Saunders, Clare. "Key Organizations and Campaigns in London's Environmental Networks." *Environmental Networks and Social Movement Theory*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013. 45–73. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472544490.ch-003>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 12:35 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.

3 Key Organizations and Campaigns in London’s Environmental Networks

This chapter describes London’s environmental networks in more detail. Although it focuses on the state of play in key environmental organizations in 2003 – the year the primary research for this book was conducted – it has been updated to include more recent developments. It provides background to the organizations that were selected for more in-depth study (see Table 3.1) and on two key campaigns – climate change and aviation – for which networking patterns are analysed in the chapters that follow. All of the organizations introduced in this chapter are part of London’s environmental networks – they are based in London, are networked to others *and* seek to preserve or protect the environment. The campaigns that are introduced have involved a number of organizations working collaboratively, illustrating how environmental networks deploy their strengths. The chapter also demonstrates the diversity of approaches among environmental organizations, building on the previous chapters and setting the scene for the analysis that follows in the rest of the book.

Table 3.1 The ten study groups

	Conservationists	Reformists	Radicals
Southeast	Plumstead Common Environment Group	Greenwich Friends of the Earth	*
Northeast	Chiswick Wildlife Group	Hillingdon Friends of the Earth	*
Regional	London Wildlife Trust	London Friends of the Earth	Environmental Direct Action Group
National	Campaign to Protect Rural England	Friends of the Earth Greenpeace	*

Note: *Denotes that there were no environmental organizations of this type available to research

National environmental organizations

Campaign to Protect Rural England

The Campaign to Protect Rural England seeks to preserve and protect the countryside by preventing urban sprawl, supporting rural communities and their services and preventing developments that harm the ‘beauty and tranquillity’ of the countryside. It was established after the First World War, when England was being reconstructed with vigour, suburbanization was reshaping the landscape, ribbon developments were taking over the countryside and advertisement boards were creeping out of towns and cities onto rural roadsides. Under the leadership of well-known planners like Abercrombie and Williams-Ellis, it initially sought to redress suburbanization’s adverse effects on the countryside (Campaign to Protect Rural England 2000: 3 cf. Williams-Ellis [1928] 1996). Building upon this, in 1940–60, it began actively opposing motorway and power station developments. By 1968, it had changed its name from the Council for the *Preservation* of Rural England, to Council for the *Protection* of Rural England, to reflect the more proactive role it was taking in countryside protection, having been instrumental in the establishment of the 1968 Countryside Act (Campaign to Protect Rural England 2000: 5).

By the 1990s, the Campaign was demonstrating broader commitment to sustainability (Campaign to Protect Rural England 1993), setting out how to make the most of the planning system its founders established. It also began with public engagement, improving its relations with the press. This change of focus is reflected in its more recent (2003) name change from *Council* for the Protection of Rural England, to *Campaign* to Protect Rural England.

The Campaign’s strength lies in its strong relationship with government ministers and intricate knowledge of the planning system. In 2000, it took a lead role in campaigning alongside 10 other environment/planning organizations to reform the planning laws (Friends of the Earth 2002a).¹ This campaign was followed in 2002 with a successful attempt to prevent fast-tracking of the planning system for large infrastructural projects.² In the spring of 2012, it was once again actively campaigning against reforms to the planning system that would make it difficult for local authorities to oppose development. Despite its emphasis on the planning system, it has also worked on urban regeneration, rural policy, mineral extraction and energy use.

The organization consists of a national office, with a network of 43 county branches and 200 district groups that function as autonomous entities. County branches and local groups screen local planning applications, campaign against them if appropriate and promote positive solutions. Although tempting to classify the Campaign as ‘reformist’ because, among other things, it seeks policy gains via lobbying and joins reformist coalitions, the organization was selected as an

organization for qualitative study because it is the best example of a London-based national conservation organization. As illustrated in Chapter 2, environmental organizations do not consistently match ideal types. But Campaign to Protect Rural England is the only London-based national organization with a conservationist ideology. It cannot be denied that the Campaign has overarching emphasis on the countryside. Its historical claim that it 'is the only independent organization concerned with the care and improvement of the whole of England's *countryside*' (Campaign to Protect Rural England 1993, emphasis added) is challenged today only by the Wildlife Trusts, whose headquarters is outside of London. The National Trust, based in Warrington, Cheshire, focuses much of its conservation efforts on heritage sites.

Friends of the Earth, England, Wales and Northern Ireland

Seeking to be '*the* environmental justice organisation', Friends of the Earth's mission statement (2003–8) stated that:

Friends of the Earth will work with others to create a sustainable global community where protection of the environment and meeting people's needs go hand in hand. We strive for societies where people have decided to build the conditions for everyone to enjoy a dignified existence and good livelihood while not impinging on the rights of others to achieve a good life. (Friends of the Earth 2002b: 8)

Friends of the Earth England, Wales and Northern Ireland (ENWI, from here on simply 'Friends of the Earth') was established in 1971 by David Brower, founder of Friends of the Earth US. Its first high-profile media action involved dumping hundreds of non-returnable bottles on Schweppes' doorstep. Starting from a small office (less than a quarter of the size of the basement in their current six-floor building) with six desks, Friends of the Earth (EWNl) now has a staff of around 160. Its reputation, built upon long-standing emphasis on careful research, has been enhanced by on-going professionalization.

David Brower began the Friends of the Earth strategy of waging political battles to protect the environment back in 1970. Traditionally, Friends of the Earth worked at creating a climate of opinion to mobilize the public to pressurize institutions it considered most likely to have capacity to solve environmental issues. Its targets include political parties, government, international forums and businesses. The structure of the organization enables such activity at the national, international, regional and local levels under its motto of 'Thinking Globally, Acting Locally' (Lamb 1996: 50–1). However, there is an increasing tendency for Friends of the Earth to appeal directly to decision-makers: the parliamentary team tactically lobbies MPs,

and drafts bills with the hope of instigating new environmental legislation. Examples include the Warm Homes (1990), Road Traffic Reduction (1997), Doorstep Recycling (2003) and Climate Change (2008) Acts. It works with businesses, but takes a cautious approach. In the main, it establishes relationships with ethical companies – working with the best to pressurize the rest (Juniper, 2000).

Friends of the Earth's main themes for 2003–8 were environmental justice, sustainable economies, environmental limits and accountability/participation. The environmental justice theme aimed to make issues of social, economic and racial equality central to the way the public and decision-makers viewed environmental issues. It incorporated a campaign for 'climate justice', seeking an equitable climate change treaty, and 'action for justice', working with community groups suffering from injustices. 'Environmental limits' incorporated campaigns against waste, recognizing the limits to what humans can extract from and dispose of in the environment. 'Sustainable economies' aimed to develop a sustainable economics agenda at technical and public levels, incorporating an attempt to 'curb the power of the supermarkets' and to 'derail the WTO'. Other aspects of sustainable economics included 'corporate accountability' and 'reducing resource use', which promoted zero waste policies. 'Accountability/participation' sought to improve grassroots capacity for environmental campaigning in and outside Friends of the Earth.

Ultimately, it is the board of directors, which is influenced by senior staff, that decides Friends of the Earth's formal policies. The board has a maximum of 17 members, 10 of whom are elected by local groups (Rootes 2002: 23). Between 2003 and 2008, campaigns were organized on the basis of the themes noted above, directed by team leaders. Paul De Zylva led (and in early 2012 continues to lead) the England team, coordinating 12 Regional Campaign Coordinators (RCCs) who seek a regional presence in strategic planning. Since 2002, there has been a concerted effort to involve local groups more effectively in strategic planning and a capacity building team exists to support local groups (Friends of the Earth 2002b). In 2003, Friends of the Earth had 193 local groups (but 229 were listed on the website in January 2011).

Friends of the Earth currently (in 2011) structures its work around the themes of futurity, equity and change. It is campaigning to 'fix the food chain', for warm homes, to persuade local councils to 'get serious' about CO₂, and for a secure international climate change agreement. Environmental justice remains central to its work.

Greenpeace UK

Greenpeace UK (from here on, simply Greenpeace) is probably Britain's most well-known environmental organization. Its principles are bearing witness,

non-violence, direct action and internationality (Torrance, the Greenpeace Network Developer, interview 2003). Its current vision (2011) is to work towards 'a green and peaceful world – an earth that is ecologically healthy and able to nurture life in all its diversity' (Greenpeace website 2011³).

Greenpeace (International) began in 1971 when committed anti-nuclear activists hired a barely seaworthy boat attempting to bear witness and physically obstruct atomic tests off the coast of Amchitka, Alaska. Since then, Greenpeace has developed almost beyond recognition. The UK branch of Greenpeace International was established in 1977 and, unlike Friends of the Earth, initially prioritized bearing witness and direct action over research and lobbying. Over time, Greenpeace has become more committed to careful research, which now informs its policies and campaigns, establishing the Greenpeace Research Laboratories at London's Queen Mary's College in 1987, which relocated to the University of Exeter in 1992.

Unlike Friends of the Earth, which has a broad agenda for encouraging sustainability that encompasses environmental, economic and social themes, Greenpeace tends to focus on a few key global issues at a time, following a long established pattern of selecting just a handful of visible campaigns. In 2003, Greenpeace UK's campaigns were climate change/renewable energy, ancient forests, PVC, GM food, nuclear power and protection of the oceans. In 2011, it had moved on to climate change, 'beyond oil', protecting forests, defending oceans and working for peace.

Greenpeace's organizational structure has been likened to that of a corporate enterprise (Doyle and McEachern 1998). Campaign teams are centrally coordinated, with top-down management – from Greenpeace International, to the director, to the campaign team leaders, to local groups and 'active supporters'. In early 2012, there were 88 local groups listed on Greenpeace's website. Prior to 1995, Greenpeace local groups were confined to fund-raising and distributing Greenpeace literature. This has changed considerably as Greenpeace began to realize local groups' potential for raising awareness. By the early 2000s, Greenpeace local groups were actively campaigning. For example, in 2003, local groups participated in the Scary Dairy campaign targeting Sainsbury's stores. This involved dressing up as cows, drawing attention to GM animal feed, giving out free organic milk and asking customers to sign a postcard asking the store to stop selling GM-contaminated milk. In addition to local groups, Greenpeace has an active supporters' network, which contains activists not necessarily affiliated with a local group. Active supporters put themselves forward, usually via the Greenpeace website, to help with lobbying, or to offer their legal and media skills. At least until 2004, they received a monthly *Network* magazine including details of recent Greenpeace campaigning activities. Communication to and among Greenpeace activists increasingly takes place via the 'get active' section of the

Greenpeace website, which includes blogs and reports and posts opportunities for involvement.

Greenpeace's famous media stunts are carefully planned and coordinated by employed campaigners. If there is an outward appearance of fewer such stunts, it is because of the increasing emphasis placed on solutions-based campaigning (as evident in *Greenpeace Business* – the bi-monthly publication Greenpeace produces for a business audience – and declining media attention). According to Rootes (2002: 29) Greenpeace – although historically rarely invited to formal consultative meetings as a result of its critical stance towards them – has increasingly frequent meetings with government ministers and civil servants.

Although Doherty (2002) includes Greenpeace as part of his 'Green movement' because of its focus on direct action, for this study it is regarded as a reform organization, albeit a fairly radical one, not afraid to strategically break the law (Rucht 1995⁴). Although Greenpeace uses direct action, it tends not to do so in order to directly change things itself, but to levy pressure on governments and corporations via exposure in the media. In a reformist style, Greenpeace's direct actions are 'backed up by sophisticated political lobbying and scientific inquiry' (Brown and May 1991: 5).

Regional environmental organizations

London Wildlife Trust

Although the field of action for conservation organizations usually centres on practical projects and seeking changes in legislation (Chapter 2), London Wildlife Trust, one of the largest and strongest Trusts in the national network, has always been involved in fighting controversial planning applications (Dwyer and Hodge 1996). To an extent, this reflects the nature of the urban environment, which means that it acts in a very different manner to its counterparts in rural areas. In rural areas, there are considerably fewer controversial planning applications/decisions. The overarching aim of London Wildlife Trust is to sustain and enhance London's wildlife habitats. Although it engages in reformist strategies, it is clear that these are deployed in the interest of protecting sites that are important for wildlife. As its website⁵ states:

London Wildlife Trust is the only charity dedicated solely to protecting the capital's wildlife and wild spaces, engaging London's diverse communities through access to our nature reserves, campaigning, volunteering and education.

London Wildlife Trust was established in 1981. The first campaign it became involved in sought to prevent gravel extraction at the wildlife rich sites of Walthamstow

Marshes and Frays Farm Meadows. A practical project was embarked upon later that year and two acres of land were reclaimed from the rear of Kings Cross Station to create what is now the Trust's flagship reserve at Camley Street. In 2001, a Greater London Authority contract to resurvey London's wildlife sites was embarked upon, making London Wildlife Trust essentially an 'insider' – working *inside* the corridors of power – from a conservationist perspective at regional level. According to Gaines (Director of the Trust for five years before his secondment in 2002):

What is undeniable is that the Trust has grown from a small committed group of people struggling to bring the capital's natural environment to the attention of all Londoners to a thriving and diverse organisation involved in all aspects of nature conservation. (Gaines 2003: 9)

In 2003, the Trust was concerned with the conservation implications of the UK Olympics bid, 'brownfield sites' (London Wildlife Trust 2002: 5), housing expansion in the Thames Gateway area and Stratford and a review of planning laws. Its campaigns in 2011 were for wildlife friendly gardens, against climate change and to 'save our seas'. The latter was part of a national Wildlife Trust campaign that sought to show public support for a robust network of Marine Protected Areas. Although the Trust garnered public support for Marine Protected Areas using a petition, it usually campaigns using insider strategies. In addition to campaigning, it also engages in practical conservation and supports local reserves. It opposes development on important wildlife sites, but has been working to make development more sustainable in certain areas, rather than opposing it point-blank.

The Trust is managed by a Council of Management, which sets policy and manages staff and budgets. Central Office facilitates information flows between Council, local groups, reserves and the national office. It also provides an overarching strategic perspective on London's nature conservation issues, raises funds, maintains membership databases, produces public information and delivers an education programme. Local groups consist of volunteers engaging in activities such as fund-raising, promotion, reserve management and local planning issues. In total, London Wildlife Trust manages 57 nature reserves, 6 of which are staffed, and the rest manned by dedicated volunteers (Hartley 1997: 1). The Hillingdon Group of the London Wildlife Trust, for example, is responsible for looking after wildlife sites in the Ickenham area – Gutteridge Wood and Yeading Brook Meadows.

London Friends of the Earth

London Friends of the Earth is one of nine regional Friends of the Earth offices based in the national Friends of the Earth office. The other regional Friends of the Earth groups have separate offices and are run by Regional Campaign

Coordinators who coordinate campaigns that affect their region, monitor policy developments within the English regions and play a support function for local groups. London Friends of the Earth has been constructive in developing London-wide networks of anti-GM campaigners in order to inject this issue into regional governance. In physical terms, London Friends of the Earth consists of only the Regional Campaign Coordinator, Jenny Bates, with support from national staff, the Capacity Building team⁶ and local groups. Bates is responsible for 28 local Friends of the Earth groups.

Between 1997 and 2003, London Friends of the Earth was coordinated by Paul de Zylva, who in 1998–2000 worked extensively with a community in Enfield on the issue of contaminated land, culminating in the publication of the Friends of the Earth briefing *Safe as Houses*. During 2003, under Jennifer Bates, London Friends of the Earth was heavily involved in aviation campaigning and the Thames Gateway bridge proposals. It continues to work on both of these, and also seeks to make London a sustainable city: challenging the emphasis on economic growth in the London Development Masterplan, and helping to ensure that the 2012 Olympics become a ‘beacon of sustainability’. It uses a very conventional form of campaigning activity, arguably more so than national Friends of the Earth. It has close links with the London Sustainability Exchange, and London 21 Sustainability Network.

Environmental Direct Action Group

The Environmental Direct Action Group is a small but active group of radical environmentalists who campaign ‘against the root causes of climate change’, which for them means government power structures and large corporations. It is hard to say much more about its origins without breaching the confidentiality promised to group members.⁷

The Environmental Direct Action Group works for climate justice and equality. Its protests are organized through weekly meetings, emails and some telephoning. Group decisions are made on a consensus basis and there is no leader. Naturally, as in most decentralized groups, certain individuals fall into roles suited to their skills and personalities (Saunders 2009b), including one activist who was particularly adept at leaflet design and another who most often compiled action reports for the Indymedia website. The group engages in a range of actions from Friends of the Earth-style street campaigning and Greenpeace-style banner hanging, through to office occupations and disruption of conferences (for more information, see ‘climate change campaigning’ section, below). During 2010, the group protested against consumerism and nuclear power and joined the Crude Awakening blockade of Coryton Oil Refinery.

Local environmental organizations

Plumstead Common Environment Group

Plumstead Common Environment Group was formed in the spring of 1991 by a small group of local people concerned about neglected local green spaces. A ravine that is now a beautiful nature reserve used to be a hotspot for fly tipping until group members cleared the area. The group have also restored a highly polluted pond in the heart of the Common that has since become a successful breeding site for ducks and moorhens.

More recently, Plumstead Common Environment Group turned its attention to trying to prevent dog defecation, litter and graffiti on the Common. To raise attention, offending faeces were marked with flags on a 'dog poo day' in 1999, alerting dog walkers and residents to the extent of spoilage. This was followed by a highly successful pooper-scooper display. Since then the amount of defecation has been significantly reduced, aided by Greenwich Borough Council's 'clear it up' logos painted on the main paths through the Common. Volunteers not only engage in the usual conservation tasks, but have on occasions been involved in mass litter clearance, sometimes removing an entire van load at a time. They also keep a watchful eye on planning applications affecting the Common, and successfully campaigned against a mobile phone mast in 2001. The group has a very close relationship with Greenwich Borough Council and frequently spurs it into taking positive action to assist with the management and conservation of the Common. Into the 2010s, it has continued to work on campaigns against environmental crime and to run conservation volunteer task days to maintain the ponds and nature reserve. As with other conservation-focused groups, there is something of tendency for it to engage in reformist-type actions, such as lobbying the council. But its overarching emphasis on the wildlife of the Common confirms that its field of action is very much conservationist.

Greenwich and Lewisham Friends of the Earth

Greenwich and Lewisham Friends of the Earth is bound by the Friends of the Earth Partnership Agreement that lays out expectations of local groups. This dictates that they should campaign on at least one national Friends of the Earth campaign, but can campaign on other issues depending on members' interests and opportunities. They are expected to have a public profile raised through the media, posters and leaflets or through staging stalls and events. All actions they carry out should be lawful, reflecting overall Friends of the Earth policy and be non-party political. Local group members should be encouraged to attend training events, conferences and consultation events and at minimum have a treasurer and coordinator. Group

members should be contactable by phone/email and local group meetings are to be welcoming and open to all. In return, Friends of the Earth provides public liability insurance, a range of support material, and invites groups to participate in strategy and policymaking. It also provides a Local Group's Support Fund, access to information and updates on campaigns via national campaigners, a local groups' community website, and publications (e.g. the bi-monthly *Change Your World* local groups' magazine). When local groups sign up to the agreement under these conditions, they are then granted the legal right to use the name 'Friends of the Earth' (Friends of the Earth 2002c).

In common with London Friends of the Earth, much of Greenwich and Lewisham Friends of the Earth's efforts in 2000–3 involved working to prevent construction of the Thames Gateway road bridge. The two groups share this concern partly because Jennifer Bates was, for a short while, coordinating both. It has also taken part in Stop Esso actions (see below). In 1999, Greenwich and Lewisham Friends of the Earth was heavily involved in opposing plans for the millennium dome site and the 'sustainable millennium village', which, according to campaigners, made a mockery of the principle of sustainability (cf. Gordon 1994, Bates interview, February 2001). As a result of her in-depth research and analysis into the issues surrounding the Greenwich Peninsular development, Bates became Friends of the Earth spokesperson on the issue. Since then, she has made an increasingly positive impact, culminating in her appointment as London Regional Campaigns Coordinator. Greenwich Friends of the Earth, typical of most local Friends of the Earth groups engages in lobbying, stalls, Friends of the Earth-designed days of action and fund-raising. Since 2003, it has been involved in the Big Ask campaign (see below) a 'Biofools' campaign – against biofuels – and in a live-local-shop-local campaign.

Chiswick Wildlife Group

Unlike most London Wildlife Trust 'branches', Chiswick Wildlife Group focuses on one nature reserve and only monitors local planning proposals likely to directly affect the reserve. It manages Gunnersbury Triangle Nature Reserve, Chiswick (northwest London), a triangular shaped green space wedged between a road, and two train tracks (the Piccadilly Line and a National Rail line). In total, the reserve covers six acres and is a patchwork of habitats – wild woodland, wetlands, pond and meadow. It is one of the London Wildlife Trust's Key Sites, and as such has a paid warden throughout the summer months of the year.

Chiswick Wildlife Group was established in 1984 when a group of local people vigorously campaigned to save from development what was then a piece of waste ground. London Wildlife Trust helped the campaigners, resulting in the site's

designation as a nature reserve. It was a landmark case, being the first time a local council was forced to refuse planning permission due to newly founded nature reserve status.

Chiswick Wildlife Group has managerial control of the Gunnersbury reserve, but it is at the dictates of London Wildlife Trust, which had been working to keep a tighter rein on its local groups. The committee meets bi-monthly in a local public house and has an annual general meeting at which committee members are elected. The committee includes a chair, borough representative, events manager and voluntary warden.

Chiswick Wildlife Group and its summer warden follow the centrally coordinated management plan to create and maintain a bio-diverse haven. Volunteers engage in practical conservation work every Tuesday and on occasional Sundays. Pond clearance, bramble pruning, removal of invasive or non-native species, path maintenance, tree pruning/felling and wildlife monitoring are among the necessary tasks. Besides general maintenance of the Triangle, the group organizes a number of events to raise the profile of the reserve and generate community interest, hoping to recruit more volunteers. In summer 2003, the group ran a bird song evening, a butterfly and insect trail, a summer picnic and a guided walk focusing on mushrooms and other fungi. Numerous supervised visits from local schoolchildren were conducted. Chiswick Wildlife Group also write press releases to get local news coverage and leaflet the local community to raise awareness. Conservation volunteer days and education activities are scheduled to continue.

Hillingdon Friends of the Earth

At the start of its life, Hillingdon Friends of the Earth engaged in campaigns against whaling and used Greenpeace campaign materials to help spread its message. It used to show Greenpeace footage at its meetings to enthuse newcomers. In the early 1980s, the group was very active and relatively youthful, but over time, membership has dropped and the stalwarts have aged (Sweeting interview, February 2004).

The group was involved, in a supportive capacity, in the campaign against the third runway at Heathrow airport. Although members were encouraged to respond to the consultation and send a pre-printed Friends of the Earth postcard to their MPs, the main role Hillingdon Friends of the Earth played was the provision of a £200 donation to West London Friends of the Earth to pay for a new combined phone, fax and answering machine (Hillingdon Friends of the Earth 2003).

Monthly public meetings used to consist of talks from key speakers until the numbers attending meetings dwindled to seven or fewer. The group is a regular participant in Hillingdon Wildlife Week, an annual event to promote wildlife in the borough. It has also been working on producing a recycling directory which is to be

posted on Hillingdon Borough Council's website. The group continues to promote itself at local fairs and fetes and was actively involved in the campaigns to introduce and then strengthen the Climate Change Act (2008).

Key environmental campaigns in London

Climate Change Campaigning

Climate change is emphasized in this book because of its significance as a major global environmental issue and the coinciding surge in the frequency of protests and campaigns on the issue. Climate change can be said to have replaced sustainable development as the defining environmental issue of this century (Connelly et al. 2012). The Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC), suggests that temperatures may rise between 1.1 and 6.4°C throughout the course of the twenty-first century, and that most of this rise is 'very likely' due to human activities. It reports that 'eleven of the twelve years (1995–2006) rank among the twelve warmest years in the instrumental record of global surface temperature (since 1850)' (IPCC 2007: 33). There is 'high confidence' that this will have a range of dramatic effects on weather patterns and ecosystems.

Given the severity of the issue, it is perhaps not surprising that a broad range of environmental organizations have played a role in campaigns against climate change. Before I detail campaigns, I present a brief précis of international policymaking on climate change as this provides useful contextual information for understanding the campaign responses. After discussing general climate change campaigning, the campaign against the Baku Ceyhan pipeline is outlined.

International policymaking

Annual international ministerial meetings entitled Conference(s) of the Parties to the Climate Convention Meeting (COP) have been held since 1995 to make progress on implementing the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), signed by over 150 nations at the Rio Earth Summit (1992). Until the Kyoto Protocol was ratified in 2004, the Convention amounted merely to a suggestion that parties to it make voluntary reductions of greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2000.

At the first conference in Berlin (COP1), spring 1995, 116 nations agreed that climate change was the most pressing environmental policy field requiring partnership to achieve the Convention's objectives. The second conference (COP2), a year and a quarter later began to work on a protocol to ensure that nations fulfilled commitments. The Kyoto Protocol was christened at COP3, 1997, setting legally binding targets for emissions reductions.⁸ Global reduction targets were set at approximately 5 per cent below 1990 levels by 2012, with Britain committed to a 12.5 per cent reduction (although Britain had an independent target of 20%).

By 2000, it was apparent to environmental organizations like Friends of the Earth and radical grassroots protesters that the negotiations were failing to bring about concrete agreements and that targets were either too weak, or, in the view of some, significantly diluted by flexible clauses. This perception was strengthened when the COP6 (2000) negotiations at The Hague collapsed due to vociferous demands made by the industrial lobby and the US government that emission reductions be lessened. According to a Rising Tide (2000a) briefing, 'COP6 looked more like a trade fair than an intergovernmental conference looking at ways to solve one of the world's most pressing environmental problems', as industrialists sought ways of profiteering from the 'carbon economy'. Indeed, it cannot be denied that economic concerns hampered the progress of the protocol, especially in the United States. Shortly before the then President Bush Jnr rejected the protocol, the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the US company Imperial Oil told a journalist:

Kyoto is an economic entity. It has nothing to do with the environment. It has to do with world trade. This is a wealth transfer scheme between developed and developing nations. And it's been couched and clothed in some kind of environmental movement. That's the dumbest-assed thing I've heard in a long time. (quoted in Greenpeace 2002a)

Many were not surprised when, in March 2001, Bush announced – under pressure from industry and oil companies (especially Exxon Mobil, more on this later) – that he would not ratify the Kyoto Protocol. This has rendered it virtually toothless to deal with climate change given that the United States produces around a quarter of global greenhouse gas emissions.

COP9, which coincided with the fieldwork reported upon in this book, was held in Milan in December 2003, by which time most of the rules on the operation of the protocol had been agreed. Media attention during COP9, however, was focused upon whether or not Russia would ratify the protocol. Until June 2004, Russia had still not ratified,⁹ leading to consternation among campaigners that the agreement would not come into force, because to do so it needed to be ratified by enough industrialized countries to account for a total of 55 per cent of their collective emissions. Without Russia on board, the figure would have been only 44 per cent (Osborn and Castle 2004). Friends of the Earth campaigners from Russia claimed that Russia was playing a political game, using delaying tactics to seek further concessions from the European Union. Although Russia has now ratified, it continued to appear to campaigners that each round of COP negotiations resulted in a weakening of the Protocol.

Unfortunately, COP13 in Bali in 2007 did not reassure commentators, with Christoff (2008) branding the resultant Bali road map a 'rough goat track'. It did,

however, set out that a future climate change strategy would be based on the four pillars of mitigation, adaptation, technology and finance. COP15 in Copenhagen in 2009 was hailed by many commentators as a last-ditch attempt to save the world from dangerous climate change. Unfortunately, it was a notable failure. The outcome of the conference was the Copenhagen Accord, a non-committal document, drafted by a small group of countries behind closed doors, and which parties to the conference agreed only to 'take note' of. Although developing countries agreed to reduce their emissions for the first time, the document lacked reference to specific emission reduction targets. It also opened up debates about the lack of democracy in the proceedings of the UNFCCC, with countries like Tuvalu, Venezuela, Bolivia, Cuba and Nicaragua dismissing the Accord on the grounds of collusion of a narrow group of states (Dimitrov 2010). Friends of the Earth was dismayed, but other more radical environmental organizations merely had their gloomy prognosis confirmed.

Campaign responses

One should not be surprised to note there is a general feeling among environmental campaigners that UNFCCC negotiations are resulting in little, if any, progress in preventing or halting climate change. For some organizations (such as the Environmental Direct Action Group), the UNFCCC framework was never anything more than a sinking ship. Others, including Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace and Campaign Against Climate Change, have, historically at least, regarded securing an international agreement on climate-changing emissions, no matter how weak, as an essential stepping stone towards achieving more stringent targets. A wide range of environmental organizations – whether or not they believe in incremental reformist change – argues the case for a rapid and significant reduction in emissions of greenhouse gases.

Since 1997, COP discussions have been visited by demonstrations, rallies, marches and media stunts highlighting the need for urgent action.¹⁰ COP6 at The Hague saw the first International Environmental Direct Action Group festival as eco-anarchists engaged in direct action, from blockading to 'pieing'.¹¹ The Environmental Direct Action Group network originated in the Netherlands, and was at first a response to what its activists considered a flailing COP6. Shortly afterwards, it spread to Britain via ties between radical activists.

Also at COP6, Friends of the Earth campaigners created a mock dyke to draw media attention to the flooding issues associated with climate change (Rising Tide 2000b). London activists drawn from Reclaim the Streets joined in with solidarity actions in London attempting to alert the City of London to the causes of climate change. These included a festival style protest with a sound system and the

Rhythms of Resistance Samba Band. In addition, the Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions offices in London were occupied in opposition to the government's road building programme and, especially, to publicize links between increased traffic and climate change (Rising Tide 2000c).

The Campaign Against Climate Change was established in all but name in the aftermath of COP6 in The Hague. Inspired by his participation in the Hague protests, appalled by US attempts to weaken the Kyoto Protocol and dismayed with Friends of the Earth's lack of follow-up activity, Phil Thornhill, founder of the Campaign, on his return to London, began a one-man fortnight-long vigil outside the US Embassy. This was followed by a series of once-a-week vigils supported by the Green Party and some local Friends of the Earth activists. Describing himself as a 'sixties child', Thornhill had in mind to create a Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament-style protest organization. At the time of Bush's inauguration, the Campaign Against Climate Change staged a demonstration as a plea to him to take Kyoto more seriously, including a symbolic media action with 'Uncle Sam' setting fire to a globe. When Bush announced that he intended to reverse a US decision on the capping of power station emissions, the Campaign Against Climate Change mobilized 20 activists who sported Bush heads and carried placards proclaiming Bush a 'Global Village Idiot' (Thornhill interview, June 2003).

On the day that Bush announced his country's exit from the Kyoto protocol, 60 activists turned up outside the US Embassy for the Campaign Against Climate Change's Bush is a 'Dirty Rat' day of action. Annual Kyoto Marches were held between 2001 and 2005, involving a long march from Exxon Mobil's Headquarters to the US Embassy, with a rally en route. Since 2006, the Campaign Against Climate Change has (co)organized large-scale rallies and demonstrations to coincide with the annual COP meetings.

Stop Esso, like the Campaign Against Climate Change, was a response to Bush pulling out of the Kyoto Protocol. In particular, it drew attention to the relationship between Bush and Exxon Mobil (called Esso in Britain). Its key briefing (2001) stated that Esso had provided over \$1,086,080 to the Republican Party in the 2000 US presidential election, that it funded and partook in expensive anti-environmental 'fronts' to discredit climate change science (including the infamous Global Climate Coalition¹²), dismissed the potential of renewable energy, and actively lobbied Bush to withdraw from Kyoto.

Stop Esso consisted of Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth and student environmentalist network People and Planet. For the first two years, local activists in the branches of these organizations engaged in national days of action, picketing Esso petrol stations around the country. In 2004, Stop Esso turned its attention towards the lingering environmental effects of the Exxon Valdez oil spill, by lobbying

Chief Executive Officer Lee Raymond and encouraging supporters to write to him demanding that the company pay fair mitigation costs. By 2006, the network had ceased to be active.

At the 2003 COP in Milan, which coincided with fieldwork reported in this book, the protests were much less significant than they had been in Bonn three years earlier. Friends of the Earth Italy organized a march and rally with the theme 'Stop CO₂, Stop the Fossil Fuel Economy' and a student environmentalist network hung a banner proclaiming 'Stop Global War(m)'. A critical mass¹³ was held attracting an impressive 2,000 cyclists, and Friends of the Earth International staged one of its annual 'Treetanic' award ceremonies, which attempt to expose industrial-scale timber plantations seeking to unjustly profit from the Kyoto Protocol. The winner was PLANTAR, a Brazilian company specializing in charcoal production for the steel industry and barbecues with apparently little concern for the environment (Friends of the Earth International 2003). Although Friends of the Earth (ENWI) was not present, some of its campaigners and activists were. London and Oxford Environmental Direct Action Group activists joined the festivities.

In solidarity with Milan-based protesters, Environmental Direct Action Group activists staged street theatre outside the London United Nation offices entitled 'What's the Big Deal [about Kyoto]'. The aim of the play was to show how carbon-traders, business interests and what they considered to be compromising NGOs hide under the UN's cloak of respectability, giving the public the false impression that prevention of climate change is in hand. The play highlighted the group's concern that the Kyoto agreement worked against the interests of poor people from southern countries who suffer the worst consequences of climate change. Leaflets detailing radical activists' concerns about the inefficacy of Kyoto entitled 'Why Kyoto is Pants' were distributed to UN staff and passers-by.

In its tradition of bearing witness, Greenpeace began climate campaigning activity on the eve of the Kyoto agreement by reporting the retreat of ice witnessed during its voyages to the Arctic and Antarctic and seeking the views of native peoples. Since 1997, Greenpeace has vociferously campaigned against the opening up of new frontiers for oil exploration, especially near the poles and in the North Sea. In the late 1990s, Greenpeace campaigned heavily against oil company British Petroleum's (BP, now Beyond Petroleum) plans to turn the remote arctic Northstar Island into a 'fossil fuel factory'. In addition to conventional campaigning activity, this involved establishing an ice camp to monitor the progress of the development (Greenpeace 2000). Greenpeace's *Carbon Logic* (Hare 1997), showed how burning existing fossil fuel reserves could lead to dangerous climate change without even beginning to open up new frontiers. This research is the impetus behind many Greenpeace climate campaigns, and was endorsed by the Beyond Oil coalition

consisting of Friends of the Earth, Rising Tide, and Platform – an organization that works for social and ecological justice.

Using a multifaceted campaign approach that marks Greenpeace out as more reformist than radical, Greenpeace campaigners have purchased shares in companies like BP so that they can attend annual general and stakeholder meetings to raise the profile of environmental issues in corporate venues. Greenpeace has also been involved in COPs since the late 1990s and in solutions-based campaigning promoting renewable energy. Greenpeace helped launch a tidal power scheme, engaged in a partnership with Npower to help deliver 100 per cent wind-generated power, called Juice (Dorey interview, October 2003) and with the Peabody Trust, installed solar panels on Londoners' homes. In 2003 it became part of a Yes2Wind coalition, established to counteract what it considered to be misleading comments made by local anti-wind farm groups (one group, for example, was quoted making the claim that wind turbines cause grass-fires). Via the site, local people can meet up with others positively or negatively affected by wind farms, hear their views, arrange a visit to wind farms and make up their own minds about the effects.¹⁴

In addition to promoting renewables alongside Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth has been proactive in solutions campaigning by creating a Green Energy league table and encouraging people to choose greener suppliers (Friends of the Earth 2004). Friends of the Earth has also campaigned for the closure or conversion of the UK's remaining 16 coal-fired power stations, which it calls Carbon Dinosaurs. It has claimed that these old power stations produce over one-third more carbon dioxide than gas-fired alternatives and fail to meet EU efficiency standards (Friends of the Earth 2003a).

Since 2003, Friends of the Earth's most significant campaign on climate change has been the Big Ask. Friends of the Earth's parliamentary team drafted the legislation that is now the Climate Act (2008), and persuaded many of its local groups, including Greenwich and Lewisham Friends of the Earth and Hillingdon Friends of the Earth, to lobby MPs asking them to support the associated Early Day Motion. On 15 November 2006, the Queen announced to the opening of Parliament that 'my government will publish a bill on climate change as part of its policy to protect the environment' (Her Majesty, The Queen 2006). Friends of the Earth campaigners were subsequently successful in their lobbying efforts for more robust emission targets (from 60% on 1990 levels by 2050 to 80%) and the inclusion of aviation and shipping, but unable to secure desired year-on-year emission reduction targets.

The Campaign to Protect Rural England was slow to introduce climate change as a campaign issue but has been paying the issue increasing attention since 2004. Up until 2003, there was no mention of climate change in its transport policy statements (Campaign to Protect Rural England 2003a,b), although its energy statement noted

that climate change poses threats to the countryside and wider environment (Campaign to Protect Rural England 2003c). According to the Campaign to Protect Rural England, solutions to climate change should be through appropriately sited renewable energy developments, management of energy demand, an increase in energy efficiency and reducing the need to travel. It is currently (2011) working for 'an urgent and independent review of aviation policy as we believe it to be as scientifically illiterate as it is democratically challenged' (Campaign to Protect Rural England website 2011).¹⁵

The Baku Ceyhan Campaign

Despite international agreement at COP7 that Export Credit Agencies should facilitate transfer of climate friendly energy, the Export Credit Guarantees Department (ECGD) had, according to Greenpeace, by early 2003, provided 193 guarantees of support to 140 fossil fuel projects in 38 countries including Zimbabwe, China and Turkey, effectively offsetting gains made by Kyoto. As of June 2002, the ECGD had apparently not provided even a penny of assistance to renewable energy projects (Greenpeace 2002b). The case of the Baku Ceyhan pipeline is a textbook example of an unpopular ECGD-funded fossil fuel project. It is also useful to focus on this campaign because it reveals interesting patterns of interaction that exist between conservationist, reformist and radical organizations in London's environmental networks. While the radicals remained critical of reformists, they were able to work collaboratively under certain conditions. Radicals and reformists were both critical of conservationists (such as the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF)), which appeared to have been co-opted by corporate sponsors (see also Chapter 8).

The Baku Ceyhan Campaign was a coalition of organizations working to prevent construction of a BP-managed oil pipeline project. Although human rights and conservation issues were at stake, the campaign was largely motivated by concern about climate change. As Rau, then Climate Change Campaigner at Friends of the Earth, stated 'this project will supply new oil to Western economies which should be cutting their fuel consumption, and fuelling the oil addiction of countries which refuse to sign the Kyoto climate treaty' (Friends of the Earth 2002d). Unfortunately, the Campaign was unsuccessful in preventing the pipeline from being constructed, although it continued, until 2006, to work on raising 'public awareness of the social problems, human rights abuses and environmental damage' caused by the development.

The Baku Ceyhan pipeline, totalling 1,087 miles in length, now exports crude oil from Azerbaijani oil fields in the Caspian Sea region, through Georgia to a new export terminal at Ceyhan on the Turkish Mediterranean coast. Approximately one million barrels of oil travel through it daily (Muttitt and Marriot 2002). Loans from international

lending institutions have raised 66 per cent of the investment for the project. The Baku Ceyhan Campaign (2002) has estimated that the oil from the pipeline annually produces more carbon dioxide than all the road transport in California, or two and half times the gains the United Kingdom would make in meeting its 12.5 per cent Kyoto emissions reduction target.

The official Baku Ceyhan Campaign coalition consisted of Friends of the Earth (International), The Kurdish Human Rights Project (working to protect the human rights of people in Kurdish regions), Platform and The Corner House (a radical offshoot of *The Ecologist* magazine). Its international partners included CEE Bankwatch (an Eastern European organization working to minimize the social and environmental impacts of international development finance), Campagna per la Riforma della Banca Mondiale (a Rome-based environmental NGO that focuses on the role of international financial institutions) and Friend of the Earth International. In practice, Baku Ceyhan Campaign acted as two separate bodies – sometimes as a distinct organization with its own office, campaigners and constitution; other times as an umbrella organization for its collective members. Although not a part of the formal coalition, the Environmental Direct Action Group played a key role in protesting against the pipeline.

Most of the Campaign was focused on lobbying to prevent UK and European banks (including the UK Department for International Development [DFID], the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [EBRD] and the World Bank's International Finance Corporation [IFC]) from providing £2.3 million in public money that the pipeline's construction depended on. The direct action protest to which the Environmental Direct Action Group contributed, however, was more diverse and radical. It sought to cause havoc at as many of BP's events as possible.

In response to a Baku Ceyhan Campaign call to lobby the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development, 900 people commented on the adverse effects of the pipeline. Affiliated organizations also asked their supporters to lobby the then Secretary of State for International Development, Hilary Benn, asking him to prevent the funding of climate change inducing developments and to invest in green energy instead (Friends of the Earth 2002e). Friends of the Earth collected as many as 4,000 letters objecting to the use of public money for the pipeline, made a section of mock pipeline out of them and presented it to the Department for International Development (Friends of the Earth 2003b).

By mid-June 2003, a 120-day European Bank for Reconstruction and Development consultation period for informing the pipeline funding decision was underway. Campaigners viewed this as a last chance to stop the pipeline. Monthly Baku Ceyhan Campaign demonstrations were held outside the bank headquarters in Exchange Square, London, from July onwards. Friends of the Earth organized

the July protest and invited local group members and campaigners to come with a ready-made section of pipeline to symbolically link the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development offices with the BP offices and thereby raise public awareness of the funding issues. National Environmental Direct Action Group activists staged theirs in August, and the Baku Ceyhan Campaign was responsible for the September protest. The latter demonstration involved handing in signed letters from Turkish and Georgian people who would be negatively affected by the pipeline. This coincided with a Friends of the Earth organized mass fax action to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development president, to arrive at 12 noon on the same day as the protest. The demonstrations included chanting, music and dancing and were visited by a range of activists with various ideological leanings. The formal representation of conservationist organizations was conspicuously absent.

Environmental Direct Action Group activists attempted to maintain a frequent presence by appearing almost every Thursday at the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development offices. The stifling hot summer, the Earth First! summer gathering, and activist burnout meant that this did not always happen as intended. A gas-masked penguin was seen handing out leaflets at one of these demonstrations. An attempted occupation of the World Bank London offices, Milbank, by Environmental Direct Action Group activists was unsuccessful due to relatively heavy-handed security, but a successful demonstration was held outside. In October 2003, five activists from the Environmental Direct Action Group succeeded in occupying the Export Credit Guarantee Department director Vivian Brown's office for the best part of a morning, barricading themselves in, while forcefully informing the staff about the pipeline's problems. An accompanying banner was hung using the ECGD acronym: 'Exporting Corruption, Guaranteeing Destruction'.

October 2003 witnessed a 'Climate Trasher's Critical Mass' involving a dozen activists cycling around the streets of London causing transport mayhem and trying to raise awareness of links between the BTC pipeline and climate change. The journey incorporated visits to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, the Export Credit Guarantee Department, BP, private banks and construction companies involved in the pipeline project and the fossil fuel industry. Shortly afterwards, despite these actions and a letter writing campaign to Benn (then Secretary of State for International Development), asking him to influence the decision in the favour of the campaigners, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (in October 2003) and the International Finance Corporation (in November 2003) announced at board meetings that they would provide funding (Friends of the Earth 2003a).

By winter 2003, attention shifted to private banks as the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation funding

only contributed 10 per cent of the required sum. The BP-led consortium was in discussions with private banks including Barclays, Natwest, HSBC, Royal Bank of Scotland and Standard Chartered. Action shifted towards intensive letter writing (although by this stage many campaigners believed that the construction of the pipeline was a foregone conclusion). Under pressure from campaigners, Barclays refused to approve the loan for the project, but NatWest allegedly remained committed.

In addition to challenging international and British financial institutions, the Environmental Direct Action Group engaged in multifarious direct action stunts targeting BP. Only a couple of actions are chronicled here to give a flavour. In June 2004, they staged a greeting for BP at the BP-sponsored National Portrait Gallery. A leaflet was passed to attendees attempting to give 'a more accurate portrait' of BP than the harmless philanthropic art supporter it was purporting to be. The action involved activists wearing helios (BP logo) sunglasses and holding empty picture frames in front of their faces. Artists entering the awards were politely asked to refrain from attending future BP sponsored events and for help and support with a 'fossil-free' portrait award planned for summer 2004. The group also unfurled its large 'BP Sponsors Climate Change' banner at many BP sponsored events, including in the dinosaur hall of the Natural History Museum and outside the Tate Britain.

Aviation campaigning in London

Campaigning against climate change has taken a new focus in campaigns against aviation expansion, increasingly recognized as a significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. Along with major research institutes, environmental organizations have alleged that air travel is the fastest growing source of greenhouse gas emissions. Research sponsored by Friends of the Earth showed that, if the government goes ahead with its plans for airport expansion, greenhouse gas emissions from aircraft will increase by 350 per cent from 1990 levels by 2030, counteracting any positive effect in reducing emissions gained from increasing fuel tax, the climate change levy and Government promotion of renewables (Friends of the Earth 2003c). In other words, if the plans for runway expansion were to go ahead, this could 'totally destroy the Government's commitment to a 60% cut in carbon dioxide emissions by 2050' (Friends of the Earth 2003d). Note that the government has since committed to even higher greenhouse gas emission reductions of 80 per cent.

Setting the context

In July 2002, the government published its Regional Airport Studies consultation that assumed air travel demand will continue to grow and is best met by increasing capacity. It expected that between 2000 and 2020 the number of passengers passing

British airports would increase from 180 million annually to 400 million (Department for Transport 2003). To achieve this, airport capacity equivalent to Stansted airport would need to be built during each of the next 30 years (Airport Watch 2002). A second edition of the consultation document was produced in the autumn of 2003 after campaigners (especially from Cliffe and Stansted) successfully argued that Gatwick should be considered as an option for development after 2019. Gatwick was not included in the first consultation because of a legal agreement prohibiting expansion until 2019, secured by a campaign in the 1950s.

The *Southeast and East of England Regional Air Service Studies* (SERAS¹⁶, DETR 2000) predicted that air travel in the southeast (including London) will increase from 117 billion passengers a year in 2000 to 300 billion in 2030, and therefore that four new runways are required. The initial options for expansion included a third runway at Heathrow, a second at Gatwick, a second at Stansted and a new London airport (Cliffe in Kent, or an artificial island in the Thames estuary) with a supporting role to be played by Luton, Manston, Southampton and London City airports. British Airport Authority's preferred sites for new runways were Stansted (two), Gatwick (one) and Heathrow (one).

Responses to SERAS

Environmental organizations across spatial and ideological divides are united in concern over large-scale airport expansion. The Campaign to Protect Rural England is quoted as saying that 'the main pressure for new runways arises in the Southeast and East of England . . . but . . . we consider that no site can be found for a new runway, let alone a new airport, which would be acceptable on environmental grounds' (Airport Watch 2002: 3). The Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, which was shut down in 2011 due to budget cuts, used to provide the Queen, government and parliament with policy advice on environmental issues. It warned the government of the contribution that such increases in air traffic would make to climate change. English Nature, which was rebranded Natural England in 2006 and was responsible for conservation in the United Kingdom, including the designation of Sites of Special Scientific Interest, recommended an approach which 'dampens demand and sets environmental limits on airports' (Airport Watch 2002: 4).

The first national anti-aviation event after the release of the consultation document was the 'Airport Expansion: Options, Alternatives and Opportunities for Change' conference, in September 2002, organized by the London Green Party and Airport Watch – a then newly formed coalition consisting of Campaign to Protect Rural England, Friends of the Earth, Aviation Environment Federation, the National Society for Clean Air and Transport 2000 (now the Campaign for

Better Transport), set up to coordinate anti-aviation expansion groups. Its aims were twofold:

One . . . was to ensure local protest groups weren't NIMBY – that they were perfectly entitled to fight for their own backyard, but not to put it in somebody else's. And secondly, [to] link them in with the national organisations, and make arguments against airport expansion. (Stewart interview, February 2001)

The overall purpose of the conference was to 'examine the options put forward by the Government . . . to identify and agree [on] . . . alternatives . . . and to explore the potential for some joint or coordinated national campaigns' (Lucas 2002). Besides setting the scene for cooperation between groups campaigning against different runway/airport options, the conference laid out weaknesses of the consultation, concerns about planning laws, and raised climate change and air pollution issues.

West London Friends of the Earth produced an extensive 71-page response to the consultation, commenting on sustainable development implications, noise, the environment (air pollution, climate change, habitat loss) and economics, and concluding that the solution lies with managing demand for flights by removing tax breaks and placing VAT on fuel (Ferriday interview, 2003).¹⁷

During the consultation period, Friends of the Earth ran a campaign entitled *Brace Yourself*, encouraging armchair activists¹⁸ to put pressure on the Transport Secretary (then Alistair Darling) via Members of Parliament and by signing a pre-written letter raising concerns about the predict and provide approach, drawing attention to the need for removal of subsidies and tax breaks and recommending the replacement of short haul flights with high-speed rail alternatives. Subsequently, the Freedom to Fly coalition – the campaign's adversary – counterclaimed that everyone has the right to cheap flights and laid out a case for the economic importance of aviation. In retort, Friends of the Earth asked its supporters to sign a pre-printed letter to Richard Branson, Chairman of the Virgin Group (which includes Virgin Atlantic Airways) to alert him to public awareness that subsidies to the aviation industry come at the expense of people and the environment. During the consultation period, with a view to influencing people who may have been swayed by Freedom to Fly, Airport Watch issued an informative leaflet entitled *The Plane Truth . . . Myths Busted*.

For the Campaign to Protect Rural England, the main concern was that airport expansion would 'shatter the tranquillity of the countryside' (Campaign to Protect Rural England 2003d). Similar to its famous illustrated map comparing 'areas of tranquillity' in the 1960s to the 1990s, the Campaign drew up maps showing the areas that would be affected by flight paths and aircraft stacks in 2000 compared to 2030. The Campaign's consultants (TRL) showed that by 2030, 606,300 people in Britain would be seriously affected by aircraft noise – double current numbers. It

asked the government to draw up more effective sound contours, adopt the World Health Organisation's guidelines for acceptable noise levels, and extend restrictions on night flights. In addition, the Campaign to Protect Rural England in its consultation submission raised issues of air pollution, climate change, development resulting in loss of wildlife and countryside, widening of roads and ribbon development and set out the case for removal of tax exemptions.

The White Paper

The Future of Air Transport White Paper (2002) set out the government's recommendations for air transport for the next 30 years, but had no statutory authority to determine which runways should or should not be built. The choice of plans was placed firmly in the hands of developers and depended on the planning process (DfT 2002: 2–3). It fell very short of the optimistic expectations of environmental organizations. It regarded emissions trading to be the primary solution to aviation's contribution to greenhouse gases, suggested airport noise could be reduced by ad hoc measures and that legislation be implemented only when parliamentary time is available. In the southeast, the government recommended making 'the best use of the existing runways at the major southeast airports', including a second runway at Stansted to be built as soon as possible and operating by 2012, and further development at Heathrow 'provided that strict environmental conditions are met' between 2015 and 2020. In other UK regions, the government favoured extra runways at Birmingham and Edinburgh and encouraged regional airports to make full use of their current runways (DfT 2002: 6–7). This contrasts with environmental campaigners' view that the solution lies in managing demand for aircraft via removal of subsidies and tax breaks.

White Paper responses

Nationally, a second Airport Watch conference was held to discuss post-White Paper campaigning. Stewart's opening discussion concluded that the focus of campaigning needed shifting from targeting government, which had made up its mind, towards airlines and airport operators. Airport Watch and the Aviation Environment Federation have since worked on developing policy arguments on high-speed rail alternatives, climate change, noise and air pollution and economics (Stewart 2004).

After the release of the White Paper, the campaign to Stop Stansted Expansion (SSE) pulled out all the stops to influence British Airports Authority, organizing weekly public meetings and getting press coverage to alert local people. A conventional mix of lobbying, influencing the planning process and taking the campaign to the city to question the dubious financial status of the airport was undertaken (Barbone

2004). As an act of solidarity with communities threatened with airport expansion, London Earth First! occupied the offices of British Airports Authority for most of a morning in January 2004 and staged a demonstration, brandishing a 'No More Airport Expansion' banner and handing out leaflets to alert the public to aviation's environmental implications.

In March 2004, judicial review proceedings were instigated against the British government by local campaigners to challenge the green light it gave to airport expansion. Supported by local authorities, campaigners argued that key information was excluded from consultation documents, especially regarding the possibility of new airports on the Isle of Sheppey and at Thames Reach. Stansted campaigners also launched a judicial review, but theirs was focused on the way in which the specificity of the White Paper might unfairly influence the planning process, and on the government's inadequate assessment of environmental impacts (Clark 2004).

Although Stansted campaigners were not keen to cooperate with radical activists, they did compose a direct action pledge along the lines of the earlier Oxleas Woods Campaign's 'Beat the Bulldozer Pledge', aiming to persuade thousands to pledge to promise that they would engage in direct action if airport expansion goes ahead at Stansted. The story ended happily for Stansted campaigners: in the 2010 general election, all three major political parties pledged their opposition to the building of a new runway at Stansted. The coalition government has, at the time of writing, stood by its promise.

Heathrow airport campaigns

Despite strong opposition from a well-organized campaign that made articulate arguments, used a range of appropriate campaigning strategies, and incorporated strategic networking among a variety of community, noise, health and environmental organizations, construction of Heathrow airport's fifth terminal (T5) was completed in 2008. The T5 campaign is important in the context of this book because the campaign networks that developed were still largely intact when fieldwork was undertaken, and were strengthened by the Third Runway campaign that followed. Further, it illustrates well the process whereby campaigners become disillusioned with conventional channels of influencing the policy process and begin to see direct action as the only way to get their voices heard.

According to British Airways, the purpose of T5 was to modernize the airport to facilitate its future growth. It accommodates approximately thirty million passengers and covers 260 acres of land – expanding the size of the airport by almost 25 per cent. T5 alone is one of the three largest airports in Europe second only to Heathrow Terminals 1–4 and Zurich (Aitken 2002).

The campaign was run largely by local organizations alongside Friends of the Earth (national, London, West London and local groups) Heathrow and Communities Against Noise and the Green Party. It was focused on influencing the public inquiry, which commenced in May 1995, lasted a record-breaking 3 years and 10 months and finally ended, after sitting for 525 days, in March 1999. Shortly before the inquiry decision was announced, four Environmental Direct Action Group activists occupied British Airport Authority's boardroom to raise the profile of the issue and make links with climate change. After the release of the White Paper, some of the same activists repeated the action as London Earth First!.

T5 was given a green light by the then Transport Secretary, Stephen Byers, in November 2001. This was no surprise given that government regards aviation crucial for Britain's economic prosperity. Byers suggested that 'for London to compete as a world player and for it to remain a major financial centre, Terminal 5 will help it stay competitive' (quoted in Aitken 2001).

At the public inquiry, British Airports Authority promised that a third runway would not be required, despite T5 accommodating an extra 30 million passengers. Hence, when the third runway was put forward as a possible option for meeting aircraft demand in the Regional Aircraft Summaries Assessment, some campaigners were shocked, while for others it was just another tally in the long string of broken promises from British Airports Authority. The inspector at the planning inquiry for Terminal 4, for example, was 'strongly of the opinion that all possible steps should be taken to satisfy those living around Heathrow that this is the last major expansion' (Glidewell 2004). At the time, British Airports Authority agreed, stating that 'there are multiple risks associated with a 5th terminal . . . They add up to a total risk which is completely unacceptable' (BAA, February 1983, NoTRAG website, no longer available). Heathrow residents who have lived near the runway for at least two decades were waiting with bated breath in anticipation of an announcement for a third runway, and, although most were unsurprised, it was regarded as an audacious move, which served to fuel campaigner's anger. Given recommendations for a third runway at Heathrow, the White Paper was giving an amber light for a sixth terminal: 'We . . . suggest that the operator should carry out further work on proposals for terminal capacity' (DfT 2002). British Airports Authority, too, has admitted that if it has a third runway at Heathrow, a sixth terminal will be 'required' (Campaign to Protect Rural England 2003e).

According to Friends of the Earth, the decision to go ahead with T5 shows that 'the only aviation strategy the Government has is constant expansion and more public subsidy. It's no wonder that people have little faith in the decision-making process and the public inquiry system' (Friends of the Earth quoted in Aitken 2001). In October 2003, there was direct action at the construction site of T5,

which responded to the democratic deficit of planning inquiries reminiscent of the anti-roads protests of the nineties (see Chapter 5). In the autumn of 2003, eight activists, calling themselves Hounslow Against New Terminals (HANT) managed to outsmart security and scale 1 of the 22 cranes to erect a banner spelling out a demand for 'No Airport Expansion'. They kept a presence on site for over 100 hours after which they were brought before Uxbridge magistrate's court on charges of obstructing persons engaged in lawful activity and fined costs of £55.

HANT activists' court hearing was sympathetically supported by local residents and environmental organizations. Ferriday (coordinator of West London Friends of the Earth) told the local press how he would

like to place on record our admiration for the courageous young people who were prepared to take considerable personal risks on behalf of all those who feel that this government does not care about the environment and residents who live near Heathrow. (quoted in Sharp 2003)

After having been misled by British Airport Authority's broken promises, subjected to a drawn-out and intensely fought public inquiry and feeling as if their public rights had been battered, Heathrow campaigners, after a cursory pit stop, were subjected to a second battle in the war against the expansion of Heathrow airport. The time had come to fight the Third Runway.

The campaign was kick-started by the publication of the government's consultation and the South East Regional Assessment which followed. It was a joint campaign between local residents' associations, supported by local MPs, local authorities, West London Friends of the Earth and Heathrow and Communities Against Noise. The No Third Runway Action Group, financed by Hillingdon Borough Council, acted as an umbrella group.

Shortly after the South East Regional Assessment document was issued, Heathrow and Communities Against Noise alerted the community to the loss of homes and increased noise and air pollution a third runway would cause. Leaflets containing this information were handed out at railway and tube stations throughout September 2002. During the course of the consultation, which took place in a London hotel, protesters posed for the local press with an 8-foot high aeroplane-winged shark that was, they claimed, 'flying out of control' and held a counter-consultation in the same hotel. In October, a demonstration and lobby of parliament was held, organized jointly by Heathrow and Communities Against Noise and the No Third Runway Action Group. Also in October 2002, Heathrow and Communities Against Noise arranged for an open-topped bus to travel along a section of the flight path with a sound system playing recorded aircraft noise to give the community 'a taste of what was to come' between the songs of a jazz band (Raymond 2002: 7). This

was followed by a rally addressed by local politicians at Turnham Green and an opportunity for local people to sign a petition.

July 2003 saw at least a thousand people march along the route of the proposed runway followed by a rally in a local park. Speakers from Friends of the Earth, Heathrow and Communities Against Noise, No Third Runway Action Group and local churches addressed the rally (Grant 2003). In the same month, Heathrow and Communities Against Noise protesters dressed up in gas masks and boiler suits to draw attention to the predicted high air pollution.

Post White Paper (December 2003), Heathrow campaigners worked with their local authorities to ensure that pollution levels were monitored independently and not by British Airports Authority or its consultants, given that the future for a third runway was, then, dependent upon reduced air pollution levels by 2015. Efforts were also made to link up with European airport protest groups to try to achieve an EU ban on night flights.

From 2008, notably not earlier, Greenpeace contributed to campaigns against the third runway at Heathrow, instigating an ingenious 'airplot' campaign. For this, Greenpeace purchased a strip of land 'bang in the middle of the proposed third runway site at Heathrow',¹⁹ and allowed supporters of the campaign to nominally purchase small chunks of it at no cost. Thus, the deeds to the land were owned by thousands of supporters who would have had a say in future land use.

Also in 2008, there was a week-long direct action-oriented Camp for Climate Action close to the airport, which culminated in a protest march and mass blockade of British Airport Authorities offices (August 2007). Climate Camp picnics at the new Terminal (early 2009), and a 'flash mob' (2009) – a group of people seemingly spontaneously congregating – followed. These actions, and those that preceded it, suggest that local people and climate change campaigners were not going to let the new runway be built without a fight.

Since the mid-2000s, environmental direct action, having reached a lull in Britain in the earlier part of the decade (Rootes 2007), appeared to be on the rise again, focussed, in particular, on climate change. This can be explained in a similar fashion to the emergence of the roads protests, which were also met with an apparent democratic dead end (see Chapter 5). Climate change campaigners and activists are frustrated by the government's apparent lack of commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, which, despite the Climate Change Act 2008, is exemplified by its apparent willingness to give the go-ahead to coal-fired power stations and new airport runways. The new direct action networks, including Camp for Climate Action, The Coal Hole, Plane Stupid and Climate Rush, have engaged in all manner of direct action stunts: from blockading British Airport Authority's offices, to shutting down coal-fired power stations, disrupting the development of open cast

coal mines, blockading coal freight trains, occupying airport runways and ‘rushing’ parliament (see also the beginning of Chapter 1).

Concluding remarks

This chapter has sought to illustrate the diverse nature of environmental organizations and campaigns in London. One thing it has demonstrated is the difficulty of pigeonholing organizations into ideal types. We can see that even radical groups like the Environmental Direct Action Group sometimes engage in more reformist strategies. And even the Campaign to Protect Rural England commonly viewed as conservationist has reformist tendencies. Although the previous chapter suggested that conservationists are not particularly well networked into the movement, the case study of the Campaign to Protect Rural England and its involvement in campaigns against aviation expansion demonstrates the difficulty of making such sweeping generalizations and illustrates how networking can be contingent upon the issue (see Chapter 5).

This background material also forms foundations I build upon in order to illuminate the patterns of interaction in environmental networks and assess the applicability of social movement theory to their praxis. In particular, we have seen that Greenpeace was slow to network with groups campaigning against the third runway, and that moderate environmental organizations are pushed to network with more radical direct activists upon meeting a democratic dead end. This happened in campaigns against the Baku Ceyhan pipeline and against aviation. I return to discuss such tendencies with reference to social movement theory in the chapters that follow. I shall look at the extent to which social movement theories can help explain and/or understand the networking among environmental organizations.