of the information she looks at from other organizations is 'fairly glib . . . and designed for a public audience and not of much use'. Similarly, Robertshaw (voluntary warden, Chiswick Wildlife Group), mostly finds the monthly glossy magazines she receives unhelpful to her conservation work:

Mostly because we are at a stage where if we need information, we need specific information. And these magazines are for a public audience . . . they don't tell you how to do butterfly transects . . . because that would be deadly boring for the public. (Interview, February 2004)

I would, therefore, argue that Diani's (1992a) suggestion that the network dimension of a movement can be informal and irregular is too weak – especially for a study of environmental networks. Information often flows only one way and has no effect. If it is stockpiled, ignored or is too basic then it is clearly not leading to the development of the 'broader senses of meaning' deemed necessary to bind movements together

(Diani 1992a: 8). Although engagement in collective action is part of Diani's definition, he only recently came to insist on a collaborative network. In this book I shall look mostly at collaborative links between environmental organizations in London that are part of an environmental network, although I also consider the extent to which they share information. I suggest, in tune with Diani and Bison (2004) that collaborative networking is what really binds organizations together, not cursory or brief information passing links.

Concluding remarks

This chapter has defined environmental networks and stressed their relationship to definitions of social movements. Research which analyses the interaction between environmental organizations is better addressed through a study of environmental networks rather than environmental movements. It allows avoidance of conceptual confusion surrounding the term 'social movements'. This is a term sometimes used to talk only of organizations and activists that engage in non-institutional protest and which seek profound change to the social order via political conflict against an identifiable opponent. Viewing social movements as such precludes development of an understanding of the links that exist between different types of environmental organizations. Organizations using a wide variety of tactics that are, (a) networked; and (b) seek to preserve or protect the environment, are considered part of London's environmental networks. Tactics can vary from the pressure group-like approach taken by organizations like Friends of the Earth, to the practical conservation focus of groups like London Wildlife Trust, or the autonomous networking space found in radical social centres. I shall continue to include conservationists in the analysis that follows because I am interested to find out more about their extent of networking with other environmental organizations, even if they cannot be convincingly be considered part of an environmental movement.

Now that the scene has been set, I proceed in Chapter 3 to look in more detail at several key campaigns and environmental organizations in London.