The Environmental Movement in Ireland

The Environmental Movement in Ireland

Liam Leonard

Foreword by John Barry

Springer

Liam Leonard
Social Science Research Centre (SSRC)
National University of Ireland
Galway, Ireland

ISBN 978-1-4020-6811-9 e-ISBN 978-1-4020-6812-6

Library of Congress Control Number: 2007938051

Printed on acid-free paper.

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

springer.com

Foreword

At the time of writing many of the issues discussed by Liam Leonard in *The Environmental Movement in Ireland* are reflected in the new political realities of the island of Ireland North and South. The Green Party – since December 2006 organised on an all Ireland basis – is in coalition government in the Republic while in the Northern Ireland Assembly elections in March it gained its first elected Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLA). These developments clearly indicate a level of popular and political success of the Green Movement and issues of (un)sustainable development, but also open up a new and uncharted area for the movement with high expectations of Greens in Government. Long-standing green issues, particularly around climate change and energy security, have received unprecedented levels of popularisation through almost daily media coverage and documentaries such as former US Vice President Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth* and the 'Live Earth' global concerts. Green issues are no longer marginal but increasingly at the heart of mainstream Irish political debate and policymaking, particularly as we look into a 'post-Celtic Tiger' era.

As this book demonstrates, the green movement(s) in Ireland does not have it easy. The green movement on the island of Ireland is one of the weakest in comparison with other European countries whether measured by membership or influence on policy and politics. For example, attitude surveys from the 1980s onwards show that the public in the Republic and Northern Ireland placed environmental concerns consistently below other concerns, especially orthodox economic growth, security and employment, and environmental concerns in both jurisdictions has traditionally been lower than in other EU countries as measured by Euro barometer studies. However, there is evidence that we may be witnessing a 'tipping point' given the success of the Green Party in both parts of the island.

Leonard's book admirably outlines the extent to which one cannot understand the green/environmental movement without understanding the political economy of unsustainable development in both parts of the island and the complex legacies of colonialism and (partial) decolonisation. In particular, his book shows how the pursuit of orthodox economic growth (especially since the 'Celtic Tiger' era via neo-liberal strategies) is the root cause of, inter alia, growing environmental degradation and pollution, a waste crisis, rising levels of social inequality, insecurity and

exclusion and decreasing levels of economic (and energy) security amongst others. *The Environmental Movement in Ireland* sketches the main contours of the underlying causes of unsustainable development on the island of Ireland which is one of the main explanatory factors for the rise, composition and success or otherwise of the environmental movement.

On the island of Ireland both the Irish and British state have prioritised an orthodox view of economic growth as the state's main goal (though in Northern Ireland security has long been the state's primary interest until the recent fitful and as yet incomplete 'peace process'), with little consideration or importance attached to environmental protection or sustainable development. Across the island, the environmental costs of 20th-century economic growth are all too obvious, from the excessive use of nitrogen and other fertilisers of industrialised forms of agriculture; the pollution of inland waterways from agricultural, industrial and domestic sources; the loss of biodiversity and habitats; unsustainable increases in carbon dioxide emissions from burning fossil fuels; patterns of land use and urban and suburban development which each year decrease green spaces; to the congestion and pollution associated with an explosion of privatised car transport onto a road and transport infrastructure than cannot sustain it and making, for example, Northern Ireland one of the most car-dependent parts of Europe.

However, from a sustainable development point of view there are also other 'non-environmental' costs of state policies and strategies for orthodox 20th-century models of economic growth and wealth creation. The Republic of Ireland is second only to the USA in income inequality according to the 2005 UN Human Development Report with over 15% of its population living in poverty. In both parts of the island, the governance and political structures for sustainable development are marked by less than democratic and accountability processes, which largely reduce and actively discourage citizens to participate in decision-making in policy processes that give structural advantage to market actors, interests and imperatives. While there is lip service to 'joined up thinking' and policymaking in regard to sustainable development, as a policy area it continues to be defined and confined to the 'policy ghetto' of 'the environment' rather than as functioning as an overarching, integrated policy programme for government as a whole. That is, 'sustainable development' is, by and large, interpreted as 'environment' and therefore consigned to the Department of Environment and related agencies and authorities rather than a cross-cutting government objective and one that every department and agency needs to take seriously. In particular, the potential for sustainable development to redefine economic development has yet to be seriously explored on the island, though it is to be hoped with Green Ministers in the Departments of Energy, Environment, and Food and Agriculture, this will change.

Leonard shows that tackling the underlying economic model which is the root cause of ecological degradation and the intensification of inequality and eroding quality of life and work/life balance will force more and more parts of the Irish environmental movement to politicise themselves and make alliances with other social movements and forces to fulfil their objectives – including the labour movement and the community sector. That is, if the environmental movement wishes to

deal with the *causes* of ecological destruction for example, rather than simply dealing with its *effects*, we can expect to see a greater degree of analysis and action around critiquing, challenging and proposing alternatives to the underlying political economy of the island as part of the transition to a more sustainable Ireland. In particular with 'peak oil' looming and Ireland both North and South being dependent on this imported, non-renewable energy source, a serious debate around energy security has started in which the transition to a post-carbon economy now pits renewable, clean energy against nuclear power, which environmentalists thought they had defeated in the late 1970s in Ireland. Battles the movement had won now will have to be refought and in much more testing times against a coalition of state and business interests determined to find a technological fix for our energy hungry economy rather than using the energy crisis as an opportunity to plan a transition to a more sustainable and different type of *society*, and different political relations between citizens and state, as opposed to a more resource-efficient *economy* with no changes in our structures of governance and democratic system.

Leonard's book has staked out a new terrain of Irish politics which others will follow. His book offers an in-depth analysis of the Irish environmental movement and the politics of (un)sustainable development and a mark of its holistic, integrated character is that it will be of interest not simply to academics and students of (post-Celtic Tiger) Irish politics and the Irish environmental movement but to participants in that broad movement itself. It is a fantastic achievement and deserves to be widely read.

School of Politics and International Studies and Philosophy Dr. John Barry
Queen's University Belfast
July 2007

Preface

Ireland's recent social history has been characterised by a series of environmentally based community challenges to multinational plants in the 1970s and 1980s and disputes about infrastructural projects in the years since the 'Celtic Tiger' boom. These protests can be located in the context of a rural resistance to a technology-driven modernity and its inherent 'risk society' (Beck 1992). This book identifies the community movements which have emerged as part of a growing resistance to accelerated growth as a significant component of environmentalism in Ireland. As green issues increasingly come to the fore, the politics of place has become an important aspect of pluralistic society in an Ireland where scepticism about the grand narratives of mainstream politics abounds in the wake of successive scandals and tribunals.

The Environmental Movement in Ireland will examine these themes, by looking at the main categories which have come to define such events: **Environmentalism, Communities** and the most significant incidents of environmental collective action in this country. **Campaigns: Phase One** of these protests took place between the 'No Nukes' protests of the late 1970s and incorporated campaigns against multinationals perceived to be a pollution threat in the years of economic stagnation. **Campaigns: Phase Two** occurred in the years after economic buoyancy was achieved, as the demands of rapid growth threatened communities, the environment and our heritage in the face of major infrastructural projects such as roads, incinerators and gas pipelines. These events will be analysed using social movement theories, including the resource mobilisation, political opportunity, framing of key events.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my family, and colleagues at the ECI, SSRC and Department of Political Science and Sociology at NUI Galway for their support. I would also like to acknowledge the assistance of Fabio de Castro and Takeesha Moerland-Torpey at Springer Environmental Science. Dr. Leonard's web page: www.ecopoliticsonline.com. I wish to acknowledge John Barry for his insightful foreword and his support during the drafting of this book.

Contents

Part I
Politics

Chapter 1
The Environmentalism Debate

Introduction

In the course of developing his highly significant contribution to ongoing debates about the meanings of 'environmentalism', the ecologist and philosopher John Barry posits the question as to whether 'it would be an exaggeration to proclaim that we are all greens now' (Barry 1999). However, ecological issues may entail more than the sum of its inherent philosophical debates; contemporary environmentalism can be said to be as much about the interpretation of competing forms of development between state-supported industrial actors and local community movements, both of which compete for control of environmental destinies. Within this contestation, two competing forms of environmentalism have emerged; one based on a growth based form of *ecological modernisation* which has come to be challenged by grass-roots movements inspired by a localised *rural sentiment*. This dichotomy between modernist and populist forms of environmentalism occur within a wider context of ecologically derived debates which incorporate a series of motivations such as anthropological health risks, democratic deficit and political accountability and a range of attitudes towards everything from the role of the European Union to the anti-globalisation movement (Leonard 2006). A growing questioning of aspects of industrialised development and related patterns of consumption that have had a major impact on the environment has led to the rise of 'green politics' which have become characterised by localised protests and disputes, but which forms the basis of the modern environmental movement. Nonetheless, the debate about the future of *sustainability* has thrown up some interesting arguments. One of the core issues at the heart of this debate is the extent to which liberal democracies can embrace sustainable development. This acceptance of sustainability as a means of continued ecologically derived development is dependent on an interpretations of sustainability 'that respect liberal democratic values and institutions' (Barry & Wissenburg 2001 205). However, the outcomes of these conceptualisations of sustainability must take community values and local sentiments on board in order to be truly 'sustainable'. In the absence of an agreed understanding between communities, states and industrial interests, attempts to impose 'sustainable' initiatives without considering local relationships between communities and their hinterlands risks ongoing campaigns of opposition, something which has occurred in Ireland since the late 1970s (Leonard 2006).

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland*.

Here, the values which shape 'anti-authoritarianism and moral scepticism' (Barry & Wissenburg 2001 207) lie at the heart of liberal pluralistic democracy, as represented by the idealism of those who have over time answered the call of 'revolution', 'movement' or 'freedom' be they republican, socialist, feminist or environmentalist. At the heart of the great intangible of 'progress' lies a democratic impulse borne of localised desires for freedom from oppression or degradation through 'contentious repertories' (Tilly 2004) whereby understandings of local sentiments come to be replenished by continued opposition to the destruction of what is significant to a community within the context of the landscape which surrounds it. Concerns about the effects of ecological degradation have increased since the 1960s and environmental social movements have emerged as a result. These movements have challenged concepts of industrialised growth which dominated political thinking over recent centuries. Although environmental groups can network with one another, exchanging expertise and support, the localised focus on environmental grievances may lead to accusations of "NIMBYism", or the "Not in My Backyard" syndrome. Local groups frame the 'moral discourse' (Grove-White 1993) surrounding the environmental and health risks facing communities where toxic plants are situated, and highlight the potential economic and health costs which may result from the distribution of toxic effluents and emissions. These community groups are characterised by intensive outbreaks of local activism, as public responses are galvanised in opposition to hazardous plants. Protests are used to bargain for the restoration or maintenance of collective goods such as clean air or waterways.

Environmental organisations may be dependant on the goodwill of external agencies for other resources, such as financial contributions or favourable media coverage. In order to attract such support, environmental organisations depict themselves in a manner that can exploit the wider sympathies of a public which may be supportive of environmental issues without wishing to become participants in a campaign. In this way, environmental groups may exploit wider public concern for the global commons, given that shared environmental goods such as clean air or food products invoke a degree of concern across society. Accusations of NIMBYism may therefore be overcome, as environmental movements present themselves as responsible protectors of the environment. Movements for environmental change may undergo an 'ideological development' (Szasz 1994 77) as increased professionalism, wider networks and political interaction create understandings of how environmental issues overlap at a national or global level. Environmental protests are organised by networks that exploit resources and opportunities. The distinction between 'old' and 'new' social movements can be located within this understanding of a social movement sector that provides resources and negotiates opportunities and mobilises campaigns. The form of organisational structure employed by environmental movements may vary, ranging from the 'participatory, anti-hierarchical and anti-institutional…' on the one hand to 'formalised, hierarchical and oligarchic organisations on the other' (Rucht in Klandermans 1989a 63). The variance in environmental movement organisational structures is replicated in the different types of movements that organise challenges against

political and scientific orthodoxy. Rucht (1989) suggests three distinctive types of environmental thinking that shape movement ideology. This thinking is built around the following themes:

- *Conservationism* or the aesthetic, ethical and religious protection of nature. Conservationist methods include respect for the rights of nature, preservation of natural space or parks, and campaigns of aesthetic education.
- *Environmentalism* involves a combination of concerns for quality of human life and of the natural environment. Environmentalism embraces scientific, economic and political arguments about the policies that impact upon lifestyles and the ecosphere.
- *Ecologism* is concerned with a holistic or utopian conception of human existence in harmony with nature. Ecologism prioritises the concerns of nature over human needs, advocating changes to existing lifestyles and political systems which should reflect the primacy of nature (Rucht in Klandermans 1989a 64, 65).

Various research points to a dichotomy between ecology-centred (ecocentric) and human centred (anthropocentric) types of environmental movement. One aspect of ecocentric thought is concerned with a critique of technology. O'Riordan (1989 9) has identified another dichotomy, between what he refers to as 'ecocentricism versus techno-centrism.' Techno-centrism focuses on reforming technology to prevent some aspects of environmental degradation, while an ecocentric focus in contrast advocates the complete reform of socio-political patterns by giving priority to the environment. In this way, politics may be viewed from an environmental perspective. O'Riordan (1989 9) outlines the techno-centric 'belief in the retention of the status quo in the existing structure of a political power' associated with middle ranking executives and environmental scientists. These people have 'faith in the application of science and market forces' (ibid.) and feel that institutions can adapt to environmental needs. Techno-centric approaches are at the centre of an 'ecological modernisation' approach, which sees environmental pragmatism as an efficient part of economic and industrial processes.

Martell (1994) examines the general conditions under which environmental movements emerge. They may have a shared or 'collective' interest, and pursue goals which will challenge or change institutions, without operating through the channels of formal party politics. As the institutions of the state fail to deal with the environmental grievances of communities, movements are organised around issues of local concerns. Indeed, due to the state's primary focus on infrastructural development and competitiveness, state agencies are often the target of environmental movement campaigns. If the political process is seen to be exclusive, and policy that has an ecologically harmful aspect is seen as imposed undemocratically, then movements can form to express alternative or oppositional positions. Scott (1990 145) has provided examples of neo-corporatist government arrangements that exclude environmental concerns from the political agenda. As political parties, industries and trade unions map out their policies, environmental issues may be overlooked. This can lead to environmental movement activism in response to perceptions of democratic deficit on matters of environmental concern, as some

social groups feel left out of the political arrangements based on corporatist relations. The closure on competitiveness by the state and its neo-corporatist partners in Ireland has also led to Irish environmental movements facing political closure. However, this exclusion also creates opportunities for movement challengers.

One result of the wider support enjoyed by environmental movements has been an increase in levels of professionalism and bureaucratic control. As campaigns evolve, so too has the role of movement leadership changed, as the requirement for expertise in areas such as management, media, politics and science has increased. The representation of environmental interests has also become dependent on a group's ability to translate an environmental issue in a manner that attracts the public's attention. State and corporate interests in environmental issues are being represented with a greater degree of sophistication due to public interest in environmental issues, and must be matched by increasingly sophisticated challengers. This may lead to a movement losing touch with more radical groups and could create problems for challengers, as the authorities may exploit internal movement tensions, making movement success more difficult. Local responses to a national or international environmental issue may vary in line with the availability of expertise within movement organisations. Additional factors which environmental movements must contend with include the extent to which control over environmental or development issues is centralised, the competency of the tier of government which must be dealt with, and the manner in which policies which affect local environments or communities are implemented (Van der Heijden 1997; Carmin 2003). As former US Vice President Al Gore's film *An Inconvenient Truth* and *Live Earth* concerts have led to the issue of climate change gaining increased public exposure, the very basis of uneven development, planetary degradation and growth at all costs has come to be challenged. Yet it is the very nature of western society's capitalist growth impulse which is the basis for the extensive global crisis which we are all threatened with.

Does the Liberal notion of humankind's 'natural' rights of freedom allow for the type of environmental destruction currently happening throughout the world? Clearly, deep green and ecocentric grass-roots politics reject this. And as the rise in the politics of environmental protest show, many people have decided to question and reject current development models, in favour of an improved coexistence with the environment. Of course, like other political forms, environmentalism has areas of ideological overlapping in many paradigmatic areas, but the distinction between deep green radicalism and a 'shallow' compromise which tolerates high levels of pollution for profit can be clearly identified. The 'deep green' position, as articulated by Dobson (1990), argues for a 'limit to growth' and understands 'sustainable' to mean no sustainable damage to the earth rather than the 'sustainable pollution' ethic found in the concept of ecological modernisation. As such, deep green politics argues for an ecocentric society, which places an intrinsic value on the environment, above any consideration of profit or structural development.

Robyn Eckersley (1992) first defined the distinction between the ecocentric and anthropocentric spectrums of green politics. By this distinction, Eckersley meant the politics of ethical environmentalism which included 'resource conservation, human welfare ecology, preservationism, animal liberation and eco-centrism'

(Eckersley 1992 34) was separate from the accommodation of 'sustainable' development which placed that development at a higher value than the environment itself. This argument is at the crux of the environmental debate and is central to the definition and public ownership of a shared understanding of what environmentalism is. In the Irish case, these distinctions have been demonstrated in competing environmental paradigms through a presentation of a dualistic eco-sector with:

> Two environmental movements in Ireland, one based around established conservation organisations and a developing environmental 'knowledge elite', the other located within populist movements for rural community development. (Tovey 1993)

Ecopopulism as Deep Green Politics

We can understand this form of rural ecocentricism through an examination of 'rural sentiment' (Leonard 2006). This concept has emerged from an analysis of existing studies of local environmentalism and rural change in the Irish case. Initial accounts of 'rural fundamentalism' (Commons 1986) provided a basis for an understanding of the resistance to state sponsored rural development projects as Irish agriculture became scientised and industrialised in the years after Ireland joined the European Community (EEC) in 1973. Resistance to perceived interference from the state or Europe was derived from a localised sense of mutual dependency and embeddedness within the local hinterlands of rural Ireland. As modernisation and economic growth occurred, a concept of 'rural discourse' was forwarded to describe local responses the location of multinational factories in rural areas (Peace 1997). However, this discourse was in itself a representation of a primordial or visceral 'rural sentiment' (Leonard 2006) which became manifest at times of societal discord in rural Ireland, such as the 'Land Wars' of the late 19th century. Through time, this underlying sentiment becomes a discourse of fundamentalism in the face of external threats to local communities or landscapes which are etched within the subconsciousness or rural dwellers, as part of a 'unifying ether' (Varley and Curtin 1999) which transcends time. When locals invoke the ancient battle cry and song *'the West's Awake'* during episodes of resistance to the degradation of outsiders, it is the landscape, hills and coastline of the west of Ireland that is alive for its inhabitants, in a manner that has parallels with aboriginal tribes globally. This primal response is the basis for understandings of 'rural sentiment', which can be seen as part of what Arne Naess (1972) originally called ecocentricism, the valuing of the hinterland over the self. The dichotomy between deep green and eco-modernist paradigms has its basis in Eckersley's definition of an 'anthropocentric/ecocentric cleavage'. The distinction is made clear from the following quote:

> The first approach is characterised by its concern to articulate an eco-political theory that offers new opportunities for human emancipation and fulfilment in an ecologically sustainable society. The second approach pursues the same goals in the context of a broader notion of emancipation that also recognises that moral standing of the non human world. (Eckersley 1992 26)

While both approaches are concerned with the environment, it is the emphasis placed on 'human emancipation' over 'the non human world' which demarcates the anthropocentricism of the sustainable development culture from an ecocentric perspective. Eckersley also cites the 'broadly similar distinctions found in the ecological theories of Naess ('shallow and deep ecology'), O'Riordan ('techno-centricism and eco-centrism'), Bookchin ('environmentalism and social ecology') and so on. The positioning of humankind in relation to other species and ecosystems is pivotal in regard to this theoretical contextualisation of two main distinct features of current environmental thought. While not aligned with a traditional understanding of the left/right divide within political ideology, the distinction between anthropo-centric and ecocentric does have its basis in humankind's technical and industrial capabilities, which have become the basis for the type of environmental destruction evident in contemporary society. While traditionally the Left pinpointed control of the means of production as the crucial issue of political contestation, environmental politics is more concerned with how the means of production impact upon the environment and to what extent this is acceptable in society. Nonetheless, mainstream political structures have continued to concentrate on the development of society which threatens the environment. Environmentalists have responded to this by addressing the technical nature of industrial development, and the need to critique that development through deep green politics, or alternatively, to try to compromise and regulate industry. A difference has been detected in both aspects of environmental thought in so far as perspectives vary as to whether industrial development should be slowed down, through eco-modernist principles such as 'BATNEEC' or 'the best available technology not entailing excessive costs' or 'The polluter pays principle', or whether industrial growth should be reversed and replaced with a more ecocentric social planning. Pepper (1993) and O'Riordan (1981) have defined such environmental diversions as that of a 'technocentric perspective as opposed to an eco-centric' view:

- *Techno-centrism* recognises environmental problems but believes our current form of society will always solve them and achieve unlimited growth ('the cornucopian view') or more cautiously that by careful economic and environmental management they can be negotiated ('the accommodators').
- *Eco-centrism* views humankind as part of a global ecosystem and subject to ecological laws. These…constrain human action, particularly through imposing limits to economic population growth (Pepper 1993 33, 93).

In other words, the root of techno-centrism lies in social and political compromise between the earth's resources and human development with technology as the cutting edge of this manipulation of the earth's resources. Techno-centric approaches are determined with no overhaul of human social systems envisaged and despite recognition of the inherent ecological problems of this analysis. Eco-centrism, conversely places humankind not to the fore of the global ecosystem, but rather sees humanity as part of an organic whole, with a moral imperative to restrain activity and growth and to interact and cooperate with the greater ecosystems that populate the earth. This view holds a respect for a pristine, natural world

in its own right before any aspect of human economy and development is considered with human beings living in a spirit of cooperation and ecumenism with the environment. The 'deep green' view of environmentalism had its roots in the ecological, feminist and other new social movements of the 1960s and 1970s and has challenged the hierarchical hegemony of political dominance and technological development over social and ecological systems across the globe. Deep green ideology goes beyond old left wing attempts at 'controlling the means of production' or of deconstructing class systems and sets its point of origin before the era of revolution to the beginning of modernity and the age of Enlightenment. By questioning the concept of social order based on expansive development which had its roots in the Enlightenment project present day environmental protests have rejected the concept of a technologically driven modernity in itself, radically moving beyond the position of 'sustainable development' by questioning the validity of development from an ecocentric perspective. Bookchin spells out this premise with a view on these challenges of hierarchical systems of development:

> Ecology raises the issue that the very notion of man's dominance of nature stems from man's dominance of man. Feminism reaches even further and reveals that the domination of man by man actually originates in the domination of woman by man. Community movements implicitly assert that in order to replace social domination by self management a new type of civic self … must be restored … to challenge the all pervasive state apparatus. (Bookchin 1980 15)

Risk Society

Andrew Szasz examines the changing reactions to increased environmental problems in society, which he feels are symptomatic of 'a resigned, fatalistic environmentalism' (Szasz 2007 1). This analysis can be linked with the understanding of a poorly planned and toxic existence put forward by Beck in his portrayal of a 'Risk Society'. Essentially, this outlook views the earth in a hazardous light as rampant industrialisation pushes the planet to the brink of a catastrophe caused by a 'bewitchment of reason' (Beck 1996) which holds that in the event of possible global calamity such as nuclear or chemical fallout prevailing attitudes are so transfixed by existing industrialised systems that no real provision has been made for such an event. Furthermore, it seems beyond the genius of current populations to envisage a system of human existence which, at least, doesn't threaten humankind and the planet we inhabit. Yet Beck sees no saviours in the environmental movement, which he claims is trapped in a naturalistic misunderstanding' (Beck 1996 7). He furthers this argument by claiming the ecological movement 'reacts to and acts upon a blend of nature and society that remains uncomprehended, in the name of a nature no longer extant'… which is held up as 'a model for the reorganisation of an ecological society' (ibid.).

Criticisms of the environmental movement from industrialists are commonplace but Beck's analysis of an overriding confusion as to the positioning of the

paradigms that intersect the bounds of society and environment point to the need for interrogation of the cultural and ideological backdrop to environmental politics. In doing so, this book addresses the varying strands of ecological discourses, by surveying the writers mentioned above, as well as undertaking to analyse recent theoretical conceptualisations in relation to the environment and post-modernity, as well as some of the more diverse examples of environmental consciousness. Beck claims that 'ecological protest is a matter, not of natural but of cultural fact; a phenomenon of cultural sensibility and of the attentiveness of institutions' (Beck 1996 49). This assertion has its basis in the argument which characterises environmental concern as a cultural rather than purely ecological expression. Essentially, the argument highlights the difficulty in explaining the inherent meanings underlying environmental discourses. Political protests, ecological or otherwise, invariably follow from cultural rather than ideological grievances. As western culture has industrialised so too has a new emphasis been placed on protecting an environment once seen as the very impediment of human aspirations for development.

All political ideologies shared at their core a belief in the betterment of humanity through the taming of the ferocity of nature. This is what makes aspects of deep green environmentalism distinctive from the rest of the ideological spectrum. While acknowledging the Left's position on the failure of industrialised capitalism to include large sections of the global population in its wake, deep Ecologism goes beyond protesting this as unjust and inequitable and goes on to advocate an overall rejection of human development based on industrialised, technologically driven expansion in favour of cooperation with the still ferocious natural world.

However, theoretical conceptualisation of environmental modernisation which relates to sustainable development of industrial and political processes does not always fit into policy agendas at the EU or national government level. Tensions remain between environmental directives and some policy objectives of economic and structural growth. To achieve some semblance of ecological consciousness many industries hire PR spokespersons that use ecologically friendly language to mask their true intentions. Such rhetoric allows multinationals to sell themselves (and their products) on an environmentally friendly basis and allows a greater threat to the environment to be sold to an unsuspecting public. As a result it is often left to enquiring bodies such as protest groups to oppose multinationals. Many such groups and protestors are portrayed as unreasonable extremists by the public relations mechanism of multinationals. This type of posturing has blurred the definitions which underpin ecological politics. As a result environmental discourses have taken on the dialogue of metaphor and imagery, becoming a part of post-modern representations of the fragmented relations which concern humankind, nature and the building of social networks both globally and locally. As environmental definitions fragment and as the strategies and movements surrounding ecological politics diversify multifarious strands of 'green' political, cultural and social analysis vie with each other in an attempt to engage the public perception of what it is that 'environmental' actually means for them. These ecological discourses become central to the conceptualisations which define the environment. Furthermore, these definitions also challenge the discourses previously set by the parlance and paradigms of industrial society.

Through this discursive contestation of social paradigms, ecological political debate has changed society's vision of itself as well as altering the dynamic of social and political relations, through protest and dialogue, since the last decades of the previous century. This questioning has enabled the growth of new approaches to many aspects of social and ecological relations and in turn has reshaped existing cultural and political discourses while also giving rise to new paradigms of distinct ecological expression. This new expression has come to be known as the green movement' or theoretically 'environmentalism'. If western thought contains elements of a dualistic anti-naturalism, then the theoretical conceptualisations stand aside from previous political aspirations in the Western sphere of influence, while fundamentally laying down a challenge to the social constructs which promote an ongoing form of accelerated development.

However, there are two variations of environmental theory which can be used to divide the various elements within ecological thought. One contends that the environment can be 'managed' in conjunction with industrial development. As such this viewpoint, which includes theories such as Ecological Modernisation and Sustainable Development, are in conflict with the 'deep green' school of thought. The 'managerial approach' contends that 'environmental problems … can be solved without fundamental changes in present values of patterns of production and consumption' (Hovden 1999). One of the central theories which underpin managerial approaches to the environment is 'Ecological Modernisation' (EM).

The development of EM theory has been linked to the publication of the Brundtland Report (WCED 1987) and other events such as the UNCED conference on environment and development (1997). Through these formalised declarations the diverse actions and agencies involved in environmental protection began a process of dialogue concerning the global effects of development on the environment and how agencies can have some input into the environmental issues in their regions. In turn, environmental theorists such as Janicke, Weale and Hajer, began to examine the varying strands of social actors involved in environmental matters; these included multinational companies, national and local governments, social and environmental movements and other NGOs. Through this review of existing environmental paradigms a critical theoretical concept, Ecological Modernisation theory was advanced.

Ecological Modernisation gained a particular momentum in terms of environmental debate and developed various localised aspects in different states. Huber has been credited with the earliest incarnation of EM Theory, which was significant for its emphasis on the technological benefits of this approach, including:

> the role of technological innovations in environmental reform … a critical attitude towards the (bureaucratic) state, a favourable attitude towards the role of the market actors and dynamics in environmental reforms; a systems-theoretical and rather evolutionary perspective with a limited notion of human agency and social struggles; and an orientation towards analyses at the level of the nation state. (Mol & Sonnefeld 2000)

However, debates about Ecological Modernisation theory in the 1990s were redirected towards the cultural and institutional sphere of influence over the environment, through the works of Weale and Hajer, among others. Weale defines 'the new politics

of pollution' with a quote from Commoner, as the process by which affluent societies begin 'making peace with the planet' (Weale 1992 1) and its levels of affluence which vary from country to country. There has also been a dichotomy between the rates at which different states developed pollution controls and environmental policies. New forms of institutions, using sanctions and regulations, have become an integrated part of states' and regions' environmental policy. For instance, EU member states respond to the ongoing environmental directives emanating from Brussels and the regulations behind these directives go on to become that member state's internal environmental law. However, the complexity of the increasing challenges placed on the environment, when added to diverse cultural factors at a localised level, creates a multilateral, problematic response to centralised directives.

Ultimately, many environmental problems were 'unresolved or growing worse' (Weale 1992 23). Increased population trends, with resultant growth in infrastructural and consumption patterns have compounded responses to ecological crises. Among the issues involved in the growing ecological threat outlined by Weale are 'Growth in population, pressure on food supplies, increased use of fertilisers, depletion of ozone, contamination from sewage and waste disposal, oil spillages, nuclear accidents, species extinction and global climate change are among the issues which currently threaten the earth' (Weale 1992 24–25).

While this has seen an increase in environmental concern globally and in eco-policies nationally, a 'sense of policy failure' (Weale 1992 26) remained in relation to ecological matters. This sense of despondency is due, in part, to the difficulty in coordinating a global response to environmental challenges, through existing agencies, when individual states have different levels of economies, industrialisation, environmental values and localised problems. It was also becoming apparent even to the industrial sector that levels of pollution were now beginning to threaten economic development, through costs and fears for market confidence. For political planners 'environmental protection is now a precondition of economic growth' (Weale 1992 32).

An understanding of new political approaches to the environment can be made clearer by examining some of the paradigms which have become part of this process. Among the theoretical concepts which can explain new approaches to pollution are Rational Choice Theory (RCT), systems analysis and what Weale calls 'the idiom of institutions'. Rational Choice Theory is used to examine the background to why pollution occurs and 'why does it take the form that it does' (Weale 1992 39)? 'Market failure' is given as the origin of pollution conflicts in society, with the specific consequences of 'externalities' causing a 'spill over effect' (ibid.). In other words, pollution caused by waste by-products affect many others outside the producer and buyer of the product, indeed the spill over effect often affects nations far away from the point of origin of that product. For instance, toxic waste produced in Europe or North America is often found in Asia and/or Africa, with a trail of corruption to enable such processes to damage local democracies. For Weale, Rational Choice Theory addresses these concerns through the creation of a public demand for environmental protection which 'takes the form of a public good' (Weale 1992 41).

This ‘public good’ is acted on through ‘public choice theory’ which examines ‘rational agents in the context of collective action’ (Weale 1992 42). Among the actors concerned with public choice theory in relation to pollution are politicians, individual citizens and interest groups. Politicians respond to demands from the electorate. Experienced politicians will know that the answer to environmental problems is only to be found in an area of policy acceptable to the electorate. In turn, individual citizens and interest groups grow concerned when the perceived generality of political responses to environmental challenges (formed in response to the perceived desires of the electorate) fail to deal directly with issues. The complexity of such responses, at once interdependent and yet at odds with each other, does much to create the state of chassis which has resulted in a sense of ‘policy failure’ surrounding environmental issues.

Systems and institutions are also identified as important aspects of collective action on pollution. Systems theorists examine the link between the functions of the state and economy in what is described as a ‘system of relationships’ which become problematic when the ‘imperative of capitalist accumulation’ (making profits) ‘is in conflict with the imperative of political legitimacy’ (meeting the democratic aspirations of its citizens) (Weale 1992 97). This conflict is met by state regulations but in the case of multinationals and the globalisation of industry such regulations are discouraged in favour of capital investment, creating a crisis of legitimacy for the nation state. It is at this point that the role of the environmental movement impinges upon the state, as such movements respond to a perceived lack of activity by the state in aspects of ecological protection. This role is outlined as being that which is concerned with ‘what could be saved from and defended against the state…trying to protect a sphere of life against the intervention of the state or state-sanctioned policy’ (Offe 1984 189–190).

The third ‘idiom of analysis’ in relation to ecological modernisation is that of institutions. Institutions are defined as ‘systems of rules governing electoral processes, the practices governing the use of resources’ (Weale 1992 52). Furthermore, an institution is defined in relation to ‘identifiable practices consisting of recognised roles linked by clusters of rules or conventions governing relations among occupants of these roles’ (Young 1989 52). A distinction is made in relation to their possession of ‘physical locations, offices, personnel, equipment and possession of budgets’ (Young 1989 32). Institutions are often cast in the role of ‘honest broker’ in relation to common sense policy decisions. As such, institutions are used to pass on or retain information which, while crucial to policy processes, holds to an informal non-bureaucratic aspect which is often lost to other, relevant actors in the policy process.

As a result, institutional arrangements tend to exist between policy actors at local and international levels. Ultimately, the disparity in institutional influence shaped by cultural and historical factors, affects the regional outcomes of policy directives not least in relation to environmental matters. This complexity in the procedural apparatus of state and voluntary actors reveals the fragmented nature of the political arena which is charged with pollution controls and environmental protection. It is this very complexity which lends itself to the adoption of policies

built from an ecological modernisation perspective, as a form of compromise with the labyrinth of bureaucratic agencies which are a feature of modern society.

By the late 1980s, in response to a growing recognition of an increased complexity in the strands of environmental discourses, attempts were made to create a new consensus in environmental politics. Among the most significant of these are the Brundtland Report in 1987 and the UN Earth Summit in 1992. In particular, the Brundtland Report outlined the concept of 'sustainable development', a concept which quickly began to take on many different meanings. This diversity in the overall understanding of what sustainable development actually means became further apparent at the UN Earth Summit in Rio, which began as a conference to herald a new ecological age, but ultimately highlighted the difficulty in even defining what the environment meant to people from differing cultural and political backgrounds. In Rio it had become apparent that 'Our Common Planet' as defined by the UN Report on 'Our Common Future' from 1987, had failed to grasp the diversity of opinion as to how that future would be met.

It was the recognition of the failure of such conferences and official reports to grasp the concepts of overlapping or fragmented discourses as they existed in many areas of environmental politics (with the addition of regional variations and localised bureaucratic interpretations further complicating such issues) that ecological modernisation as a theory first began to take shape. With an initial emphasis on technology, theorists such as Huber and Janicke initiated an understanding of how environmental protection could coexist with industrial expansion. With an emphasis on policy and directives, EM has been defined as 'the discourse that recognises the structural character of the environmental problematic but nonetheless assumes that existing political, economic and social institutions can internalise the care of the environment' (Hajer 1995 25).

As a policy concept, Ecological Modernisation challenged the notion of 'end of pipe or quick fix' solutions to industrial pollution. It promotes the 'polluter pays' principle, which places financial responsibility as well as blame at the feet of those responsible for environmental damage. Furthermore, the actual benefits of pollution controls for industry are highlighted, going beyond the issue of environmental protection itself. Science is also given a role through Ecological Modernisation, in the area of providing an understanding of ecological problems and evidence of ecological degradation. This burden of proof has shifted, in certain cases, onto the industrial polluter and has become part of industrial planning. However, in many cases individuals or environmental movements are still left with the task of protecting the environment against industrial pollution. While Ecological Modernisation 'acknowledges new actors, in particular environmental organisations and to a lesser extent, residents' (Hajer 1995 29) conflicts between authorities and industry on one level and environmental movements on the other remain a feature of the contemporary political landscape.

More recently, the impact of ecological modernisation on the UK, USA, Germany and Norway has been analysed to reveal varying degrees of connectedness between ecopopulist movements and 'core state imperatives' in these states (Dryzek et al. 2003 191). What becomes clear from this study is the degree to

which local factors in each state influences the impact of EM on policy or the 'sub-politics' of environmental movements. Environmental values and state imperatives reached congruence at various stages of each states' development of environmental policy frameworks and movement activism over recent decades, with EM becoming central to either wider acceptance of environmental initiatives in the case of Germany or becoming part of the ecomodernist versus ecopopulist divide in the case of the USA, which 'an old fashioned stand-off between economy and environment' (ibid.) still exists. This dichotomy between the economically derived imperative of the state and the 'sub-politics' of ecopopulists exists in Ireland. This article will demonstrate that while the EM regulatory framework reflects a critical new positioning of the environmental debate, in the Irish case, the imposition of EM derived policies or infrastructure on rural communities has led to a competing form of populist environmental sentiment derived in part from green philosophies.

While undoubtedly eco-modernism has provided an outlet for the many competing elements in the Irish environmental arena and it has crystallised current understanding of what the environment means from an industry perspective, it is not without its criticisms. Although facilitating policymaking at an administrative level and bringing diverse elements of pollution control together under holistic regulatory frameworks, eco-modernism has been criticised for being too inclined towards industry for an ecologically minded concept. This criticism may overlook the necessary role of Ecological Modernisation in bridging the gap between business and ecology, in the face of the regulatory failure of the 1970s, as it has been the main point of contention between deep green ecologists and environmental agencies and has also affected the structures of Green parties across Europe.

Ecological Modernisation may challenge industry into creating new markets from a reassessed vision of how business relates to the environment; it also 'turns the meaning of the ecological crisis upside-down what appeared a threat to the system now becomes a vehicle for its very innovation' (Hajer 1995 32). However this innovation has in itself created further tensions between capital and the environment, as with each new innovation in business comes new and better concealed threats to the planet. In other words, it has become almost easier to pollute under eco-modernist guidelines due in part to the fact that such environmentally friendly practices are now considered to be 'dealing with the problem' while most industries now hire PR firms and consultants to 'sell' their angle on any particular issue. A further criticism of Ecological Modernisation is that the strengthening of the relationship between administrative policymakers and industry in relation to the environment, the independence of the legislative and regulatory process, has become compromised. This is evident in terms of how governments attract multinationals for the purpose of job creation. In the event of environmental regulations hampering the operation they may often be altered or overlooked and in the easing of conflicts of interests, the public is often caught in a propaganda war over the merits of industrial progress in relation to environmental protection. This has become a recurring feature of environmental conflicts in Ireland, from the Raybestos dispute in Cork in the 1980s to the campaign against incineration in Galway or the Shell to Sea campaign. A feature of both these campaigns was the conflict

between the PR section of the polluting industry, which was given practically limitless funding to give their viewpoint and the oppositional efforts of concerned citizens and groups who had little or no previous expertise and no funding beyond public contributions. Ecological modernisation as a discourse, while acknowledging the role of the citizen fails to address the social reality underpinning the politics of environmental protest, a reality which cast the modern protest in the role of David to an industrial Goliath. By promoting a 'techno-institutional fix' (Hajer 1995 32) for the challenges of the environment, EM has served to provide a 'Trojan-horse' for the potential polluter, In so far as that pollution is possible as long as an industry can provide funding for the potential fines incurred. In addition funding programmes for substantial public relations operations have to overcome incidents of localised hostility. This in an ironic twist has become central to our very understanding of what it is that the environment is, as our definitions are often driven by public relations and media images of 'the environment'. As a result many have felt the need to fully challenge the concept of industrial progress and have begun to question aspects of industrial development. To further understand meanings of the environment in this regard we will now go on to explore these viewpoints, which have come to be known as 'deep green' or 'ecocentric' concepts.

Deep green ecologism represents the embracing of nature, as opposed to the centuries old Enlightenment process of science repressing nature. It has at its root an overall concern with a sense of global cooperation and species ecumenism which go far beyond the compromising elements of ecological modernisation. Where nature was once 'wild' and in need of taming, deep green ecology places the environment as the equal, or more fundamentally, a more important entity than humankind. Of course, this places most deep green activists in opposition to the onset of a society enthralled by rapid acceleration, over-consumption and environmental degradation in the name of profit. Moreover, while deep green ecologists may have been members of the larger environmental agencies, such as Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace, they have come to reject the bureaucratic nature of such groups, working instead in small clusters of committed activists, protesting about specific environmental problems, such as the protestors around The Twyford Downs protest in the UK, or the activists of the Glen of the Downs in Co. Wicklow.

Theoretically, deep green ecologism has been part of the process of shaping an environmentalism which was understood within a liberation framework heavily influenced by the social criticism articulated by Marcuse and the emergent New Left. As such environmental politics have been shaped by a critique of modern society as having a concern for nature itself. It is through this radical praxis, which fuses social protest with a rejection of industrial agendas such as globalisation and mass consumption, that deep green politics finds a basis for its support especially among the young, students and those previously involved in environmental agencies. In this way the environment became a key manifestation of the counterculture and environmental lifestyle as a way of resisting destructive culture apparently bent on self destruction' (McNaughten & Urry 1998 47). Bahro (1994) argues that a division

between Ecologism and what he calls 'exterminism' exists in Western society. Such arguments are now strengthened by the Intergovernmental Panels on Climate Change (IPCC 2007), which have found that global warming is occurring as a result of human behaviour. While Ecologism is represented by the many disparate aspects of environmental thought their opposition to capitalist development (or the 'Imperial Consensus', as he terms it) ranges from strategies of environmental compromise to radical positions such as eco-terrorism. These various possibilities are outlined in the following manner:

- *The restorative*, represented by a 'necessary minimum of environmental protection'
- *The reformistic*, revealing a 'concealed ecological fundamentalist intention'
- *Radical conservative*, which would achieve environmental goals through 'economic planning'
- *Left radical or New Left* uses 'hostile' approaches to environmental problems
- *Terroristic* wants to 'terrorise liberal capitalism into insecurity'
- *Radical-ecological* with 'human egoistic arguments'
- *Spiritual fundamentalistic*; dissolve it from within (Bahro 1994)

In this era of planetary climate change, ecologists now fear for an earth threatened by the actions of humankind, driven by greed and seemingly unable to separate these processes of expansive development from a culture of environmental degradation. Such fears have been confirmed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports in 2007. It is interesting to look back at the recent history of the USA in relation to the rise of deep green political thought from its basis in the counterculture movement of the 1970s. Writing in 1975, Bookchin claims '*Environmentalism*' does not bring into question the underlying notion of the present society that man must dominate nature; rather it seeks to facilitate that domination. … The very notion of domination itself is not brought into question. Ecology, I would claim, advances a broader conception of nature and of 'humanity's relationship with the natural world. To my thinking it sees the balance and integrity of the biosphere as an end in itself" (Bookchin 1975 123). This contrasts greatly with current views on 'sustainable development' and places the earth's ecosystems on a higher plane with an almost spiritual dimension, to the compromising position offered by ecological modernisation. While undoubtedly radical in so far as advocating a rejection of modern industrial society (and even working to subvert this society), deep green politics is less volatile than left wing radical groupings as protest movements replace revolutionary cells. This distinction can be used to distinguish 'environmentalism' from Ecologism. It is from this perspective that a concept of ecology is developed, one which 'advances the view that humanity must show a conscious respect for the spontaneity of the natural world' (Bookchin 1975 123). In regard to social relations the same writer views ecology as affording 'a new relationship between humanity and the natural world in which society itself would be conceived as an ecosystem based on unity in diversity, spontaneity and non-hierarchical relationships' (Bookchin 1975 133).

Conclusion

Competing meanings of environment contend with each other as society grapples with ecological issues on an increasing scale. Environmentalism has many separate meanings but for our purposes a distinction has been made between the type of radical green politics, which argue for a complete change in emphasis in humankind's relationship with its surrounding environment and the type of compromising pro-industrial approach of eco-modernist and sustainable development discourses. This distinction has come to represent the growing alienation that has developed between green political groups and the institutional agencies charged with implementing the bureaucratic and legislative infrastructure which derives from sustainable development, such as 'the polluter pays' principle. While both would claim to be pro-environment, per se, they remain essentially divided in relation to their theoretical interpretation of whether society can continue to develop as it has done since the Industrial Revolution and whether consumption and pollution levels can be sustained in their current forms. It is from within the tensions of this societal dichotomy that the politics of environmental protest has grown as administrations, already faced with a crisis of legitimacy are now confronted by sections of the population not necessarily politicised until faced with a nearby environmental crisis. Campaigns such as Shell to Sea in Co. Mayo show that communities can become politically motivated by a looming environmental crisis, even if economic or legalistic difficulties or even imprisonment result from their resistance to an industrial polluter. This may not mean that community protest groups are all green political ideologists, but they take on the mantel of environmental activists, at least for the duration of their protest.

Theorists have argued that aspects of radical ecologism are disconnected from political reality, claiming that much of what passes for green politics is based on a form of 'anti-humanism' which lacks a rational basis (Bookchin 1975). It can also be argued that green politics has provided a focus for the type of community-based protest movements that can address the democratic deficit created by over-bureaucratic and hierarchical administrations, at both the global and national level. By providing an outlet for social protest deep green environmental movements are addressing the onset of democratic deficit in society. In so doing, green politics has provided a basis for political movement rather than the type of entrenched ideological positions which have emanated from traditional left or right wing politics. In other words, the basis for green political protests may not necessarily be a strong belief in green politics. However, the types of protests which have become identified with the environmental movement have at their core not just ecological issues but also a representation of an understanding that the type of expansive capitalism which pits polluting industries against local communities in the name of jobs and profit. Moreover, a hegemonic response to the discord of public protest has been seen in what Dryzek (1997) has described as 'the Repertoire of Administrative Rationalism' which represents an institutional response to environmental issues. Dryzek describes aspects of this approach:

- *Professional Resource-Management Bureaucracies* consisting of 'natural resource management' policymaking, usually in the areas of national parks, marine, sea and geophysic concerns.
- *Pollution Control Agencies* the use of regulations and directives to control pollution.
- *Regulatory Policy Instruments* the use of regulations and directives to control pollution.
- *Environmental Impact Assessment* administrative (and industrial) assessment of environmental damage.
- *Expert Advisory Commissions* the use of scientific and technological expertise in relation to environmental issues at the behest of senior tiers of government.
- *Rational Policy Analysis Technologies* the utilisation of the knowledge and methods of environmental science and engineering (Dryzek 1997 64–70).

Such a response to environmental issues places an emphasis on science and technology and 'takes the structural status quo of liberal capitalism as given' (Dryzek 1997 74). Administrative Rationalism relies on a hierarchical approach and a regulatory response to environmental issues, within the existing bureaucratic and administrative structures of modern, capitalist societies. It assumes the 'subordination' of nature to development, people to state and experts and manager over communities. However, Administrative Rationalism, like the ecological modernisation discourse from which it emanated, is in a state of crisis as industrialised development impacts more and more on the environment. Weale described this administrative failing as an 'implementation deficit' (1992 17, 18) which represents a deficit in the aims and actual achievements in relation to environmental matters at the administration level.

This has fuelled a sense of public doubt and mistrust of administrative bureaucracy on environmental issues. In turn, individuals and communities no longer deriving their understanding of 'the environment' from the administrative level are coming to terms with ecological issues from their own perspective which was shaped by environmentalists and non-governmental organisation (NGO) actors, green political discourses, media concepts of environmental and 'New Age' philosophies, which have come together with remnants of the old left, to form a social movement based on community responses to environmental issues. Moreover, as centrist and centre-right ideology have come to dominate the politics of Western Liberal democracies, many disparate elements of the old left have realigned themselves and their struggles with the agendas of deep green and eco-protest politics. This has been as much through necessity as ideological choice due to the lack of any real momentum in radical politics, outside of the globalisation protests, as seen in Seattle and Rome at the G8 protests in Germany in 2007 or during the protests of Irish groups such as Shell to Sea or Tara Watch. These eco-activists have at their basis elements of an anti-globalisation youth movement which is disaffected and disenchanted with liberal capitalism overall. As activists they also provide a platform for the expression of environmental concern and even anger in a way which the substantive body of mainstream politics can not begin to represent,

due to the embracing of models of liberal capitalist development by all shades of Western political expression.

As ecological management practices and sustainable development approaches become features of industrialism's compromise with a growing sense of ecological concern, the true nature of environmental protest has come to represent as much a challenge to established agencies of bureaucratic administration. In addition, this has led to the challenging of the infringement of industrialism on the environment of 'unspoilt nature'. The cases studied in this book can be understood in the context of this wider contest between grass-roots community campaigns and the technocratic alliance between industry and the state over the introduction of major projects or policies.

Chapter 2
Irish Environmental Activism: From Woodquay to the 'Celtic Tiger'

Introduction

Environmentalism and heritage in the Irish case are rooted in a diverse and contested history. For Tovey (1992b 278, 280) the contestation of heritage in Ireland is an 'ideological conflict' (ibid.) with problems on all sides of the divide. For instance, the project of modernisation involves a debate about historically derived meanings surrounding built or natural environments. The fact that Irish heritage is part of an 'official' environmentalism with links to British conservation initiatives became problematic in the postcolonial era. The demolition of Georgian Dublin was also part of a contested modernity (ibid.). Tovey quotes MacDonald's account of a government minister on the destruction of Georgian buildings in Kildare Street as claming 'They stood for everything I hate' (Tovey 1992b 279 in MacDonald 1985 12). The fact that much of Dublin's tenements were no more than slums in pre-independence Ireland added to the sense of ambivalence about the city's architectural heritage. As Tovey (2003) has noted, heritage groups such as the Irish Georgian Society took on the mantle of the 'moral entrepreneurs' (ibid.) of Dublin's built environment when the destruction of sections of the southern section of the city began in the 1970s. Ireland's heritage groups had invariably been closely connected with their British counterparts, and in some cases pre-dated partition. Essentially, conservation had emerged in the late 19th century as an aspect of colonial mapping of local heritage and wildlife, and in postcolonial Ireland a residue of unease has tainted many conservation debates due in part to its imperialist origins. Faced with a hegemonic concern for development combined with attempts to wipe out unwanted aspects of the past, conservationists became the curators of a living history which was under threat from political elites and developers alike.

Thomas Farel Heffernan sets the inception of this curator's vigil around the time of excavation of the east-end of the cross block in Dublin Castle in 1961 (Heffernan 1988 5–6). In the era of John F Kennedy's presidency, Ireland's architectural heritage had been revealed in 'an exciting glimpse' (ibid.). Dublin's origins could be traced back to their ancient Viking and Norman past, with visible links to Celtic neighbours also evident (ibid.). This discovery provided visible confirmation that the remains of Viking Dublin contained a site which could represent the past.

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

For Duncan (1993 39), 'sites of representation' present a dualistic signification of place. However in postcolonial Ireland, this representation was contentious, as the disputes about Woodquay and Georgian Dublin would later prove. The Irish environmental *movement* essentially has its roots in the Woodquay conservation protests and the Carnsore Point anti-nuclear dispute of the late 1970s and early 1980s.

The Woodquay protests were a series of marches in 1978 and 1979 led by archaeologists, student activists and the citizens of Dublin who were appalled by plans by Dublin Corporation to build new 'bunker'-style civic offices on the site of Dublin's original Viking settlements at Fishamble Street near Christchurch Cathedral and Dublin Castle. The offices, designed by Dublin architect Sam Stephenson, were opposed by Alderman Carmencita Hederman, Senator (and later President) Mary Robinson, medieval scholar FX Martin and Pat Wallace, later Director of the National Museum, archaeologists, actors and antiquarians as well as the Irish Communist Party and the *Hot Press* rock magazine (Heffernan 1988 58–79). Up to 20,000 people participated in the mass-marches at the height of the campaign, as Woodquay became a rallying call for those opposed to poor planning and political deficits After a major public debate and a series of High Court appearances, the site was declared a national monument, but one that could be built over by its legal owner, Dublin Corporation. As the Tara campaign would reveal 30 years later, national monuments were not protected from destruction by the apparatus of the state. The civic offices were built, but not before the protesters 'forced events' which led to the site being excavated for 8 years beyond the original date for the site's destruction (Heffernan 1988 132). The role of the Office of Public Works (OPW) was critical here as it would be in the Mullaghmore dispute in the 1990s. Woodquay was also the site of Ireland's first conservationist protest occupation, which would be repeated in various forms at the Glen of the Downs, at Rossport and at Carrickmines and Tara. It was here that conservation, environment and community concerns merged, creating a form of ecological populism that has been revived a certain moments of societal strain ever since. However, this movement has not always been a united one. In the post-boom years of the 1990s, concerns were voiced about the future direction of the movement. One of the key distinctions between first- and second-phase environmental campaigns has been the emergence of internet technologies in the 1990s. Communications technologies allowed campaigners to communicate with experts and like-minded campaigners, establish web pages, and provide immediate information for news services in a manner which allowed movements to compete with their mainstream opponents (Leonard 2005, 2007).

As the contexts of environmental disputes shifted from concerns about conservation and toxic industries towards a debate about the problems of consumerism and waste in Irish society, the focus of environmental campaigns were redirected, while a debate commenced as to the future of environmental movements in Ireland. A key point of this debate centred on the need for development of stronger links between environmentalists to successfully build an overall environmental movement in Ireland. The specific nature of localised or NIMBYist (not in my backyard) environmental campaigns in Ireland led to the creation of 'a particular kind of tunnel

vision' (Cox 1997 33) for Irish environmental movements. The opportunities for bridge-building and movement cooperation were not seized by the disparate groups campaigning against pollution in their local communities. One ecology conference set out the 'aims, aspirations and realities' facing the Irish environmental movement. These included the establishment of 'a sustainable movement culture' (Cox 1997 33–48), based on the movement theorists. Mario Diani's definition of movements is as 'networks between individuals' (ibid.). This networking was defined as occurring between people involved in groups, rather than through groups themselves. Such a definition is similar to that of the role of 'interpersonal contacts' established by Friedman and McAdam (1992 158), or of the 'solidarity networks' established by Della Porta and Diani (1999 8). The Galway conference, which was held under the title 'The Future of the Irish Environmental Movement', went on to discuss the significance of 'networks and cooperation' for environmental movements. The potential and possibilities of networks are based on two things; 'a shared movement identity' and 'a shared movement culture' (Cox 1997 33–48). Movement 'identity' is established through shared concerns and cooperative behaviour on environmental projects. 'Movement culture' is built from established contacts 'built into' (ibid.) specific campaigns, as well as into the lives of the participants. Within this understanding of networks the concept of 'skills and understanding' (ibid.) is established. Cooperation networks can put activists in touch with those who have 'skills' needed by a movement. These individuals can be 'persuaded to come along and give us the benefit of their experience' (Cox 1997 33–48). This sharing of 'skills and understanding' (ibid.) could be used to build a more extensive movement. However, the conference concluded that such networks had yet to be established in Ireland:

> I'm describing things, not as they are, but as they should be. We should be in this situation, but very often we're not – we don't see its value, we don't see what it's worth, we aren't prepared to 'waste time' on talking to each other except when we're already organising something very specific. And I think we pay the price of that. (Cox 1997 35)

However, environmental movements remained 'locally based and relatively small' (Yearley 1995 53) groups of local residents who formed to combat the perceived threat to their environment (Baker 1990; Tovey 1992b; Yearley 1995) in the decades of pre-Celtic Tiger multinational-led industrialisation. The lack of communication between groups before the rise of the internet remained a problem for Irish environmental movements throughout the 1980s. The isolation experienced by environmental activists led to a lack of 'sustainability' in campaign, as 'burnout' became a feature of environmental activism (Cox 1997 36). Further difficulties were encountered in relation to 'motivation and mobilisation' (ibid. 37) as activists struggled over time to maintain the organisational aspects of campaign mobilisation; maintaining offices, producing an 'alternative press' (ibid. 39) and retaining the networks necessary for wider campaign mobilisation.

Gerard Mullally (1997, 2006) has attempted to identify Irish environmentalism as a facet of an organised and globalised modernity. Irish environmental organisations are comprised of institutional agencies such as An Taisce, the National Trust

or NGOs like Greenpeace. For Mullally the existence of such groups represents an 'incorporation' of Irish environmentalism. Mullally identifies this disparity in his analysis, where he states that 'there is a danger of overstating the degree to which Irish environmentalism has been incorporated in decision-making structures' (2006 160). In order to fully understand community environmentalism in Irish society, the writings of Hilary Tovey remain the leading source of sociological analysis of the transition from rural traditionalism to urban modernity which has become a most significant theme in the Irish case. Throughout her many publications Tovey examines the environmental movement as a facet of radical rural development locally with links to the anti-globalisation movement. Essentially the environmental movement is reflective of an alternative living movement, which for Tovey encompasses lifestyle choices, environmentalism as a critique of mass production and consumption. The resultant movement is described as a 'working utopia' and a 'model for change' (Tovey 2006 181). There is also a distinction in tactical directions taken by Irish environmental movements. Peace (1997) has set out a definitive account of the oral hearing process which denies campaigners their 'discourse' (ibid.), as the emotions of rural sentiment dissipated within the confines and contexts of the courtroom. Many environmental groups have become social movement organisations (SMOs) or non-governmental organisations (NGOs) as non-community based campaigns undertake a 'process of institutionalisation' (Mullally 2006 146). The adoption of formal structures has allowed the environmental NGO sector to flourish in an era when politics has become globalised, allowing such groups to maintain a presence in a world that is continually reinventing itself and its means of debate. However, activists face the problem of cooptation by engaging with the processes of the mainstream, where political spin and hidden agendas compete with legal complications and cultural shifts as the issues most likely to cause a campaign to ultimately capitulate or lose its core identity in the face of wider global issues. Tovey (2007) examines activist culture as part of the 'movement scene' as well as those who participate in collective action, through an analysis of patterns of recruitment, life experiences and ideological orientations in the context of emerging as personalised notions of environmental citizenship (ibid.).

Laurence Cox's writings on the anti-globalisation groupings, which have fashioned the 'Movement of Movements' (2006 204), has mapped out a new direction for understandings of collective action in Ireland and beyond. His works weave many insightful threads through a number of recent movement events such as the opposition to the Iraq war and use of Irish airports by US military aircraft in route to the war and protests against the Dublin EU summit during Ireland's European presidency. Cox sets out to fashion an understanding of what the anti-globalisation movement means, be it anti-multinational, environmental, anti-war in addition to being opposed to many of the international neo-liberal forums such as the World Trade Agreement or the World Bank. Without doubt, these movements have provided a degree of the political momentum, leadership and overlapping personnel which in some way shaped incidents of environmental collective action in Ireland.

Professionals, Expertise and Mobilisation

'Resource Mobilisation Theory' (RMT) was initially conceived by McCarthy and Zald (1977) and later developed by many others. McCarthy and Zald revisited the concept of resources, extending its definition to include external linkages such as access to the state, corporate donations and other financial resources as well as internal movement features such as expertise, professional networks and voluntary support from the public. Movements were seen to be dependent on externalities such as:

> societal support or constraint … the linkages of social movements to other groups, the dependence of movements on external support … and the tactics used by authorities to control and incorporate movements. (McCarthy & Zald 1977 212)

Other studies of Resource Mobilisation Theory (McAdam 1982; Tarrow 1994) began to look beyond material resources towards the importance of movement leadership, organisation and interaction with the political process. The response of movements to the political sphere can be measured by examining the strategic choices of its leadership and the degree of organisation that can be achieved. Movement leaders must interpret the social and political processes that a movement encounters. As participation, commitment and achievement ebbs and flows throughout the duration of a protest, movement leaders or entrepreneurs must map out a strategic path which can create mutual understanding out of shared grievances. The background of a movement's leadership is also a crucial feature of campaigns of collective action.

Whereas 'old social movement activists' were often comprised of members of the working class, new social movements (such as the environmental movement) draw their participants from what has been described as 'the new middle class' (Inglehart 1977). Middle class interest groups may mobilise around environmental disputes in order to increase their political inclusion in wider neo-corporatist arrangements, while at the same time defending their local communities' autonomy from the state's development of infrastructural projects in their locality. Environmental disputes may be exploited to create the leverage necessary to increase access in a system of political closure (Scott 1990 135).

Furthermore, the tendency in neo-corporatist systems to focus on 'technocratic criteria' (Offe 1987 in Scott 1990 142), creates difficulties for political parties who wish to represent the concerns of the professional middle class, due to the tendency of professionals to have concerns that go beyond the economic, embracing lifestyle concerns as well. This void can be filled through the campaigns of environmental movements as public sector professionals, such as academics and those with alternative forms of expertise, mobilise and challenge the structures of closed corporatist power. The critique of closed political systems applied to European states such as Sweden, Germany and Austria can be applied to Ireland's own system of neo-corporatist closure, echoing Scott's question:

> What is it about neo-corporatist arrangements that have stimulated the development of Green movements in those countries? (Scott 1990 144)

New middle-class professionals also tend to live in newly built, suburbanised areas, where urban sprawl can be seen to impact upon the surrounding hinterland. New middle-class groups may use their education and professional expertise to organise in response to their lack of political representation, together with local environmental concerns (ibid.). This combination of perceptions of democratic deficit and environmental grievance provides the momentum for movement formation as communities of professionals mobilise in defence of ecological responsibility campaigns. As white-collar public sector workers, these professionals are not as dependent on industrial growth as private sector professionals. They can oppose industrial development without facing the costs of such opposition. In this way, some new professional or middle-class members can afford to take on challenges to industrial policy in ways not open to other social groups included in corporatist arrangements.

Professional experts often provide the leadership for movements. Movement leaders have been described as 'program professionals.' Leadership is exercised through the dissemination of information to potential activists through communication technologies. This allows such 'program professionals' to set the ideological agenda of a movement at its inception, creating a type of leadership which differs from the formal settings of established political parties. Middle-class participants contribute to a cause by offering their time or expertise. Networks of potential supporters or activists, some with prior experience, are then activated. A rather different suggestion is that leadership elites may centralise decision-making power and organise movements in a bureaucratic way, in order to increase movement effectiveness. These bureaucratic structures provide the basis for the maintenance of campaigns of collective action (ibid.). The utilisation of various forms of protest is considered by resource mobilisation theorists such as Gamson (1975) and McAdam (1982) to be an essential tactical resource, allowing for the mobilisation of the wider non-professional class in support of a particular cause. Due to their tactical importance, protests are planned and coordinated well in advance, with movement leaders orchestrating and demonstrating with the help of communication technologies. In so doing, a concerted attempt is made to highlight the movement's grievances, while attracting the support of the public to the movement's cause. In many cases, protests will embark on a series of disruptive activities that will then provoke a response from the authorities. In an era of continuous news coverage, contentious events are given priority airtime and thus can capture the public's attention.

By defining movement mobilisation as a rational activity, RM theorists highlight existing networks of activists as a further resource. The alliances and networks formed by movements are an integral aspect of collective responses. Much of what transpires as movement activity has its roots in the activation of networks or 'interpersonal contacts' (Friedman and McAdam 1992 158). Movements are influenced by previous campaigns of action and leaders may be drawn from prior movements. Networks may also be created from the sharing of resources such as office space and communication technologies. Networks provide outlets for participants from previous campaigns and the passing on of professional or scientific expertise from previous campaigns can provide crucial material for new challenges in other areas.

Movements must maintain an array of tactical approaches. Tactics such as strikes or public marches present a challenge to authority, while facilitating the promotion of a group's cause. This form of tactical approach also allows for a greater degree of interaction with the wider public, enhancing mobilisation while improving participant morale. Authorities are also notified of a movement's intent and must respond in some way, either granting access or increasing repression. These 'repertoires of contention' (Tilly 1977; Crossley 2002) are the chosen tactics and strategies of a movement, usually passed on by movement leaders with prior experience. The history of past campaigns is an important feature in the creation of future repertoires of action. In this way 'collective action usually takes well-defined forms already familiar to the participants' (Tilly 1977 143). As repertoires convey the medium of protest, media coverage has also come to shape the tactical choices made by movements. Large-scale direct actions such as mass marches are more likely to attract media attention. The increased media coverage of such events has led to a requirement of tactical flexibility and innovation from movement leaders. Fears of setting off reactions that increase repression may also influence repertoire choice.

Outcomes can be measured by the degree of structural or institutional change that results from a movement's campaign of action. Increased access to the structures of power is often synonymous with movement success, while increased repression may represent defeat. However, this is not always the case, as increased access may lead to a movement being co-opted by the political establishment, while increased repression may spark more widespread activism in response. By availing of the existing political opportunity structure, a movement may achieve some degree of success, and so bring about change in the short-term. However, movements that cross the threshold of the mainstream and come to be seen as political insider (ibid.) run the risk of losing touch with their membership, or of being subsumed by the formal structures of politics.

Political Opportunity

As societies undergo periods of transformation, increased discord can create what theorists have come to describe as 'political opportunity structures' that facilitate movement responses. This concept, first put forward by Eisinger (1973), describes the contexts in which patterns of political opportunities emerge and decline. The 'biases' of the political landscape must therefore be negotiated. If the political structure displays a degree of responsiveness towards activism, the opportunity structure for such groups remains open. Influence can be brought to bear by groups in this case. In the over-centralisation of power, opportunities may be limited, as local interests are superseded by policy considerations.

Once activated, movements create further conditions for opportunities to surface in response to mobilisation, emergent networks and responsiveness of government. If participation is widespread and effective, to the point where a successful outcome

is possible, political opportunities may result. In addition, repressive or undemocratic responses by the state may create further opportunities for movements to exploit. Those participants 'who seize upon such opportunities have been described as movement "entrepreneurs" (McCarthy & Zald 1977 in Tarrow 1994 15). These entrepreneurs or leaders have the motivation to invoke activism through the utilisation of existing political opportunities. Tarrow defines political opportunity structure as the external resources that can provide wider incentives for protests. The external features of a political opportunity structure include aspects of the political system that affect the public, through government policies. These are enduring but informal with an uneven distribution, yet are utilised by every level of group organisation. The varied levels of political interaction provide the dimensions of opportunities which frame the political landscape from which a movement can emerge:

> The concept of political opportunity structure helps us to understand why movements sometimes gain surprising, but temporary, leverage against elites and then quickly lose them despite their best efforts. (Tarrow 1994 85)

Another feature of the political opportunity structure that can be exploited is the existence of political instability, resulting from electoral difficulties, uneasy coalitions and political realignments. The existence of political divisions in the ruling elite encourages challengers to act upon these 'windows of opportunity.' Electoral success in marginal constituencies and internal political disputes provide instances where opportunities can be seized upon by challengers. One way in which challenges can be undertaken is demonstrated in the third aspect of opportunity structure presented by Tarrow the availability of influential allies. Gamson is cited in this regard, providing evidence which points to the existence of:

> a strong correlation between the presence of influential allies and movement success. The allies can provide a legal or political counterbalance to the authorities and provide advice or expertise to a campaign. The creation of interpersonal relationships and movement networks has become a feature of challenges to political elites, as the existence of such networks may provide increased chances of successful outcomes. (Gamson 1990 in Tarrow 1994 88)

The existence of cleavages within elite groupings may present further political opportunities. Where divisions occur among those in authority, challenges can be encouraged. These political circumstances can provide the incentive necessary to induce mobilisation for action. Leaderships in waiting can also try to seize power by exploiting political divisions in the ruling establishment. Ultimately, these aspects of political opportunity structure may not occur simultaneously and the existence of any one of these features may be enough to encourage political challenges. Within this political upheaval opportunities for protest may be found.

Pre-existing socio-cultural cleavages are the basis for class and political divides in modern societies, creating adversaries who are imbued in long held understandings of existing societal factions and their relevant beliefs and conflicts (Kriesi 2004 73). From this basis, emerging issues are reframed in modern contexts, as new variables are applied to traditional disputes between classes, regions, religions or

states. This embedded culture of dissent provides movements with their mobilising potential, as old grievances are developed in opposition to modern impositions, when political structures allow access during moments of crisis. Therefore, social movements must exploit the political opportunities that emerge during the evolution of a dispute. One way that movements can successfully contest issues is by creating a degree of consensus around the meaning and values surrounding the dispute. By creating meanings based on their positions movements can shape understandings about the nature of dispute, thereby influencing responses of the public and the involved institutions. This creation of meaning around protest is known as framing. Movements create a frame by 'identifying events' (Goffman 1974 21) and establishing the sense of grievance that can be presented to the public as part of a movement's cause. The creation of meanings through 'collective action frames' is achieved through the Amplification of meanings, Transformation of old meanings and the Generation of new meanings (Snow et al. 1986 in Snow & Benford 1992 136).

When a movement has identified a societal grievance which can provide the focus of a dispute, its meaning is 'amplified' by the mobilisation of resources by that movement. Therefore, mobilisation transforms old meanings, providing movements with the opportunity to challenge the policy creating the grievance. New meanings are then 'generated' through the 'cycles of protest' (Snow & Benford 1992 141) that emerge from that movement's ability to exploit the political opportunities arising as a result of their challenge. This creates a link between the manner in which movements frame grievances, mobilise resources and exploit political opportunities. This link is established around 'the mobilisation of consensus' (Klandermans et al. 1988 175) as movements attempt to promote their perspective on issues through public events, utilising the media and by elevating their campaigns. By 'amplifying' certain issues of contention, movements can influence the cycles of protest, framing the wider understandings of these issues in a way that correlates with their ideological perspective

According to Tarrow (1994 123), 'frames like injustice are powerful mobilising resources.' Movement leaders, made up of entrepreneurs, must translate the grievances inherent in any perceived injustice to their movement, the public and the institution being challenged. Movement leaders that fail to establish overall understanding about such grievances may lose control of the movements and protests may lose direction as a result. One method of establishing consensus is through 'media framing' where movements strategically interact with the media, as the media becomes 'an external resource' (Tarrow 1994 126). This use of media allows movements to contest or create orthodox understandings about the issue or grievance central to the dispute. Internet technology and news networks can be utilised by movements to propagate their grievances and aims as a 'diffuse vehicle for consensus formation' and to 'help gain initial attention and maintain support' for their campaigns (ibid.). Framing the significant events of a campaign can allow grassroots movements to mobilise the data and expertise with which challenges to mainstream information sources can be taken. For environmental movements, it is their ability to use 'interest driven science' to challenge 'official science' (Grove-White 1993 22) that strengthens their case and provides the leverage necessary to maintain

campaigns. In this way, environmental movements have been able to frame wider understandings of what environmental disputes are about; allowing movements to gain increased access to political opportunity structures though a successful mobilisation of consensus about grievances, making it difficult for an institution or state to win the confidence of the public, who have become wary of risk technologies:

> The persistent political misrepresentation of human experience … intensify mistrust in engaged individuals in environmental and other NGO's … this results directly from the fact that the concepts … are frequently inadequate … people use, and even manipulate the consequential mistrust … much of the drive behind environmental politics … may well have arisen from it. (Grove-White 1993 25)

A global network of environmental and anti-toxics movements has emerged, providing resources, expertise and support for like-minded movements worldwide, challenging 'the basis of social authority of scientific knowledge…in environmental argument' (ibid.). By contesting official science, movements can frame 'a new moral discourse' (ibid.) around environmental orthodoxy, creating orthodox understandings that can become embedded in social thought. This allows movements to shape understandings, create consensus and to exploit the anxieties of the public, in an era where the 'risk society' has created simultaneous dependency and concern about technology (Beck 1992). This has led to the 'opportunistic character' (Grove-White 1993 27) of much of the environmental movement's contestation of environmental policy. Political opportunities must be seized upon and framed in a manner that correlates with the agenda of populist movements. The shifting and evolving dynamic of the institutional dependence on and need for regulation of technologies, can lead to policy changes which are exploited by environmental movements. However, the evolving political opportunity structure that emerges around the contestation of orthodox understandings of environmental risks may have as much to do with the dynamic of movement agenda and institutional responses.

Some features or variables of a political opportunity structure may act as both a resource for and a constraint on environmental movements. Movement literature (McAdam McCarthy & Zald 1996; Rootes 1997) has built upon the original understandings created by Eisinger and Tarrow, by focusing on the manner in which political opportunity structures are established through the alliances and interactions that are formed by movement integration with the institutions of the formal political sphere. This external political environment contains a shifting array of variables from which collective activity is shaped. Nonetheless, these variables may not exist or may become problematic for interest groups in states that are characterised by tendencies towards centralised power, clientelism and corporatism. These are variables of the political environment that become the external resources that shape the political opportunities which movements can exploit. For instance, when the nature of government is weakened by coalitions, politics, internal competition and corporatist arrangements, the resultant over-centralisation of power leads to reduced or closed political opportunities. Neo-corporatist structures may lead to the exclusion of environmental interests from partnership arrangements that focus on industrial and economic growth.

Proportional Representation through the Single Transferable Vote (PR-STV) allows constituents to maximise their voting power and has led to an over emphasis on localism and personalism in the Irish system, as competition within parties between candidates becomes prevalent:

> Brokerage work affects the operation of the political and administrative systems and some suggest that it plays a part in shaping political culture. (Coakley & Gallagher 1999 225)

The Irish political system is presented as a clientelist model where corporatist structures incorporate pressure groups to the benefit of privileged interests. Collins and O'Shea also define Irish clientelism as a form of brokerage, liking it to a form of professional mediation, albeit with special access to the mechanism of state bureaucracy (Collins & O'Shea 2004). This restriction of access may have implications for environmental movements that challenge policy. Environmental movements are dependent on a degree of openness in the existing opportunity structure to achieve the alliances necessary to further their representation of interests. Movements that engage in challenges to policy are dependent on the availability of resources and opportunities within existing political environment. Problems arise for movements when collective behaviour encounters restricted access to the levels of power, due to the prevalence of clientelist structures or over-centralised institutions of government. Political closure through the centralisation of power can result in weak governments and an over reliance on coalitions. The distinctive types of institutions that shape the wider political structure are central to understandings of the performance of environmental movement operating within a given political framework (Scruggs 1999 9). In the case of governments who favour corporatist arrangements, environmental movements may face restructured access. If corporatist policymaking excludes environmental groups and prioritises the interests of industry, this restriction may constitute an opportunity for movements who wish to challenge the resultant policy. As professional middle classes supply a large number of environmental movements' participants, the exclusion of this social group's concerns from the corporatist table creates unrest and gives rise to movement responses (ibid.).

In political systems such as is employed in Ireland, which utilises a system of PR-STV, a wider representation of interests may occur as competition compels 'parties to accommodate interests' (Scruggs 1999 9). Local councillors keep the brokerage system activated while the TD representative is away on Dáil business. Bax (1976 81) calls these local brokers 'the broker's broker'. While this set of political relations promotes alliances between interest groups and politicians at a local level the demands of government from the centralised core leads to a restriction in opportunities, as access is constrained. However, in states where clientelism is prevalent this may not be the case as competition between the parties may overcome such accommodation of interests. As movements seek out alliances with political parties or figures at times of elections, promises given in return for electoral support may be broken as the demands of government formation supersede all other considerations. In this way, the political opportunities presented to a movement can be demonstrated to be constantly in a state of flux, highlighting the

importance of a movement's ability to negotiate the shifting sands of the political opportunity structure open at the moment collective action is undertaken.

Social Partnership and Neo-Corporatism

The priority of the Irish state, since its inception, has been the creation of a stable economic environment that would provide a platform for long-term employment and continued economic growth. The ideological and electoral concerns of the political parties have been overcome by the prioritisation of low corporate tax regimes, beginning with the Lemass/Whitaker Shannon Enterprise project in the late 1950s. The focus on low corporation taxes was one of the policy goals of the Fianna Fáil/Progressive Democrats coalitions between 1997 and 2007. The decision to focus on neo-corporatist style 'social partnerships' was a strategic choice for Fianna Fáil as that party had a populist core identity. Fianna Fáil had made a choice to favour the state's policy framework in order to maintain focus on competition and growth. For instance, in regard to the 2002 election Fianna Fáil made no change to their waste manifesto despite populist pressure. Relationships between ideologically opposed parties, which are presented in manifestos for election, may differ from the policy pursued by that party once elected (Mair in Laver 2001 24). In other words, the ideological contestation of elections may have no bearing on the subsequent policy programme of that party. Invariably, Fianna Fáil reverted to the state's competitive policy framework once they had been re-elected. The merger of party manifesto and state policy created an overarching focus on a 'multifaceted competitiveness' (Mair in Laver 2001 23–24). Today Irish policy remains in the hands of state managers, technocrats and unelected bureaucrats, advisors and civil servants. These elites are recruited by the state to maintain its structuralist supremacy over the ever-changing political actors who are concerned with populist responses to their stated manifestos. It is the job of the technocrat to ensure that the state's political strategy of maintaining competitiveness and growth is maintained, in spite of populist or ideological demands. In this way, environmental challengers are stymied as their local political allies are restricted in their responses, once they have entered parliament.

The state has reached out to the major representative social groups such as the business and trades unions to create a neo-corporatist social partnership that shared this focus on competitiveness and growth. Here, an agenda for low corporate tax regimes, improved industrial relations and wage restraint was established as the template for competitiveness and growth. The concept of 'bargained' or 'neo-corporatism' (Roche and Cradden in Adshead & Millar 2003 71, 74) has the state taking a pro-active lead in a collective bargaining process which encompassed employers and unions in an attempt to manage economic performance. This form of 'competitive corporatism' subsumes the once divergent agendas of tax reform or reduction, flexible specialisation in the workplace, pay negotiations, industrial relations, training of the workforce and reform of public and state expenditure.

Leading employer and trades union representatives took on the role of issue groups' negotiators trying to gain concessions from the state for their members. Forms of neo-corporate social partnerships have been denounced for being undemocratic (ibid.) as this type of institutional arrangement may lead to an over centralisation of power, with the prioritisation of focus on the concerns of social elites over the aspirations of the democratically elected parties of the Dáil.

Another perspective on social partnership is that it allows for an enhancement of democracy, as political participation becomes more inclusive of sectional interest groups through 'associational democracy' (Hirst 1993). However, the model of social partnership in operation in Ireland currently excludes environmental movement organisations, creating ongoing tension between the state and the environmental lobby. As environmental concerns may run counter to the state's prioritisation on competitiveness and growth, a dichotomy between both the state and the EU's environmental directives, on one hand and between the state and local environmental challengers on the other, has opened up creating the opportunity for environmental challenges to state policy to be undertaken.

The 'Paradox' of Exclusion

While some groups such as An Taisce or Comhar (the National partnership for Sustainable Development) do contribute to discussions about social partnership or local development boards, they do so in a 'semi-detached' manner (Doran 2007 3). Critics of corporatist and neo-corporatist centralised arrangements have indicated that the processes of inclusion or exclusion that result from the state's facilitation or repression of access to political structures creates a 'dimension of political opportunity' (Tarrow 1994, 1998) for movements such as environmental campaigners. 'Inclusive' corporatist arrangements are usually 'restricted to employers and organised labour' (Scott 1990 144). The 'closed' (ibid. 145) nature of corporatist arrangements:

> Means that groups excluded from these processes may mobilise at grassroots level, knowing that 'normal' challenges are closed off (ibid.).

One social group that is particularly affected by this form of corporatist closure is the new middle-class professionals. This group is therefore in a position to challenge political exclusion or democratic deficit, providing advocacy groups with a degree of oppositional power lost to the now less significant unionised industries:

> It is the paradoxical position of the new middle class, rather than its exclusion alone, which has inclined it towards social protest and ecological ideology. (ibid.)

This 'paradoxical position' has been described as a 'simultaneity' between the 'challenging' and 'sustaining' dimension of rights campaigns and institutionalisation, placing rights campaigns between 'the power over' and 'the power to' within the wider dimensions of political opportunity structures (Stammers 1999 96).

The relevance of a wider political opportunity structure for environmental movements that operate in a clientelistic and neo-corporatist state is a significant feature of Irish environmental disputes. As opportunities are presented the role of movement leaders becomes important as the crucial nature of movement mobilisation in response to attempts to gain access becomes apparent. The role of new middle-class movement leaders in challenging policy has become a significant feature of these disputes. The emergence of new social movements has become a feature of a changing Irish society, and environmental movements are located in the context of collective actors who challenge the state for reasons other than concerns about economic inequality. Environmental movements can be seen as a part of the new social movement 'sector', displaying characteristics in their mobilisation and organisation that are typical of 'new' movement campaigns.

The environmental concerns of the professional middle class are ultimately seen to be contravening the economic priorities of the neo-corporatist partners of the state, business groups and trades unions who are focused on maintaining competitiveness (Jessop 1990 248–272). We have examined the 'paradox' of neo-corporatist closure for environmental movements, as such political arrangements deny access on one hand and provide an impetus for the mobilisation of environmental campaigns on the other (Scott 1990). While environmental movements may mobilise local populist support and forge alliances, the political opportunity structures that facilitate this at local level may lead to restriction of access to the political arrangements of core state structures. Ultimately, the manner in which movements mobilise internal resources such as expertise, networks and leaderships to frame their campaigns allows for an extension of these campaigns into a phase of exploiting the external resources of the political opportunity structure.

These movements have come to be seen as 'rational actors, facilitated by the mobilisation of resources by movement leaders or entrepreneurs' (Della Porta & Diani 1994 7) has established an elementary 'polity' model depicting the wider participants in many forms of collective behaviour responses to social discord. This includes the participation of 'government' or the institutional authority causing social grievance, 'contender' which contains the collective activity of groups and governments and 'coalitions' which are networks that emerge from such collective action. Political opportunity structures are established through the interaction of a movement with the wider political sphere. Tilly (ibid.) describes these political opportunity structures as being comprised of 'power' or the favouring of interactions to the benefit of one side of a dispute. 'Political power' results from 'interactions with governments'. The degree of power lost or gained is equated with the degree of 'favourability' achieved. 'Repression' is measured through the 'costs' of activism extracted from contenders. 'Political repression' is derived from the increased costs that result from losses after a challenge to government. 'Opportunity' can be seen as the degree of success of a group or 'realisation of its interests being enhanced through a successful utilisation of events and resources.

In his article on 'Identity and Mobilisation' Melucci (1988 329) sets out an understanding of how the 'gap' between the objective conditions and 'collective behaviours' created the phenomenon of an 'actor without action.' Melucci (1988)

has fashioned an understanding of the dynamics of group integration and mobilisation. Individuals communicate meanings, which are translated into action. According to Melucci, a process of 'organisation' takes place in the following manner:

> Individuals acting collectively 'construct' their action by means of 'organised' investment that is, they define in cognitive terms the field of possibilities and limits which they perceive, while at the same time activating their relationships so as to give sense to their 'being together and to the goals they pursue'. (Melucci 1988 332)

Furthermore, Melucci has highlighted some of the underlying aspects of group mobilisation which can address the case. His understanding of 'movement potential' or the existence of a section of the population that is favourably disposed to a campaign is applicable to various environmental campaigns. Mobilisation has been defined by Etzioni (1968 388–389 cited in Tilly 1978) as 'the process by which a unit gains significantly in the control of assets it previously did not control.' Tilly (1978 69) presents Etzioni's classification of assets, or resources, that are utilised for mobilisation purposes. These include 'coercive' and 'manipulative technologies' utilisation, such as finances and 'information services' and/or the loyalties of interpersonal contacts. The resources mobilised include information and communication technologies, the information services of mainstream media, local and national press, the internet and the normative networks and contacts with local and international figures who could provide expertise for the case. In this way, movements are able to interpret 'shared grievance', such as the proposal for an infrastructural project and shape a challenge to government or industrial policy from this interpretation. One of the first challenges faced by the committee was convincing the public of their argument. This process is described by Piven & Cloward (1979) as follows:

> It is also necessary that people who normally accept authority and are convinced of the legitimacy of institutions, come to recognise that this authority and these institutions are unjust and wrong. In addition, people who are usually fatalistic and feel that the existing order cannot be changed must become convinced that they are capable of changing their condition. (Piven & Cloward cited by Klandermans 1989a 179)

While the shared grievance of opposition to projects brings participants together, there may be those in a campaign's leadership who recognise the need to avoid generating the degree of negative coverage directed at previous environmental groups by the media. Klandermans (1989a 181) outlined the importance of establishing 'action goals' which are:

> instrumental for eliminating the dissatisfaction or fulfilling the aspirations that are at the root of a movement's mobilisation potential. (Klandermans 1989a 181)

Studies have indicated the existence of 'leadership types' who step forward as groups emerge. On a more practical level, 'decision-making' leaders 'direct the movement by their preferences and choices' (Klandermans 1989a 220). Leaders can be further distinguished as mobilisers of consensus, publicity or other resources. Wilson (1973) identifies these distinct leadership types as being either 'charismatic' or 'pragmatic', while further studies indicate a distinction between participants who

engage in bureaucratic organisation and others who focus on activism. The utilisation of resources by leaders shapes the structures of a movement.

A central feature of this analysis is the importance of how issues are framed in the context of social grievances. The relevant issues can only be framed through the intervention of movement entrepreneurs or gatekeepers. 'Issue importance', according to Dearing & Rogers (1996), can be increased through 'public' and 'policy agenda setting.' From this perspective, policy response to an issue is dependent on the importance such an issue is granted by public and media agendas. In this way, successful outcomes to social movement activity are demonstrated to be increasingly reliant on that movement's ability to frame issues and influence professional media elites, in addition to provoking a public response to an issue of public concern. Subsequently, a movement's ability to frame issues and build consensus becomes a crucial aspect of their campaign.

A further understanding of the importance of influencing media in the framing process can be achieved through an analysis of the 'editorial gatekeeper'. It is the role of such gatekeepers to decide what events in society are noteworthy enough to feature on front page or primetime news reports. Their importance to a grass-roots movement framing their grievance can be crucial to the success of a campaign. While political disputes still require the exchange of views from adversarial groups, the influence of media on the public perception of that dispute ultimately influences the outcome of such disputes. Gradually, the media's coverage of events can be influenced by ideologically driven perspectives. The meanings of societal disputes around topics such as environmental or human rights are subject to an ideologically based conflict of definition. Here again, framing issues through the media plays a central role, shaping the public perception of social issues.

According to Tarrow (1994 125–129) media framing is an important aspect of movement strategy. Tarrow looks at 'three stages' where media becomes 'an external resource' (ibid.) for movements. The first is in the area of consensus mobilisation and formation, from a movement's inception through the establishment of a shared social grievance that can be framed as an injustice. Secondly, the media allows movements to communicate with the public, providing a degree of legitimacy and 'status' (ibid.). However, Tarrow also argues that the media is 'far from neutral' (ibid.) and movements must establish their credentials through the provision of accurate data to help the media's presentation of the issue. In so doing, movements can give a degree of journalistic or editorial support. Movements have become adept at utilising internet technologies in the information age.

The Phases of Economic Development

Environmental campaigns in Ireland can be divided into pre- and post-affluence phases of multinational-led economic development between 1958 and 2002. These cases can be examined through an application of Tarrow's 'four most salient changes' in relation to the 'dimensions of political opportunity' in each of these community

responses. Particular aspects of the political opportunity structure include 'Increasing Access'; 'Unstable Alignments'; 'Influential Allies' and 'Divided Elites' which can encourage community responses to state policy (Tarrow 1994 85–89). Tarrow's theory sheds light on questions about the nature of Irish environmental campaigns by asking the following questions:

- Who is looking for 'increased accesses in these cases and how access is increased?
- What types of 'alignments' were created?
- To what extent were alliances 'influential' or otherwise and who were the influential allies?
- How were elites divided?

An 'issue history' (Szasz 1994) survey provides further understandings of the nuances of each case. It places them in the overall context of environmental campaigns in Ireland that have mobilised and framed issues concerning health risks and democratic deficit during an era of post-modernity (Lyotard 1984) where science no longer provides all the answers:

> Intellectual life is now dominated by a crisis of faith in the major modern ideas of science, progress and reason; individuals have lost their trust in the ability of science to give them answers. (Bilton et al. 2002)

This 'crisis in faith' was manifested in the community challenges to multinationals in Ireland, as the concept of 'science' itself came to be contested. Another significant event that shaped the 'curvilinear' (Eisinger 1973) political opportunity structure surrounding the issues was the emergence of the 'Peace Process' and the signing of the Good Friday Agreement in 1998. This led to increased opportunities for cooperation between the administrations in Dublin and Belfast, as the international funds for reconciliation turned the border into a resource, creating 'networks of interaction' (O'Dowd & Wilson 1996 8) in the once mutually exclusive areas on either side of the frontier. The wider context of the evolving opportunity structure was also influenced by external factors such as the demands placed on the state by EU anti-pollution directives. This increased demand for a more stringent regulatory framework, in addition to the increase in community campaigns on environmental issues, led to the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1992. Within the pre- and post-Celtic Tiger phases a series of subcategories prove to be part of the evolution of the issue history and opportunity structure. These subcategories include ecopopulist campaigns which mobilised in opposition to US multinationals in the first phase and state supported infrastructure in the second phase:

- Pre-*Celtic Tiger* Disputes Urban Heritage and Opposing Toxic Industries
- Anti-Multinationals Raybestos Manhattan/Merrell Dow in Cork
- Anti-Pharmaceuticals Merck Sharp and Dohme in Tipperary
- Cross-Border Du Pont, Derry
- Post-*Celtic Tiger* Resources and Conservation Shell to Sea and Tara/Skryne
- Anti-Landfill Tralee, Ennis and Galway

- Anti-Incinerator Cork Harbour, Galway and Duleek, Co. Meath; Poolbeg in Dublin
- Cross-Border All Ireland Waste Strategy

The political opportunity structure evolved in a 'curvilinear' (Eisinger 1973) manner, as the shifting dimensions of political opportunity came to be affected by external events such as the peace process or the onset of environmental regulation. The variables of resource mobilisation, framing and interaction within the opportunity structure can be tested by applying Tarrow's (1994, 1998) 'four most salient changes' to each of the cases that have emerged in this context. The political opportunity structure surrounding ecopopulist campaigns in Ireland emerged from the state's choice of a policy that created a dependency on external transnational investment at a time when groups of 'new middle class' professionals were becoming concerned about environmental issues. The state was also in the paradoxical position of having to implement EU environmental protection policies, which the local authorities were responsible for, while continuing to compete with each other to attract multinationals into their locality (Coyle 1994 68). This intense pursuit of a policy of attracting foreign investment to Ireland became a priority of both the state and local authorities during the 1970s and 1980s. At the same time, Irish communities were beginning to develop 'from below' (Varley 1991a 49) as groups opposed to the health-risk potential of some multinationals were formed. At the heart of the matter was the prioritisation of economic growth over environmental protection, leading to 'an extremely facilitating and generous open-door policy to foreign companies. Ultimately community campaigns against multinationals emerged from the political opportunities thrown up by this paradox at the same time as the potential for mobilising the concerns and expertise of a middle class that had grown by 22% in the previous two decades (Breen et al. 1990 57) was increasing.

There are two strands of 'scientific data' utilised by both communities and the state in the course of disputes. On the one hand, a form of 'official science' (Grove-White 1993) exists based on the data of the professional consultants, such as chemists and engineers, employed by the state. This 'official science' is based on understandings of science and technology that are linked to industrial development. Then there is the 'issue driven science' (ibid.) utilised by communities who challenge state policy based on concerns about the health risks posed by the processes of 'official science'. Professionals such as Dr. Paul Connett contributed the 'issue driven' scientific evidence in the DuPont case in Derry and in disputes on toxics in Cork Harbour, as well as being a pivotal resource during anti-incinerator campaigns during the 1990s and 2000s.

Ireland has been traditionally over-reliant on landfill as a waste management solution (Fagan 2003) and the state's attempts to locate new dumps in areas around the country were met with local resistance. Communities were concerned about the health risks posed by landfill sites, and groups in Tralee, Ennis, Cork and Galway have challenged the state's landfill policy. In Galway, the challenges against the Carrowbrowne and Ballinasloe landfills impacted upon the local anti-incinerator campaign, as these landfills reached near capacity and the state responded to the rejection of the regional waste plan by councillors on the grounds of concerns about

incineration. However, the potential health and the emergence of environmental groups as risks posed by incineration would be framed as a societal grievance by campaigners in 2001 in a similar way to the environmental disputes of the 1970s and 1980s. In short, the first major political opportunity presented to environmental movements was the state's attempts to locate multinational industries in areas around high unemployment spots. While the Republic of Ireland went through an economic transformation from the mid-1990s on, the overriding concern of the state throughout was to attract multinationals. As economic stagnation gave way to growth, an emerging consumer society saw the focus switch from industrial to consumer waste. Baker (1990) has divided the strategic approaches of Irish grass-roots groups into 'formal' groups, using legal frameworks and 'direct action' groups, using pickets and marches. Irish environmental groups have combined both 'formal' and 'direct' approaches to challenge the state. As economic demands shaped the response of the state during these environmental disputes, movements were unable to make the transition defined by Szasz from 'NIMBY to radical environmentalism' (Szasz 1994 69). However, Tarrow's understanding of the 'four most salient changes' (Tarrow 1994 85) explore the manner in which Irish environmental movements have mobilised and exploited opportunities.

The Republic of Ireland emerged from colonial domination to become a semi-peripheral, dependent and agrarian economy on the edge of Europe. Its economy was characterised by high rates of unemployment and economic stagnation, with little or no indigenous industry outside of the larger cities such as Dublin and Cork. In 1958 a policy of multinational-led development was prioritised by the Lemass government. This policy, devised by the senior civil servant, Ken Whitaker, was introduced to help expand the Irish economy, based on the adage 'a rising tide lifts all boats.' In other words, foreign investment through US multinationals would create enough of a wealth-base to enable the Irish economy to develop and modernise. Transnational corporations (TNCs) would provide the investment capital which the Irish business class were unable or unwilling to supply (Allen, K. 2000 17). Although the Lemass/Whitaker economic plan was based on the introduction of direct foreign investment, Ireland lacked an investment class and never achieved the 'value-system shift' (ibid.) necessary to overcome local mistrust of technology, science and multinational industry. Although DeValera's protectionist economic policies were being abandoned, local communities and business interest remained inward looking, in the main. In the aftermath of Ireland's entry into the EU in 1973, foreign investment increased in the following 6 years by 27% per annum (O'Hearn 1998 39). These electronics, chemical and pharmaceutical multinationals were primarily US based, with plants being established across Ireland eager to avail of the EU's duty-free tax regime (ibid.). The Irish Development Authority (IDA) was given the remit to attract foreign investment into Ireland. So successful was the IDA that the state became dependent on its ability to continually bring new multinationals to Ireland to create jobs, rather than in promoting indigenous manufacturing. 'As time went on the southern state relied more and more heavily on attracting greater numbers of new firms each year to meet its employment targets' (O'Hearn 1998 40).

The Irish state relinquished many regulatory procedures to facilitate the attraction of inward investment, as well as introducing low corporate tax policies, all of which increased foreign investment, while weakening indigenous business and investment regimes. This loss of control over aspects of economic power has been identified as part of the dependent nature of 'recent rapid growth economies' (O'Hearn 1998 116) such as Ireland's, in the 1990s. While Ireland's entry into the EU brought some initial benefits, the 1980s brought increased economic stagnation, characterised by rising unemployment and emigration. The Irish state was desperately attempting to attract multinationals into the country at a time when US pollution controls were being tightened, in the aftermath of the Love Canal controversy (Szasz 1994 5). One result of the Irish state's carte blanche approach towards multinationals was the location in Ireland of industries which became the focus of community campaigns. These campaigns focused on the pollution and health risks posed by some multinationals. Three such campaigns, in the 1970s and 1980s outline the shifts in Irish environmental campaigns against toxic industries. These shifts embraced the anti-multinational and localised concerns of communities. The common problem was the toxicity of the products and emission or dumps associated with the relevant multinational industry. This problem of toxicity was framed by local activists as posing health risks for communities, as well as threatening farming and fishing industries. In each case, populist responses to the threat of pollution by multinationals represented the beginning of an anti-toxics collective action tradition in Ireland. These cases were notable for the involvement of educated middle-class professionals, less dependent on multinationals jobs or the State, who had the expertise and autonomy to mobilise against state or industrial policy when health risks were presented and framed in an effective manner.

The state's attempts to site multinationals in locations around Ireland have been contested since the 1970s. Baker (1990 47) has highlighted the nature of Ireland's 'dependent industrial development' that sees the state attempting to locate toxic industrial plants in areas of high unemployment. She points to the peripherality of Ireland's economy which results in highly polluting plants that are unpopular in core states where environmental groups are highly organised. While a consensus on social partnership and neo-liberal economics has been credited with reviving a troubled economy with high unemployment rates (Allen, K. 2000 11), the state's attempts to tackle local unemployment by attempting to lure in foreign TNC's precede the Celtic Tiger. There were two strands of environmental controls which were dealt with by the Minister for the Environment, while the implementation of environmental regulations was the responsibility of the Local Authorities. Compliance with environmental regulations was often negotiable, and 'it was not uncommon for close consultation to take place between the regulator and business interests' (Taylor 2001 10). This form of consensual clientelism was the norm in the pre-'Celtic Tiger' Ireland, with the focus of local politics fully geared towards the provision of industry and employment. In this context, environmental regulations were not necessarily a priority; indeed the opposite may have been the case as local authority officials could be influenced by local politicians in certain cases, and proceedings against industries could be discontinued (ibid.).

Of course, the application of stringent environmental regulations might have jeopardised attempts to attract direct foreign investment into Ireland. With little regard given to environmental regulations, Ireland became a 'pollution haven' (Allen, R. 2004 3). In particular, Ireland became a favoured destination for US multinationals who hoped to avoid the stringent regulations imposed by the US government. While EU environmental directives were adopted as part of domestic legislation, they were not enforced with any degree of stringency, as many multinationals came to believe that Ireland was a country were the regulatory regime was somewhat lax, facilitating industry at almost any cost to create employment. Environmental issues were not as prominent during the lean economic years of the late 1970s and the 1980s. During this time Ireland was:

> near the bottom of the league in terms of concern for the environment, especially when the issue was a trade-off between economic growth and environmental protection. (Whiteman 1990 from Coyle 1994 63)

While the Irish Green Party began to make some impact on the national political scene, winning its first seat in 1989 (ibid. 65), the state's prioritisation of multinational-led development continued to be subject to challenges from 'locally based indigenous groups' (ibid. 63). Local debates about the economic benefits of having a multinational sited in a community as opposed to the potential risks to health and the local environment often led to ecopopulist campaigners being:

> met with hostility within their own community where they have been perceived as anti-development and anti-industry. (ibid. 65)

There was already a consensus between the agencies of the state, local authorities, corporations and unions which pre-dated the social partnership ethos that became prevalent in the later 1980s. With the trades unions on board, the only effective opposition to neo-corporatist orthodoxy was found in local community groups, who began to protest about the potentially harmful effects of the pollution emanating from multinational plants. This original consensus, which emerged as the model for the neo-corporatist partnership in the later 1980s and throughout the 1990s, also led to the creation of political opportunities for community groups with concerns about the environmental degradation caused by multinational plants. Environmental movement responses to the state's industrial policy began in the 1970s. Objections to toxic industry occurred at Pfizer's in the early 1970s, Akcan in 1974, Schering Plough in 1974 and Beechams in 1977. Baker has claimed that the focus of these disputes challenges directly the very foundation of Irish industrial policy development through the attraction of direct foreign investment in Ireland (Baker 1990 76).

These environmental groups exploited the shifting political opportunity structure that surrounded the issue of institutional exclusion of environmental actors due to neo-corporatist orthodoxy, as community groups challenged the state and the multinational sector on issues such as the siting of toxic plants or landfill dumps. An historical survey using Tarrow's (1994, 1988) 'four most salient changes' (1994 85) provides an illustration of how the political opportunity structure surrounding environmental challenges to the state was constituted, and what influence it had on

the mobilisation of such challenges. When the Merck Sharp and Dohme chemical plant opened in South County Tipperary in 1976, it was seen as a victory for the Industrial Development Authority (IDA), who had joined with South Tipperary County Councillors in defeating a small group of environmentalists who had objected to the plant. During the debate about the potential benefits of the plant, 1,000 jobs were promised. However, only 260 jobs were delivered. With regard to the costs, it is necessary to point out that EU environmental policy had not yet been clearly established in relation to industrial pollution. This meant that the Merck Plant had few limitations placed on its pollution capacity. Within 2½ years of the Merck plant commencing operation, families in the vicinity had reason to suspect that health problems, animal and human, were being caused by emissions from the factory (Allen & Jones 1990 35). One family began to frame a challenge to Merck Sharp and Dohme with the assistance of the 'interest-driven science' provided by the Canadian toxicologist Dr. James Neufield, who contested the data on dioxins provided by the Department of Agriculture.

Eventually, a High Court action against Merck Sharp and Dohme was taken by Mr. John Hanrahan. A community group was formed to object to the granting of permission for an extension to the plant. Picketing of council meetings continued through 1984, as the symptoms of poisoning continued to be a concern for local farmers. A further development saw John Hanrahan take a High Court lawsuit against Merck. The trial detailed the suffering endured by the Hanrahan family, which included the loss of 225 animals that they claimed had died as a result of the emissions from Merck between 1980 and 1984 (ibid.). Merck countered this claim with an accusation of farm mismanagement, a claim that was supported by officials from the Department of Agriculture. Dr. Neufield provided evidence of a similar case to the Hanrahan's in Canada. His presence at the trail provided the 'influential ally' (Tarrow 1984, 1988) necessary to present an interest driven scientific challenge against Merck. The case also revealed that the health of the Hanrahan family members had suffered from symptoms similar to that of toxic poisoning (Allen & Jones 1990 40). By mobilising the resource of expertise, the Hanrahan case challenged the orthodox arguments that were presented by the state, in a framing process that focused on the toxicity and health risks facing the family.

At the end of the case, in July 1985, the High Court ruled against the Hanrahans. Legal costs were set at £1 million and credit was removed and farm equipment auctioned, in order to pay costs and fund an appeal. The appeal was heard in 1987, and this time the ruling was in favour of the Hanrahans. The undertaking of the Merck incinerator was highlighted as a probable cause of dioxin emission. According to the Justice Henchy's summation:

> The most credible explanation offered for the ailments and abnormalities in the earth was the toxic emission from the factory. (Allen & Jones 1990 44)

The Hanrahan case demonstrates the ability of a local family, with community support and interest driven 'influential allies' to take on a multinational toxics industry, by exploiting the resources and political opportunity available to them. This was achieved by the success of these 'influential allies' as the court action taken by the

Hanrahans allowed scientific experts to challenge the 'official science' (Grove-White 1993) of the Department of Agriculture. The use of scientific expertise allowed the challengers to frame the issue in a manner which maximised the sympathies of the public for a local farming family, as the health risks posed by Merck's plant were highlighted. The issues around toxic plants would play a major part in the outcome of a subsequent grass-roots campaign against the toxics industry, that of the Raybestos Manhattan Plant, in Co. Cork. By applying Tarrow's (1984 86) 'four most salient changes' to this rural dispute key points can be identified in the 'dimensions of opportunity' that surrounded the Hanrahan case. By linking the Hanrahan's own grievance with the concerns of the farmers and small indigenous business interests of the Suir Valley, 'increased access' (ibid.) was achieved. 'Influential allies' (ibid.) were found through the involvement of 'interest-driven' scientists (Grove-White 1993 21) from Canada.

Northern Ireland

While the economic dependency of the Republic of Ireland shifted from a reliance on Britain to a policy of attracting US multinationals (O'Hearn 1998 51–54), Northern Ireland had made no such transition, remaining 'subservient' (ibid.) to the wider UK economic circle. Northern Ireland's economy went into decline in the 1970s and 1980s as 'a lukewarm distant government' (ibid.) remained slow to invest in the strife-torn province. More importantly, Northern Ireland was unable to avail of the type of focused drive for direct foreign investment that had been undertaken by the Irish state (ibid.). As a result, two very different economics emerged, North and South, by the 1990s. This dichotomy is illustrated by the fact that '629 non-British transnational companies employed 73,800 in the South compared to just 86 such subsidiaries employing 17,826 people in the North' (Hamilton 1992 86 in O'Hearn 1998 54).

One multinational which attracted support from both the Irish state and the Northern Ireland Office (NIO) was the DuPont plant in Derry. Both the Republic's Minister for Environment Padraig Flynn and the NIO's Department of Environment were involved in negotiations with DuPont to open an all-Ireland toxic dump (Allen, R. 1992 4–23). While DuPont received planning permission for a 'chemical waste burner' from the North's Department of Environment as far back as 1981 (ibid.), it was Minister Flynn's negotiation with DuPont to locate an all-Ireland toxic waste incinerator at the Derry plant that provided the political opportunity, as well as the 'unstable alignment' of the two authorities on the island, for a community-based challenge to the incinerator as well as the industrial policies of both jurisdictions.

As the concerned citizens of Derry mobilised, they were able to draw on the existing experience and expertise of the Cork Environmental Alliance that had been active against Raybestos Manhattan (Allen, R. 1992 5) The proposed incinerator was to take waste from both sides of the border, leaving the Derry campaigners two

sets of government officials with which to engage. Minister Flynn's proposal to send toxic waste from the Republic to the North was called 'a Northern Irish solution to a southern Irish problem' (Allen, R. 1992 5). The Northern Ireland Department of the Environment also became involved in the project. Opposition to the incinerator took on a cross-border manifestation, as the campaign drew on two groups: the Inishowen Environmental Group from nearby Donegal, and the Derry-based Greencastle and Moville Environmental Groups.

Experts were drafted in by both sides to support the pro or anti-incinerator argument. Questions were raised about the need for a cross-border incinerator, what type of toxics would be burned there, what were the subsequent health risks and whether DuPont had a history of environmental pollution. There was also the question of how would they respond to a health problem at their Derry plant (Allen, R. 1992).

An anti-toxics rally in Derry led to further clarification on the basis for concern about DuPont. Protestors were anxious to pinpoint what harm the process of incineration could do to local residents. Again, the community groups turned to 'influential allies' with scientific expertise. Interest based scientific experts were consulted, including Dr. Paul Connett, spokesperson of the US anti-toxics movement. In interview, Connett, who was to become prominent in later anti-incinerator campaigns, stated that

> My first incinerator battle (in Derry) was the DuPont incinerator. Then the next year we were back in Derry, in Donegal, fighting trash incinerators, people forget this, we keep going through the same arguments again and again. (Dr. Paul Connett interview 21 January 2002 in Leonard 1999)

The expertise of Connett and others provided the basis for the anti-toxics groups' opposition to DuPont and he helped the Derry protestors to frame the dispute around the potential for health risks posed by DuPont, exploiting the fears of the public. 'Influential allies' could also be found in local politicians, such as John Hume, the Social Democratic Labour Party (SDLP) leader, who was particularly concerned about the importation of waste into Derry. With the change of government in Ireland in 1992 and the rise of the peace process as a focus for northern Irish politics, financial aid was not forthcoming. The Derry anti-toxics group's framing of the health issue proved to be successful, as their presentation of 'interest driven science' (Grove-White 1993 21) led to the postponing of the plans for a national incinerator and in establishing the anti-toxics movement in Ireland. The 'mix of open and closed factors' (Eisinger 1973 15) such as the history of oppositional politics in Derry and the 'unstable alignment' of the Northern Ireland Office and the Dublin government led to 'increasing access' (Tarrow 1994 86) for the Derry community challengers to exploit.

The DuPont dispute can then be analysed through the application of Tarrow's 'four salient changes' (1984 86). 'Increased access' (ibid.) was created by the Derry campaign's ability to create links with 'influential allies' such as Dr. Paul Connett, who later became a central figure in regional anti-incinerator campaigns. By introducing Connett and his 'interest-driven' science to the campaign, the Derry protesters were able to challenge those in favour of the DuPont Plant, including the Irish

government and the Northern Ireland office. Another 'influential ally' was the SDLP leader John Hume, who provided political support for the campaigners. In the aftermath of the Good Friday Agreement and the re-establishment of the Belfast Assembly in 2007, the prospects for cross-border cooperation is good. This is also reflected in the merger of the Northern Ireland Greens party with their counterparts in the Republic in 2006. Movements are also cooperating between North and South on issues such as the Corrib Gas protest and in campaigns against military stopovers at Shannon Airport or at the Derry armaments plant led by activist Eamon McCann.

Both the Irish state and the Belfast Assembly are faced with other environmental issues, such as the growing waste crisis and the continuing degradation of water supplies across the island. The issue of emissions trading must also be addressed. And while some environmental challenges have led to increased cooperation between environmentalists both North and South, others have been less successful as both the Dublin and Belfast governments resist their efforts through a closed approach which falls back on the 'strength of the state' (Tarrow 1994 89) and therefore reduces the capacity for challengers to exploit political opportunities to the fullest. According to Tarrow 'strong states also have the capacity to implement the policies they choose to support' (ibid.) limiting the effectiveness of environmental challengers. While the Northern Assembly is still finding a distinctive policy direction, the Irish State came to centralise power through its neo-corporatist partnership arrangements from 1987 onward, and it soon became apparent that movements would need to expand their strategic approaches in order to achieve any form of leverage in the face of increased consumerism and growth. The years since the Good Friday Agreement also gave rise to an increase in chemical plants in the North, protests against lignite production in Armagh along with the dispute about an armaments plant in Derry (Barry 2007). However, the new regime has indicated its wiliness to fund environmental research and development in the areas of biotechnology and environmental innovation, albeit within existing socio-economic growth models (ibid.).

The 1990s the 'Celtic Tiger'

The overriding policy agenda of the state since the late 1950s had been aimed at creating a successful economy through multinational-led development. Throughout subsequent decades, successive governments tried to kick-start the Irish economy by attempting to entice transnational corporations (TNCs) to locate in Ireland. One of the features of the state's sales-pitch to TNCs was a low corporate tax regime combined with ambivalence, at local authority level, to pollution at source from newly located industrial plants. Local authorities were also hindered by the lack of funding for regulatory surveillance and lacked the necessary expertise for the monitoring of pollution (Taylor & Murphy 2002 81–82).

The phase of economic growth experienced in Ireland in the last decade came after three decades where government policy was primarily focused on industrial development and job creation. By opening the Irish economy to globalised market forces, a period of intense economic growth was achieved, often referred to as the 'Celtic Tiger' (O'Hearn 1998). One result of this growth in industrialisation, urbanisation and consumerism can be seen in the emergence of a waste management crisis across Ireland. The Irish government also had to operate within the constraints of the wider political demands of the European Union. This led to directives and legislation on pollution controls, which changed the nature of environmental disputes in Ireland from a focus on health risks to one which was concerned with the waste management crisis that resulted from rising consumption rates. Rates of affluence and consumption increased in an unparalleled manner throughout the 1990s (Allen, K. 2000 68). Ireland's waste-management infrastructure (which consisted in the main of municipal landfill sites) was unable to cope with the increased rates of waste being produced. At the same time, the demands of European Commission directives on waste management called for new approaches Ireland. Article 5 of the directive says that member states should aim for 'self sufficiency in waste disposal'. This placed landfill at the bottom of the scale and greater emphasis was placed on reducing, reusing and recycling materials. Incineration was also an option according to the waste hierarchy. In 1992, the government established the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to regulate waste disposal. Its remit has been criticised for not focusing on environmental degradation and for its subordinate role to the IDA and the project of industrial development (Taylor 2001). As the demands of EU directives and the state's own legislation dictated that landfilling alone was no longer acceptable waste management practice, the state was faced with a new problem as communities began to protest about the siting of dumps in their areas.

We can better understand the problems of Ireland's society by examining the manner in which local communities exploited the 'unstable alignments' (Tarrow 1984 87) that existed between national and local government in relation to waste policy. One critical aspect of the growing waste crisis was linked to the fact that Ireland disposed of up to 93% of its municipal waste through landfilling. Such is Ireland's over-reliance on landfill disposal that the country is ranked second only to Russia in European landfill dependency. Landfilling has fallen to the bottom of the EU's waste management hierarchy, below first preferences such as reduction, reuse and recycling. Concepts such as the 'polluter pays principle' have become central to the EU's environmental policy (O'Sullivan 2000 21).

Landfills are also facing increased legal challenges from local community groups who fear an appearance of a regional 'super-dump' in their area. Residents' groups in Tralee, Ballymahon (Longford) Doora/Ennis, Ballyguyroe, Co. Cork, as well as in Carrowbrowne and Ballinasloe in Galway have taken High Court proceedings, exploiting the 'unstable alignments' which existed between the state and local authorities in relation to waste policy. These court actions have led to orders against the relevant local authorities, forcing landfills in these areas to close immediately or after a period of time (ibid.). In order to contest the state's landfill policy,

community groups have framed their challenges around nuisance factors, health risks, agricultural impacts and legal breaches. The first of these cases occurred in Tralee in 1992. Two Tralee families, the Baileys and the Galvins, took an action against Tralee Urban District Council that criticised the operation of the Tralee landfill. Later that year, a dispute over the Ballymahon landfill in County Longford led to a more protracted case. Local residents picketed the site, with the result that Longford County Council obtained an injunction against the residents. In turn, the residents obtained an injunction requiring the closure of the Ballymahon landfill site. After appeals to the High Court by both parties, a negotiated settlement led to the closure of the landfill. Residents' legal costs were also paid (ibid.). The main framing issues for the anti-landfill groups included:

- The health risks posed to communities through water table and seepage pollution, increased rodent and vermin infestation and unbearable odours from dumps.
- The agricultural and tourism/visual impacts due to land erosion, toxicity levels from dump residue and the impact of large-scale landfills on the landscape.
- The legal framework community groups were able to utilise EU legislation to support their position, as landfill was the least-favoured option of the EU's waste hierarchy.

In 1997, the Kildorrey Anti-Dump Group took a High Court action against Cork County Council, claming that the council had failed to comply with the legal operating procedures of the Minister for the Environment. A lengthy case led to a negotiation on landfill operations, a date for closure, and an abandonment of plans for expansion of the site. Costs were also awarded to the group. The following year, residents from the area around Doora, the Ennis dumpsite in County Clare took a High Court action against Clare County Council. The residents framed their concerns about landfill claiming the dump was causing:

> significant nuisance smells, visual intrusion, noise, fires, smoke, ash, wind-blown litter, water-borne litter, rats, flies, birds, flooding of adjacent lands and damage to agriculture. (O'Sullivan 2000 21)

These problems had led to a decrease in the locals' quality of life and to property prices, which can be seen as giving rise to NIMBYist concerns. The council was accused of causing these problems, due to poor management of the Doora site. A 23-day hearing at the High Court led to negotiations on the operation and closure of the site, with no expansion allowed for the future. Costs for the group were settled, as was compensation. Having framed the issues as one of environmental degradation, rather than focusing only on property prices, the residents were able to succeed in presenting themselves as pro-environment rather than NIMBYist.

In the same month, three residents from the Carrowbrowne area of Galway took a case against Galway Corporation regarding their operation of the Carrowbrowne dump. The residents again framed the issue in a particular way, citing legal breaches as the basis for their challenge. Galway Corporation obtained permission to operate the dump for 2 years from April 1997, with a number of conditions attached.

The residents claimed that these conditions were being ignored. Judgement was for the residents, with Justice Kelly claiming that the Corporation was:

> involved in the commission of a criminal offence … in serious breach of the planning laws; while the Corporation's approach to the case "was quite alarming" and "leaves a lot to be desired". (O'Sullivan 2000 23)

Landfilling was prohibited by order 'as of today' (ibid.), according to Justice Kelly. An extension was granted to facilitate Christmas collections, after which Galway city's waste was to be taken to the Poolboy dump at Ballinasloe. This in turn led locals to picket the Poolboy dump, with injunctions being taken out by the Urban District Council to get residents to lift the picket. The Poolboy residents subsequently obtained an injunction against Ballinasloe UDC, repeating the procedure of previous anti-dump campaigns. A settlement was negotiated through the High Court, which closed the Poolboy, Ballinasloe dump in 2005. Poolboy was to be run in accordance with EPA practices in the meantime. While the landfill issue was met by many similar challenges, these community campaigns framed the issue in a manner which created a moral and 'orthodox consensus' (Grove-White 1992 19) that runs parallel with the demands of EU directives on landfill. The European waste hierarchy emphasised waste reduction at source. Reduction, reuse and recycling are the preferred options while incineration and new forms of landfilling remain contentious. Irish governments are feeling pressure from above to comply with EU environmental directives, in addition to pressure from below from community groups who oppose landfill and any new site designated for incineration. The detail of the 1996 Waste Management Act also emphasises the responsibility of local authorities in relation to the planning for, and implementation of, new waste management practices as presented under the Act. Despite the acceptance by government of the 'best practices' approach, local authorities continue to approach new waste management practices with a degree of reluctance:

> Very few of the waste management plans produced by local authorities since 1997 give priority to these waste management strategies. Instead, most of these plans discuss all options except landfilling or incineration…and there has been little meaningful public involvement or participation in their preparation. (O'Sullivan 2000 23)

In contrast, the EPA received up to 7,500 submissions in relation to waste license applications, reflecting the high degree of interest and concern on the part of a public excluded from the waste consultation process. While the policy statement and regional waste plans contain 'best practices' such as reuse, reduce and recycle a stark choice between a waste crisis brought on by the closure of landfills and incineration was presented by the government in advertising campaigns. As the 'partial access' (Tarrow 1994 86) created by the level of public submissions as a vehicle for challengers increased, there was a groundswell of opposition to incineration across Ireland. In terms of Tarrow's 'four salient changes (1984 86) these community groups 'increased access' (ibid.) by challenging the 'unstable alignments' (ibid.) which existed between the state and local authorities, as the legal system was utilised to prevent landfills being opened, or having their licenses extended. Galway would also face a water crisis as its natural water supply was infected with the

cryptosporidium bug, causing all drinking water to require boiling in 2007. Throughout the changes in Ireland between the Woodquay protests and the Celtic Tiger economic boom, communities across the island would continued to mobilise in defence of their environment, both built and natural in the face of a reckless pursuit of development.

Chapter 3
The Environmental Protection Agency and the Irish Green Party

Introduction

What is evident in any study of environmental policy is that the significance of EU policy in the development of environmental procedures throughout Europe cannot be underestimated. Specific German, Dutch and British or Irish case histories can be examined in order to establish the sources and motivations behind any eventual EU policies. Over the previous decades the impact of a heightened ecological focus has brought these debates to the fore in Irish life as a previously agrarian society industrialised and the Celtic Tiger economy gained strength.

High profile cases such as Mullaghmore and the Mutton Island Sewage Treatment controversy have heralded the arrival of many diverse groups such as the Burren Action Group and the Save Galway Bay Campaign onto the social and political spectrum. These groups seem to be the result of spontaneous community protest rather than stemming from any history of ecological activism in the country. However, as the Irish Green Party have increased their representation at local, central and EU levels while eco-protests have become a feature of Irish life since the Carnsore point Anti-Nuclear protests of the late 1970s, which in itself was influenced by its larger British and European counterparts. There are parallels with that event and the anti-roads protests, as in the eco-activists who took to the trees to prevent the destruction of the Glen of the Downs for a motorway development, as the influence of anti-globalisation and anti-roads protestors were also felt in Ireland.

In effect, the Irish landscape has become a site of conflict in the ongoing struggle for the type of economic and structural development that has come to characterise globalisation. The lack of a strong ecological dynamic in Irish politics as seen in its over-reliance on British and EU policy innovations to deal specifically with Irish test cases compounded the nature of this problem. As economic and industrial growth increases and EU Directives highlight further aspects of ecological threat which need intervention, a tension developed in Irish society which is manifest in the increasing number of eco-protest groups. The traditionally populist nature of the Irish political system has been unable to respond with any clarity to the environmental debate despite the adoption by mainstream parties of token

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

'green' manifesto promises. Clearly, the shifts in the politics of environmentalism have not been fully realised by the mainstream political establishment of Ireland.

These shifts have centred around a plethora of issues that have their roots in the ecology versus development debate with arguments and conflicts in the areas of planning procedures for infrastructural development, large urban housing estates and their road and sewage offshoots, IDA sponsored industries polluting the waterways, agri-industrial spillages destroying lakes and fish stocks and the hidden pollution of companies such as the former Syntex factory in Clare or the location of major incinerators or 'super-dumps' in rural areas all taking precedence in recent years. Despite the debate about the introduction of genetically modified, 'frankenstein foods' into the marketplace and the fact that the public seems to have little desire for such products manufacturers continue to supply genetically modified goods to the market. This has led to the establishment of a protest group named Genetic Concern. Concerns about wind farms and pylons have emerged in Sligo, Tipperary and Cork, while water quality degradation has caused long-term disruption of water supplies in many towns such as Galway and Ennis (Leonard 2007).

While pressure groups represent a public response to environmental concerns government agencies have a poor record of environmental action. Environmental policy has been largely in the hands of Irish regional and local authorities. Control over ecological issues was consolidated in 1977 by two pieces of legislation the Local Government (Water Pollution) Act and the Local Government (Planning and Development) Act which gave Local Authorities primary responsibility for air and water pollution controls as well as sanitation and water management. However, these acts of legislation reflected a need to implement EU directives rather than a new ecological awareness on the part of government agencies. It also had the unfortunate result of establishing local government as a conduit for agrarian and corporate interests which aimed to minimise the affects of environmental legislation on their inherent production costs.

The 1970s and 1980s were marked as an era when environmental concerns were often relegated in favour of attracting inward investment and multinational jobs as a result of pressures to increase employment. Many of the multinationals were grant-aided by the Irish Development Authority (IDA) and attracted by a less than stringent regime of environmental legislation. This placed the Local Authorities in a position where, in an atmosphere of near-desperation for any form of job creation, pollution controls that could hinder major industrial investment were largely sidelined. The result of this was an influx of chemical and pharmaceutical industries to Ireland with regular incidences of pollution and public outcry becoming more frequent.

Public disquiet about the relationship between the IDA and multinationals was met by a policy response by the government in 1989. The first Green party T. D. (teachtaí dailí) Roger Garland was elected to the Dáil that year. This led to the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1992, 4 years later. The delay points to the lack of preparation and direction surrounding the structures and remit of this body. The new powers were to include the provision of a legislative framework to assist Local Authorities with their environmental duties. The EPA

was to be independent, free from the role of dealing with the multinationals on the level of attracting industries into the country. Instead, the EPA took charge of licensing and regulation of industries in regard to their pollution levels, monitoring and gauging the response of the industries to new directives. One of the most significant aspects of the EPA's new responsibilities lay in its attempt to implement policies in line with the innovative concept of Integrated Pollution Control (IPC). The central feature of IPC is based on the establishment of an overriding system of pollution containment that links together the various features of the environment such as land, water and air and recognises their intertwined relationship.Scannell outlines the areas covered by the EPA's Licensing Regulations (1994) where a system of integrated pollution control would bring a diversity of categories under one central authority. These include 'Minerals and other materials, Energy, Mineral Fibres and Glass, Chemicals, Food and Drink, Wood, Paper, Textiles and Leather, Cement and waste' (Scannell 1996 525).

Clearly, the broad spectrum of Irish industry would now come under the remit of IPC regulations. In addition Semi-State and Local Authority activities would be monitored under this Act. Another important area of IPC monitoring would be the increasing expansive pharmaceutical industry. The pharmaceutical industry, one of the main industrial pollutants whose poor environmental record was a factor in the establishment of the EPA, is only subjected to IPC scrutiny 'where the numbers of employees exceeds 100 but is less than 200' (ibid.). This section of the Act was obviously included with the input of the IDA who hoped to continue to attract large-scale major employers to Ireland unhindered by any ecologically minded small print due to the insertion of this form of legal loophole.

Despite the fact that large areas of the environmental landscape are addressed by the criteria which surrounded the establishment of the EPA, the priority given to increasing Ireland's industrialisation, as well as economic and political considerations, have left some doubts surrounding what should be strong parameters that will shape Ireland's environmental future. Section 52 of the Act outlines how the EPA should "provide support and advisory services to local and public authorities in relation to the performance of their functions" (EPA Act Section 52). This section of the Act deals with the highly contentious area of Local Authority's environmental performance, yet it in no way specifies how such 'support and advisory services' should be provided. The controversial nature of how Local Authorities deal with the IDA, multinationals and the agricultural sector is not legislated for. Equally important policy formats such as integrated pollution control are introduced without a clear indication of the overall basis or direction such IPC controls are intended to achieve.

A central feature of IPC is the concept of BATNEEC or 'Best Available Technology Not Entailing Excessive Costs'. The EPA handbook on IPC states that 'The technology should be best at preventing pollution and Available in the sense that is procurable by the operator of the activity concerned. Technology includes techniques and the use of techniques such as training and maintenance. NEEC sets out the balance between environmental benefit and financial cost (EPA guidelines on IPC 3).

Coming into a relative void of environmental legislation and policy planning the EPA should have been seen as an opportunity to introduce far reaching and comprehensive environmental protections to the domestic political scene in such a way as to bolster already existing EC directives. Instead, political and economic considerations led to the drafting of a watered down form of legislation, full of the type of legal vagaries which can be fully exploited by corporate lawyers on behalf of their multinational clients. This has implications for the Irish environment and can only be addressed by the drafting of a more comprehensive body of legislation which takes on board both policy advances and environmental considerations and relegates economic factors. Any form of environmental legislation drawn up with the extensive remit such as those of the EPA Act should have extensive and detailed powers with environmental protection and the encouragement of ecologically minded structures being incorporated as an integral part of future planning at its core. Bodies concerned with industrial performance, such as the IDA and the trade unions were represented on the EPA's advisory committee, which led to criticism from environmental groups. The agency was initially constituted so as not to hinder industry, or to be perceived as such by prospective multinational investors (Taylor 2001 68–69).

A prioritisation of economic requirements over all others was intended as the government was concerned that the EPA could become an environmental rather than industrial agency, as the independent but state-linked agencies of An Foras Forbatha (National Institute for Planning and Construction) and An Taisce (The National Trust) had become. The EPA's initial budget was set at £8 million but by 1995 it was reduced to only £5 million, thus lessening its potential power. Another area of concern was a regulation that allowed the Minister to delay the implementation of EC Environmental Directives, with no chance for a public hearing on such decisions. Essentially, the EPA represents an official form of environmentalism one which is wedded to maintaining Ireland's climate for investment. Official environmentalism draws on forms of professional expertise which have their basis in economic planning and the sciences and which work through formal political processes. These processes include the following:

> public education and extension of centralised regulation which is concerned with the establishment and authorisation of centralised planning procedures, enforcement of environmental controls through legislation, and the establishment of centralised institutions for research and monitoring. (Tovey 1992b 276)

While Ireland remains broadly supportive of European Union membership and its subsequent funding dividend, Irish environmental policy is formulated primarily through the European commission in Strasbourg, with limited input from Irish EC commissioners. However, the implementation of this policy is then shaped to suit the neo-corporatist economic agenda promoted by the Irish state. In this way, Ireland takes on aspects of what has been described as an environmentally 'laggard' state, (Weale 2000 466) taking a minimalist approach to environmental policy creation and implementation. In contrast, environmental 'leader' states, such as Germany and Holland, dominate EC environmental thinking. This has led to the 'Europeanisation' of Irish environmental policy (O'Hearn 1999).

One of the most significant aspects of the EPA's new responsibilities lay in its attempt to implement policies in line with the innovative concept of Integrated Pollution Control (IPC). The central feature of IPC is based on the establishment of an overriding system of pollution containment, which links together the various features of the environment, such as land, water and air, and recognizes their intertwined relationship. Scannell outlines the areas covered by the EPA's Licensing Regulations (1994), where a system of integrated pollution control would bring a diversity of categories under one central authority. These include; minerals and other materials, energy minerals fibers and glass, chemicals food and drink, wood, paper, textiles and lather and cement and waste (Scannell 1996 525).

While a large area of the environmental landscape was now under a focused and centralized legal structure through the EPA, the criteria which surrounded its establishment, such as the priority given to increasing Ireland's industrialization as well as economic and political considerations, have left their imprint on the Act's legal framework. For instance, Section 52 of the EPA Act outlines how it should 'provide support and advisory services to local and public authorities in relation to the performance of their functions' (EPA Act Section 52). This section of the act deals with the highly contentious area of local authority's environmental performance, yet it in no way specifies how such 'support and advisory services' (ibid.) should be provided. The controversial nature of how local authorities deal with the IDA, multinationals, and the agricultural sector is not legislated for, while equally important policy formats such as integrated pollution control are introduced without a clear indication of the overall basis or direction such IPC controls are intended to achieve (Leonard 1999 64–65).

A central feature of IPC is the concept of BATNEEC or 'best available technology not entailing excessive costs.' The EPA's own handbook on IPC states that 'the technology should be best at preventing pollution in the sense that it is procurable by the operator of the activity concerned. Technology itself includes techniques and the use of techniques, such as training and maintenance. BATNEEC set out the balance between environmental benefit and financial cost (EPA guidelines on IPC 3). The contradictions between the spirit of the EPA and its operation have been criticized by those who feel the EPA should be following the precautionary principles of the EU (Taylor 2001 48–50). Problems of equality of public access, in terms of format and agenda, as well as difficulties for the public in approaching a legalistic framework are areas that are left unanswered by the EPA legislation, and point to the act's structure having been built around the state's policy framework.

The Irish Green Party

Faced with a less than decisive body of legislation from the EU and an absence of any real environmental planning in Ireland, future Irish governments will have an opportunity to introduce a positive and visionary environmental agenda to the domestic and international body politic. Ireland still retains a less than deserved

image as a place of unspoilt natural landscapes and a still-developing industrial and economic infrastructure. By introducing the holistic structures that will produce an environmentally minded society Ireland could provide a model of how successful economic management can be achieved by working on all the different levels of policy which have an environmental dimension and by bringing consensus to planning and industry ion relation to all ecological obligations. Thus far Irish administrations have relied on EU and British innovation to apply any form of environmental legislation, so the likelihood of a major ecological breakthrough on the domestic political scene remains distant. However, a far reaching environmental agenda remains as the best political strategy yet to be fully exploited by the Irish political parties.

At a time when left-wing parties around Europe have moved to the centre, activist and 'militant' groups were seen as a threat from within by party leadership, in advance of an overall shift to the centre. While this shift has come as world politics was in the grip of neo-liberal dominance, a gap between political activists and Green Parties occurred throughout Europe. With the emergence of the anti- globalisation movement, this dichotomy between parliamentary politics and collective action has become a cultural as well as a political issue. Furthermore, while neo- liberal politicians have grappled with 'Green' issues since the 1992 World Summit, Green Parties have not made the major advances that may have been possible at that time due, in part, to a disillusionment with the rigidity of mainstream politics that left a chasm between grass-roots ecological movements and European Green Parties. This gap has equally affected the growth of the Irish Green Movement and can be seen in the distance between the position of the activists in the Wicklow Glens and the attempts by the Irish Green Party to attract votes from the professional classes and young urban voters during the 1990s, despite the involvement of local greens in the roads campaign at that time. Equally significant is the fact that the Irish Greens do far better at European elections than in Dáil and Local elections. For instance, they received 7.9% of the vote in the June 1994 and 3.5% in June 1998 as compared to 2% in the 1997 General election. Mullally has outlined the Irish Green Party's gradual shift from a 'party of protest' towards a group that has had 'more pronounced success on the European level' (Mullally 1999 166). The Irish Greens, who were known at their inception as The Ecology Party of Ireland, had gone through a process of splits and realignments from more radical ecological factors, on a par with other European Green Movements. In adopting the standard 'Green Party' title in 1986 while retaining the Irish language suffix of *Comhaontas Glas* the party 'signalled a commitment to electoral politics' (Mullally 1999 167).

Initial gains by the Irish Greens were soon countered by a process of adaptation of Green issues by the major centrist parties, in particular, the Progressive Democrats. The business oriented thrust of the EPA Acts, drawn up the PD's Mary Harney, is an indicator of how Green issues were co-opted and manipulated by government parties in order to facilitate job development. Despite this, electoral successes for Trevor Sargent in the Dáil, as well as for Nuala Aherne and Patricia McKenna in successive European elections, have given the Irish Greens an established position on the Irish political scene. Other successful campaigns, such as John

Gormley's tenure as Mayor of Dublin, pushed the Green agenda onto the national political scene. These advances are tempered by the stilted nature of Irish politics where shifts in EU policies are adapted in a gradual manner while local issues and agendas take priority. All major Parties have converged towards the centre and have adapted pragmatic 'catch-all' policies, including whatever is seen as relevant in regard to the environment. In light of this it is perhaps unusual that the Irish Greens have also staked a claim for the suburban and middle-class voter. However, this can be seen as part of an overall European trend away from early ecological 'survivalist' agendas and a move towards adapting a 'green lifestyle' centred on middle class, suburban concerns such as recycling, retaining green areas such as forests and the spread of genetically modified foods. Like their European counterparts Irish Greens have adopted many issues to suit the increasing trend towards suburbanisation rather than advocating any real alternatives.

This has left some theorists questioning whether the Greens are, as yet, ready for government and how much of a truly 'Green' agenda they can maintain in the pursuit of this aim. The question remains open as to whether ultimate goals of environmental communion, species cohabitation and universal non-violence are attainable through the political structures of Western Liberal democracies and if not, how can realistic alternative structures be realised. In this respect, Irish Green Party Policies such as Gormley's Mayoral Commission on Cycling and the McKenna court case taken to force equal funding for the divorce referendum in 1997 can be seen as campaigns geared towards the suburban voter, policies which the Greens introduce alongside plans for a fully structured and far reaching plan for an environmental future. For instance, how would a Green Minister for Justice, in a future 'Rainbow Coalition' government, deal with an event like eco-activist protest? Power provided its own dilemmas yet the Irish Greens, like all other Green Parties, must pursue power through existing political channels. Nonetheless, the Greens have performed well when elected to office and both John Gormley in Dublin and Niall Ó Brolcháin in Galway proved to be effective and popular civic mayors.

In essence, Green Party campaigns of urban recycling and consumer consciousness rely on a high degree of civic responsiveness and responsibility. Any major challenges to the existing status quo cannot, therefore, be too extreme or rooted in civil disobedience as this could challenge the structures needed to highlight the domesticised Green agenda. This leaves legal action as the only recourse left to Greens who wish to challenge existing structures. However, the legal approach remains problematic according to Peace (1997). Taylor noted that this approach 'fails to acknowledge the importance of participation ion creating a consensus to underpin the legitimacy of the regulatory framework' (Taylor 1999 143). In other words an over reliance on legal actions and challenges to planning permission, while maintaining a legislative presence and 'watchdog' image for the Greens, can ultimately cause a gap to open up between party and grass roots. Civic participatory groups are needed to back up any advances in parliamentary politics for the party. These tensions may have lead to a breakdown in communications between the bureaucratic central party structures of the Greens and their activist support-base, leading to a further distancing of the general public and the Party, as a whole. To avoid

this, the Irish Green Party must maintain its activist base with moves towards a sufficiently politicised agenda outside of the increasing trend towards challenges to the legal framework on planning process. Older ecological issues, based on conservation, could be revisited rather than exclusively working towards a 'greening' of the suburban lifestyle. There is also a need to bridge the gap between forms of public protest that verge on civil disobedience and a plan of action which alienates both activists and the wider public through excessive legal parameters. In the roads dispute in the Glen of the Downs, local Greens were very involved, and this has continued at Carrickmines and Tara. There remains a need to open up the channels of protest between the Greens and the activist public. Open public hearings are one way to highlight and facilitate public debate over environmental issues. However, Taylor points to the weakness of EPA legislation in this respect, citing how 'the agency shall have absolute discretion to hold an oral hearing which shall be conducted by a person appointed by the agency' (Taylor 1999 147 from EPA Act 1992 64).

The Rise of the Greens from Protest to Power

The May 2007 General Election in the Republic of Ireland resulted in a familiar post-election scenario the majority of voters chose Bertie Ahern's centrist/populist party Fianna Fáil to form a coalition with one of the many smaller parties which flourish due to the electoral system of proportional representation (PRSTV). However, after 10 days of intense negotiations, the Irish Green Party entered government for the first time on 10 June 2007. The Greens ascent to power was no overnight success however; rather it was something of a 'tainted triumph' (Manning & Rootes 2005). One major casualty was the party leader Trevor Sargent, who resigned his position on a point of principle at the party convention as the membership voted to enter government. Sargent, the Green's first elected leader, had stated during the election campaign that he would resign on principle rather than lead the party into government with Fianna Fáil, due to that party's association with many of the political scandals that had characterised Irish politics in recent years. For many party members, the idea of a coalition with Fianna Fáil was unacceptable; one of the party's successful candidates and government programme negotiators Ciaran Cuffe had referred to this outcome as 'doing a deal with the devil'.

The Irish Green Party or *Comhaontas Glas* had many 'breakthroughs' throughout its 20-year history. The party gained their first elected members of parliament in 1989. In 1994 the Greens won two of the eighteen seats in that year's European Elections, in the same year that party councillor John Gormley became Mayor of Dublin. Despite a history of rural-based disputes against multinationals in the 1970s and 1980s (Leonard 2006), the Green Party's successes in 1994 were located around Dublin city and its immediate vicinity. It is interesting to note that Sellafield's nuclear threat was the main focus of the party at this point, dominating their posters and broadcasts during the election (Holmes & Kenny 1994). The fact

that the party's electoral gains were attributed to their presentation of 'a broad agenda beyond environmental issues' (ibid.) indicates a world still unfamiliar with the threat posed by climate change at that point. In addition, one the party's key arguments (shaped by candidate and author Richard Douthwaite) was that of a basic income, an idea first put forward in his seminal book *The Growth Illusion*. The 1997 General Election saw the party double its share of the vote and its number of parliamentary representatives (Mullally 1997 165). The 'Celtic Tiger' economy of the 1990s brought an increase in consumption and waste, creating disputes about sewage, waste management and water quality, which elevated Green representatives such as Ciaran Cuffe and Dan Boyle into the public eye during campaigns about incineration or roads (Leonard 2005, 2006). The issues raised during the election indicate a shift in environmental strategy since 1994; sustainable development had replaced concerns about Sellafield's radioactive waste as the key issue of the campaign (Mullally 1997 168–171). The pragmatic wing of the party had come to the fore on the issues of broadening both the party's appeal with the wider electorate as well as its viability as a potential coalition partner. Having retained their two MEPs and local authority presence in the 1999 European and local elections, the Greens went into the 2002 general election with hopes of forming an alternative coalition with Fine Gael and Labour. While this didn't occur, Dan Boyle did take the party's first seat outside of Dublin, in the southern city of Cork. The 2002 election also gave rise to a post-materialist 'floating' voter (Taylor & Flynn 2002 225–232). Increased interest in green issues were reflected in the 2004 local elections, where the party made its second electoral 'breakthrough', gaining 26 local authority councillors as the mainstream parties witnessed a dramatic decline in their electoral share.

This 'green tide' gave rise to a sense of optimism in the party as the 2007 general election campaign began. The success of Brian Wilson in winning a seat to the Northern Ireland Assembly represented a significant political moment for the by now all-Ireland Green Party and for key figures such as John Barry and Peter Doran who had driven the merger. With early polls putting the party as high as 8%, the Greens opted out of either of the pre-coalition pacts, in order to maintain their independent stance. This was picked up on by Fianna Fáil, who introduced a range of environmental policies designed to attract voters as much as the Greens. Ethics in politics were a key issue for the Greens, a concern directed at some of the more unsavoury elements within Fianna Fáil. Party leader Trevor Sargent stated that he would resign rather than lead the Greens into coalition with Fianna Fáil, despite the fact that, numerically at least, this outcome was beginning to look increasingly likely in the weekly opinion polls. Sargent also claimed that 'it will be a Green Party mandate' which would force Fianna Fáil 'to implement eco-friendly policies' (*Sunday Times* 29 April 2007).

Many environmental issues came to the fore during the election. As well as debates about carbon taxes and emissions trading, local issues such as protests about the Corrib gas pipeline in the west of Ireland and a dispute over plans to run a motorway over the ancient site of the High Kings at Tara continued to feature in the headlines throughout the election. These campaigns had attracted considerable

national and international attention, while senior Green party personnel had been prominent in their support of these campaigns (Leonard 2006). Launching their economic manifesto *Fairness and Prosperity A Green Approach to the Economy* in May, the party bridged the gap between their grass-roots membership and its targeted young urban voter by presenting 'carefully costed and designed' economic programme which offered 'fiscal prudence' (*Irish Times* 2 May 2007). The main points in the manifesto included carbon taxes, bank levies and an unchanged personal tax rate alongside a rise in capital gains tax, while retaining Ireland's corporation tax at 12% to protect current rates of economic growth. Investment in public services, including transport and the crumbling health service were included alongside increases for alternative energy sources such as wind and wave energy, an approach which was described as 'both innovative and challenging' and 'prudent yet cohesive' (ibid.). Party leader Sargent also pursued senior Fianna Fáil figures (including their popular leader Bertie Ahern) about perceived financial irregularities, something which larger opposition parties avoided due to fears about an electoral backlash from voters weary from a decade of political scandals and tribunals of inquiry. Running under the confident slogan 'Its Time', the party faithful canvassed in hope throughout the spring sunshine. This rosy picture was soon blighted as the larger parties began a sustained attack on the Greens both nationally and locally, as concerns about potential seat losses were heightened by successive polls. Moreover, gloom laden headlines about an end to the property boom and rising interest rates began to resonate with electorate. Innovations in energy and climate change were swept off the agenda while locally Greens were forced onto the defensive when faced with questions about issues such roads and property development by the mainstream parties.

In the week of the election, Fianna Fáil received a boost with a 5% surge in the polls. It now appeared that the outgoing coalition would be returned, with the support of a few Independents. Concerns about a downturn in the economy were seen as the main reason for this shift, as voters seemed prepared to stick with an experienced government. The Green's campaign ended as it had begun, with the party polling at 6%. The election results provide a similar result, with Fianna Fáil getting first preferences of 41.1%, (78 seats) Fine Gael 27.3%, (51 seats) Labour 10.1%, (20 seats) Sinn Fein 6.9%, (4 seats) Green Party 4.7%, (6 seats) the PDs 2.7% (2 seats) with five Independents (*Sunday Times* 27 May 2007). The Greens lost one seat (Dan Boyle in Cork) but gained with deputy leader Mary White in rural Carlow/Kilkenny. With their usual PD coalition partners reduced to 2 TDs, Fianna Fáil began to sound out Green party sources about a coalition. A period of shadow boxing was followed by 10 days of intensive negotiations between the parties. However, the Greens were somewhat constrained as Fianna Fáil had the numerical advantage of being able to form a government with the two PDs and Independents. By June, negotiations between the parties had commenced, with senior figures maintaining a disciplined silence with the media. Manifestos were exchanged, while negotiations were claimed to be 'cordial and constructive' by both sides. The media rehashed many of the two party's electoral criticisms of their potential partners as the talks went on for a week. With the Greens needing to have the agreement

passed at a special convention of members and the Dáil set to go into recess on June 14th, the pressure was mounting. Then late on Friday 8th of June, the news of a Green walkout broke. Senior negotiators John Gormley and Dan Boyle were unhappy with the deal on offer, claiming it wouldn't be passed by the membership. Sensing the Green's dilemma, Fianna Fáil gave ground on a few issues and on June 13th the party's membership gave coalition a resounding endorsement, with 86% of the attendance at the special convention in Dublin's historic Mansion House approving the deal. The main aspects of the deal on offer were a gradual carbon tax, a reduction of 3% per annum in emissions, commissions on climate change and taxation, increases for wind and wave energy, reform of local government and 35 million euros for education. Key areas where the Greens failed to achieve their aims included the motorway at Tara, the use of Shannon Airport as a stopover for the US military, the banning of corporate political donations and the use of public land for private hospitals (*Irish Times* 14 June 2007).

The convention had also witnessed the resignation of party leader Trevor Sargent, who remained true to his word about not leading the party into coalition with Fianna Fáil. His actions were rare in a country were resignation for even the most serious allegations of corruption was unheard of. The Greens did gain two Senior Ministers, with John Gormley taking the Environment portfolio and Eamon Ryan becoming Minister for Energy and Resources. Sargent was named a junior Minister with responsibility for Food and Horticulture (with an additional junior ministry promised during the government's lifetime), while the party also gained two nominations to the senate. The Greens began life in government with its two ministers cycling to work rather than taking the ministerial Mercedes, with John Gormley (tipped to be the next party leader) facing a row over the Tara heritage site on his first day in office. The electorate's view on the Green's play for power will be revealed at the next election. One initial achievement for the party has been John Gormely's announcement to the European Council of Ministers that Ireland would be declared a genetically modified free zone. However, the party can feel a sense of achievement as it reflects on its slow ascent into government, looking forward to the challenges which will invariably result from its time in office.

Conclusion

According to writers such as Allen (1990) and Baker (1990) Irish environmental movements retained the potential to achieve some political access without being able to influence policymaking. The pretext for the degree of closure, faced by environmental and anti-toxics movements was based on the state's prioritisation of job-creation and economic growth during the decades of the 1970s and 1980s. The directives of the EU also increased pressure on government in regard to Ireland's increasing waste management problem. The state was obliged to introduce environmental legislation due to European Commission directives, leading

to the establishment of what has been described as a pro-industry Environmental Protection Agency (Taylor 2001). The EPA's establishment came at a time when the nature of environmental protest changed from a pre-boom anti-toxic multinational phase into a post-boom anti-infrastructural phase. However, the ability of Irish movements to create networks allowed progression from what Cox (1999b) has described as 'local rationalities' into a nascent movement in a manner described by Szasz as 'an ideological development from NIMBYism toward a radical environmental populism' (Szasz 1994 69). While Irish environmental movements have been described as 'populist' (Tovey 1992b), they are often reliant on the new middle-class experts who have the professional expertise necessary to create movement consensus and mobilisation. In this way, Irish environmental movements can be said to be driven by 'issue-driven' (Grove-White 1993) professionals who maintain the 'interpersonal contacts' necessary to provide an ongoing pool of resources that subsequent movements can draw on over time.

The significance of this resource network for movements that are attempting to gain access at various stages of the evolving political opportunity structure can not be underestimated even though Fagan and O'Hearn et al. (2001) have acknowledged the depth of local feeling created by community-based disputes, dividing local responses into 'negative' (NIMBYist) and 'positive' (environmental). However, this categorisation fails to recognise that a path from one to the other may be put in place, as many Irish cases indicate. Invariably, Irish eco-movements can be located somewhere in between, as primarily issue-driven campaigns that mobilise beyond their NIMBYist inceptions but often failing to make a complete breakthrough towards becoming integrated in either the radical or formal political sectors. In this regard Irish movements embraced ecopopulist agendas through professionally led public and media campaigns. And while the Irish Greens have had electoral successes and entered government, the party will need to maintain links to its grass-roots supporters at the key moments of what Sidney Tarrow describes as 'increased access'. The emergence of the Irish Green Party from a protest coalition into a coalition partner in government is the most momentous mainstream political event in the history of the nation's environmental movement. There is a risk that this mat lead to a dichotomy between the party and its activist support on certain issues. The grass-roots movement has certainly had its share of success and failure. Nonetheless, Irish environmental campaigns have repeatedly displayed the ability to mobilise internal resources and exploit external political opportunities providing campaigns with the momentum to challenge state policies, with temporary and contingent increased access leading to mixed results for the overall environmental movement across the island of Ireland (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1 Categories of Protest Event and Framing Analysis

Frame	Type of Campaign	Type of Protest/Tactics	Framing Outcome	Political Outcome
Political	concerns for democratic deficit and party support/opposition; local political allies, national political allies exploiting political opportunities, electoral leverage	locally alliances, national alliances, global alliances, embedded advocate framing issues, political opportunities	Mobilisation of grievance consensus at local and national level; heightened awareness of environmental issue and democratic deficit	Increased political access and leverage
Social	NIMBYism grassroots alternative energies new Middleclass professionals, working class	populism supported or opposed by local interests, health risks, marches, demonstrations	evolving from NIMBYism into wider movement	increased politicisation of civil society
Cultural	rural discourse/eco-feminist discourse, moral discourse / religions, use of interest-led expertise, nationalist discourse	External advocate Mobilised resources Cultural and heritage frames Media & celebrity advocacy	More expansive media coverage. Discursive interpretations of culture and heritage.	Enhanced socio-political and cultural discourse
Legal	Oral hearing, High court, European Court	Legal challenges to policy or projects.	Establishing precedents or overturning laws or policy	Redefined policy agendas Changes to Legal Framework
Institutional/ Agencies	EU – UN – Sustainable Development, Local Authority Support or opposition, the State, An Taisce, An Bord Pleanála	Legal campaigns, expertise advocacy, institutional allies, political allies	Enhanced understanding of overall issue from grassroots grievance to institutional frameworks	Reinforced linkages between institutional sector and community
Economic	Pre-growth – pollution, resource protection, post-growth infrastructural	Anti-multinational, anti-state, opposition to sitings	Establishing grievance over costs and location of projects	Projects delayed or shelved
Scientific	Global networks	Interest-led advocacy	Counter arguments to scientific viewpoints presented	State and industrial science challenged

Part II
Communities

Chapter 4
Rural Sentiment and the Irish Environmental Movement

Introduction

The significance of rural life and thought in the development of an environmental consciousness in Ireland is considerable, yet rarely acknowledged. The division of Irish conservationalsim into either urban watchdogs of built heritage or rural communities resisting infrastructure has been complicated by the increased pressures faced by farmers due to the scientisation of that sector. The National Trust, An Taisce, has also faced difficulties in the debate about one off housing in scenic rural areas at a time when property values have become a key component of economic growth In attempting to define the sociology of the rural in 1992, Hilary Tovey surmises that Irish rural sociology has been understood as 'sociology of farming' (Tovey 1992a 97). This analysis equates rurality with an agricultural way of life, once deemed to have a primary significance by the state, but now under threat from political and socio-economic fixations with technologically derived modernisation. The traditional agricultural sector which spawned the 'informed institutions of municipal support provided by the local community' (ibid.) have given way to the systems of globalised capitalism as new forms of production have been introduced through scientific and technological innovations. As the process of market-led efficiency favoured larger producers in the new agri-business sector, small holdings and their traditionally rural way of life has been eroded over the last 50 years.

At the same time, the state has attempted to inject new patterns of production and lifestyle into rural communities, through its agenda for multinational-led development (O'Hearn 1998). In so doing, a new understanding of rurality can be identified; this extends the connotation of rural as primarily agricultural towards a new conceptualisation of rural as environmental. Moreover, the interaction of rural communities with their hinterlands takes on an integrative aspect, beyond the production-based model which was derived from an emphasis on farming activity alone. It follows that the recent engagement with environmental issues in an era when agricultural production has shifted from localised practices to the multinational agribusiness section would be reflected through emergent notions about the very basis of what is meant by the rural.

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

While Tovey cites Curtin's maxim that rural agricultural lifestyles could be defined through 'a form of production which … is embedded in sets of non-commoditised relationships' (Curtin 1986 in Tovey 1992a 100), contemporary concerns about the environment may have reconstituted these arrangements as a form of relationship embedded in a set of traditionalist and community centred interactions that go beyond production. Essentially, Curtin has anticipated the emergence of a predominantly consumerist commoditisation of both farming produce and community relationships in the post-economic boom era. In addition, this new set of commoditised relations involving communities as mass consumers has foisted a post-productionist crisis about waste management and infrastructural development on a rural population still in transition in recent years. The structural transition from traditional practice to modern economic setting led to an increased sense of marginalisation in rural communities (Kelleher & O'Mahony 1984). For this reason, longstanding suspicions and hostility directed towards the authorities in Dublin or Brussels have been reinforced at a time when the imposition of environmental directives had further alienated that sector of the population (Leonard 1999). From this ferment of discord the simmering rancour inherent in much of rural fundamentalism can be found. Such malcontent cannot be assuaged by state or EU handouts, which seem to have been paid over to accelerate the demise of the small holder, in any event. The much vaunted subsidies paid out to farmers to alter or prevent traditional practices are a bitter stipend, increasing the sense of desolation amongst its recipients who have, at times, been lampooned as ungrateful cheque-grabbers at a time when their very way of life has been decimated.

The state's response to increased dissent in rural areas has been twofold promoting 'rural development' while increasingly broadening the extent of infrastructural and industrial growth. Subsequently a type of rural industrialisation has emerged involving the onset of 'part-time farming' which theoretically allows farmers to maintain their links to small-scale agricultural practice while simultaneously becoming viable economic units working a multinational industry. The combination of a self-sufficient but otherwise unskilled and non-unionised labour force was one that many multinationals, as well as influential local interests, found attractive and easy to exploit (Tovey 1992a 109). Rural opposition to large-scale infrastructural projects such as mines, nuclear plants or toxic industries formed the basis of the first wave of community opposition to what was perceived as a threat to local ways of life, community relations and values, personal health and environment in the regions.

While rural communities may not be as rooted in the type of mutual dependency represented in Arensberg and Kimball's seminal study on life in the Irish countryside, a strong sense of identity and place is still characterises life in the regions. Ultimately, 'rural community' may be defined through embodiment of a response by the periphery exploitation of the institutional core at the centre of power. The fact that 'rural' remains an important 'mobilising concept within Irish society' (Tovey 1992a 111) during an era when many of the grand narratives of Irish society have become diminished is testament to the crucial nature of individual, family and

community relations with the surrounding hinterlands, landscape and earth in which those rural populations are embedded. The extent of this entrenchment has been characterised through the response of rural communities to the perceived threats posed by industrialisation and changing patterns of consumption and waste in an era when Irish society has been dramatically altered. Seen in that context, rural communities' opposition to the destruction of 'a sustainable, ecologically managed way of life for the short term benefit of outsiders (Varley 1991b 186) is not surprising, but rather represents an articulation of defence of space, lifestyle and environment by a social group who are concerned about the degradation of all that they hold dear.

Community environmental campaigns began in the 1970s when Irish communities started to resist state policy agendas aimed at introducing toxic or nuclear industries in rural or suburban areas. A small, but significant, amount of literature has examined Irish environmental campaigns (Baker 1990; Allen & Jones 1990; Peace 1997; Allen 2004; Leonard 2006; Tovey 2007). Applying Resource Mobilisation (RM) theory presents an understanding of collective access frames and political opportunity structure (POS) which illuminate certain areas of commonality and differences successive community campaigns have shared. In so doing, the book will demonstrate the manner in which a pool of community resources and environmental consciousness fermented over the decades which encompassed the twenty first century. In addition, the particularistic nature of Irish politics, including its clientelism, populism and increased dependence on coalitional politics in the context of the comprehensive accounts of community politics (Varley 1991b; Curtin & Varley 1991, 1995), provides an overview of how the Irish case presents a framework of community-based environmental politics that has notable differences to existing Anglo-American or European models.

One of the most significant differences is that the inception of environmental campaigns in Ireland is derived from the groundswell of cultural nationalism which formed the backdrop to community life in rural regions across the country. Neither can the resistance of local communities which is rooted in a colonial mistrust of both Dublin and London and which has more recently, been extended to include a disdain for the officialdom of the EU or 'big shots' from US multinationals, be dismissed simply as a form of NIMBYism as such community identity has a local basis but has been shaped by a wider and shared identity. Moreover, community-based environmental campaigns have drawn on a type of cultural nationalism that is characterised by a rural traditionalism which has, at certain times, been infused with new left radicalism, moralistic dogma, ecological consciousness and a concern for the land of generations gone or yet to come that defines rural identity and shaped the meanalities of landscape and resource contestation.

In many environmental responses to perceived threats, defence of space campaigns can be better understood as 'territorial' rather than NIMBYist. Traditionally, rural communities have formed a collective identity based on their relationship with their local landscape, particularly in the years before independence when people didn't have a state or flag to demonstrate their allegiance to. Since the formation of the state the spatial divide between the rural periphery and the urban core has been

replicated with the location of the core of power changing from London to Dublin and later Brussels, or even corporate headquarters in the USA. What is clear is that the dichotomy between rural communities and urban-based elites has been an ongoing feature of Irish society over the centuries and in some ways represents a type of class division within our society between an urbanised elite with links to the political or economic core and local communities that remain marginalised due to this ongoing spatial hierarchy. Therefore, an urban-based population in cities such as Cork and Galway is included in this understanding of territorial distinction within the traditional demarcation of 'the West' as represented by phrases such as 'beyond the pale', 'all points west of the Shannon' or 'the line running from Derry to Cork'. Many of the territorial-based environmental disputes in Ireland have occurred west of that imaginary boundary.

A series of frames have been used by movements including political, cultural, social, legal, institutional, economic, scientific and moral. Invariably the discursive framing patterns presented in cases of Irish environmental activism have emerged from a populist context. Kitching (1989) examines populism from the perspective of developing societies and makes the distinction between populism and neo-populism. While both are presented as critiques of industrialisation and mass-production in favour of small and localised entities 'populism' is defined as being based primarily in a social and ethical critique, whereas 'neo-populism' is seen as being 'more ambitious and 'not primarily oppositional' (Kitching 1989 20, 21). The process of migration from rural to urban centres during the industrial revolution is presented as a factor in the development of populism based on rural sentiment by Kitching creating an 'anti-urban nostalgia' for the rural in elements of populism (ibid.). The geographer David Storey (2001) creates an understanding of how forms of territorialism come to inform community responses to the perception of risk. These responses involve the mobilisation of rural sentiment by advocates who wish to preserve local ways of life or environments. In the case of Irish environmentalism territory is defined by local discourse rather than boundaries except perhaps for the county allegiance that has been developed as an integral part of the ideology of the Gaelic Athletic Association which is now recognised as an important component in the formation of 'social capital' (Putnam 2000) in the regions. When it comes to environmental disputes the mobilisation of territorial responses derived from traditional rural sentiment, or more recently formed local identities, represents the political articulation of progressive social capital as such local responses empower communities in an era of globalised economy and culture. And it is within this understanding that new sections of the population have been assimilated with many providing wider networks and areas of expertise for campaigns which have allowed communities to challenge globalised corporate entities on a more equal footing. It is the utilisation of the internet and communication technologies that has underpinned this increased flow of expertise networks for campaigns, allowing them to move 'beyond NIMBY' as Szasz (1994) has stated, or to emerge from their initial territorial response.

Politically this form of expansive territorialism allows environmental campaigns to challenge the spatial exclusion caused by the neo-corporatist model prevalent in

Ireland. While partnership has served many sectors in society like unions and employers well, its focus on economic growth has also led to the exclusion of other sectors of the population such as women's groups, the poor and environmentalists. As local authorities have had many of their powers removed territorial campaigns have come to represent the grass roots in the regions articulating a 'bottom up' response to the neo-corporate core which prioritises multinational agendas over local concerns. And despite the emphasis on rural development in the National Development Plans it is quite evident that multinational-led growth remains the economic priority for the state. For Storey, sub-state regional development is part of the hegemonic process of state dominance. Nonetheless, we can see that neo-corporatist exclusion provides the political opportunity for territorial campaigns to mobilise around environmental issues. Equally the inherent populism which characterises Irish politics provides leverage for campaigns at times of elections when the coalitions formed from necessity due to the returns of PRSTV can be undermined. This leverage is only temporary as the neo-corporatist core soon reasserts itself in the aftermath of post-election government formation.

While the traditional clientelism renowned in Irish politics allows territorial groups local political access, the spatial dichotomy extended to rural communities can include its political representatives particularly that most isolated breed, the backbencher from a rural constituency. While campaigns attempted to gain access to the power core as represented by the cabinet this led to a loss of support from their own grass roots, a fatal outcome for any territorial campaign. As neo-corporatist 'partnership' comes to represent the triumph of economically based sectional interests over others territorial groups become more reliant on the input of new middle-class professionals who become the entrepreneurs, or advocates, of environmental disputes. These advocates retain a degree of economic autonomy from the state's neo-corporatist plans despite or perhaps because they may be in the employ of the state as academics or researchers. In many cases the adversaries of the territorial advocate can be the technocratic advisor who creates a contest between competing sets of expertise, a forum which has up until recently provided equal footing for advocates who often outperform their technocratic opponents. Invariably, many territorial advocates are charismatic figures whereas the technocrat remains an largely secretive figure while the media performances of advocates such as Tara Watch campaigner Vincent Salafia, GSE's Conchuair O'Brádaigh or Shell to Sea's Mark Garavan are a testimony to the significance of professionals with expertise who provide campaigns with a direction. However, recent events have demonstrated that the advocate is coming under threat from the neo-corporatist elite who have come to view territorially based campaigns as NIMBYist or self interested missing the significance of rural responses to environmental issues. The nature of the ruling against Vincent Salafia over The M3 at Tara and the tone of subsequent articles in the press are in keeping with a climate of intolerance which has been demonstrated in the needless and unjust imprisoning of the Rossport 5, the censure of the Centre for Public Inquiry after their reports on Trim Castle, the Shell pipeline and the treatment of John Hanrahan. Despite these events, environmental advocacy has been a significant factor in the consolidation of a nascent

environmental lobby, built from a series of campaigns which began at Carnsore Point with the anti-nuclear protests and have culminated in the Shell to Sea campaign.

Writing in 2002, Hilary Tovey posed the question 'when is a campaign a movement?' Charles Tilly (2004) claims that a movement emerges from the interaction of 'political circuits' therefore, a movement occurs when a campaign moves beyond a single event or localised focus and results in the interplay of activists' planning and agitating together, resonating against the seemingly impenetrable walls of the neo-corporatist elite, leading ultimately to the achievement of social or political change. And as growth and greed come to threaten the environment all the more, it is this challenge to neo-corporatism that provides the environmental sector with its greatest difficulties and opportunities. It is not a coincidence that we as a society are searching for a way to accommodate environmental perspectives at a time when accelerating rates of growth challenge our ability to protect and conserve the nation's hinterlands. At a time when negotiations for partnership have recommenced between business the government and unions we might ask the question as to why environmentalists remain excluded from the neo-corporatist table. Surely, a state which purports to embrace the concept of sustainable development would be better served in reaching out to the environmental lobby in an inclusive manner? However, like women's groups or the economically disadvantaged environmentalists have found to their cost that participation in partnerships is the sole preserve of those involved in the generation of financial wealth.

The imperative of economic growth through multinational-led development first set out by Lemass and Whittaker in the 1950s has served the country well, as indeed has the partnership model. Nonetheless, as the Good Friday Agreement has demonstrated, it is only when those diametrically opposed to each other build consensus that progress based on social inclusiveness can be achieved. For those involved with environmental issues in Ireland inclusiveness remains elusive with competing sets of interests vying against each other in an attempt to convince the wider public that their perspective is the only way forward. Adversaries are depicted as sinister polluters or self interested 'NIMBYs' with little or no dialogue between the two. At the centre of this debate are representatives of the state, parties of government or relevant agencies such as the EPA or An Bord Pleanála. In many cases the only dialogue between both groups is provided through the courts, with environmental advocates providing the expertise, and sometimes bearing the cost, of these challenges.

There is little doubt that environmental advocates have made a significant contribution to the development of a coherent civil society in Ireland over recent decades. The emergence of a community-based environmental movement in Ireland has articulated the grievances of rural communities over projects perceived to carry environmental or human health risks. These projects can be divided into two phases. In the first, pre-Celtic Tiger phase communities mobilised against multinationals that had relocated from the USA to escape regulation or against energy sources like nuclear power which represented the worst elements of what Ulrich Beck has called 'risk society'. The second phase, which has come in the years

subsequent to economic growth, involves campaigns against infrastructural projects such as sewage treatment plants, incinerators and landfills as the state struggles to deal with the waste which is a by-product of increased rates of consumption (Leonard 2005).

Throughout both phases of community-based collective action one common theme has been the importance of environmental advocates who provide leadership, mobilise responses to commonly held grievances and articulate a path for campaigns that move away from initial concerns about local issues into something that Szasz has described as going 'beyond NIMBY' into a form of environmentalism that can embrace wider issues of national or global importance. Many local campaigns have taken this path and a network of national and international ecological activism has emerged which complements existing levels of mainstream environmentalism such as An Taisce or the Green Party. All of the campaigns achieve some level of networked environmentalism where the shared knowledge and expertise of prior campaigns is drawn upon or added to, creating an important layer of civil society which is a key tenet of pluralistic democracy. The one exception is the tragic case of Tynagh mines where the local community's isolation from other environmental groups concerned about resources left the Tynagh community struggling to put up even a basic backyard campaign, never mind evolving into a more coherent ecopolitical grouping. As a result of this inability to mobilise effectively, the Tynagh hinterland and waterways were scarred and polluted with demands for reclamation going unanswered.

As we know, the campaign to prevent the mining of Croagh Patrick in Mayo, which occurred at that time, had more success thanks to a strong campaign led by the local Archbishop Dr. Joseph Cassidy and links with the campaign against mining in Donegal. Moreover, some of those involved in the Shell to Sea campaign took their first steps along the environmental path during the Croagh Patrick dispute, something perhaps which Shell overlooked when they planned their pipeline across the Mayo countryside. For many environmental campaigns, the existence of experienced and committed activists in a region becomes a valuable resource in the process of mobilisation. The importance of environmental advocates was also witnessed during the Mullaghmore dispute, when Emer Colleran and others were able to combine their expertise with a locally held understanding of the ecological significance of the Burren region. Again the contribution of local advocates became more potent when engaged with international figures from the legal or environmental world who could demonstrate, with Professor Colleran, that the Burren should be protected from the impacts of tourism development. Without doubt, the actions of Emer Colleran and her colleagues at Mullaghmore represent a major contribution to the conservation of a region which is an area of special environmental value for people across Ireland and the world.

By using the tools of group culture such as political activism, a social reality is constructed which challenges and redefines our cultural expectations. The emergence of territorially derived group culture has come to define the campaigns of socio-political and culture resistance to the modernising projects of the state or industrial sector. Rural territorial campaigns have opened up a socio-cultural narrative at a

key point of departure in Irish society, as we move into a post-consumptionist phase, providing an integrity which is all too often lacking in the behaviour of prominent politicians and cabinet ministers. Environmental scientists also take a different viewpoint calling for accuracy and expertise during debates about the anthropocentric development of the landscape while the technocratic advisers employed by the multinationals or the state always find enough evidence to demonstrate the safety of their technology no matter how many complaints such technologies have raised in the past. Therefore, we can see many environmental disputes as debates about rational choice. For communities the scientific evidence which demonstrates the safety of technologies provides little comfort when prior campaigns have argued about the inherent risks posed by the same technologies. And so many disputes become contests between rational science versus community concerns with one side marshalling data and the other mobilising grievance. Set in this context it seems difficult to imagine that communities bring themselves to accept infrastructure or technologies until after they have been proven to be safe. Such is the nature of the 'risk society' outlined by Ulrich Beck (1992).

Using the rational underpinning consumption-based behaviour scientists, advocates and the community adopt particular roles within the process of accepting change within the context of modernisation. And yet, the state or multinational, despite their array of technocrats, scientists and consultants often fail to recognise the unpopularity of the technology they are attempting to introduce, be it nuclear power, sewage treatment plants, incinerators or gas pipelines. From the community perspective technologies or infrastructure is understood in three states. At the 'pre-issue' stage communities come to an understanding about the pros and cons of the technology being introduced. During the 'issue-acceptance' stage communities attempt to comprehend the competing expertise provided by consultants in favour of or advocates who oppose technologies or infrastructure. At the 'post-issue' stage the functional performance of any new technology or infrastructure is assessed providing that technology or infrastructure is actually introduced. Environmental impacts are assessed at this stage and poor performance or results may lead to further mobilisation against the offending project. In this way we can see that the process whereby projects are introduced to (or imposed on) communities has become part of the culture of the modernising state. Segments of the community may then feel the need to resist modernisation at certain moments where technology or infrastructure is anticipated as too great a risk.

In the absence of the recognition of community concerns by the authorities advocates can mobilise grievance by establishing 'consensus' (Klandermans 1989b) built from symbiotic understandings of local heritage with a nostalgic sentiment for an era characterised by understandings formed from local discourse. Once re-ignited this form of what I term 'rural sentiment' can be mobilised through collective activity which allows communities to share the experience of communal resistance to projects, leading to enhanced integration, communication and participation. By moving beyond the single issue surrounding the technology or infrastructure being challenged local campaigns can open up networks with global movements which provide expertise and data that can be used to challenge the science of the state or

multinational. And while projects are introduced to address a social need which the state has identified through its policy framework, the response of communities is based on a new set of needs that emerge in the pre-issue stage. These community-based needs are constituted from within, in what the Shell to Sea advocate Mark Garavan has described as a 'visceral' response based on fear of large-scale projects. This is a fear which scientists dismiss as irrational but it is a fear which is all too natural when viewed from the perspective of members of the public who have grown up in an era where risk and toxicity have become a feature of popular culture, appearing in films, books and even cartoons with the classic 'good guy' advocate challenging the 'mad scientist' and the 'evil corporate entity'. The state, which is viewed with suspicion in an era of democratic deficit driven by successive corruption-based 'scandals' is seen as a compliant facilitator of multinational agendas. Within this dynamic of social change community-based environmental campaigns have become an integral part of the rights-based autonomous politics which spawns the new social movements. These environmentally based social movements emerge from a range of issues including social psychology and group behaviour, economics and the consumer society, demographic change within the context of urban sprawl and the cultural setting that creates an anthropologically or historically derived territorial response from within a community that feels threatened by risk-based projects. Within this understanding of collective behaviour the responses of communities in the face of risk are anything but irrational.

It follows, then, that environmental perspectives can be divided into two competing paradigms. One is dominated by a science-based positivistic rational which holds that modern technology can provide a functional answer to existing social or ecological problems. The other perspective has emerged from an age of scepticism and takes a post-modern view which questions or interprets the material assumptions and grand narratives of science. Both perspectives are embedded in current socio-cultural thought and in that context community-based interpretivist responses to large-scale projects should be seen as one form of rationality rather than being dismissed for not conforming to another. As the state continues to exclude community-based environmental groups when introducing major projects social movement mobilisation becomes part of a conditional response to neo-corporatist exclusion. It is part of a process of socialised behaviour where each subsequent campaign draws on the existing knowledge of prior disputes to formulate their challenges. In many cases a community wishes to be seen to take a strong stance in defence of their territory so as not to be perceived as weak.

It is this reinforced and accumulative sentiment that provides part of the motivation for collective action responses to perceived risks. The backdrop to Irish history has encoded interpretivistic responses into the collective folk memory of our rural communities by way of a series of key events such as the Land Wars of the late 1800s. These understandings form what has described as 'practical consciousnesses' (Giddens 1984). This form of social encoding can become part of an ongoing interpretive or 'discursive consciousness' (Haugaard 1997 179) that can be drawn upon to formulate understandings based on traditional perspectives at times of accelerated change. While science-based meanings tend to be presented in a fixed

manner, due in part to their technocratic presentation, the 'interpretative horizons'(ibid.) which shape local discourses during territorial disputes can be a potent source in the formation of collective responses to perceived threats from outsiders, be they state or multinational. When faced with the certainty of science the emotive responses of communities during environmental disputes can draw on encoded local understandings in the process of articulating a coherent challenge to positivistic rationale providing a degree of equality until such time as rural-based sentiment is demystified which, in the Irish case, usually occurs during the legal process characterised by an oral hearing (Peace 1997).

We can place this 'interpretivistic' (Solomon 2002) contest within the concepts of structure and agency where deterministic understandings about social responses are formulated. Of course, individuals and communities are not constrained by the collective consciousness formed over the ages. Nonetheless, the social relationships of a region shape that region's perception of what is internal or external. The commonly-held structures which form community sentiment create an institutionalised, or learned, response when faced with external risks. The flow of knowledge becomes part of the associative process by which a community defines itself and formulates responses. By forming extended linkages with communities that have previously dealt with similar technological or infrastructural risk, a network of consensus can be built, transforming disparate campaigns into a movement. One of the integral figures involved in this transformative process is the advocate or interest-led expert who provides the expertise necessary to authenticate campaigns that would otherwise decline in the face of positivistic interrogation during legal challenges. It can be said that environmental campaigns operate at two levels of rationality within the shared understandings of territorial consciousnesses as well as in the more pragmatic realm of shared knowledge which can inform challenges to technocratic science. Community responses formed from interpretivistic sentiment are triggered by advocates or 'entrepreneurs'(Della Porta & Diani 1999) who harvest the grievances held by rural communities in order to create the motivation for collective action. While some responses are more instinctively driven by the threat of whatever project is being imposed motivations for collective action are invariably driven by the advocate who manages such responses.

This shaping of community motivation is part of the agenda setting which occurs at the inception of a campaign and sets the tone for the initial phase of that action. The cognitive process where communities map out a response is a complex one and the depth of collective identity built from adversity has underpinned much of the interpretative cognisance in the Irish case. We can understand the formation of this response as part of a hierarchy of basic grievances or concerns for communities. Ranging from the need for safety from risk and protection for domestic environments at the basic level through to the fulfilment of collective capacities by association with and mobilisation of community through moral framing the process of collective action can ultimately provide communities with significant levels of esteem and accomplishment in an age of contested legitimation or democratic deficit. Ultimately, environmentally based activism creates an important stratum of a pluralistic democracy allowing peripheral social groups to create evolutional and political interaction with the core.

Chapter 5
Rural Sentiment as Ecological Capital

Introduction

For many the changes that have occurred in rural Ireland over the last half century have mirrored a disengagement from the traditional patterns of life that had embedded a set of values and practices which allowed rural communities to coexist with their surrounding environment. With the onset of a technologically driven agribusiness sector, mass production and scientisation drove a wedge between rural dwellers and their hinterland. Farming would become synonymous with over production, fish kills derived from slurry spillages and images of EU subsidies for non-production in the wake of the 'butter mountains' and 'gravy lakes' which stemmed from unsustainable practices. In the era of globalised production local production for local markets came to be dismissed as small minded thinking. The damage caused to local interactions between communities and hinterlands was significant.

Constructing Rural Sentiment

One response to this loss of local identity was the concept of 'rural development' which involved community-based initiatives to reinvigorate local discourse in the face of outside challenges, both culturally and environmentally speaking. A combination of grievances relating to depopulation, unemployment and neglect of rural regions provided successive environmental campaigns with a groundswell of dissent to facilitate mobilisation processes against multinationals or the political establishment. When combined with the renewed confidence achieved by new middle-class figures bolstered by expertise on rural rejuvenation programmes learned during migrant experiences abroad, a significant form of rural-based resistance emerged. This fundamental response came to be articulated around 'defence of space' types of territorial campaigns involving the imposition of industrial plants or infrastructural projects.

By addressing the political void which had opened around an increased sense of democratic deficit in a scandal ridden era, rural-based environmental protests reclaimed a dominant sense of agrarian nationalism which could be traced back to

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

Michael Davitt and the Land League agrarian movement of the late 1800s. This potent mixture of traditional values and local sentiment created a persuasive moral frame for many environmental campaigns to build on. Furthermore, the increased sense of confidence that collective mobilisation in common cause can re-establish a sense of cultural resistance to the globalised hegemony of development and consumerism at a time when uneven economic growth and industrialisation threatened to create unsustainable imbalances between the rural and the urban and between developed sprawl and rural environment. By analysing the community responses which emerge from the 'habitus' or perceptions and dispositions which are shaped by an individual's or group's social structures (Bourdieu 1986), I have constructed an understanding of how *ecological capital* is formed from *rural sentiment* from existing accounts of populist, rural and agrarian politics including:

- Commons (1986) *Rural Fundamentalism*
- Tovey (1992b) *Populist Environmentalism*
- Peace (1997) *Rural Discourse*
- Varley and Curtin (1999) *Unifying Ether*
- Storey (2000) *Territorialism*
- Leonard (2006) *Rural Sentiment*

The underlying themes of populist rural discourse are in themselves, sufficient for the development of rural attitudes in the face of ecological degradation in the regions. However, I felt that a discourse could only be aroused from something more intrinsically held in the collective consciousness of a community; the basis of identities formed in an area over centuries and passed down amongst indigenous peoples. Ultimately, it is this embedded sentiment which becomes ignited, leading to any subsequent discourse of community protest, as the 'unifying ether' is sparked into the flames of collective action.

Community Politics in Ireland

The backdrop to the emergence of environmental disputes in Ireland has been the development of a form of community politics which has its basis in a rural identity which is embedded in Irish society. This identity has been born out of a traditionalist discourse which embraces local values over the modernisation projects of colonisers, state officials or EU bureaucrats (Tovey 1992b). Over time attempts to tame both the 'wild Irish' and their rugged landscape have cultivated an instinctive mistrust of officialdom and technological change in rural communities. One result of this has been a growth of an identity-based community politics which challenges industrial policies and projects in the regions. This form of externalised community expression has taken shape in spite of the dependent nature of the industrialisation policies of the state, and illustrates a rural mindset that holds self sufficiency and local wisdom drawn from interaction with the hinterland in higher regard than the conventional wisdom of the representatives of politics or industry.

This form of 'rural fundamentalism' (Commins 1986 47) places an emphasis on localised structures that includes landowners, family-based farms and agrarian small-town life as the unifying component of social and political life in Ireland. While the lineage of this agrarian ideology pre-dates independence the protectionist policies of Eamon de Valera and his promotion of a vision of a nation built on rural values have bolstered this perspective (ibid.). The state's policies of modernisation of agriculture through the application of science or through promoting industrialisation served to further strengthen this rural fundamentalism over recent decades. A wider sense of community grievance also developed in response to incidents of environmental and resource contestation. Extreme emigration was suffered in rural communities between the 1930s and 1980s. Over these decades, a sense of 'rural decline' (Varley 1991a 83), due to depopulation and a perceived loss of traditional lifestyles led to a hardening of rural fundamentalism, allowing environmental challengers to construct grievance frames by drawing on the shared sense of injustice that had developed in rural communities. Seen in this light the sense of democratic deficit which existed in Ireland can be better understood, particularly in the context of an historical resistance to authority which had been at the heart of nationalist attempts to subvert the rule of authority, be it based in London, Dublin or even Brussels. Political deficit, in this form, is demonstrated by the low levels of membership of political parties, which was as low as 21% (Hardiman 1994 108). In the absence of a strong political culture, a parochial form of populism emerged, which created a growing sense of civic-based 'political competence' (ibid.) among citizens who wished to challenge the state. As mistrust of and participation in the formal political sphere went into decline protest politics emerged as a vehicle for dissent in Ireland. Many issues, such as civil rights for nationalists in Northern Ireland, equality for women or better economic conditions for farmers or trades unionists were characterised by public protests and marches across Ireland from the 1960s to the anti-globalisation marches of recent years.

Within that growing sector of a politicised civil society a reservoir of radicals, pacifists, nationalists and feminists was established, which provided both expertise and prior campaign experience that facilitated the mobilisation of environmental campaigns over the last 40 years in Ireland. The 'interpersonal contacts' between these individuals and groups has created a network which can be mobilised around environmental issues, creating a strata of civil society which assists movements to emerge from their NIMBY inception and go on to build wider campaigns (Leonard 2005). It is important to note, however, that this stratum of politicised civil society is very much in the minority in Ireland. Invariably that society was characterised by a conservative political and social culture where values based on tradition, moralism and a paternalistic authoritarianism held sway over time. While recent years have witnessed more liberalised social norms alongside rapid economic growth, it is important to remember that the "Celtic Tiger" has by-passed many rural areas and has remained a largely urban phenomenon. The state's attempts to modernise through industrial or infrastructural projects have been presented as key components of spreading an industrialised wealth base across the country which would stem the tide of emigration. And yet, in spite of historical depopulation and economic

stagnation, rural communities have resisted industrial or infrastructural projects which they have deemed to be too much of a risk to the local population or environment.

The basis for their community-based environmental resistance has been non-party or 'non-political community groups' (Varley 1991a 85). The social networks which were established across a series of cooperatives and community groups created the 'platform for popular discourse' (Peace 1997 67) which provided fertile ground for the germination of many community challenges in recent years. And while the state has attempted to reach out to communities through the social partnership model, the networks of civil society have also provided effective links for the dissemination of information that underscores the mobilisation process. Although the relationship between the state and community partnership groups has been weighted in favour of the authorities, the interaction between civil society and local and national government created a sense of efficiency and confidence amongst community leaders which has bolstered the leadership of environmental campaigns, in the guise of 'community primary resources' (Varley 1991a 100). While these individuals may have been involved with community development they were more likely to be familiar with the marginalisation experienced in their locality.

The position of many community development groups who were directed by the state to develop tourism, agriculture and fisheries was often diametrically opposed to the infrastructural or industrialisation projects which the state wished to impose from above. The emergence of campaigns of rural regeneration, such as the 'Save the West' movement or Irish language campaigns, have further served to create variants of rural fundamental discourse. In the late 1980s and early 1990s community politics gave rise to the 'single issue candidate' (Varley 1991a 105) based on the mobilisation of campaigns highlighting the need for or loss of local services, although the political potency of the single issue or Independent Candidate has been shown to be reduced significantly once the candidate crosses the threshold of the Dáil. On other occasions community groups have formed alliances with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) such as An Taisce (The National Trust) to preserve areas of scenic beauty (Curtin & Varley 1989 216). While rural community groups had the provision to appeal to An Bord Pleanála (The Infrastructural Board) to register their concern about projects in their areas, attempts to transplant their rural discourses into a legal setting was often lost in the constrained setting of the oral hearing or legal challenge (Peace 1997 99). This inability to translate rural meanalities into legal efficacy stymied many environmental campaigns yet the legal route was retained by many campaigners as the primary external strategy.

For many campaigns the ability to create 'links' with 'influential allies' (Tarrow 1984 88) from elite groupings became an essential component of the wider mobilisation process. By obtaining sponsorship community groups could attempt to gain access to the formal political structures of the state and thereby attempt to influence policymakers. By exploiting clientelist political arrangements in this way, community groups hoped to apply pressure on the state. When local elites are linked with grass-roots groups the combination can work towards creating effective community

responses which can build a sense of local populist resistance to both state and corporate entities. This local opposition can draw on 'rural discourse' (Peace 1997), which can be found in even 'non-political' community and voluntary groups which form the basis of Irish life in rural areas (Varley 1991a 84–85).

By exploiting the unstable alignments (Tarrow 1984 88) that exist between the political parties of the Dáil, communities can also come to define themselves through their attempts to resist the policies of the state, as local viewpoints are shared and articulated, and grievances highlighted during the course of a campaign (Tucker 1988 284). However, a number of factors militated against outbreaks of widespread collective action in rural areas. These variables have their basis in a persuasive sense of conservatism that restricted a person's or groups' ability to respond to incidents or disputes. These factors included the intricate set of relationships that existed around property and land ownership as the most significant 'established institutional arrangement' (Varley 1988 8) in the regions. Relationships are built around land ownership, so resource disputes impacted upon the very basis of community interaction. This stratified social structure also militated against wholesale class-based collective action (ibid.) and the resultant emphasis on individualism and independence reduced mobilisation potentials, as did practices of clientelism and political brokerage between individuals (ibid.). Accordingly, only the cultivation of grievance frames built on rural fundamentalist discourse facilitated the establishment of a template for community mobilisation against projects or policy initiatives, based on the depiction of such projects as 'an intruder which exploits rural labour, destroys rural values and ruins the beauty and tranquillity of the countryside' (Gillnor 1986 29). The dichotomy between the state's attempt to reduce dependency in rural peripheralities by promoting local self-reliance and the manner in which industrialisation or infrastructural projects were imposed 'from above' also provided campaigners with a basis to construct grievance frames by drawing on resultant societal strain.

Community Advocacy and Expertise

Over time, rural community sentiment has come to depend on the leadership and 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu 1986) of an autonomous middle class. This social group, often residing in the suburban belts where environmental disputes occur, have both the independence and expertise necessary to sustain campaigns against multinationals or the state. The expertise of what has been termed the "new middle class" (Inglehart 1977) professionals has become a crucial component of Irish environmentalism. Whereas first-phase campaigns in the pre-Celtic Tiger era were often dependent on external experts from the UK or North America, the emergence of a new middle class in Irish society in the post-boom years coincided with the increase in localised incidents of ecological and infrastructural disputes from the mid-1990s onward. Expertise in communications technologies would become a vital part of this emergent group of advocacy entrepreneurs as returning emigrants

brought back new skills gained during spells abroad during the unemployment blighted 1980s. Moreover, these returning professionals brought with them a sense of confidence combined with a determination to improve conditions at home for their families, economically, politically and environmentally. The role of indigenous expert became a significant aspect of the wider framework of environmental campaigning in Irish cases, as new and previously existing connections with international advocates were created and maintained, adding to the potency of the network circuits which provided the interest driven data necessary to contest the scientific arguments of the industrial sector and the state (Leonard 2005).

Furthermore, these new middle-class advocates were autonomous from the neo-corporate partnership model which characterised Irish political life from the 1990s onward. In the absence of trade movement mobilisation, environmental advocates were well placed to mobilise existing dissent in an era shaped by a succession of religious and political scandals. Inevitably, neo-corporatism creates political opportunities for those excluded from the partnership table, particularly environmental activists who challenge the economic imperative of the neo-corporatist state (Scott 1990). While many members of the new middle class were in the employ of state, particularly in the university sector, their relative economic independence combined with their positioning on the apex where urban sprawl was causing ecological degradation gave rise to a suburban eco-consciousness which spawned many of the campaigns of recent years. In addition, many of the new middle class had become aware of their Gaelic heritage during their time in exile, and the connection between locals and their hinterland became a social trend alongside the emergence of the Gaelscoilanna, the local Gaelic Athletic Association club and the popularity of Gaelic names for children in recent times (McWilliams 2005).

The role of the new middle-class advocate has become that of a disseminator of knowledge and expertise, and in many cases these advocates have become charismatic figures who project their concerns onto the national stage, as in the case of Emer Colleran or the Rossport 5. These advocates are, invariably, unpaid volunteers who compete with the highly paid consultants of the multinationals or the state. Over time, they can suffer from “activist fatigue”, as the strain of sustaining a campaign begins to weigh heavily on the shoulders of the main personnel or leadership group driving any protest movement. Many environmental campaigners I have spoken to have gone on to reveal the extent of the personal cost, or that suffered by their families, over the duration of a campaign. Nonetheless, these campaigners have captured the imagination of the public at various times, as a sense of genuine sympathy has come to replace dismissive depictions of these ‘eco-warriors’ in both the local and national press. Eco-advocates have also been able to benefit from the wider understanding of environmental issues which have resulted from better education in schools, as well as the initiatives and information drives of the state as it introduced a succession of EU environmental directives on waste management, plastic bag taxes and the introduction of smokeless fuels.

Without doubt, the mobilisation of successive environmental campaigns have had the effect of creating a degree of environmental consciousness across Irish society which has been evident in the support shown to campaigns as well as the

rise in votes for the Green Party in recent elections. It remains a fact that the work of environmental advocates has contributed to the much vaunted social capital which has so enthralled both the media and political elites as a source of all that is good in Irish society. Regrettably, this hasn't as yet led to the ending of the isolation, harassment and at times, imprisonment of many of those who have fought to defend the Irish environment at various points in our recent history. In order to better understand the nature of community mobilisation around environmental issues, an examination of some of the main aspects of social movement and resource mobilisation (RM) theory will be undertaken. These theories will be applied to the series of environmental campaigns discussed throughout this book. The development of resource mobilisation theory can be traced back to attempts to measure the outbreak of new left activism during the 1960s in the USA. Collective action by civil rights activists, anti-war protesters and women's liberation groups was defined as part of an attempt to 'promote or resist change in society' (Turner & Killian 1972 246). Arising from historical conditions or societal strain, new middle-class students or professionals attempted to utilise collective action to promote either increased levels of resource distribution or further autonomy from the state in an era of 'post materialism' (Davies 1962).

The importance of charismatic leaders who influence a wider activist base around key moments of social change has been documented by movement theorists. The significance of leadership groups or committees in interpreting grievances and creating collective action has been highlighted (Wilson 1973; Klandermans 1989a). While earlier theorists identified charismatic consensus forming, recruitment and fund-raising as the key focus of movement leaders, later works highlighted the significance of prior protest experience, political, legal and media expertise, and an ability to maximise the use of communication technologies as vital components of a potential leader's strategic portfolio. In many cases, distinctive leadership types emerge, offering their expertise as part of a leadership collective or committee. In the era of mass communications, a leader's ability to open up network channels and effectively link with like minded groups, the media and the institutional sector can define a movement and enhance the outcome of a protest. Incidents of environmental collective action in Ireland, have tended to rely on local or internal leaders mobilising grievance frames, while external leaders or experts have provided updated information, strategies or contacts to regional campaigns, leading to a wider range of 'enriched options' (Morris & Staggenborg 2004 178) for protestors.

Leaders must also mobilise the resources available to them, in order to galvanise a movement over the duration of its campaigns. Over time, a movement's ability to access and utilise resource has been identified as a crucial factor in determining the effectiveness of any campaign, based on the generation of resource mobilisation theory (RMT). Through this approach, a model of movement development has been established (McCarthy & Zald 1973, 1977, 1979; Gamson 1975; Jenkins 1983), focusing on both the benefits and constraints of resource-based movements. While the initial wave of RMT theorists comprised the first strand of that perspective, later analysis of collective action emphasised the political opportunity structure

(POS) as an external resource which movements could exploit to gain leverage or access the political process (Kietcschelt 1986; Tarrow 1984, 1988; Kriesi 1989, 2004). However, the nature of the POS in a state may influence the manner in which political opportunities emerge, thereby influencing the tactical approach of a campaign (Kriesi 2004). Eisinger (1973) initially defined the 'curvilinear' nature of POS, as structure 'open' and 'closed' at different states. For Tarrow (1994, 1998) this 'shifting dynamic' of POS created 'salient changes' such as 'increased access' or 'divided elites' (ibid.) which movements could exploit to gain leverage or influence.

Master Frames, Grievances and Consensus

The evolution of a campaign of collective action may depend on the ability of movement 'entrepreneurs' (McCarthy & Zald 1977; Della Porta & Diani 1999 7) to exploit an issue around a 'shared grievance' (Klandermans 1989a) held by a community. Grievance can have its basis in a sense of injustice which has been harboured by a social group against the state or industry. Movement leaders or entrepreneurs can make issue out of the lack of facilities or the manner in which facilities are imposed through policy agendas. This form of 'grievance interpretation' (Klandermans 1989a) can be revisited throughout the duration of a campaign. The 'mobilisation of consensus' (ibid.) around issues is an important part of extending a campaign to the community. Movement leaders attempt to link their issue with the wider grievances held by the community, creating 'frame alignments' (Snow et al. 1986) to build wider support for their cause. In time, a movement's interpretation of a grievance can become a 'master frame' (Snow & Benford 1992). Master frames come to define an issue, and can be used throughout a campaign, or by subsequent activists, to rekindle grievance issues. Such master frames come to define the key moments of the 'cycles of protest' (ibid.), as movements attempt to change existing meanings, particularly through the forum provided by the media. Tarrow (1994, 1988) highlights the importance of 'media framing' for campaigners.

Environmental movements have been able to use media frames to highlight major incidents of pollution extending the wider sense of concern about 'risk society' (Beck 1992). This concern has persisted in the wake of large-scale technological accidents such as Three Mile Island or the Chernobyl reactor meltdown. By using media frames movements can communicate their aims to a wider audience, enhancing the presentation of their cause through relayed or documented events or debates. However, media frames are subject to editorial control and issue salience (Dearing & Rogers 1996) as disputes ebb and flow through the consciousness of the public. Incidents of collective activity take on many different forms. The 'repertories of protest' (Della Porta & Diani 1999) that define a campaign may include a range of approaches. Those most frequently used include protest marches, sit-ins, strikes, petitions and public meetings. In Ireland environmental groups have traditionally

used the legal or oral hearing approach (Peace 1987; Taylor 2001). A movements' readiness or 'flexibility' (Tilly 1977 155) in relation to implementing tactical repertories has a significant relationship to the overall impact of their campaign. Innovation in repertoires is difficult to achieve, as the forums and meanings of protest frames have come to be defined. One recent area of innovation in protest has been the utilisation of communication technologies as a 'privileged tool for acting, informing, recruiting, organising and counter dominating' (Castells 2001 137) The use of communications and Internet technologies has become a basis for expertise information flows which creates support networks for disparate campaigns.

Many of the various components of environmental movement activism can be diffused across Internet and media outlets, academic and scientific expertise, political strategies, legal frameworks and the location of national or global networks (Leonard 2003 88). This innovation in technology has facilitated the creation of wider repertoires of contention for movements and increased the importance of leaders who can exploit both the new technologies and the expertise that emerges from their use. The relationships between movement leaders, individual activists and like-minded groups allow movements to reconcile their aims, experiences and outcomes with other collective actors. Such links become the basis for the diffusion of expertise, grievance frames or pertinent forms of social capital (Diani 2003 109). Movements must create networks in order to partake in information flows and media debates. Networks are often based on the maintenance of 'interpersonal contacts' (Friedman & McAdam 1992 158). These contacts can have a client-broker type of relationship between groups or individuals as experienced campaigners pass on information or expertise to fledgling activists (Diani 2003 108).

Many advocacy researchers or entrepreneurs play a key role at the centre of environmental networks. They provide a brokerage link between various regional campaigns, global campaigners and media groups, using Internet technologies to provide a resource for activists, news corporations and even the institutional sector. The role of a movement broker may lead to the embedding of an advocacy expert at the heart of debates about social capital or environmental disputes (Ansell 2003 125). By igniting social ties movement advocates can illuminate relevant social grievances to the wider community. The role of the embedded entrepreneur of social capital has become a pivotal aspect of environmental disputes in Ireland.

Since the era of protest in the 1960s new social movements as represented by the environmental, feminist and civil rights movements have become an increasing feature in societies facing periods of political, structural and economic change. Aspects of social movement theory include the concept of 'social breakdown' which holds that social movements are a response to democratic deficit from the perspective of theorists such as Smelser (1962), Tilly et al. (1975) and MacAdam (1988). This is followed by an exploration of 'rational choice theory' which holds that any movement that can point to the benefit of its proposed change over any cost incurred stands a better chance of mobilisation and success. Theorists examined in this regard include Klandermans (1984) and Borgetta and Borgetta (1992). Resource Mobilisation Theory looks at the organisation of movements through the application of resources of finance or skills. The use of traditional social movement

strategies such as strikes and protests have been supplemented by scientific and technological expertise as movements go from street-level politics to professional campaigning. Once mobilisation has begun movements must undertake to create an overall consensus maintaining focus on the original movement aims. When established a movement must engage with potential participants through organisational efficiency and reliable, sourced media statements amongst other factors Klandermans (1988) Wilson (1973).

Conclusion

The pool of discontent from which many Irish environmental groups draw support can be understood as part of a wider grievance frame which has emerged from historical circumstance. Culturally the articulation of rural sentiment has been intertwined with the many versions of nationalism that transpired in opposition to centuries of colonial rule. While rebellion and independence followed on from the evocations of such nationalist sentiment, rural meanalities were only reflected in the artistic renaissance of the Celtic revival by Dublin-based ascendancy figures such as JM Synge or WB Yeats. And while the daily life of the inhabitants of the capital city was brought to life through the works of Joyce and O'Casey it would be some time after independence before Kavanagh's 'stony grey fields' of Monaghan would project deeper insights of the relationships between country people and their hinterland on the consciousness of the nation.

Inevitably the enduring hardship and poverty which had come to characterise life in many rural communities, since the Great Famine, became an underlying source of communal grievance in the regions. Urban poverty in Ireland was just as obdurate but the huge rates of emigration from rural areas and the West of Ireland in particular, added to the sense of societal loss which left many rural communities concerned about the possibility of complete demographic and cultural extinction. Moreover, the deeply rooted sense of connectedness that defined rural communities through their hinterland created a strong sense of what Benedict Anderson (1983) has called 'the imagined community'. Within this fulcrum of grievance, folklore and opposition, a sense of place emerged and a set of fundamental beliefs have been cultivated alongside the ditches and hedgerows of the West.

In the years after independence, this sense of parochial grievance was strengthened by what was perceived as the heavy hand of officialdom. The state attempted to impose modernity on rural communities which used traditional methods of production. This model of development emphasises science and technology as a way of maximising the market potential of agricultural produce, with a view towards exports. In order to achieve a modern agri-business sector, the state set out to provide grants and technical assistance which would affect a transition form smaller family-based farms with an emotive attachment to land, towards more 'efficient' larger farms which could service a globalised food-processing industry (Tovey & Share 2003 56). One result of these changes was a decline in the numbers involved in

agriculture with countless thousands taking the emigrant boat to find work abroad. Viewed in this context, the state's attempts to generate employment through multinational-led development were perceived with a degree of scepticism and hostility, even before pollution or health risks were discussed.

The grievances of rural communities which emerged from this perception of a loss of community have contributed to the growth of 'populist environmentalism' (Tovey 1992b 283) in Ireland. Populist environmentalism has been manifested as part of the 'rural discourse' (Peace 1997) which was a characteristic of anti-toxics and anti-multinational disputes during the pre-boom decades of the 1970s and 1980s. Populist sentiment had also been a feature of many of the anti-mining and resource disputes which occurred during the same period. It is quite interesting to see the re-emergence of rural populist discourse during the recent dispute about the Corrib gas pipeline involving calls for local ownership of local resources were combined with concerns about the risk posed by on-shore pipelines as part of the framing strategies of that campaign.

The existence of strong parochial rural sentiment has been cited as a factor in the lack of acceptance of 'official environmental' organisations in country-based disputes (Tovey 1992b 286), as communities attempted to mobilise grievance based on local understandings and relationships. However, this localism has also left many populist environmental groups open to the accusation of being mere NIMBYists as opposition to industrial or infrastructural projects in a communities 'backyard' is identified as the primary rallying point for campaign mobilisation. Further challenges for populist campaigns such as the problems of translating rural discourses as part of normal legal hearings have also been identified (Peace 1997 99). Essentially, the well of grievance which provides much of the underlying discontent for populist campaigns to exploit is the basis for an understanding of exactly how the various environmental campaigns that have occurred over recent decades can be characterised as components of an overall social movement (Tovey 2002 147–148). While populist environmental campaigns may 'wax and wane' (ibid.), the significance of each campaigns' contribution to an articulation of community grievance has created a movement of sorts, where outcomes can be measured through an understanding of the extent to which populist fundamentalism has come to be seen as the very basis for traditional rural identities in the post-consumption, post-modern era. This is an outcome that can be measured as part of the social capital of all rural and rural-urban communities and which has far greater significance than the outcome measurement models which chart the impact of protest campaigns on policy implementation. The true measurement of the impact of rural populist discourse goes beyond moments of access to political opportunity structures and contributes to the shape and nature of the populist Irish political system itself.

There are many definitions of what the term 'rural' means. By and large, rural life is understood as an existence in a hinterland, defined by a relationship with the land, through agricultural production (Curtin et al. 1996 11), or traditional cultural values and discourses (Taylor 1989 19). In the Irish case rurality has also been associated with 'spatial peripherality' (Curtin et al. 1996 13), as the communities

west of the Shannon River came to define themselves through their distance from the 'developed core of society' (ibid.). This sense of local embeddedness and hostility to the core can be traced back through Michael Davitt and the Land League. It remains a pivotal feature of the ongoing recreation of societal grievance which Giddens (1984) has described as 'practical consciousness', the basic opposition to officialdom due to an emergent sense of both ontological insecurity and structural motivation which stokes the embers of rural discourse, which Irish environmentalism exploits. Invariably, it has been the gradual translation of agrarian discourse into a form of environmentalism shaped by new middle-class advocates which has influenced the emergence of a wider eco-consciousness in Irish society in recent years. This motivation can be traced through a succession of Irish environmental campaigns over the last 40 years.

Over time, a pattern of rural resistance to the onset of globalised development becomes discernable in the Irish case. We can see that an overall combination of grievances around perceived threats to traditional processes and identities led to a growing sense of resistance which in many cases surfaced around environmentally based contests and disputes. In many ways the culture of social and political acquiescence which permeated life in the years after Independence gave way to a community-based political articulacy which sought to interrogate the grand narratives of industry or the state in the same manner as had been undertaken around issues of equality and religion across the nation. Moreover, at a time when the cycles of economic growth and recession sundered society through emigration and poverty in the pre-boom years or immigration and accelerated growth in the post-'Celtic Tiger' era, the values embedded in traditionalism rural mobilisation and concern for heritage became appealing and achievable for beleaguered communities when faced with the threat from 'outsiders', be they industrial or institutional.

Ecology and Feminism

Of course the student activist who took part in organising participation in the Carnsore Point Anti-Nuclear Protests in the late 1970s has emerged in adulthood as the concerned citizen protesting against the health risks of incineration for his/her children. In many ways the generation that has their feet planted on either side of the Millennium have grown up with and continued to be involved in environmental discourse as a facet of their lives, in the same way that emigration and immigration, political scandal and economic success have been embraced. During the previous 40 years environmentalism became part of the discourse of rights issues that have shaped modern Ireland. Many of the leaders of this generation were women, such as Mary Robinson, who took part in protests against the destruction of Georgian Dublin during her student days and who later became President of Ireland. Others, such as Petra Kelly, would go on to become leading figures in European environmentalism, with Kelly becoming a founder of the German Greens in her native Germany. Emer Colleran, who orchestrated the Mullaghmore protests with such

effectiveness, went on to become the founder and Chairperson of the Environmental Change Institute which encompasses diversity to facilitate greater ecological awareness. The Cork MEP Kathy Sinnott, who became a prominent advocate of disabilities rights, raised the issue of the legal context of the Tara site in 2007. Essentially, a strand of eco-feminism can be traced throughout the successive campaigns that have come to make up the Irish Environmental Movement; this presence allowed that discourse to become more representative of the population as a whole while locating a strand of Irish environmentalism within the contexts of Celtic mysticism and a deep green connection between the cycles of nature, both of which inform the prevailing 'new age' attitudes now commonplace in both deep green thinking and alternative culture. The sociologist Linda Connolly (2003, 2005, 2006) has written definitive accounts of the Irish women's movement in a social movement context. Without doubt, the overlapping synergies of the 'new left' movements such as feminism, environmentalism and the peace movement have shaped a powerful discourse which challenged the patriarchy of the last Millennium, while shaping the politics of the anti-globalisation in the early years of this century.

Another facet of the new environmentalism in modern Ireland has been the emergence of risk society and toxicity as a new issue of concern in our daily lives. With the onset of regular flights from the USA and a series of low tax incentives in Ireland, American Multinationals began to set up across the country, primarily in rural areas. In the aftermath of the Love Canal and Three Mile Island toxics scandals in the USA, issues surrounding nuclear or toxic pollution came to be a part of modern culture. As multinationals availed of the lax regulatory regime in Ireland, communities grew increasingly concerned about the costs to human health and the environment in the vicinity of established or proposed industrial plants. At the same time, a culture of oppositional politics has become an integral part of civil society. Student, feminist and republican protests were routinely featured in the media and on the television news. These new social movements also provided a pool of activists who also found common cause with community and environmental campaigners.

Issue salience was established around protest events throughout the 1960s and 1970s. By the end of the Millennium all relevant actors, ranging from campaigners and their adversaries through to the media and their audience became more adept at recognising the manipulation and framing of events to maintain an ongoing awareness around environmental issues. And while international movements such as Greenpeace became an integral part of both media and public understanding of environmental issues the institutional input from agencies such as the UN and the EU to the acceptance of concepts such as sustainable development across the globe has completed the acceptance of environmental issues as a significant component of life in the early part of the 21st century. As the paradigms of environmental discourse have come to be embedded in the public's consciousness so have the understandings of protest events and collective framing developed amongst campaigners and public alike. As a discursive tableau of environmental protest has emerged so too has a degree of acceptance of the components of protest frames and events occurred as the public's consciousness heightened and media focus increased around environmental issues.

Chapter 6
Understanding Collective Action

Introduction

Collective action has been described as 'collective attempts to promote or resist change in a society…'. Emerging from a set of social conditions social movements undergo a process of recruitment, campaigning through various strategies such as protests and developing the movement through media relations and political participation. The organisation of social movements is undertaken through a variety of strategies. Social movements try to alter society through large-scale revolutionary change or by focusing on a specific aspect of social tension, often 'during times of rapid social change' (Smelser 1962). Thus social movements can be said to be a response to democratic deficit and 'systematic breakdowns' which become evident through periods of accelerated development that lead to social and environmental upheaval.

Large structural re-arrangements in societies such as urbanisation and industrialisation 'increase social breakdown and widen the democratic deficit' which increases 'the impulse towards anti-social behaviour'. However, the 'New Social Movements' such as environmentalism and feminism have been identified by theorists such as McAdam (1988) as 'simply politics by other means'. While participation in new social movements is sometimes met with repressive measures from the authority of the state theorists such as Klandermans (1984) have developed the 'rational choice' theory which argues 'that the anticipated benefits outweigh the expected costs of participation'. While these benefits may be related to an improvement in lifestyle or otherwise for social movement members some political or ideological advancement may be at the heart of those aims central to the social movement's organisational core. These political motivations may differ to the stated aim of the social movement but the use of such movements for anti-social or ideological purposes may meet a similar agenda to that of a previously existing political group. For example, anarchist groups may hi-jack an anti-globalisation protest to cause rioting and disruption as has occurred in Genoa in 2001, Dublin in 2002 or Germany in 2007.

Thus many diverse social movements can develop around a particular issue. While the social movement organisations (SMOs) may share similar aims their strategies and ideologies are often diverse. However, SMOs hold their movements

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

together and reinforce the overall campaign even through this diversity. 'They acquire and deploy resources, mobilise adherents and plot movement strategy'. SMOs become the central tenant of social movements according to Resource Mobilisation Theory through the raising of revenue, publicity, enrolling new members and planning campaigns. SMOs also become the 'command posts of movements' (McAdam et al. 1988). It is interesting to note that McCarthy and Zald have also linked the affluence of society as a factor in both creating social change through development on the one hand while being an important factor in the mobilisation of social movements on the other. As a result social movements tend to flourish in times of economic growth and prosperity.

Although many campaigns such as the anti-nuclear or anti-globalisation protests are comprised of loose alliances of social movements these may sometimes come together to form a stronger movement often with a view of participating in the mainstream of politics. One instance of this was the rise of the Green Parties in Germany and Ireland where a once diverse set of environmental campaigners came together to form a political alliance which then took on the structures of a political party attempting to influence the political process from within the parliamentary system. This process is not without its critics who, like Bahro, argue that the compromise of parliamentary politics leads to a weakening of the movement's initial core aims while simultaneously leaving a void on the protest side of the movement alienating more radical members. By incorporating both professional expertise and internet technologies new social movements allow a wider range of strategic operation matching and often surpassing the government and private sector in relation to gaining public and, crucially for campaigns, media support. In so doing new social movements set themselves up as major players in affluent, developing societies contributing to pluralistic society and to the public consultation process in relation to environmental matters. Advantages are gained from this diversity in approaches open to social movements. The confidence of members and the widespread public is gained through the utilisation of expertise while the individual contribution of members with expertise becomes more valued. As a result individual expertise can widen the range of strategies open to social movement through individual innovation.

Patterns of Mobilisation

Movement mobilisation can take place in many ways. However, a model of mobilisation can be established by detailing the emergence of collective action in the following manner:

- Key event precipitates concern amongst citizens.
- Activists emerge as main grievances are established.
- Leaders begin to gauge potential community support and assess political opportunities.

- Adversaries and media are informed of campaign and core issues as framing process commences.
- Marches, protests and petitions are undertaken to mobilise support and to demonstrate extent of support for cause.
- Access to political core is attempted through meetings or opportunities such as elections.
- Political pressure mounts as campaigners effect issue and politicise beyond initial issue or alternatively loose ground and momentum.
- Outcome realised as issue is dealt with on a certain level.
- Inevitable split as leaders become co-opted while activists melt back into society, awaiting the next cause.

Theorists have focused on the importance of resources available to social movements. Resource Mobilisation Theory (RMT) examines resources as a factor in the mobilisation of movements. These resources, be they material or expertise based, become the dynamic that drives social movements in regard to the mobilising and sustaining of protests to the point of reaching an outcome:

> The type and nature of the resources available explain the tactical choices made by the movement and the consequences of collective action on the social and political system. (McCarthy & Zald 1987)

The application of resources through a variety of strategies allows movements to mobilise a wider membership, organise protests and expand networks of activity with like-minded movements. The utilisation of internet technology in recent years has allowed for the creation of a globalised network of social movement groups in areas such as environmental and anti-capitalist resistance. According to Piven and Cloward (1991) 'Resource Mobilisation theory defines the importance of institutional continuities between conventional social life and collective protest'. The sentiment underlying this analysis holds that social movements are not random occurrences of public protest but are instead part of an overall pattern of 'normative and non-normative forms of collective action'. This is a contrast with mal-integration theory which contends that socially disruptive or rebellious behaviour is less discernable as a facet of social functioning and more likely to represent an anti-social rejection of societal norms. As a consequence of this theoretical dichotomy RMT analysis has tended to pursue an examination of the organisational aspect of social movements concentrating on the links between the mainstream establishment of financing norms, media relations and conventional collective activity in regard to formalised procedures such as committee and meeting structures and behaviour.

Social movement strategies have shifted from a reliance on anti-social activity such as strikes to the incorporation of establishment knowledge based in the realm of science and technology together with a degree of political sophistication that enables campaigns to be undertaken through wider parameters. Resource mobilisation analysis in defining these procedural changes in social movement practices has come to emphasise the importance of organisation and access to both political and professional resources as critical factors in social movement development. Piven and Cloward (1991) cite Gamson's (1998) 'check list' in relation to resource

mobilisation for movements taking into account the need to match the bureaucratic structures of establishment actors through the following actions:

- The drawing up of a 'constitution'
- The establishment of 'an internal division between officers, committees and rank and file'
- The maintenance of a 'formal membership list'

Formation of Consensus

Having established a movement structure based on the above criteria the generation of an overall consensus in regard to a movement's aim and direction is undertaken. This sets in motion the process that has been described by Klandermans et al. (1988) as 'a spiral of mobilisation' led by 'activists, political entrepreneurs or indigenous leaders'. One of the more dynamic features of the mobilisation process is the utilisation of media coverage. For Klandermans et al. (ibid.) a 'successful mobilisation draws mass-media attention especially if innovative action strategies are used'. From extensive media coverage a movement can build on its membership as awareness of the campaign increases. According to certain theorists (Kriesi 1986; Klandermans et al. 1988) new social movements such as that led by environmentalists and feminists have a reserve of activists who maintain a loosely knit network of 'already motivated campaigners'. These reserves 'are rooted in dense sub-cultural networks that serve as communication and mobilisation channels in case of need' (Kriesi 1986). Nevertheless, despite any previously existing network being already in place consensus formation and mobilisation must be created and maintained in relation to each new issue and campaign as it arises. In this regard the resource of expertise becomes a critical factor as the main unifier of participant opinions. New information routinely accessed helps to bring together various factions which can exist in many campaigns particularly as they expand and gain momentum that sometimes moves the overall group away from the control of the organisers. As expertly given information also wins media support the overall importance of maintaining these channels of expertise becomes crucial to a campaign's success. If maintained, the flow of expertly given information emanates throughout the movement creating consensus.

This form of consensus mobilisation allows individual participants to take the personal decisions necessary which in turn allow for a more committed participation in the movement's strategies. It is the sum of this form of personalised consensus that creates the overall strength of a movement. It also gives social movements a further underlying strength that oppositional agencies such as governments and large businesses lack in terms of a freely given commitment of support. Once this commitment is formed into an overall consensus an essential difference can be established between consensus formation and subsequent mobilisation. According to Klandermans et al. (1988) 'Consensus mobilisation must be distinguished from consensus formation it is a deliberate attempt by a social actor to create consensus

among a subset of the population whereas consensus formation concerns the unplanned convergence of meaning in social networks and subcultures'. Once established a campaign's perspective is then made coherent and disseminated throughout the community through the utilisation of the media, public meetings and rallies and through availing of the already existing support networks open to social movements. Once consensus on a movement's direction is reached it must be open to the competition of existing social discourse. It is through this form of open debate that a movement's aims can be seen to strengthen and gain momentum with the overall public as these aims challenge the orthodoxy of existing social structures. By presenting a new alternative, often to the excesses of injustice and greed, the agenda of a social movement can attract further consensus and participation amongst a disenchanted public.

Mobilisation of Consensus

Once a movement or campaign has gained momentum participation is maximised in the following manner:

- Formation of mobilisation potentials
- Activation of recruitment networks
- Arousal of motivation to participate
- Removal of barriers to participation (Gamson 1975)

These aims are achieved through the galvanising of political support through a widening of a movement's parameters to as wide a range as possible without losing focus on the issue at hand. Furthermore, Gamson has differentiated between what he terms 'consensus' and 'action' mobilisation. From this comes the understanding of what has been described as that which distinguishes 'the creation of commitment from the activation of commitment' (Gamson 1975). In other words a reserve pool of previously engaged activist support may already be in place around the scene of a new dispute. This support may be part of previously active and like-minded social movements. Or it may be part of an emerging population of academics and professionals who have gained a certain wealth and social status and form part of newly formed suburban belts. Both of these groups are faced with all the infrastructural and environmental difficulties urban sprawl can raise. Likewise urban renewal has, according to Castells (1983), led to social movements emerging from areas of strong trade union or radical political support.

Klandermans et al. (1988) details the rationale for the mobilisation of consensus among potential participants. He cites Freeman (1983) in regard to how 'the desire to spread the marriage of the movement is even considered as one of the defining characteristics of social movements'. Beyond this a movement's ideology is given as the main framework for its medium. A set of factors introduced by Wilson (1973) can be used to demonstrate the role of movement ideology in regard to creating a series of conditions for protest including the following:

Diagnosis (an indication of the causes of discontent)
Prognosis (an indication of what must be done)
Rationale (arguments to convince the individual that action must be taken) (Wilson 1973)

Having established a framework for mobilisation a movement must then engage with potential participants while attempting to enact their strategies. This process includes the mobilisation of both the already committed and the motivation of new forms of commitment. In order to maximise mobilisation potential activists are sought from groups that are hit the hardest by the negative consequences of modernisation processes. In addition to locating a reserve of potential activists social movements are often mobilised around particular incidents that have a bearing on an overall issue for instance, a leak at a nuclear plant, an incidence of industrial pollution or a threat to a shared resource such as parks or woodlands. This leads to a collective grievance which can then be exploited by social movement organisers or 'incident entrepreneurs'. These entrepreneurs transform shared grievances into movement mobilisation through the utilisation of existing communication networks. Klandermans (1980) points to the existence of research in relation to what he calls 'grievance interpretation' theorists such as Ferree and Miller (1985), MacAdam (1982), and Snow et al. (1986). From this research it is concluded that 'Grievances that are attributed to situational factors predispose people to participate in social movements'. What becomes crucial in relation to a social movement's mobilisation of potential is the pinpointing of blame for whatever grievance is being exploited. At this point the utilisation of expertise becomes important as the institutions of authority are targeted as culpable agents in the grievance process. As institutional authority becomes the target for accusations of certain forms of injustice it becomes 'necessary that people come to recognise that this authority and these institutions are unjust and wrong. In addition, 'people who are usually fatalistic and feel that the existing order cannot be changed must start to demand change' (Piven & Cloward 1979 from Klandermans et al. 1988).

In order to transform grievance into activism theorists such as Kriesi (1984), MacAdam (1986) and Melucci (1985) have examined the difference between shared grievance and activist potential in a 'micro' or 'intermediate' social grouping that exists before an incident around which a movement can be mobilised. Once aligned around an issue a group can be mobilised and strategies enacted. When linked, a movement can spread through the community as grievance and values become enmeshed thus increasing participant levels. It is not uncommon for a movement to hold a large scale protest, meeting or demonstration at this point to combine strength with the increase in participant interaction strengthening the channels of communication within the wider movement. Klandermans cites Snow et al. (1986) in relation to the 'frames' of grievance interpretation:

- *Frame Bridging* 'Occurs when the individual and social frames are congruent'.
- *Frame Amplification* 'Occurs when an interpretative frame is clarified and strengthened by linking it to values or beliefs held by the public'.

- *Frame Extension* 'Occurs when values and interests of potential adherents become aligned with participation in movement activities'.
- *Frame Transformation* 'Occurs when individual frames need to be changed … to make them congruent with the movement frame' (Snow et al. 1986).

Sustaining a Campaign

Consensus mobilisation in itself is not enough to sustain a movement. While the aspiration to unite a section of the population against a certain issue can be achieved through the methods discussed above further patterns of mobilisation are necessary to activate a movement. Strategies must be devised which are sufficient enough to create a consensus in relation to a movement's potential to be effective and create change. In order to best enact strategies the aims of a movement must be legitimised. These aims must be focused enough to maintain the interest of potential participants while being flexible enough to sustain the fluctuations and changing demands of an ongoing campaign. It is at this stage that core group members become crucial in maintaining an overall direction for a movement as peripheral actors may find shifts in movement direction confusing lessening the overall momentum of a campaign. In order to maintain a high level of activist mobilisation a movement needs to convince its members 'that individual participation contributes significantly to success or alternatively that non-participation threatens success' (Klandermans et al. 1988).

Furthermore, movement activism can be reinforced by applying a rationale that justifies participation to those within the movement and those outside who may question the legitimacy of the strategies engaged in by the movement. This justification of activism has been described as a 'vocabulary of motives' (Snow & Bedford 1988). These justifications can be used 'as motivational prods to encourage sympathisers and adherents to take action on behalf of movement goals' (Borgetta & Borgetta 1992). The employment of 'vocabularies of motive' enables a movement to develop a system of informal commitment with participants. Activists identify themselves more closely with the movement as they participate in movement strategies and help achieve movement goals. Theorists have indicated 'that such conversion and commitment building processes are … typically voluntary' (Snow et al. 1986).

Achievement of Objectives

As each movement has its own desired outcomes in relation to the fluctuations involved in each campaign it is fair to say that social movement outcomes are largely dependent on the parameters defined by any original set objective. In most cases the achievement of movement objectives is relative to effecting a change to

the relevant area of policy. This change must be then measured in relation to the situation prior to the existence of the social movement. Nonetheless, the effects of a particular social movement campaign may not be immediately known as the central movement's activities gain mainstream acceptance over a period of years eventually making once radical social changes seem timely or overdue. Certainly, this has been the case in relation to the campaigns for equality in relation the feminist or US Civil Rights Movements. Ultimately, change is often effected on a cultural level as certain injustices become intolerable. The immediate impact of directly changing policy on an outstanding issue of grievance is an altogether rarer occurrence. In this regard the likelihood in achieving social movement outcomes has been identified as being dependant on the existence of certain characteristics within a movement. These include:

- Selective incentives for participants
- Unruly tactics (e.g. strikes, violence)
- A Relatively weak, bureaucratic, centralised target
- The absence of factional splits within the group (Gamson 1990)

Any social movement success is dependant on the challenging and changing of perspectives in the process of effecting structural changes either through their immediate campaign or through any subsequent cultural repositioning of society. As such, social movements must contend with deeply entrenched social perspectives regarding the legitimation of authority. Challenging the perceived legitimate authority is according to Gamson 'a formidable task'. The same theorist has identified the potential outcomes arising from social movement activity:

- Full response, both gains and acceptance
- Co-optation, gains without recognition
- Pre-emption, gains without recognition
- Collapse, neither gains nor acceptance (Gamson 1990)

What becomes clear from this analysis is that social movement success has varying degrees of success and failure from which it is measured often in regard to an overall time scale. In other words, social movement success is often measured over a long period of time subsequent to any initial phase of activity. In certain cases such as the Women's Movement, there has been a degree of success in relation to some issues (equality legislation in the workplace) which is tempered by some outstanding inequalities (the representation of women in politics) demonstrating the difficulty in measuring the outright success or failure of any movement.

Protest Event Analysis

Protest Event Analysis (PEA) is a quantitative, methodological approach which can be applied to the cycles of collective action in order to better understand the key elements of the processes of framing which surrounds consensus building and

campaign enhancement. While concerns have been expressed about protest event research methods which rely too heavily on media data, we will combine media reports with alternative data sources such as campaign websites and literature, together with academic research and inspired observation to create a wider 'issue history' (Szasz 1994) to underpin the argument model.

By combining 'media theory' and 'representational' approaches (Mueller 1999) an overview can be constructed which allows a protest amalgam which avoids the biases of media or campaign sources becoming the explicitly dominant elements which shape conceptual findings. By applying a protest event analysis to these findings, further understanding of how the cycles of environmental protest in Ireland have come to be influenced by events, both internal and external, in a diffuse set of campaigns. This analysis makes it possible to develop a coherent account of how these campaigns have come to represent a nascent environmental movement in the country.

The protest event analysis which is used in this book identifies the cognitive frames established by each of the environmental campaigns which developed in Ireland since the 1970s. By applying this diachronic analysis to the key events which shaped these environmental action frames, a discursive overview can be established which demonstrates a convergence of campaign collectivity which reveals evidence of an articulate environmental movement built on national and global linkages. Recent critiques of protest events have purported to use news reports as the basis for their analysis.

However, the event analysis introduced in this book allows for a wider understanding of the manner in which framing processes create issue salience through the innovatory application of tactical initiatives which can shape subsequent media coverage of protest events. To do otherwise attributes too much ideological diffusion to a media which is often bound up in reporting accurate data, while becoming increasingly reliant on activists for material in an era when the public has grown tired of political 'spin'.

There are many additional variables associated with protest event analysis such as the impact of mobilisation processes or access to political opportunities (Kriesi 1995) or the alliances and alignments which emerge from the fluctuation shifts of political opportunity structures (Tarrow 1998). This methodological approach is developed by applying a political discourse analysis (Gamson 1992) (Koopman & Statham 1999) to the collective action frames outlined in each campaign. As each campaign identified new understandings of environmental contests within the framework of dominant social and political relations a new discourse of cultural opposition emerged.

Over time this cultural discourse has come to be a feature of Irish modernity as territorial localism has encapsulated a type of community opposition to the grand narratives of the state. By establishing a discourse of environmental opposition successive campaigns have established an articulate reservoir of community actors who have at their disposal an accumulated network of experts, campaigners, strategists and communicators who can advocate the concerns of those citizens who have come to question the wisdom of unfettered growth and development.

Moreover, the emergence of a cultural discourse that has at its core an embedded concern for the environment provides each campaign with a template for their own mobilising and framing processes. As the internet has become an integral part of environmental protest, the patterns and cycles of collectivity have become enmeshed, with mobilisation of dissent and the framing of the cycles of protest centring on major events which promote not just current concerns, but also established environmental values.

Protest Event and Framing Process Analysis Movement theorists have developed understandings of protest cycles (Tarrow 1998) and tactical innovation (MacAdam 1983). This liberation has highlighted the interconnected linkages that provide a fragmented series of protest campaigns which interact with elements from prior activist movements as well as with agencies of the state, industry and media (Oliver & Myers 1999). Successive events can create a momentum towards collective responses to the imposition suffered by civil society as a result of state policy, technologically led development or multinational greed. The cycles of protest which underpin the spread of collective action frames as a cultural response to impositions 'from above' provide us with a framework with which to develop a framework of analysis. The methodology applied to the Irish environmental case studies in this volume will combine protest event and framing process analysis, drawing on the integrated protest event analysis and political discourse approaches established by Koopman and Statham in 1999.

Many approaches to protest event analysis have come to rely heavily on press reports of protest events (Fillieule & Jimenez 2003 258–260). By using a media analysis, protest analysis can be located in the wider contest of an 'issue history' (Szasz 1994), in a comprehensive study which measures the mobilisation political access and overall impact of a series of environmental disputes ranging back over many decades. In order to facilitate such a wide ranging overview, a broad series of materials will be consulted and analysed. These materials will include the body of literature surrounding Irish sociological and political inquiry, as well as case studies, articles, methodological debates and wider media coverage. Such an integrative approach will provide an in-depth understanding of the contexts from which incidents of environmental disputes emerge in the Irish case, in an era when Ireland has undertaken a transition which Tovey and Share (2003) have defined as going from tradition to modernity. Some of the primary environmental contestations which have characterised the underlying social and political tensions surrounding that transition can therefore be identified in this study.

Part III
Campaigns: Phase One

Chapter 7
No Nukes: Carnsore Point

Introduction

As the crisis of peak oil looms, the debate about the viability of substituting fossil fuels with wind or wave energy have begun. One alternative which has been revived is nuclear power. Despite its radioactive waste, fears of meltdowns at plants or of terrorist attacks, a pro-nuclear lobby has raised the suggestion that nuclear power, currently declared illegal in the Republic of Ireland, could provide a part of the solution to the energy crisis. The Irish Green Party set out 'ten reasons why nuclear power makes no sense for Ireland in their 2007 election manifesto. The ten issues raised included prohibitive costs, renewable alternatives, nuclear not solving climate change, promotion of efficiency, lack of heat or transport options, the centralised nature of nuclear, radioactive waste, unsafe plants, depletion of uranium and links to nuclear weapons (Green Party 2007). The extent of this opposition raises the question as to why the nuclear option is still on the agenda. Campaigns against nuclear power plants emerged from the concerns expressed by some US medical and science experts about the dangers of radiation exposure in the decades after the Second World War. While the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and fears of Cold War nuclear arms proliferation created a combination of grievance factors for many people, the global oil crisis of the 1970s had led to a renewed interest in nuclear energy as an alternative to fossil fuels. Many western nations such as the USA and Britain had developed their nuclear energy capacities, and as Ireland had little in the way of natural resources, some favoured the nuclear option as a potential policy for consideration. While many opposed nuclear power due to fears about the harmful effects of radiation, others saw it as a futuristic and efficient energy source.

By the late 1960s and early 1970s the anti-war movement which had emerged around Vietnam War protests developed an interest in building up a resistance to nuclear power plants. Protests emerged in West Germany and France as activists, students and citizens came together to prevent nuclear plants from being constructed. Common cause was established between the anti-war protestors and environmentalists, while many feminists joined the anti-nukes campaign with the Greenham Common Women becoming synonymous with the movement in the

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland*.

UK by the 1980s. Anti-nuclear campaigns had already commenced in the USA where the site for one nuclear plant was occupied to prevent further construction. The nuclear accident at Three Mile Island proved to be a fundamental moment for both the industry and the anti-nuclear movement providing as it did a visible manifestation which seemed to validate the grievances of concerned activists. With its pacifist inception the anti-nuclear movement came to be characterised through its strategies of non-violent protest, occupation of nuclear power sites or military installations and the involvement of concerned students and women's groups. The emergence of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) came to replace the nuclear energy protests particularly in the aftermath of the Chernobyl disaster in 1986. This accident put grievances about nuclear power to the fore across the globe and certainly set nuclear energy back in the public's eye. Many states began to call for the phasing out of nuclear power in its wake (Kriesi et al. 1995 151).

In recent years the Irish state, which tried to develop their own nuclear energy policy in the 1970s, began to challenge the UK government over the nuclear power plant at Sellafield, North Cumbria. In June 2005 the Irish government's legal team claimed that the discharge of nuclear waste into the Irish Sea was a breach of UN conventions. Despite the Irish state's poor record on environmental regulations the British government was taken to the European Court of Justice by their Irish counterparts but the case was rejected in January 2006. It was a far cry from the Carnsore protests in the late 1970s when the WISE 'nuclear power – no thanks' logo began to appear on the back windows of Volkswagen vans across the country. The debate about nuclear power has recently re-emerged in the wake of some environmentalists such as J.F. Lovelock proclaiming that nuclear power was still a viable and green alternative to the fossil fuels which have caused global warming.

Background

The announcement by the All-Ireland Nuclear-Free Local Authorities Forum, which embraces councils from both sides of the border, calling for clarification on plans for a nuclear power station in Northern Ireland (*Irish Examiner* 30 December 2005) rang a familiar, if somewhat alarming note with those who had opposed nuclear power in Ireland during the 1970s and 1980s. The campaign against the state's decision to build a nuclear power station in Carnsore Point, County Wexford in 1979 was the first large-scale instance of a collective response by environmentalists in Ireland. Many of the initial networks of the Irish eco movement were established as a result of the Carnsore campaign. Links were established with environmentalists at home and abroad. The anti-nuclear issue would become an iconic one, characterised by an energetic alliance of many of the 'new left' social movements such as feminist, anti-war and student groups, as well as environmentalists who would go on to form the basis of the new social movements of the modern era.

A significant amount of popular opposition to nuclear power was mobilised through the Carnsore protests, creating the resource of a collective pool of environmental consciousness which future campaigns would draw upon. Perhaps more importantly, the state's plans for nuclear power were defeated by the Carnsore protestors, a victory which established a precedent which Irish environmentalists would aspire to, as policy was seen to be reversed through political protest. Plans for the use of nuclear power for the generation of electricity were first put forward in 1968. It was hoped that the nuclear option would help to meet projected increased demand for power in the 1970s. As the electric grid between the Electricity Supply Board, (ESB) and the Northern Ireland Electric Services (NIES) had been connected, the Irish state attempted to bring their policy of power generation in line with that of the UK, where the nuclear plant at Windscale, later Sellafield, had been in operation since 1951.

The fact that the Windscale plant had been involved in Britain's military nuclear project was one of the first issues picked up on by Irish anti-nuclear Protestors. Indeed, British and European anti-nuclear groups, who were primarily pacifists concerned about nuclear arms proliferation during the Cold War, provided important links with Irish anti-nuclear protestors. The state's project for nuclear power took a few different turns throughout the 1970s. Initial plans were put back in 1972, in favour of the development of the Kinsale gas field in County Cork (Dalby 1985 3). The onset of the global oil crisis in 1973 forced the state to again consider nuclear power as a possible option. As oil prices rose considerably as a result of oil shortages, a Nuclear Energy Board (NEB) was established to examine the feasibility of a nuclear power plant (ibid.). The planned location of this plant was Carnsore Point, a peninsula in County Wexford. In September 1974 the ESB applied to Wexford County Council for planning permission to build four energy stations, without specifying which technology was involved (ibid.).

Although all of the parties of government had examined options for nuclear power, the populist Fianna Fáil government led into power by Jack Lynch in 1977 became most associated with the Carnsore project. Under the supervision of the Minister for Industry, Commerce and Energy the momentum for a nuclear plant at Carnsore increased, while energy demands in the economically buoyant late 1970s grew. The brash "men in mohair suits" who led Fianna Fáil at this time equated national growth and nation building with large-scale industrial projects. Historically, Fianna Fáil had promoted campaigns of self-sufficiency, characterised by the protectionism of the 1930s. Major projects such as the Ardnacrusha Hydro Electric Dam on the Shannon River or the industrial zone at Shannon airport were overseen by Fianna Fáil governments in an attempt to promote industrial infrastructure and economic growth. Carnsore nuclear plant was seen as a project which would bring Irish industry into the future.

This form of 'economic nationalism' (Baker 1990 50) was central to the political platform of Fianna Fáil, combining that party's inherent populism with a policy framework which would allow Ireland to grow beyond the economic constraints traditionally associated with dependency on the UK. The partitioning of Ireland into northern and southern states in 1922 had also shaped this post-colonial mindset

as membership of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1973 was seen as facilitating Ireland 'taking its place among the nations of the earth'. The development of an industrial sector in Ireland remained a key objective for successive governments. The Industrial Development Authority (IDA) was established in 1959 to encourage direct foreign investment by US multinationals in Ireland. Carnsore nuclear plant was seen as a vital component for presenting Ireland as a good destination for industrial investment. In many ways, the contestation of environmental disputes in Ireland can be placed in the context of the state's attempt to impose modernisation from above, through industrial and infrastructural projects and community resistance to such projects 'from below' in an attempt to retain traditional ways of life and autonomy from the sate, particularly in rural communities.

Seen in this context, the campaign against nuclear power at Carnsore Point can be seen in the fullest cultural context as part of an attempt to resist aspects of modernisation by a sceptical community. A number of objections to the application for planning permission for the Carnsore plant were received by Wexford County Council in 1972. There was also an initial wave of enthusiasm about the plant, led by local businesses. As early as July 1971, local groups including An Taisce, The Irish National Trust, and the local Chamber of Commerce had formed an impact study group to examine the potential affects of a nuclear plant in the area. The first attempts to create a local campaign against the plant began in Rosslare in late 1973 (Dalby 1985 6). The Rosslare Development Association hosted a meeting of local groups and the Nuclear Safety Committee (NSC) was established. This group began to research the nuclear issue focusing on safety and environmental concerns. In June 1974 a debate on the issue was held featuring Sean Coakley of the ESB and Dr. McCauley of the Physics Department, Trinity College. The morality of nuclear power's potentially toxic legacy for future generations was questioned from the floor of this meeting (ibid.), indicating the degree of existing local concerns.

Throughout that year, the National Safety Committee became the Nuclear Safety Association (NSA), as the campaign grew (Baker 1990 53). Meetings, events, newsletters and a letter writing campaign were established to promote the aims of the NSA (Dalby 1985 7). Thus, the Irish anti-nuclear movement began. The ESB had put forward their planning permission application by the end of August 1974 and held seminars and meetings on the issue to which the NSA and local politicians were invited. While all political parties supported the nuclear plant, local opposition on moral grounds was growing, reflecting the concepts of a finite and fragile 'planet earth' and concern for future generations represented during the first 'Earth Day' held globally since 1971. The NSA framed their objections to the plant on moral grounds, putting forward the following objections:

- A nuclear plant conflicted with high amenity area
- Cancer and leukaemia risks
- Disruption to local bird sanctuary (Lady's Island Lake)
- Radioactive waste as a national security risk
- Aggravation of fresh water consumption

- Long-term hazard of radiation in local ecosystem
- Disruption to tourism
- No provision for domestic storage of radioactive waste if export proved impossible (Dalby 1985 7)

A further mobilisation tactic of the NSA was the collection of 2,200 petitions against the plant, in February 1975, which had been presented to the local authority (ibid.). During 1974 potential supporters for a nascent anti-nuclear movement could be found in branches of Friends of the Earth which had opened in Dublin and Cork (Baker 1990 3). However, reduced demands for electricity due to economic recession in 1975 saw the plans for the plant put back again. By 1977 the recession had ended and Fianna Fáil was back in power. The Carnsore plant was back on the political agenda. This was reflected in the appointment of Professor C.T.C. Dillon from the Nuclear Energy Commission to become the chairman of the ESB in the spring of 1977. By that autumn the public inquiry at Windscale had revived local concerns about nuclear power.

The inquiry debated the nature of the future of Windscale as British Nuclear Fuel Ltd. (BNFL) attempted to make that plant the largest nuclear reprocessing plant, through its thermal oxide reprocessing plant (THORP) facility, in the wake of growing popular resistance to nuclear power in the USA. The subsequent protests became a unifying (2002 416) force for the UK's anti-nuclear movement which would also benefit the Carnsore campaign.

Expertise, Leadership and Expansion

The original committee of NSA was led by local people such as Harvey Boxwell and Helen Scrine. Having mobilised local opposition to nuclear power based on health and moral issue framing, the local campaign was expanded into a larger group known as the Council for Nuclear Safety and Energy Resource Conservation (CONSERVE) in January 1975 (Dalby 1985 8). This was an attempt to increase the levels of expertise available to the campaign while networking more effectively with the regional branches of Friends of the Earth. FOE had undertaken a leafleting campaign highlighting important issues about nuclear power and radioactive waste and at the same time promoting alternative energies such as solar and wind power. The CONSERVE Committee produced their own document in July 1975 titled Legislation, Energy Conservation and the Balance of Payments which outlined the dangers and inefficiencies of nuclear power (ibid.). The alternatives put forward in this document included better energy legislation, decentralised electricity stations and the cogeneration of heat and power (ibid.).

FOE extended their campaign against nuclear power by promoting alternative strategies. Another group to emerge at this time were the Solar Energy Society (SESI). At the same time a coalition of anti-nuclear groups was growing across Ireland in Cork, Limerick and Galway (Baker 1990 54), with support from the

student populations in those cities. As the anti-nuclear movement expanded, cleavages began to develop between the various strands of the movement. One of the central areas of discord was based on the tactical approach to a campaign against nuclear power. Friends of the Earth favoured a strategy of legal challenges and organised themselves with formal structures, leaders and members with links to the global FOE organisation (ibid.).

Another section of the anti-nuclear movement had a more radical and grass-roots basis. Following on from the radical origins of Italian anti-nuclear groups which had links with revolutionary movements, groups such as Revolutionary Struggle, Trotskyist and anarchist collectives became involved in the campaign. These groups advocated violence as part of their resistance to nuclear power (ibid.). The radical groups did not have formal structures and wished to oppose all forms of capitalism, rather than promoting alternative power (ibid.). However, both sets of groups worked together on a casual basis producing literature, newspapers and organising protest events. The area of expertise was becoming more important for the anti-nuclear campaign, as academics such as Dr. Robert Blackith of Trinity College became more involved in the articulation of a critique of the nuclear issue. Dr. Blackith's book *The Power that Corrupts* was issued in 1976. This text included criticism of the ESB's approach to the nuclear issue in regard to providing the public with answers to these concerns (Dalby 1985 9). During 1977 the newly formed Friends of the Earth branch in Dublin continued the debate in a series of letters to the media. The national press featured articles on the subject of nuclear power, providing an outlet to those for and against the issue.

Another ally of the anti-nuclear campaign was John Carroll, president of Irish Transport and General Workers' Union (ITGWU). Carroll spoke at many anti-nuclear rallies, helped launch and would also edit a book with Petra Kelly of the German Greens who was doyen of the European environmentalists, called *A Nuclear Ireland?* (Baker 1990 55). The link between trades unions and the nuclear industry had been noted in the anti-nuclear World Anti-nuclear Service on Energy (WISE) newsletter in 1978. In their first edition, WISE, which developed the famous 'sun-smile' symbol with the 'nuclear power – no thanks' logo stated that workers were beginning to question their role in the 'energy – jobs link':

> They are beginning to realise that they are effectively terrorised by governments and energy monopolies with threats of mass unemployment unless atomic plants get built … In some cases, links are starting to be established between the trades unions and the environmental and anti-nuke lobby … to find out the real relationship of energy to jobs. (*WISE Bulletin* May 1978)

In the same issue, a list of trades unions sympathetic to the anti-nuke movement stated that the ITGWU was 'opposing the plans of the Irish government for giving Ireland its first atomic reactor' (ibid.) and included John Carroll's contact details. Its round-up of global anti-nuclear protests included the following article:

> *Ireland: Opposition Starts*
>
> Ireland is about to go nuclear. The government has decided in favour of a first atomic reactor, to be built at Carnsore Point in County Wexford. The decision is the result of

> heavy pressures from the industry, and discreetly from the EEC. … An opposition front is already forming. The biggest Irish trades union is opposed. … Opposition to the scheme will be a major concern of the Irish Friends of the Earth, which has come to life again. (ibid.)

As a result of increased networking by the various components of the Irish anti-nuclear movement, a wider consciousness developed around related issues such as Windscale's dumping of nuclear waste in the Irish Sea. The global campaign against nuclear armaments was also gaining strength and these issues increased interest in the anti-nuclear movement. Many people were concerned that the Carnsore plant could become involved in these processes in some way, particularly with groups such as Sovereignty Ireland (ibid.) Student groups such as the Student Christian Movement (SCM) continued to press the moral argument against nuclear power, with the support of 'new theology' Catholics and other Christian groups (Baker 1998 6). Another issue which came to light was the campaign against uranium mining in Donegal which involved direct action and the destruction of equipment (Baker 1988 9).

"Get to the Point"

By September 1978 a decision was made to seize the land at Carnsore, with further plans for an anti-nuclear festival. A new group, based on the various elements of the anti-nuclear movement was formed for this purpose, called the Carnsore Collective (Baker 1978 10). At the same time Friends of the Earth began a national campaign encouraging people to lodge planning objections to the proposed site with Wexford County Council. These two tactics would form the main mobilisation strategy for the anti-nuclear campaigns with both the planning protest and the festival receiving prominent national and even international attention, with reports of the event featuring in the WISE Bulletin:

> *Irish anti-nuke show*
>
> An anti-nuke show will be held on August 18–20 [1978] at Carnsore, planned site of Ireland's first power plant. A local farmer has made his land available. There will be a weekend of practical work-shops and education on nuclear power, "plus enjoyment". An Irish decision on whether to go nuclear is still pending. It has now come out that the Irish electricity board plans a battery of four reactors at Carnsore, total capacity 3000 MW (as compared with present total Irish electricity generating capacity of 2540 MWs! (*WISE Bulletin* July 1978)

As anything up to between 7,000 and 25,000 people descended upon Carnsore on the weekend of the 18th of August, the scale of the free festival was given front page coverage in the national press, with both the BBC and RTE featuring the protest. Special buses and trains brought the crowds to the site and a team of volunteers was on hand to provide stewarding, parking and crèche service (Dalby 1985 11). The festival was called "Get to the Point", and featured a mixture of popular and folk

musicians led by Christy Moore. Local activist Jim "Doc" Whelan provided Moore with a song called "The Ballad of Nuke Power" which was used throughout the Carnsore protests as an unofficial anthem of the movement. The opening lines of the song set the tone:

My name is Nuke Power, a terror am I
I can cause such destruction on land, sea or sky.
Your Minister tells you I'll do you no harm
If he locks me up in that house down in Carne.

(Whelan & Moore 1978)

Onstage, between luminaries such as Clannad, the Atrix and the Roache Band, speakers included Petra Kelly, John Carroll and Dr. Blackith. In the crowd, radical left wing and anarchist groups were well represented. Gales and heavy rain on the Saturday of the festival made heavy going of the festival site but there were no reports of criminal activity. On Sunday, a choir from the local church sang as festival goers swam at the local beach (Cassidy 1998). There were many tents which became forums for alternative politics, energy and lifestyles. Stalls sold books, newspapers and distributed leaflets and badges while most groups recruited new members at membership and information posts. By the end of the festival, it was suggested that over 7,000 letters objecting to the nuclear plant had been lodged with Wexford council (Dalby 1985 12).

Following the festival the national press and opposition spokespersons such as Fine Gael's John Kelly, began to call for an inquiry into the Carnsore Plant, something that was rejected by the Minister of State, Desmond O'Malley. By November the Minister had the support of the Confederation of Irish Industry which claimed nuclear power was 'essential for industrial development' (ibid.) Throughout the autumn of 1978, the anti-nuclear movement built on the momentum of the Carnsore festival, as events were held around the country. A major anti-nuclear meeting was held at the Mansion House in Dublin, while the ESB began to bulldoze the memorial cairn at Carnsore. Additional large scale meetings in Dublin and Cork were followed by the 'Roadshow' tour of artists such as Christy Moore and Freddy White, together with an anti-nuclear play. One resource which was established was a newsletter for the combined anti-nuclear movement in Ireland. This was used to promote the 'Monster Meeting' held on the 25th of November in Dublin.

This meeting included all-day seminars followed by a performance by the 'Roadshow' artists. The meeting was unstructured and led to a frenetic exchange of ideas (Dalby 1985 13). In January, RTE broadcast a programme exclusively on the nuclear issue. This special edition of the popular 'Late Late Show' was hosted by Gay Byrne and featured speakers such as John Carroll and Petra Kelly. The programme was aired in the aftermath of a series of radio programmes on the issue. The show was a raucous affair, with the panel's statements being subject to interjections and booing from the audience. In between the lively debate, Christy Moore sang anti-nuclear ballads (Dalby 1985 14). The issue began to crystallise in the minds of the viewing public.

A Nuclear Ireland?

In May 1978 an Energy Symposium was held under the auspices of the now defunct Irish Transport and General Workers Union (ITGWU) at the Royal Marine Hotel in Dun Laoghaire. Among the contributors to the Symposium were Dr. Blackith, Petra Kelly and Dr. Michael Flood, who was the Energy Consultant for Friends of the Earth (FOE) in London. The Unions were represented by John Carroll, the ITGWU's vice president, who chaired the symposium alongside union president Senator Fintan Kennedy and Dr. James Kavanagh, Auxiliary Bishop of Dublin. The State was represented by Minister Ray Burke. Submissions were divided into five sections. The first considered 'the Case for and against Nuclear Energy' with pro and anti arguments being presented by Ray Burke and Dr. Blackith. John Carroll addressed the subject of 'Jobs and Nuclear Energy' while Petra Kelly discussed 'Nuclear Energy and the European Community'. 'Medical Considerations' were the subject of presentations by three medical doctors and paediatricians from the UK and the USA while the 'Ethical, Moral and Social Ramifications' of Nuclear Energy were debated by Sr. Bertell from New York State University and Dr. Michael Flood of Friends of the Earth. The proceedings of this Conference were published under the title of *A Nuclear Ireland?* This text highlighted a number of the frames which the No Nukes campaign had already employed. The first of these was the moral frame.

Moral Frame

The preface to *A Nuclear Ireland?* opens with a poem from Karol Wojtyla, otherwise known as Pope John Paul II, whose iconic status was confirmed by the hundreds of thousands who flocked to see him on his visit to Ireland in 1978. The poem, entitled "The Armaments-Factory Worker" makes a connection between the sin of war and the participation of workers who build armaments. At the time the Cold War between the USA and the Soviet Union was at its zenith with thousands of nuclear missiles primed for catastrophic destruction if launched by either side. The use of Pope John Paul's poem on the need for conscious responsibility on everyone's behalf at a time when fears about possible nuclear war were heightened allowed the anti-nuclear campaign to grab the moral high ground.

This moral frame was underlined by the participation of the Auxiliary Bishop of Dublin, Dr. James Kavanagh, as well as through the submission of Sr. Rosalie Bertell, who had a Doctorate in Biostatistics, from New York. Sr. Bertell presented some of the ethical problems posed by nuclear proliferation in her contribution to the symposium. She claimed to have been politicised after being intimidated by a utility company after publishing her findings on links between nuclear power and leukaemia. Her findings demonstrated that the ageing process was advanced by 1 year for each rad exposure experienced, which was the equivalent of the yearly exposure for a worker in the US nuclear industry. This damage also

causes increased susceptibility to leukaemia tumours and heart disease (*A Nuclear Ireland?* 1978 162). For Sr. Bertell these side-affects, which were more pronounced for at-risk groups such as infants or the elderly, posed a series of moral and ethical problems. These included the following issues:

- A shift from the father working to provide for his family to the father's exposure to radiation threatening his family including the unborn child
- Community exclusion from the nuclear industry's decision-making process on workers' health, community protection and family compensation
- Increased secrecy from industry and the state over nuclear power
- The threat of nuclear pollution (ibid.)

Sr. Bertell made the moral point that a link between technology, jobs and health should coincide with increased civic participation and awareness. At the same time she called for increased controls over technology which should be employed for human good (ibid.). Sr. Bertell echoed the UN's call for sustainable development when she stated that a balanced approach was needed on energy

> The energy source we pursue cannot sacrifice the needs of future generations to satisfy the desires of present generations. The energy source we pursue cannot sacrifice truth-telling and concern for public health for economic good. (*A Nuclear Ireland?* 1978 166)

The Health-risks Frame

The Health-risks frame was presented by Dr. Helen Caldicott of Boston's Children's' Hospital. Originally from Australia, Dr. Caldicott had lobbied the French government about a decade before the sinking of the Greenpeace ship, the Rainbow Warrior, in New Zealand by French agents. In her submission Dr. Caldicott challenged a statement by Ray Burke that nuclear power would be 'good for the people'. Nuclear power 'had produced epidemics of leukaemia, cancer and genetic disease' (*A Nuclear Ireland* 1978 106) according to Dr. Caldicott. She linked nuclear power with the armaments industry. The health risks of radiation were seen in instances of cancer and leukaemia in the USA, she claimed. The doctor also made reference to the threat of genetic engineering, a subject that would re-emerge in Ireland decades later. For Dr. Caldicott the damage caused by radiation to the human genetic system would have dreadful repercussions over generations. Another health risk raised by the doctor was the carcinogenic radioactive waste from nuclear power which remains toxic for half a million years (ibid.). Dr. Caldicott also predicted the dangers of terror groups stealing or obtaining materials for nuclear weapons.

The Economic Frame

The economic frame was put forward by the union chief, John Carroll. While he acknowledged the wider acceptance of the hazards of nuclear proliferation among the public Carroll wished to highlight the economic fallacy involved in the nuclear

option. The 'doubtful economics' as he termed it, involved the development of energy plans that would leave Ireland's grid in the hands of the international cartels which controlled multinationals. In addition to the health risks highlighted by other speakers, Carroll argued that nuclear power plants were expensive due to the high security costs associated with similar projects elsewhere. The transportation of raw materials and nuclear waste was both expensive and hazardous in the extreme and would be subject to 'severe security measures' (*A Nuclear Ireland* 1978 44). Furthermore, a nuclear plant at Carnsore would have been achieved at a high cost of over £300 million with US cases indicating rising costs for nuclear power plant construction and maintenance. Some American plants were unable to operate due to the scarcity of uranium supplies, which had rising costs of nearly 10% per annum. Another cost outlined by Carroll was the 'vast sums of money which the nuclear industry has spent on propagandising its wares' (ibid.).

Carroll was concerned that the high costs for building, maintaining and promoting a nuclear power plant would be taken from social services or other aspects of the state's development plans. Moreover, he anticipated only minor employment levels at the Carnsore plant with no extra employment that would have been achieved from a conventional power plant. At the same time resources for alternative energies such as wind and tidal power would be diverted to fund the nuclear plant which itself, would struggle to reach full capacity due to 'shut downs and infrequency of operation that performance entails', with 'no guarantee that such a plant will operate during its lifetime at anything like an average 60% capacity which will add to the costs of the energy produced' (ibid.).

The European Frame

Petra Kelly outlined her vision for a better Europe which embraced 'a civic, non-violent community of various member states' (*A Nuclear Ireland* 1978 89). For Kelly, a German of Irish extraction, Ireland at that point remained 'ecologically intact' (ibid.). Kelly outlined a cultural discourse which contextualised Ireland as a place of rural culture with an enduring 'loyalty to locality' (ibid.), which reflected a European ideal of traditional values. The shift to nuclear power would see Ireland become reliant on a centralised and erratic form of energy. The security threats surrounding nuclear power would affect Irish politics and society, leading to an over-emphasis on centralised technocratic power. The risks inherent in nuclear processing were so great that a controlled society would emerge in its wake, with implications for democratic freedom, according to Kelly. The results for Irish society were stark:

> The delicate web of social life called democracy will be torn and ripped apart due to the very nature of nuclear power and the monitoring and protection and surveillance necessary for the worker, the general population and the environment. (*A Nuclear Ireland?* 1978 91)

This combination of economic, cultural and ecological frames allowed Kelly to invoke a familiar rallying call for the Irish audience, that of dependency on a foreign source. This dependency would range from various supplies to nuclear expertise,

while security demands would challenge the social fabric of the countryside. Kelly called for Ireland to resist the type of technocratic power which had been introduced in other EEC member states. She appealed to the Irish sense of independence to argue that the country could stand out as a type of ecological beacon for a Europe which had become engulfed in an economic and political morass. She also raised concerns about the need for democratic participation in the nuclear debate, saying the state's endorsement of Carnsore 'already demonstrates that the right to complete and objective information of every citizen is being squelched' (ibid.). Kelly argued that across the EEC political and scientific expedience was replacing accountability, while the true health costs of nuclear power were being withheld throughout the Community's member states. Ireland's involvement with nuclear power would also pave the way for an erosion of her traditional neutrality, with European military cooperation focusing on nuclear capabilities. Such a scenario would draw Ireland closer to membership of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance (NATO), according to Kelly, in order to fulfil the EEC's ambitions to increase its global political power. This was being resented by anti-nuclear and pacifist groups across Europe and Kelly asked Irish citizens to join their campaign of resistance to nuclear energy. For Kelly, Ireland could still choose 'two minutes before midnight, whether or not it will accept the two headed monster – nuclear power and NATO' (ibid.). Kelly would subsequently go on to found the German Green party and win a seat in the European parliament.

In the aftermath of the anti-nuclear campaign calls for a public inquiry increased. The Labour Party, under pressure due to its pro-nuclear stance, called for a referendum (Baker 1988 12). Fine Gael limited itself to calling for an inquiry while adding that the concerns of the public should be addressed. While the radical left and the ITGWU opposed nuclear power, the Worker's Party continued to support the Carnsore Plant placing itself in the mainstream (ibid.). Fianna Fáil conceded on the public inquiry, hoping to reduce the public pressure which was building on the issue. Not for the first or last time would Fianna Fáil be caught between an economic nationalist infrastructural project and growing populist opposition. In February, Minister O'Malley announced that a public inquiry would take place. However, this did not have the desired effect, as opposition to the state's nuclear policy increased after the announcement (ibid.). An Interdepartmental Committee was established but again the government provided further political opportunities for the anti-nuclear movement by referring to the Committee's Report. In addition, the planned public inquiry never took place. The public felt misled on the issue, and the anti-nuclear campaigners appeared to be justified in their stance.

The campaign against nuclear power in Ireland and globally had been bolstered by concerns raised by the Three Mile Island reactor core meltdown in March 1979. By that time in the USA the anti-nuclear movement, led by Ralph Nader, had captured the public's imagination in the wake of the 'No Nukes' concerts and film featuring contemporary artists such as Jackson Browne, Bruce Springsteen and Crosby Stills and Nash. The threat of hazardous nuclear waste was also becoming part of popular culture featuring as a threat in films and on television programmes (Szasz 1994 55). While people lacked the expertise to

fully understand all of the issues, popular culture had branded the nuclear industry and any client governments as the 'bad guys' in this dispute. This populist framing of the nuclear issue helped to mobilize the national and global anti-nuclear movement to a considerable extent. The summer of 1979 gave rise to plans to hold a second festival at Carnsore. This rally was more politically focused but lacked the national impact or serious media coverage of the first event (Dalby 1985 14). The second Carnsore festival called "Return to the Point" also provided a forum for radical European groups, and some of the increased political debates led to splits and disagreements on tactics (Baker 1990 56). Three more festivals were held at Carnsore and the Irish anti-nuclear movement began to network and interact with the international movement particularly the French movement (ibid.).

Conclusion

Movements mobilise 'internal' resources such as expertise, leadership, finances, in order to improve the 'process of increasing the readiness to act collectively' (Gamson 1975). What was interesting in the first phase of the Carnsore protest was the willingness of locals with expertise, such as doctors who were concerned about the health risks of nuclear plants, to involve themselves in a campaign opposed to state policy. From that point on personnel, such as leaders, experts or support volunteers made themselves readily available to support the anti-nuclear cause. The emergence of a 'new middle class' (Inglehart 1977) in Ireland during the 1970s represented a section of the population that was educated and understood the potential threat posed by nuclear power. Culturally, these new middle-class activists were conditioned by local and international events ranging from the 1960s new left student, feminist and anti-war movements to the emergence of an environmental consciousness in the aftermath of the first Earth Day in 1970. The emergence of a post-1968 radical left in Europe also brought their influence to bear on the Irish anti-nuclear campaign (Baker 1990 56). The ecopopulist 'no nukes' movement in the USA also provided a context in which Irish activists could locate their campaign. The ability of the Irish movement to frame the anti-nuclear issue as a moral question also appealed to the wider public who were less interested in radical or cultural politics. In contrast the state seemed unable to present a strong case in favour of nuclear power.

As the state attempted to shift its energy policy in the aftermath of the oil crisis in the mid-1970s, the less than comprehensive knowledge about the links between nuclear energy and nuclear arms created a political opportunity for Irish activists to exploit. This opening in the political opportunity structure of the state allowed anti-nuclear activists to frame the issue as a moral one, thereby extending the grievance frame surrounding the issue in a way which would add pacifists, radical leftists and even the largest trades union to their list of allies. This facilitated the mobilisation process allowing a local protest in County Wexford to grow into a national movement. Due to the nature of the populist Irish political system

politicians are vulnerable to the demands of the public, if these demands are mobilised in a significant and politically coherent manner, as the state attempts to accommodate vested interests (Scruggs 1999 9). Therefore, the nature of the Irish political system could be said to have facilitated the wider mobilisation of the anti-nuclear movement. As the Fianna Fáil government of 1977 had been elected on the back of a populist surge in their vote, they were vulnerable to a potential electoral backlash from the public, a concern which outweighed their desire to introduce nuclear power in Ireland.

The government eventually abandoned its plans for nuclear power, due to a series of factors including 'the Three Mile Island accident and the Kinsale gas find, combined with Des O'Malley's expulsion from the party' (Edward Walsh *Irish Times* 26 April 2006). However, the Carnsore anti-nuclear protests were also a factor in the reversal of the government's nuclear energy policy, a significant victory for any social movement. However, the anti-nuclear protests also represented the birth of a wider populist environmental movement in Ireland. This movement was distinct from the 'official environmentalism' (Tovey 1992b) of groups such as An Taisce. It was a coalition of many green and new left groups across the island of Ireland. Some of these groups would go on to form the Green Alliance, which later became Comhaontas Glás, the Irish Green Party. Petra Kelly returned to Germany as a co-founder of the German Greens *Die Grünen*, making a significant imprint on European environmental politics until her death. The ITGWU would ultimately go into neo-corporatist partnership in the 1990s while Christy Moore became an Irish folk hero, having recorded the anti-nuclear protest song *Hiroshima Nagasaki Russian Roulette with Moving Hearts*. However, like so many radical Irish movements this nascent environmental movement experienced many splits over tactics and strategies. But many groups such as Friends of the Earth continued to be active, particularly on University campuses.

By the 1980s the global Campaigns for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) would become a major political voice against nuclear arms proliferation. Despite the Chernobyl disaster in 1986 and the end of the Cold War, nuclear power has again come to the fore, ironically, as an environmentally friendly alternative to fossil fuels in the post-Gulf War era. A recent Forfas report (April 2006) has also indicated that the nuclear option may have to be considered by future governments as Ireland's dependency on external, fossil-based fuels will become unsustainable, while Dr. Edward Walsh of the University of Limerick has argues that Ireland might need 'a cluster of nuclear plants' to deal with any impending fuel crisis resulting from the decline of fossil fuels (*Irish Times* 26 April 2006). The advocacy campaign of Adi Roche and Ali Hewson, who run the Chernobyl Children's Fund and bring children affected by the Chernobyl disaster for recuperation with Irish families serves as a reminder of the perils of nuclear power. It may be some time before people are willing to consider the nuclear option as a future energy policy for Ireland, despite the UK government's plans to redevelop Sellafield as a potential site for the next phase of their nuclear energy production.

The campaign against the nuclear option continues in Ireland. The Irish branch of Friends of the Earth (FOE) is part of a wider campaign to mobilise "One Million

Europeans against Nuclear Power". They claim that Europe's governments are wasting taxpayers' money to protect a dangerous and expensive technology

> 20 years after the Chernobyl disaster, nuclear power remains the most dangerous mechanism for electricity generation. Nuclear energy is also no solution to climate change. And, globalised terrorism makes nuclear power stations and the uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear material a serious security hazard. (www.foe.ie)

Irish FOE also put forward the following arguments against nuclear power, claiming that nuclear:

- Emits as much as much CO_2 over the whole life cycle from fuel mining to waste management and decommissioning as a modern gas-fired power plant.
- Is insanely expensive and wouldn't survive without taxpayers' subsidies.
- Risks serious accidents with radioactive release. There have been at least 22 since the Chernobyl disaster in 1986.
- Still creates dangerous waste for many generations to come.
- Relies for fuel on uranium, the known reserves of which will run out in 50 years if nuclear energy production is maintained at current level.
- Risks nuclear proliferation, as we can't present nuclear energy as the solution to energy demand and climate change and then seek to prevent Asian, African and Latin America countries developing it (ibid.).

The issue remains a controversial one in Ireland, as peak oil creates further debate about sustainable futures. However, it would seem that the protests at Carnsore Point, for some thebirthplace of the Irish environmental movement, will remain a definitive moment for many in Irish society.

Chapter 8
The Anti-toxics Movement

Introduction

During the 1970s and 1980s the issue of toxic pollution from multinationals gained international significance while anti-toxics campaigns became widespread. With increased understandings of the risks posed by toxic pollution, due to increasing media coverage a 'new issue' (Szasz 1999) developed in community politics, initially in the USA and subsequently across the globe, including Ireland. As with most new social movement activity there was a good deal of interaction between various campaigns as anti-war and anti-nuclear protests came to provide momentum and influence for anti-toxics groups across the USA. Issues such as the use of 'agent orange' herbicide defoliant in populated areas during the Vietnam War and the risks posed by radiation informed the stance of anti-toxics campaigners who framed their protests around health-risks and corporate indifference to host communities.

One of the multinationals involved in the production of 'agent orange' was Merrell-Dow, who planned to escape the onset of the increased environmental regulation in the USA by relocating a pharmaceutical plant to Youghal in County Cork. Dow had planned to manufacture the antihistamine terfenadine at the plant (Whitty 1988 9). Dow's involvement in the production of 'agent orange' and subsequent publicity about the health affects on US soldiers who came into contact with the chemical provided anti-toxics campaigners in Ireland with a set of pre-existing arguments which assisted the formation of discursive health risks and the 'uncaring and deceitful' multinational frames. US campaigns against corporate groups such as Merrell Dow also provided an established portfolio of advocate driven scientific data that could contest any scientific positions held by the multinational or state officials. In addition, the success of the 'no-nukes' protests at Carnsore were underpinned by the Chernobyl nuclear power-plant meltdown in 1986 which sent a radioactive cloud across Europe increasing communities' concerns about the motives and culpabilities of industries or the state, in cases of widespread industrial pollution.

Ireland's favourable low corporate tax regime attracted many US pharmaceutical industries including Merrell-Dow in the 1970s and 1980s, such as Pfizer, Merck, Syntex, SmithKline and Schering-Plough. Factors which these multinationals

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

found attractive included the IDA's presentation of Ireland as a location with wage restraint, purpose built factories, compliant local authorities and lax environmental regulation (Jones 1988 19). With a potential of halving operating costs being one of the favourable results for multinationals that relocated from the USA to Ireland this increase in multinationals coming to Ireland was hardly surprising. However, the onset of the toxic multinational would also result in a series of protests about the environmental and health risks of corporate pollution across the nation.

Multinational-Led Development

The abandonment of protectionist policies in the 1950s was followed by the state adopting multinational-led development as a means of securing growth. This process began with the relaxation of corporation taxes while the introduction of the Shannon Free Airport Development Company and the industrial zone were significant components of this new economic restructuring. By the 1970s import tariffs were abolished as the state prepared to join the EEC (Travers 2000). The Irish Development Authority (IDA) was given greater flexibility in the task of attracting multinationals to Ireland. Other policies introduced by the state to improve the climate for multinational investment included a zero rate of corporation tax on export profits and a combined analysis from the state, industry and trades unions to increase Ireland's competitiveness and manufacturing potential (ibid.).

In addition, specific sites were targeted as potential destinations for multinational plants that were offered generous incentives to relocate to Ireland. One such area was Cork Harbour, which was identified in 1972 as a site for significant industrial development due to its deep-water port and on land facilities. Overall, Ireland's attempts to attract US investment in the early 1970s were very successful. Between 1970 and 1973, the US chemical industry alone invested up to $173 million in Ireland (Allen 2004 3). Major US chemical industries such as Beecham, Pfizer and Schering Plough opened manufacturing plants in Ireland during this time. While IDA-led programmes were a significant factor in this investment drive, so too were the changes in legal frameworks and public perceptions of the toxics industry in the USA.

Just as the anti-nuclear movement had become a vehicle for the expression of dissent on a range of issues, the anti-toxics movement in the USA had become a significant political rallying point for communities that were concerned about health issues as well as local corruption and a wider democratic deficit on a national level. As technology and science were perceived as the vehicles for the capitalist state's imposition of modernity on local communities, communities led by new left activists in the USA began to resist toxic dumps and plants, leading to a rise in 'ecopopulism' (Szasz 1994). As the federal government in Washington responded to ecopopulist resistance by passing increasingly stringent anti-pollution laws, US multinationals began to look elsewhere for potential sites for their manufacturing plants.

These moves coincided with Ireland's liberalisation of their regulatory corporate legislation. As individual multinationals found out, local authorities were in competition with each other and offered deals which included further regulatory laxity at local level in return for investment in their areas. In addition, powers to inspect or close down polluting plants were scaled down or removed altogether (Taylor 2001 16–17). In this context the difficulties faced by community groups opposed to toxic plants becomes evident. Throughout the early 1970s, a number of communities resisted multinational sites in their localities, due to concerns about toxicity and pollution. As many of these plants were being sited in rural areas the alliances between local farmers and their political representatives was enough to lead to plans for any potential multinational plant being abandoned. The farming community was still the source of considerable local power and both Fianna Fáil and Fine Gael were reliant on the support of the agrarian sector. However, as the decade went on, the state's prioritisation of multinational-led development over agriculture and tourism meant that local political alliances did not have as much political clout as they once had in Ireland's traditionally clientelist political system. As the economy went through periods of fluctuation rural communities facing high unemployment and emigration had become more reliant on the state and multinationals to provide jobs. In this context, the emergence of local anti-toxics groups is significant as new middle-class professionals, unrestricted by dependency on the state or agricultural sector, began to oppose multinationals due to the threat of health issues.

Mobilisation

The localised nature of community resistance to multinationals meant that the groups were NIMBYist in nature, often emerging from concerned meetings led by residents' groups. One of the primary tactics used by communities against multinationals was in lodging planning process objections in large numbers, primarily citing health concerns and pollution potentials. In order to achieve any sort of success, community groups had to organise committees, hold public meetings to highlight their grievances to both the wider community and the authorities and engage with sympathetic experts such as lawyers and scientists, to support their arguments. The emergence of new left politics in the late 1960s meant that there was a small but significant pool of environmentalists and radicals to draw upon as a source for activists willing to donate time or money to the cause.

As community campaigns against Beechams in Clare and Pfizer in Cork indicated even in the early 1970s, communities that were determined to resist multinational plants in their areas could be successful. However, as the state began to prioritise multinational-led development from the mid-1970s onward, the pressure to present Ireland as a suitable region for investment without major industrial or community unrest began to build. And while the conflict in Northern Ireland began to intensify, the state's desire to placate local radicals began to diminish. External pressure from

corporate headquarters in the USA increased the constraints faced by the Irish state in dealing with concerned communities. As authorities attempted to impose unpopular policies from above, political opportunities for grass-roots campaigners increased, as the initial concerns about health risks and toxicity could be combined with a portrayal of the state as undemocratic as part of a framing process (Leonard 2005 63–65).

The campaigns against toxic multinationals have been characterised by a community group's ability to forge alliances with scientific experts who can present an argument which demonstrates why any political site would be harmful to the local population and environment. This contestation of science has been the basis for 'populist' environmentalism's (Tovey 1992b) resistance to the professional expertise employed by the state or multinational. The use of science as an empowering resource (Phyne 1996 3) to be mobilised by communities has emerged in an era of 'risk society' (Beck 1992) and 'legitimation crisis' (Habermas 1972), where people are no longer convinced of the rationality of the argument put forward by the state or scientists in defence of new technologies or industrial processes. In a time where oil spills from super-tankers, chemical accidents and even nuclear reactor core meltdowns became a part of people's lives, attempts to mobilise communities against the potential threats posed by a multinational were enhanced by an increased sense of risk and scepticism.

By the time of the first Carnsore protests, Friends of the Earth in Cork also began to organise protests about toxic plants around the Cork Harbour area. Cork Harbour was central to the state's multinational-led development policy and was seen as a base for many of the chemical plants now having to leave the USA due to the tighter regulatory regime operating there. FOE combined with local residents' associations to mobilise large-scale opposition groups such as the Bandon Valley Protection Association (BVPA) and the Cork Noxious Industry Action Group (CNIAG) which also had members of the Cork Anti-nuclear group on their committee (Baker 1990 58, 59).

This creation of networks and larger groupings represented the next phase of mobilisation for the anti-toxics movement as localised campaigns of opposition began to unite together pooling the resources of expertise and campaign strategies, while bringing together a wider activist base. Toxic waste was becoming a political and cultural "icon" (Szasz 1994 38) for environmental groups, both in Ireland and globally. In 1978, the discovery that thousands of tonnes of toxic waste had been illegally dumped over decades at the Love Canal site in New York catapulted the issue of toxic waste into the media while simultaneously confirming the worst suspicions held by environmentalists and concerned communities about the shadowy nature of some components of the chemicals industry. As information about the long-term health issues of toxic chemicals became common knowledge through the ongoing media coverage of Love Canal, communities became concerned about the potential for birth defects, miscarriages, leukaemia and cancers resulting from exposure to industrial pollution, reinforced by the decision to evacuate pregnant women and young children from the Love Canal region (ibid.). The destruction of the community at Love Canal, who were left with traumatic health problems in an

unliveable, toxic, neighbour-hood illustrated to many the potential price to be paid for inviting a multinational into a region.

While Ireland was particularly vulnerable to long periods of economic recession and unemployment many communities, particularly those comprised of middle-class professionals or affluent farmers, were not interested in importing the threat of toxic pollution into their areas. As local concerns about health risks clashed directly with the state's policy of multinational-led development the late 1970s and early 1980s were characterised by a series of anti-toxics campaigns against the siting of factories or toxic dumps. A number of well documented campaigns came to signify the Irish anti-toxic movement, including the Hanrahan family's challenge against Merck Sharpe and Dohme in County Tipperary (Allen & Jones 1990; Allen 1994; Baker 1990), the Ovens residents' groups' successful campaign against Raybestos Manhattan between 1976 and 1980 (Allen & Jones 1990) and the Womanagh Valley Protection Association campaign against Merrell Dow in 1988 (Peace 1993), or the people of Derry's challenge against DuPont in Northern Ireland (Allen 1992), a campaign that united environmentalists against both the Northern administration and the Southern state.

All of these campaigns against multinational-led development shared certain mobilisation strategies and their campaigns took on sinister characteristics despite a range of differing outcomes. All of the anti-toxics groups built their challenges around a contestation of science as they framed their arguments around the health risks posed by chemical pollution. This allowed the challengers to build up a dialogue with the wider public, who may not have had the same views or benefited from a similar middle-class autonomy. By creating a sense of 'shared grievance' the anti-toxics groups widened their appeal amongst the general public. In order to promote their concerns about health risks with the public the anti-toxics groups needed to create events which the media would cover at local and national levels. In order to maximise any media coverage, protest events played on cultural images of 'risk society' (Beck 1992) as activists dressed in industrial protective clothing and boiler suits and wore face masks to highlight risks of airborne toxins. Women and children were often prominent at protests carrying hand made placards against pollution while creating a sense of inter-generational grievance against the threat of toxics, which could take years and decades to repair after spills or leakages.

Anti-toxics campaigners also exploited a traditional sense of hostility to officialdom and 'outsiders' that existed in Irish communities as part of their attempts to create a sense of shared grievance. Exploitation of populist localism was a feature of the Irish political scene and was part of a culture of opposition which could be traced back to the days of British rule through to the post-independence, inward looking protectionism which had shaped cultural and political activity over time. This 'populist' environmentalism (Tovey 1992b 283) was part of an emerging backlash against the modernisation projects of the state, the EEC, or multinational corporations, and had a particular resonance with rural communities and suburban professionals who combined in their opposition to toxic plants in their areas.

Cork Harbour

When Raybestos Manhattan began to experience regulatory difficulties with their asbestos manufacturing plants in the USA, a decision was taken to relocate its production base to 'non regulated peripheral' (Allen 1990 95) locations. One such location was Ovens, near Ringaskiddy, County Cork. Planning permission was granted for the Raybestos plant at an early stage, denying concerned locals a chance to lodge objections to the project. The first attempt to frame a challenge to the plant focused on the lack of clarity over the nature of the production at Raybestos' proposed plant, the toxicity of asbestos and the lack of planning notices in the local Cork press (Allen 2004 96). This approach gave the Ovens residents an opportunity to open up two action frames; one focusing on health risks and toxicity, while the other portrayed the state and Raybestos as engaging in dishonest collusion about the nature of such risks.

By focusing on 'hard grievances' (Walsh et al. 1997 45) such as the threats posed by the toxicity of the asbestos manufactured at the plant, the Ovens residents were able to benefit from a wider mobilisation of concerned residents in the surrounding Ringaskiddy area. This form of 'hard grievance' highlighted the wider risks posed by a toxic industry in the overall geographic area and allowed the NIMBY style Ovens residents' groups to extend their campaign at an early stage. Further mobilisation opportunity for the residents emerged when Raybestos began to attempt to locate an asbestos dump in the area. This provided an opportunity to object to the planning application for the dump, which the residents took in July 1976 (Allen 2004 196). The residents achieved some access to political structures through their consultations with the planning committee of Cork County Council (ibid.). The residents' tactic of objecting to the dump led to a new site being sought in a nearby area providing the residents with further alliances and wider mobilisation.

Associations' involvement in the dispute grew from the wider mobilisation through the spread of 'shared grievances' against Raybestos across the area. Local women's' groups also came to the fore during this campaign. These groups favoured direct action over the legal process and began to engage in a high profile picketing campaign at the Raybestos plant, IDA offices, and even the US embassy in Dublin (Allen 2004 95–99). By early 1977, as Raybestos were granted planning permission for their dump site, the residents' campaign had grown to encompass residents' groups and civic organisations across Cork City and County, as well as encompassing allies such as John Carroll from the IGWU (ibid.) who had led the Carnsore anti-nuclear protests. At this stage, the residents had developed an 'Eight point programme' as part of their tactical approach to the campaign. This incorporated strategies such as appeals, a rates strike, pickets against local IDA and trades union offices, as well as against waste haulage contractors and the withdrawal of children from a nearby school (ibid.).

Raybestos responded by taking out an injunction against the picket at the dump site, held 24 hours a day to prevent any dumping taking place. Pickets were also

being maintained at the Raybestos plant. Threats of jail terms did not deter the protesters and by May 1979 Raybestos' attempt to use the dump was blocked by picketers. The brutality of the police response has been documented in local press reports as having involved excessive force against the picketers, who were mainly women and children (Allen & Jones 1990 109, 110). This form of hostile response from the authorities provided the residents with an extension to their frame of multinational and state collusion against local communities. Press reports describing the police assault on the picketers shocked the wider community. The negative press coverage weakened Raybestos' resolve and the residents responded to this incident by taking a more militant position in their communications with Raybestos and the IDA after these incidents. Raybestos claimed they were making millions in losses (ibid.).

The residents employed some innovative tactics in response to Raybestos' continued dumping of asbestos, and the group were able to convince Cork County Council that Raybestos was engaged in violation of its planning permission (ibid.). Ultimately, it was the poor condition of workers employed at Raybestos that would lead to the plant's closure and after a series of spills in the factory Raybestos announced the closure of their Cork plant in October 1980. The workers had been able to draw on the resources and expertise of the Cork Noxious Industry Action group, which had emerged at the time of the first Carnsore anti-nuclear protests. The networking potential of the nascent Irish environmental movement was established through these links and communities on the South coast had seen off a nuclear plant and an asbestos factory through their campaigns of resistance to aspects of the state's industrialisation policy. While the issue of toxic pollution had provided a localised sense of grievance which campaigners could mobilise, the indifference shown to the local communities allowed protests against toxic multinationals to 'go beyond NIMBY' (Szasz 1994) through the creation of a more extensive network of activists and experts who supported campaigns with 'interest-driven' (Grove-White 1993) data with which to frame their arguments.

Rural Cork

In the aftermath of the announcement that the US multinational, Merrell Dow, was going to open a chemical factory in their region, the farming communities in east Cork began the process of mobilising a campaign against the proposed plant. Their first tactic was appealing to An Bord Pleanála (Peace 1993 189). This dairy farming community was different to the new middle-class residents of Cork Harbour. It was a mixture of small and large farm holdings combined with shopkeepers and publicans in an area of relative affluence (ibid. 191). However, one area of commonality this community shared with its urban professional neighbours was a desire to maintain their autonomy from state or multinational interference in their region.

As in many such disputes the secretive approach taken by the technocratic state and regulatory fearing multinational provided a significant opportunity for the local

community to mobilise a campaign of grievance against any proposed plant. Resourceful local families were able to open up links with environmental sources in Ireland and the USA. Through these links Merrell Dow and Dow Chemical's extensive history of pollution at their US plants in Michigan were uncovered. This pollution involved discharging effluent into local weirs (Peace 1993 194). This had created a history of discord between Dow and the US EPA. Concerned locals were able to construct a frame of shared grievance with this information, allowing their campaign to envelop the concerns of the wider community. At the centre of this campaign was the Womanagh Valley Protection Association (WVPA). This group was determined to mobilise a wider support base for their campaign and engaged the support of a new ally with scientific credentials, Dr. Rory Finnegan. His expertise was a vital component of the communities' attempt to expand their grievance and link frames to incorporate some of the negative impacts the Merrill plant could have on the locality. The impacts included a reduction in property and land values, air and water pollution, increased health risks to humans and livestock, which would create major changes in the local way of life (Peace 1995 194).

The mobilisation of internal links by the WVPA's committee was also successful due to a series of meetings in local communities at which the latest information on the campaigns was disseminated. The hazards posed locally by Merrell Dow were placed in the context of other environmental disputes, both in Ireland and internationally, to combine local concerns with a growing ecological consciousness taking place globally after major incidents such as the meltdown at Chernobyl nuclear plant in 1986 (Peace 1993 195). The recognition by community groups about their need to mobilise against the state's 'integrationist approach' whereby community development and legitimacy was equated with job creation (Curtin & Varley 1995 380). Seen in this context the mobilisation of a community response in east Cork against a multinational could be seen to be as much a part of a contestation about the state's capacity to implement policy initiatives in the face of a community's desire for greater autonomy, as it was about any emergent environmental consciousness.

Herein lay the dilemma of the shifting the political opportunity structure surrounding Irish community campaigns which opposed the state's policy agendas. While the state wished to 'modernise' rural areas by facilitating multinationals who wished to set up plants in Ireland communities become concerned that the state was failing to prioritise the safety of those living in that region. Sociological research has indicated that rural Irish communities invariably identify themselves in reaction to change rather than in response to it and the community remains the core component of individual identity in rural areas (Curtin 1998 80). Community groups which organise themselves in 'defence of space' campaigns see themselves as custodians of not just their hinterland, but of their very way of life (Curtin & Varley 1995 392). It is this area of commonality through shared identity which community campaigns such as the WVPA can exploit for the purpose of mobilising around understandings of shared grievance. Attempts to understand what lies at the heart of Irish community opposition to state policy on environmental issues must first identity the strong sense of local identity which is rooted in the hinterland. This

form of environmental 'consciousness' is different to learned behaviour or concern for the state of the oceans or of the future of the planet. As such, two forms of environmental consciousness can be said to exist simultaneously. One is based on a shared identity which is shaped by relationships with the local environment which is largely instinctive and the other is based on a concern borne primarily out of media depictions of global environmental degradation.

In this context, the WVPA's ability to mobilise a significant section of the population of east Cork against Merrell Dow's plant could be understood as part of a deeper rural antipathy to outside interference. This form of grounded opposition held sway despite Merrell's attempts to convince locals that safety at the plant could be achieved by investing more money there (Peace 1993 195). The WVPA could draw on themes of morality, local identity and opposition to multinational ruthlessness to frame their grievance campaign. Their tactic of bringing public meetings to the towns and villages in the area was successful serving both as a vehicle for disseminating information about the potential hazards of the site while simultaneously fostering a sense of community resistance to the plant in defence of their locality. Another opportunity for the campaigners arose from the decision to let Merrell Dow with its history of polluting communities near its plants in the USA to monitor its own pollution levels. The problems stemmed from the practice of local authorities granting multinationals a lax regulatory regime in order to attract investment in their areas and acting as 'both gamekeeper and poacher' (Taylor 2001 27). The benign and facilitating approach of both the state and local authorities became a focus for the WVPA who highlighted the scant regard that the authorities or multinationals had paid to local concerns (Peace 1993 195). However, the WVPA didn't attempt to build any significant alliances with political figures and those who attended their meetings were rounded upon sharply (ibid.). In the absence of any attempt to bring their campaign to the political level the WVPA missed an opportunity to bring the mobilisation process to another level. However, such was the strength of their mobilisation of a sense of local grievance, borne out of a community under threat, that any need for alliances with key political figures was unnecessary. The depiction of a toxic multinational attempting to alter a traditional way of life with the support of uncaring bureaucrats was a potent image for the campaigners and attempts to create links with formal political figures may have compromised that image.

"Hard Grievances" and Scientific Discourse

The ability to shift the basis for the campaign from 'hard grievance' to 'soft grievance' (Walsh et al. 1997 45) as the situation required was essential. At times the WVPA highlighted the hard grievance of the hazardous waste plant being imposed by Merrell Dow on the local community. On other occasions their campaign focused on the 'soft grievance' of the rights of local communities to control their own future. 'Soft grievances' based on autonomy, equity and social justice concerns

are often the basis for campaigns of cultural mobilisation and resistance. And while anti-toxics movements are usually characterised by the 'hard grievances' of campaigns against technology the combination of hard and soft grievances can become a potent one. Strengthening the mobilisation of a campaign by combining grievances based on technological risks while also acting as a cultural rallying point (ibid.).

This form of emotive mobilisation also allowed the WVPA to build up a critique of the state which was selling out the local way of life in order to promote 'modernisation'. Farmers in small communities had been subjected to an ongoing offensive by the sate, which wanted farmers to introduce more scientific and technological practices into agricultural production. At the same time the state had prioritised the development of an 'agribusiness' sector in place of small holdings, in an attempt to shift Irish agriculture 'from Co-ops to capitalism' (Tovey & Share 2003 61). Deviation from supporting local knowledge to importing scientific approaches from abroad created a sense of grievance in rural communities which campaigns like the WVPA could draw on. As grant-aiding for scientific technology was introduced small holders that were deemed to be inefficient by the state were encouraged to give up farming despite its centrality in their way of life (ibid.). The WVPA's gathering of over a thousand signatures from concerned locals led to An Bord Pleanála's decision to grant the group an oral hearing. This transformed the WVPA's challenge from a campaign which had focused on the mobilisation of grievance through a rural 'discourse' (Peace 1997 196–199) to an urban-based legal challenge where legal and scientific fact held sway over community values. The WVPA spokespersons were cut off from their community at the Dublin-based hearing and their arguments, which had lit up many a meeting in east Cork, became lost in the bureaucratic arena. The WVPA also found that their key allies such as tourism and fisheries board representatives only provided input into how a plant could be improved rather than prevented. They also had difficulties establishing exactly what Merrell Dow were going to do with the plant which undermined some of their scientific projections about the plant's hazardous potential (ibid.).

Conclusion

The many campaigns against toxic multinationals in Ireland occurred in the 'first phase' (Leonard 2005) of environmental campaigning which occurred during the 1970s and 1980s, particularly in the rural counties of Munster which the state had targeted for multinational-led development since the introduction of heavy industry to areas such as Cork Harbour or the Shannon Industrial Zone from the 1960s onward. The protracted dispute at Raybestos Manhattan, as well as the well documented Hanrahan dispute against Merck Sharp and Dohme in County Tipperary, were among many disputes were local communities rejected industries that threatened local health and environment. These campaigns occurred despite long-standing patterns of unemployment and emigration which had blighted many of

these regions. While in essence these campaigns were primarily populist in nature, the cycles of community-based activism which began at Carnsore Point with the anti-nuclear protests led to an overlapping pattern of territorial protests with an emerging element of environmental consciousness which demonstrated a move towards a type of political response rooted in the landscapes and hinterlands these communities were attempting to protect. This development can be observed in the campaign which occurred at Womanagh Valley.

The WVPA's attempt to extend their campaign beyond its populist inception ran aground amid the scientific discourse created by both Merrell's experts and the WVPA's own key allies such as Rory Finnegan. The forum provided by an oral hearing did not allow the WVPA or their key allies to frame the issue in the manner they had hoped for applying a populist discourse to oppose the threat of pollution in their region. While this process may have compromised the impartiality of An Bord Pleanála's hearing due to their deviation from an evaluation that was independent (Peace 1997 159) the loss of potency experienced by the WVPA and their sympathetic experts served to underline the weakness of a planning process that was too reliant on populist sentiment without the legal or political connections to support the challenger's scientific arguments. Ultimately, the WVPA's attempts to resist Merrell Dow's plant through mobilisation of populist rural dissent gave way to a bureaucratic exercise in keeping the plant's pollution levels to an 'acceptable' level (Peace 1993 201). The anti-toxics campaigns which occurred throughout the 1970s and 1980s were part of the 'first phase' of environmental campaigning in Ireland (Leonard 2005).These campaigns had a localised or territorial aspect to them, but were part of a emerging consensus across rural and suburban communities in the west of Ireland that had come to consider toxic industries with a degree of scepticism, due to a series of incidents which pointed towards the exploitative nature of the relationship between external multinationals and their host communities. Although these communities were often economically disadvantaged, they valued the resources of clean air and water or unspoilt agricultural land over any 'quick-fix' solution which came with the siting of a toxic multinational in their area.

Chapter 9
Mining: Tynagh and Donegal

Introduction

Throughout the economically stagnant decades of the 1970s and 1980s a number of local disputes about national resources emerged across the country. The diverse and varied geological make-up of mountainous areas in the north-west or in County Wicklow were identified as holding potentially lucrative reserves of gold, zinc and uranium while the off-shore oil and gas fields of the Atlantic Shelf remained untapped. The extent to which successive Irish governments disposed of the nation's natural resources became the subject of considerable controversy leading to many campaigns which combined a resource protection frame with one of concern about democratic deficit as the activities of government ministers was called into question in regard to their dealings with mine and exploration companies. The legal framework for resource protection was also criticised by campaigners who feared that Ireland's natural resources were being sold off in a series of over-generous deals which provided no financial gain for the Irish taxpayer in addition to extensive ecological damage and limited concern for the local communities involved. The methods employed in the process of mining became an issue of contention for communities. The use of highly toxic chemicals such as cyanide in the mining process threatened the landscape as well as the livelihoods of locals who were dependent on agriculture, tourism and fisheries in the regions. The threat to these industries was threefold

> From the chemical agents such as cyanide or mercury used to separate gold traces from rock, in the toxic sediment that accumulates in the land and lakes surrounding a mine wiping out local fish stocks and poisoning livestock and in the heavy metals found in tailings. (Laffan & Wall 1988 12)

The process of mining employed in these rural areas created an extensive threat to local ecosystems and agriculture. The use of open cast pits, the transportation of unrefined extractions for disposal and the storage of toxic residue on site exacerbated the threat to local communities. The process of leaching or washing out gold extracts from the base rock with cyanide created a series of toxic rock piles which allowed cyanide residue and dust to come into contact with the surrounding landscape and water tables, in addition to carrying the threat of airborne particles being spread across a wide area (ibid.).

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

One mining dispute which encapsulated many of these issues was the Northgate operation at Tynagh in County Galway. The response of Northgate to the concerns of locals was somewhat dismissive, leading to widespread devastation across the area. This response to the pollution in Tynagh allowed their opponents to frame the industry and their state allies as greedy and disinterested in the welfare of the Tynagh community and surrounding environment. However, this dispute never emerged as a fully fledged environmental campaign despite the high concentration of cyanide extracts used at the mine. At the time the potential for enhanced networking with other campaigns was limited due to the isolated nature of the local community and the hopes of economic benefits generated by the industry's promises to local landowners. The company's entrenched decision not to restore the area came to head decades later when the issue of ongoing pollution in the Tynagh area was raised in the Dáil and in media reports.

With the emergence of the Shell to Sea campaign in County Mayo in 2005 the issue of resource protection also came to the fore with some of the Shell to Sea campaigners having been involved in the Mining Awareness protests in Galway and Mayo throughout the 1970s and 1980s. While individual farmers were afraid to take on the mining industry a group called 'Mining Awarenes' brought hundreds of people to meetings in the West with the protection of the West's 'holy mountain' at Croagh Patrick gaining considerable support from across the community. At the same time the Resource Protection Group, a left-wing movement which protested the sell-off of Irish resources to multinationals, actively led a campaign against the exploitation of mineral and off-shore reserves. The unveiled nature of Ireland's off-shore resources meant that campaigns would fall into abeyance until the dramatic campaign of the 'Rossport 5' gripped the nation. However, the 1970s and 1980s witnessed a series of mining disputes which brought environmental and community issues to the fore in previously tranquil rural areas.

Background

The state's predilection for multinational-led development can be traced back to the 1950s when overseas mining companies were provided with incentives to exploit the mineral resources available at certain points across the country. The state's inability to extract these mineral resources led to a situation where local concerns and even domestic law were 'manipulated' (Curtin & Shields 1988 109) by multinational mining companies who had no interests other than the exploitation of the local mineral base for profit. This form of dependency development resulted in a number of disputes between communities, the mining companies and the state. This chapter examines the mobilisation of two disputes against mining uranium mining in Donegal and the lead and zinc mines in Tynagh, County Galway. Concerns about the exploitation of the country's natural resources began to surface in the late 1970s. As a result of full and half tax exemptions for mines over the first two decades of their operations, in addition to a regime of compulsory purchases of

lands and mineral assets by the state, a number of foreign mining companies came to invest in mining operations around the country (Curtin & Sheilds 1988 112). One of these companies was the Canadian operation Northgate Explorations, which was run by Irish Canadians and listed as a public company in the Toronto Stock exchange (ibid.).

Explorations at the Tynagh mine site had begun in the early 1960s. The granting of a mining licence was unusual as the first mineral finds were made by Northgate before any licence had been issued and without any consultation with local farmers (ibid. 114). While some in the local community felt that a mine would bring a degree of prosperity to the area many in the extended community became concerned that their way of life and local environment had come under threat. The local community's attempts to organise against the mine were hampered by their inability to mobilise either sympathetic experts or political allies. Farmers also felt that they had not been given a fair price for any local land that had been purchased as they were unaware of its new valuation in the wake of the mineral finds or that the state exercised control over all of the country's mineral wealth in spite of local ownership (Curtin and Shields 114–115). The farmers' inability to forge alliances with any legal or scientific expert provided an indication of just how significant such key alliances were for subsequent campaigns.

In the absence of any local expertise networks the farmers were unaware of their ownership rights. The Irish legal system had not been involved in such disputes up to that point and was unable to provide local farmers with any legal framework with which to base a challenge (ibid.). Seen in this context the lack of resources available to the Tynagh farming community made the mobilisation of a campaign very difficult. The key components of internal mobilisation such as finance, legal expertise, scientific data or political alliances were all missing. As a result the protests of the farmers lacked clarity or momentum. Certainly the risk of being defeated by the authorities and Northgate's representatives seemed to outweigh the chances of a victorious outcome to any challenge undertaken by the community. Faced with this dilemma many farmers simply sold off their land to Northgate as they were faced with the prospect of Northgate occupying and destroying their farmland anyway with the tacit approval of the state. The legal anomalies which provided Northgate with protection from the state for unlicensed mining were compounded by the farmers' uncertainty as to the extent of damages they would be entitled to (Curtin & Sheilds 1988 116). Faced with a lack of resources and poor prospects for compensation individual farmers took whatever price Northgate offered for their lands which was detrimental to the communities' overall unity and resolve.

Community resistance was further weakened when recruiting began for the ore extracting process. In an area of high unemployment compounded by the loss of land and livelihoods, due to Northgate's enforced purchases, many local farmers signed up to work as manual labourers at the mine. The workforce at the mine was also divided into various components leaving little room for mobilising dissent. The Tynagh workers had different roles, capacities and ranks and did not come from any one area in the locality thus heightening the sense of division therein (ibid. 117). The main area of dispute was economic rather than environmental. By the late 1970s

the mine began to face closure as a consequence of exhausting its mineral base so unions began to press for improved redundancy packages for the workforce. Northgate's response was to look for increased productivity under the threat of closing the mines. Workers hoped to use extracted ore as leverage in their dispute and refused to load it onto ships in Galway (ibid. 118). This action was unofficial and led to the workers being left without strike pay or unemployment benefit. As their desperation increased a mass picket and lockout shut down the mine. In August 1978 an injunction was given against the strike and the workers were forced to back down. The legal process had backed industry over the workers' concerns and they received little support from local politicians or business interests. Local community grievances about perceived injustices had no bearing and while the court recognised the depth of local feeling the overall imperative was that 'the law must be maintained' (Curtin & Sheilds 1988 120). Not for the last time would the Irish legal system fail to recognise the concerns of a rural community under threat from the manipulations of a foreign industry whose sole aim was the repatriation of profits.

Although the nature of the Tynagh dispute in 1978 was not perceived to be environmental the mine left a legacy of pollution in the area in addition to the disruption of a rural way of life. Laxity in the conditions for restoration of the land and a lack of pollution controls during the period when the mine was in operation led to thousands of acres of land in the area becoming unsuitable for agriculture (Curtin & Sheilds 1988). Over the years that the mine was in operation livestock had to be removed from local land and local produce was replaced by packaged food from local grocers paid for by the mine. Irish Base Metals had used a large amount of cyanide in their ore processing works and when the pollution from this process was highlighted by local councillors in 1982 the company refused to restore the affected areas (ibid. 121). It was only then that the Irish Farmers' Association (IFA) lent their weight to the Tynagh community, ordering a members' ban on prospectors from Irish Base Metals. The perceived short-term benefits of the Tynagh mine were offset by the considerable pollution of that region.

The extent of the pollution was compounded by the acquiescence of the state which was prepared to support the mine company at almost any cost despite local concerns about the damage that was being done to the farming community around Tynagh. The short-term gains of local employment and corporate profitability were perceived as part of the modernisation of the state. The legacy of toxic pollution at the site of the mine indicates the fallacy of that perspective. Mining companies were able to repatriate their profits without taxation while family members of prominent politicians were appointed as directors of other mining companies, a situation that was indicative of the type of cronyism that was endemic at that time (Allen & Jones 1990 50). Clearly the enforcement of pollution controls was not a priority for the state during these years. While a succession of mining controversies eventually led to the formation of the Dublin-based Resources Protection Campaign, the Tynagh community was unable to open up links with any form of political support group leaving them isolated during their dispute. Indeed the workers' prioritisation of improved redundancy packages over land restoration could be said to stem from a lack of the scientific knowledge which links with experts could have

provided. The absence of state regulations on the use of toxins such as cyanide, together with the communities' lack of external expertise links, gave the mine company a free run in regard to toxic pollution in the area. The farmers' lack of legal expertise (and the legal sector's own limitations at that point) also allowed Northgate to occupy land and begin operations with impunity. The only criticism of the mine came from left-wing radicals and trades unionists who wanted to see better conditions for workers and more state control of the mine (Allen & Jones 1990 50). During the 1980s concerns about pollution in the area increased and in 1983 it emerged that 2,000 acres of land in the area were contaminated with lead, zinc and arsenic with local accounts of the devastation describing toxic dust blowing across the area killing plant life around the ravaged landscape and dead water pools near the mine site. Large numbers of livestock deaths were reported (ibid. 54, 55). The eight tonnes of sodium cyanide used at Tynagh mines also had a devastating affect on the local bird population and workers had to be deployed to collect the dead swans and ducks from the cyanide pools (Friel 2005 3).

The Donegal Campaign (DUC)

The 1970s also witnessed mobilisation of a campaign against uranium mining near County Donegal. In the mid-1970s the European Economic Community (EEC) provided significant financial aid to mining companies in Ireland to extend explorations for uranium deposits to increase supplies for Europe's burgeoning nuclear industry. Local alternative groups made links with Belfast's Just Books Collective run by the Belfast Anti-Nuclear Group and began to mobilise a campaign around meetings, information sessions and rallies across Donegal (Baker 1988 8). Anti-nuclear groups which had emerged in the aftermath of the Carnsore protests provided support and expertise for local campaigners. The Belfast group also produced a pamphlet titled *Uranium Mining in Donegal: The Dangers and Deceits* which was a free sheet that was distributed to over 6,000 people across the county. The pamphlet detailed the links between the EEC's desire to expand uranium mining and the nuclear arms industry as well as highlighting the environmental risks posed by uranium mines (Dalby 1985 30). Locals in Tintown formed the Donegal Uranium Committee (DUC) and set about mobilising resources such as funds and scientific data with which to launch a campaign. DUC's campaign was the first such protest in Ireland to link the issues of health risks with that of environmental degradation (Baker 1990 68) and as such provided a strategic breakthrough for Irish environmental campaigning.

This template of mobilisation which combined anthropocentric and ecocentric concerns (Eckersley 1992) about human health and ecological degradation was bolstered by the strong networks established through 'interpersonal contacts' (Friedman & McAdam 1992 158) built from Carnsore to Belfast and from Belfast to Donegal. The local Tintown community became very involved in the dispute and members of the town's development committee as well as local teachers and doctors

became prominent figures in the campaign by 1980 (Allen & Jones 1990 61). Despite the extent of their initial mobilisation phase the DUC were unable to create sufficient links with Donegal County Council and were unable to get funding for a monitoring study of the mine by An Foras Forbatha (the Planning and Construction Institute). Initial attempts at drilling in the area were halted by local families concerned about contamination of water supplies. The DUC continued to gather information on the topic and by March 1980 they held a large public meeting which was attended by DUC spokesperson Brian Flannery as well as local physicians who highlighted the health risks posed by the mine (Dalby 1985 31). The campaigners were also able to highlight a number of structures that were erected without planning permission at the mine site (ibid.).

The DUC began to create a sense of grievance in the wider community through their health-risks frame. Early press releases stated that their aim was to protect the environment and health of the people of Donegal (Allen & Jones 1990 61). They also promoted their local cause as one component of a wider national campaign against nuclear power in Ireland. In August 1980 the DUC took part in the third anti-nuclear rally at Carnsore Point. The focus of the Carnsore rallies had come to encompass the issue of uranium mining by that stage and the DUC had a large exhibition on the issue providing an information resource while establishing wider networks at the festival. Members of the Cork anti-nuclear group had also attended and addressed DUC's rallies in Donegal (Allen & Jones 1990 64).

While representatives of the state had refused to meet the DUC they were able to successfully mobilise external expertise links with the Oxford-based Political Ecology Research group who said they would take on the monitoring study. Another expert who supported the DUC was Dr. Blackith from Trinity College who had been active in the Carnsore protests. The DUC's most successful mobilisation strategies included links with experts such as Dr. Blackith who provided scientific evidence at the hearings set up by An Bord Pleanála. As a result of this evidence, many of the mine company's operations in the area were halted. In fact, it was the DUC's ability to highlight possible breaches of planning laws that brought about this halt to mining in the area as the state had already provided the companies with licences (Dalby 1985 31). The DUC also turned the tables on the state's own scientists and health experts who had claimed that nuclear power would not harm the locals. The DUC were able to mobilise local mistrust of officialdom by pointing out that their experts were Dublin based and had no knowledge of, or concern about the communities in Donegal (Allen & Jones 1990 66).

The DUC acted as a coordinating committee for the various local groups that had been mobilised against the mines. These rural-based groups set up signposts on their land stating their opposition to prospecting, a tactic which legally blocked the mining companies from prospecting in those areas. By establishing such a strong grass-roots support network mining companies could not continue their operations (Allen & Jones 1990 68). The DUC were also able to eventually forge key alliances with local political figures in Galway County Council and some politicians returned donations given out by the mine companies during the by-elections in the Autumn of 1980 (Dalby 1984 32).

The ability to mobilise local sentiment, forge alliances with experts and other anti-nuclear groups and provide local politicians with reasons to oppose uranium mining while opposing the mining companies' attempts to rally business interests to support their operations was one of the strengths of the DUC. However, some differences of opinion about the manner in which anti-nuclear groups opposed state policy and the nuclear industry meant that links at a national level, while mutually supportive, did not ad up to an overall national anti-nuclear movement. One offshoot of these campaigns was the revival of the Irish Campaign against Nuclear Disarmament (CND) in the 1980s (ibid.). Other campaigns against mining included the opposition to lignite mining in County Tyrone as well as protests against gold mining in Connemara, County Galway and at Croagh Patrick in County Mayo. The West of Ireland campaign against gold mining drew on traditional West of Ireland politics to create awareness campaigns about national resource protection from multinationals as well as creating demands for greater input from local communities into state policies affecting the region (Baker 1990 69).

By 1988 one group in the West had formed around concerns about the ecological damage caused by such mining and the ease with which mining companies were able to get licences from the state. This group, Mining Awareness (MA), mobilised a campaign around three objectives the dissemination of data on the degradation caused by mining, lobbying for changes in the legislation surrounding provision of mine licences and highlighting the need for an environmental impact assessment (Allen & Jones 1990 79). The group's campaign emerged around an array of tactics which included the distribution of an information leaflet, holding a series of meetings and creating expertise links with academics that highlighted the pollution risks of mining (ibid.). The MA group were hampered by the secrecy surrounding the technocratic decision-making which formulated mining policy and legislation. However, they overcame this by making presentations of videos and photographs of mining degradation while further cultural mobilisation took place through exhibitions and concerts by supportive artists and musicians who played at benefits in Dublin and throughout the West of Ireland for the group (ibid.). However, MA's most successful mobilisation strategy was provided through the establishment of links with the Mayo Environmental Group and Gold Environmental Impact Assessment (Gold EIA). The latter group wanted to see a proper impact assessment based on European Community (EC) directives before mining licences were granted (Baker 1990 69). This utilisation of EU legislation as part of a legal framing process was an indication of the options becoming available to environmental campaigns at this point. Gold EIA and the MA framed both environmental and economic arguments highlighting the risks posed by the use of cyanide in the process of extraction for ecosystems as well as to the local water supply in the region. The campaigners also identified the damage which could be caused to local farming, fishing and tourist interests (ibid.) as they attempted to broaden their shared grievance frame across the region's social categories. The anti-mining campaigners were also able to create a frame which incorporated local culture and religious practice based on the significance of Croagh Patrick for the local Catholic population as a popular site for religious pilgrimage. The campaigners were able to forge links with key allies such as the Archbishop of Tuam. The Archbishop

condemned any mining on the 'holy mountain' (Baker 1990), claiming such activity to be morally wrong during his sermons.

Gold EIA, who created significant networks and links with a variety of groups which were the basis of Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) civil society in the West of Ireland which included An Taisce (The National Trust), Bord Failte (The Tourism Board), the Irish Farmers Association (the IFA) as well as a number of environmental and wildlife conservation groups and small business associations (Allen & Jones 1990 80, 81). By extending their networks and support base in this way Gold EIA and the MA provided as their cultural frame a type of in depth coherence which could counter the arguments of the state and mining companies about the benefits of mining. By focusing on the implications of mining rather than being seen to be anti-mining per se the discursive process involving the extension of cultural, economic and risk frames could be merged into an overall stance against a fostered image of greedy mine companies and distant officialdom. However, some activists who wanted to see a more direct approach to the campaign established the Mayo Environmental Group (MEG) in 1989 who more vocal about their outright hostility to mining in the region (ibid.). At their height the MEG mobilised over 3,000 people for a public meeting in Castlebar and established expertise links with well-known figures such as the British environmentalist, David Bellamy. They were also able to collect a petition with thousands of signatures at the annual Croagh Patrick pilgrimage in 1989 (ibid.). The group famously won support from the local Archbishop, and the moral framing that had begun at Carnsore Point and occurred in Mayo in response to mining would later re-emerge during the Shell to Sea dispute.

Such high profile events made mining in the region difficult for the companies while a groundswell of grass-roots support built on populist cultural framing led to an undercurrent of opposition to environmental risk projects in Mayo which can be traced through to the opposition to the gas pipeline in Rossport in 2005. This lineage represents a form of sustainable community development 'from below' based on the mobilisation of a 'unifying ether' (Varley and Curtin 1999 48, 49) which transcends social divides in rural Ireland. In the case of Gold EIA, their ability to create support networks across social divisions created an 'elite consensus' (Dye in Waste 1986 33) which combined a concern for local communities and the environment with a sustainable platform for local agrarian business interests. This shift in the local power base from fragmented and local activism towards a more coherent campaign was strengthened by local control of their most significant resource ownership of the land in the area (ibid. 48).

Conclusion

The history of mineral resource management in Ireland has been littered with sporadic campaigns against local mining operations and multinationals with state support. In most cases disputes about mineral resources follow a similar theme initial euphoria at the prospect of an economic boom for hard-pressed communities

followed by concern about ecological degradation during mining operations. There has also been a residue of grievance due to the lack of any clean-up regulations at disused sites. Another concern for communities regarding the operation of mines was the transportation and dumping of waste made toxic from the use of cyanide in the mining process. Property rights and rights of access for prospective mining operations to private lands were also a matter of local community concern (Curtin and Shields (1998), Allen & Jones 1990 46).

One of the most controversial aspects of resource management in Ireland concerning mineral or oil reserves was the lack of proper compensation for local communities or the taxpayer. In addition disregard was shown for communities from the Tynagh mines dispute in the 1970s through to the contested zinc and uranium mines in Tipperary or Donegal and the Shell to Sea campaign of today. In all cases state backed multinationals were given access to the resources of the nation for little return. At the same time the multinationals have displayed scant regard for either local communities or their environments. It is from this arrogant disregard for the local grievances that the initial networking of the Irish environmental movement emerged as anti-nuclear campaigners from Carnsore made common cause with opponents of uranium mining in Donegal in the 1970s. From that inception a disparate group of anti-war, anti-nuclear, environmental and feminist groups from across the island combined to oppose the sell-off of Irish resources while protesting environmental degradation. Some of those involved with opposing mining at Croagh Patrick in the 1980s became involved in the current Shell to Sea controversy demonstrating the extent to which the resources issue has retained its salience. However, the nascent Irish environmental movement did not impinge on the rural community of Tynagh in East County Galway whose lives were dramatically affected by the controversial Northgate mining operations in the 1970s. While the Tynagh community had to defend themselves the subsequent ecological degradation remains a concern for environmentalists today. The scarred landscape around Tynagh became an issue for environmental groups with the high levels of cyanide in the local hinterland a particularly controversial issue. While attempts to have the site at Tynagh reclaimed were less than successful a recent announcement by a company called Tynagh Energy to open a power generating station in the area was made in early 2006 (*Galway Advertiser* 10 March 2006). The power plant may be able to reclaim some of the disused land at the site of the mine. In addition some enduring local employment may result from the plant, something that Tynagh was promised but ultimately never delivered in any real way despite the extensive degradation caused to the local hinterland. In 2007 a private incineration plant was proposed for the area, leading to further objections from the local community. Galway has seen a protracted dispute bout the possible provision of municipal incineration to deal with waste from all of Connacht under the Regional Waste Plan. This proposal was effectively stopped by the campaign of Galway for a Safe Environment (GSE), who influenced local councilors to reject incineration. The citizens of Galway also responded positively by embracing the recycling scheme introduced at the time. Now Galway is facing another row about incineration, in Tynagh, East Galway. The Tynagh landscape and its community have already suffered the degradation caused by local iron ore mines in the 1980s. Local TD

Ulick Burke has stated that the mines in the area were never cleaned up, and locals suffered due to dust and emissions from the mine site. Now there are fears about the emissions from incineration. Concerned Tynagh residents have been quick to mobilise a widespread campaign that goes beyond narrow NIMBY or 'backyard' thinking, by putting together public meetings and a web page for their campaign group called East Galway Against Incineration (EG-AI).The group have also put together a petition, and have appealed for support from councilors in Galway, North Tipperary, Clare and Roscommon. Galway County Councillors have also objected to the incinerator.

The residue of pollution which resulted from Tynagh mines was the subject of an investigation by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in recent years. The investigation's key findings concluded that there was considerable concentration of metals around the mine site and streams in the Tynagh area. The study was undertaken by the EPA together with Galway County Council and the Tynagh Protection Group. The report recommended a long-term project to rehabilitate the site as well as precautions to protect the local environment and human health in relation to any development of the area around the mine. Recommendations for ongoing monitoring of the site for any disturbances which could release pollutants or of unauthorised access to the site and the prevention of entry to the site by livestock with fencing which would be regularly maintained were also made (EPA 2003 1–3). More recently the European Union has sued the Irish state over its inability to protect or rehabilitate mining sites including the Tynagh site. Similar concerns were expressed about contaminated water levels around Silvermines in County Tipperary with finishing plants in the area being criticised for disposal methods.

While many of these problems can be addressed the predisposition of the state is still one of lax enforcement of regulation in favour of industrial competitiveness. In addition the refusal of mining industries to address site rehabilitation increases the salience of the issue adding to the notion of corporate greed and indifference to host communities and their environment, a notion that fuels the simmering opposition to projects in rural areas. The incidents of degradation and protest at Tynagh, Donegal or Croagh Patrick may have taken on differing levels of environmental awareness or articulation. However, each dispute added to the tapestry of environmentally led rural opposition to industrial projects creating a reserve of sentiment which contemporary campaigns such as Shell to Sea can draw upon as part of their mobilisation and framing processes. The Irish state's consistent disregard for the establishment of a domestically orientated resources policy which would benefit the Irish tax-payer and protect the Irish environment has been heavily criticised over the years and has persistently resurfaced during campaigns from the Croagh Patrick dispute through to the sell off or our off-shore resources and the recent Shell to Sea campaign. The fact that these domestic resources have be sold off to the multinational sector means that not only will local communities not benefit from the exploitation of such resources, but that the Irish environment is forever under threat from future projects by a sector that has shown scant regard for community or environmental concerns in the past.

Part IV
Campaigns: Phase Two

Chapter 10
Conservation: Mullaghmore

Introduction

The conservation of areas of ecological significance or heritage value lies at the heart of many people's understanding of what essentially defines environmentalism. With the onset of accelerated levels of growth in Ireland since the 1990s urban sprawl has encroached upon the rural countryside in an alarming fashion. Furthermore, attempts to conserve scenic areas as heritage parks has led to the imposition of the apparatus of a tourism infrastructure on the very areas of natural importance that were meant to be protected. Inevitably this paradox has led to increased levels of contestation as local communities, state agencies and environmentalists debate the nature and location of areas of heritage and conservation.

While the frames of reference for conservation debates invariably divide actors into pro and anti development camps, these competing paradigms contain their own internal areas of divergence. Within the ranks of environmentalism, cleavages and alliances can become manifest between 'deep green' ecologists who may veer towards radical beliefs and strategies and the rather more grounded conservation lobby, in many cases represented in Ireland by An Taisce (the National Trust). The key points of divergence for deep green radicals and established conservationists develop around many issues the framing of environmental meanings, tactical approaches and demeanour during campaigns and perception of both sectors by the wider public. And while deep green radicals may wish to challenge the prevailing dominance of capitalism and consumerism across society established conservationists work within the institutional frameworks of the system, be they political, legal or cultural. However, both sides of the conservation lobby utilise a moral discourse to frame their arguments. For deep green radicals the issues of environmental protection are based on an ecocentric perception that privileges nature over humankind. Established conservationists on the other hand are less interested in challenging the existing structures of society but many of them have ecological expertise and concerns about conservation. For many conservationists the issues need to be considered on a case by case and sometimes species by species level.

As economic buoyancy has come to support agrarian dependency in rural areas the issue of conservation has taken on a wider moral significance for many in a

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland*.

changing Ireland. Economic growth had for many embraced a form of development which has been likened to 'a Godless mammon' and the construction of moral frames around areas of natural significance had taken on an increased primacy. In the Irish case this can sometimes be qualified by debates about property rights, commonage and access (Marsden et al. 1993 9). Furthermore, the emergence of 'eco-tourism' in recent decades has led to a new commoditisation of the landscape (ibid. 27, 30). With such a range of competing interests and definitions it is little wonder that the rural landscape has become the site of so many disputes. As the spatial geographies of territory and location continue to dominate plans for development and conservation in rural areas it would appear that disputes such as that which occurred at Mullaghmore in the Burren throughout the 1990s will continue for some time.

Background

The Burren or 'stony place' is home to one of Europe's largest and most scenic areas of limestone landscape caused by glacial drifts. Hemmed in by the Atlantic coast in Northern County Clare, the Burren holds a diverse range of flora and fauna, some of which are often found in Alpine or Mediterranean climates. The area is also the site of human settlement stretching back to the monolithic age and many ancient ring forts and stone ruins can be found in the area. In the early 1990s the debate over designating the Burren as a National Park with an Interpretative Centre to facilitate large numbers of tourists became a full scale dispute about the manner in which areas of special scenic and natural beauty need to be conserved. The dispute divided environmentalists, politicians and the local community and affected understanding about heritage and environment in the ensuing years.

Framing the Mullaghmore Dispute

The primary framing issues surrounding the disputed Interpretative Centre at Mullaghmore can be divided into the following components Property Rights, Rural Development, Heritage and Tourism Policy, Social/Economic Restructuring Consumption/Commoditisation and Cultural Debates (McGrath 1996). These issues can be examined in the context of understandings about the consumption of rurality and landscape (Marsden et al. 1993) through the advent of a tourism and heritage industry. The state began to implement plans to develop a largely unfulfilled tourism sector utilising EU policy initiatives and the European Structural Fund. One aspect of this policy would focus on developing amenities and infrastructure to facilitate increased tourist numbers (Dept of Tourism and Transport 1989 in McGrath 1995 17). Areas targeted for development included those with eco-tourist potential, such as:

> cultural, heritage and entertainment with natural heritage and business, including incentive tourism. (ibid.)

This model of rural development incorporates market rationalities into the processes of rural change (Marsden et al. 1993 27). Under this equation the rural sentiment, or attachment to local land or property, is replaced by market-driven values under the guise of economic maximisation and efficiency. Nonetheless, this model of change can be highly contentious as the emotive dispute about the Mullaghmore site would prove. The interaction between individuals and rural property has been identified as having a crucial, symbolic resonance which extends beyond mere enterprise or legal interpretations (McGrath 1995 25). However, as with many of the manifestations of rural discourse this perspective can become extremely problematic in the vapid legal arena (Peace 1997). The rootedness of one set of actors, as represented by the local community in County Clare created one understanding of the value or commodity of the lands of the Burren while the market analyses of EU or state bureaucrats would provide a different evaluation of the site entirely.

The dichotomy between cultural and economic evaluations of the landscape is part of a wider representation of heritage and landscape; both are interchangeable and yet remain 'bottom up' interpretations of the institutional or community sectors. In an era characterised by high unemployment tourism was prioritised by the state as providing 10% of GNP with revenues of over IR£1,000 million (McGrath 1995 27). As the tourism industry developed it came to be associated with certain environmental impacts as the infrastructure of tourism – hotels, camping sites, holiday homes and marinas – began to dot the landscape. Further impacts were created from the increased road building, traffic and waste or sewage plants associated with such developments (Kousis 2002 451, 452). Interpretative centres were seen as a necessary part of that infrastructural development in order that better understandings of Irish history and culture would be provided for visitors – 'creating interpretive "gateways" into our heritage' (O'Toole 1994 from McGrath 1995 29).

One such 'gateway' chosen by the Office of Public Works (OPW) was Mullaghmore. It was the OPW's view that the interpretative centre should be located within the heart of the Burren rather than in a nearby village such as Corofin, to facilitate greater visual access for tourists in order to provide a 'first-hand experience of the park' (EIS Statement 1994 cited in McGrath 1995 57). The result of this decision would lead to a sometimes rancorous dispute which impacted on both sets of local groupings that were for or against the project, and lead to a series of legal challenges at national and European levels.

The Campaign

The debate around Mullaghmore can be characterised as the mobilisation of competing sets of representation. This contestation began in April 1991 when Minister for state Vincent Brady announced the state's intention to proceed with plans to build on the Mullaghmore site. The OPW was traditionally exempted from planning

permission, as well as being in a position where it did not have to consider results of consultations with Local Authorities. In the months following the announcement of plans for the interpretative centre, The Burren Action Group (BAG) which had been formed to oppose the development forged links with An Taisce, The World Wide fund for Nature (WWF) and Plant Life International to present a joint submission to the EU Directorate General for Environment at the European Commission or request an independent Environmental Impact Statement before funding for the centre could be released (Colleran 2000 1). The joint submission framed the following issues and impacts:

- To freshwater systems from on-site sewage treatment
- trampling pressure around the proposed site
- Creation of a development precedent
- Traffic impact (www.burrenag.ie 2005 1–2)

In addition to concerns about damage to the water and lands around the centre the challengers were also projecting their vision into the future where any precedent set on developing sites in an area as fragile as the Buren would make future attempts to protect heritage sites very difficult. This framing approach was successful for the BAG and in August 1991 a significant ally was found in the figure of Dr. Ludwig Kramer, a senior official with the Environmental Directorate at the EU, who agreed on an environmental impact assessment and that structural funding would depend on evidence that no significant degradation would occur as a result of the centre's location (Colleran 2000 1).

The Action Group was also able to forge links with local opposition politicians such as Michael D. Higgins who was environment spokesperson for the Labour Party. Higgins was in a position to interact with Dr. Kramer at the EU through formal channels, something which gave the BAG access to the wider political structures surrounding the issue. As the EU had the ultimate say over environmental policy as well as structural funds the ability of the BAG to achieve access at key points of the political opportunity structure in this case provided that group with a degree of leverage over the OPW and the state. These networks led to the first strategic outcome for the BAG in October 1991 when Minister Brady, under pressure from Brussels, announced that there would be an EIS prepared on the centre.

The various components of political opportunity were located at particular points of influence or access on either side of this debate about representation. The Burren Action Group developed links with sympathetic political figures as well as building a social network which encompassed a range of locals including academics, clergy, teachers, artists and environmentalists. This coalition of activists produced their own alternative to the interpretative centre, one which would incorporate the needs of tourism with contributions from local businesses, farmers, craft workers and the arts, creating links between local agricultural and environmental practices while including the local population as part of the tourists' experience of the area (BAG 1992 in McGrath 1995 32).

This representation of a centre that allows for greater interaction between the visitor and the local community provides an example of a grass-roots response to

the OPW's plan, one which would have involved the community rather than being an imposition from the political core. At the heart of the BAG's representation of an alternative centre was the idea that local practice and custom was an essential part of life in the Burren which was inextricably linked to any wider understanding of heritage or environment. Notions of a landscape devoid of local inhabitants can be traced back to a neo-colonialist perspective whereby the 'tourists gaze' (Cronin 2000) is uninterrupted by indigenous society, preserving the relationship between colonisers and their conquest, allowing the traveller to maintain a privileged vantage over the landscape. The BAG's alternative vision of the relationship between tourist and locality is summed up in their proposal where they argue for greater recognition and harmonisation between the three main actors in 'the tourism triangle – the visitor, the host community and the host environment' (BAG 1992 in McGrath 1995 32).

The alternative proposal set out by the Action Group also challenged the notion that the Burren National Park should be run by the state, as was the practice in the USA. Rather, a model was put forward that drew on existing UK practice of shared management with local communities based on the incorporation of traditional methods of agriculture which have preserved the fragile ecosystem over time. Funding for this type of partnership model was located through the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the EU Habitats Directives (ibid.). However, the local Community was divided on the issue.

Many in the local community felt that the Interpretative Centre would have provided economic benefits for the region including an increase in employment. The employment issue was significant as the early years of the 1990s were blighted by a downturn in the economy. This pre-Celtic Tiger recession saw huge numbers of young people leaving the West of Ireland. The issue was a highly emotive one, with television news reports featuring tearful families saying goodbye to their young and then turning roundly on politicians for not creating the conditions which would have prevented this demographic haemorrhage, known as the 'brain drain' due to the loss of so many highly educated young people. In this context, many locals in County Clare wanted any project which could enhance job-creation to go ahead. The lack of any obvious health risks to the local community also gave the Mullaghmore dispute a different stance to previous disputes as mobilisation frames focused on the aesthetic resources of the Burren as an area of global significance.

The existence of competing sets of views in the local community led to a counter-mobilisation against the BAG as prominent representatives of the local civil society such as the Irish Farmer's Association (IFA) and the Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA) and political figures from the centre-right (McGrath 1995 32). This group came to be known as the 'Burren National Park Support Association'. The project's support group would present their own discursive framing arguments which favoured developing the economic potential of the Burren in order to facilitate the creation of local jobs in an area traditionally hard hit by unemployment.

From a mobilisation perspective the importance of the campaign 'entrepreneurs' (Della Porta & Diani 1999) on either side of this debate about the representation and conservation of heritage was a crucial aspect of the framing process and

campaign extension for both the Action Group and the Support Association. Significantly, both campaigns drew on understandings of rural discourse to underscore mobilisation and issues framing with contesting perspectives and meanings arising from the particular values either group were projecting on to the issue. Moreover, this contestation of rural sentiment went to the heart of established understandings of what rural community had been and would become from that point on. One of the central issues at hand was whether a sustainable rural community should use models of development, be they economic or environmental, to proceed with when planning for infrastructural projects such as the interpretive centre.

While the BAG put forward a cultural and ecological frame locating heritage and conservation with the local community the Support Group emphasised the need to draw down cultural interpretations and methods of development from the core based on a bureaucratic rational. This division in understandings of conservation can be seen as having two distinct objectives one having its basis in the concerns stemming from the environmental sciences, where expertise and research was used to promote the protection of wildlife and landscape wile the other combines concepts of protection with a desire to maximise the use of scenic areas as a resource for tourism and recreational pursuits creating two competing 'preservationist' and 'utilitarian' streams in the heritage movement (Green 1995 101). Both groups drew on the same set of environmental directives and laws to frame their arguments but with a differing set of values applied. In attempting to manage heritage sites as amenities both lobbies had to contend with a major increase in visitors to a limited set of destinations, often to the point where the area of scenic beauty came under threat of degradation (ibid. 173).

The framing of amenity management methods was crucial to both sides in the Mullaghmore dispute. Once large-scale visitor patterns have been established conservationist groups must measure the impact of their presence. One way of doing this is to examine the 'physical capacity' (ibid.) on maximum influx that the local ecosystem can endure. Infrastructural considerations such as the provision of car and bus parking or sewage treatment which were central to the Burren dispute can be measured through capacity frames. An extension of this measurement is 'perceptional capacity' (ibid.) which takes into account the diminished enjoyment of a site due to overcrowding or degradation due to infrastructural sprawl. In addition, an 'ecological capacity' (ibid.) frame can be constructed around measurements of how much usage can be sustained by a site in relation to the maintenance of its ecological features.

The Burren Action Group utilised each of these capacity frames to structure their argument. For the BAG the Burren contained such a fragile ecosystem that its physical and ecological capacity was very limited and would not sustain the imposition of an interpretative centre and its additional infrastructure. The extent of its fragility also attracted a particular type of visitor or group such as botanists or environmentalists whose perceptional capacity was intrinsically linked to a desire to see the Burren preserved in its entirety. With these frames established the BAG undertook a capacity measurement process, drawing on the considerable expertise of one of its campaign leaders, Professor Emer Colleran, who was the national

chairman of An Taisce and a microbiologist. At a conference on aquaculture organised by An Taisce in 1989 just before the Burren dispute began Professor Colleran set out her concerns about ecological degradation stemming from development. Her response was to argue for an inclusive model that brought regulators, industry and conservationists together with the public (Colleran 1989). This inclusiveness is further developed in the following quote from her address to the conference:

> The development of any industry is dependent on public acceptance of the industry and public confidence in its control by the regulatory authorities. Involvement of interested and willing non-governmental organisations is essential in order to win such acceptance and confidence should be encouraged rather than discouraged. The public has a right to concern itself with job creation, economic development and environmental protection and must demonstrate this concern in an informed and balanced way. Presentation of only one side of the argument, misquoting of scientific literature and exaggerated accounts of environmental damage. … is not in anyone's interest. (ibid.)

This balanced perspective provides us with an example of a prominent environmentalist's vision of how matters of ecologically sensitive development could be framed as in the case of the BAG's inclusive model of an alternative approach to the Mullaghmore issue. This framing process also provided an opportunity for the Action Group to acknowledge initiatives such as the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) schemes which targeted national parties run by local agrarian communities with funding provided by the Habitats Directive for Areas of Scientific Interest (ASI), or National Heritage Areas (NHAs) (McGrath 1995 32, 33). This framing strategy led to the BAG gaining support from a key ally, the Director General of the EU Environmental Directorate, Mr. Brinkhorst, who announced in June 1992 that arguments against the centre were 'compelling' and that he was recommending a withdrawal of European funds for the Centre (Colleran 2003 2).

The BAG framed their objections to the centre around a critique of the OPW's plan citing spatial and sectoral problems and a lack of managerial planning particularly around the spatial siting of the centre within the Burren to facilitate interpretation of nature by tourists (McGrath 1996 33). While acknowledging the significance of tourist engagement with the natural setting of the Burren the BAG utilised an existing Heritage Interpretation model proposed by Bord Failte (The Tourist Board) as an acceptable set of guidelines. The main points in Bord Failte's interpretation model included avoiding arbitrary developments, preventing wilderness erosion or commercial outlets and restriction of new developments which could cause degradation of the site (Colleran 1992 in McGrath 1996 33).

By November of 1992 seven key members of the Burren Action Group had taken a legal challenge against the OPW in order to obtain a High Court Judicial Review and sought an injunction against the development of the Mullaghmore site. From a mobilisation perspective, the emergence of the Acton Group's campaign from its local inception through to the creation of networks with key allies such as Professor Colleran and on to a legal challenge, established a route followed by many Irish environmental campaigns (Peace 1997; Taylor 2001). The need for key or 'influential' (Tarrow 1994) alliances with scientific, legal or political experts was a necessary part of the mobilisation process. The Action Group framed their

legal challenge around the main issues that the OPW lacked the statutory power to build the Centre and that the OPW's exemption from planning laws was unconstitutional. According to Justice Costello the presiding judge at the hearing the BAG's arguments 'raised an appalling vista for the OPW' (Colleran 2003 2). The seven Action Group members taking the legal challenge represented a cross section of relevant actors who ranged from local farmers, such as James Howard and Patrick McCormack, local priest Fr. John O'Donohue, media figures PJ Curtis and Lelia Doolin, as well as Professor Emer Colleran (McGrath 1996 34). This cross-section of people came from the immediate vicinity of the Burren or interacted with it in a professional capacity, which provided a sufficient interest for them to take their case. The General Election of November 1992 provided the Action Group with another political ally, Dr Moosaji Bhamjee, who supported the BAG and won a seat for the Labour Party in County Clare. Labour would then go on to form a government with Fianna Fáil, much to the chagrin of many who had supported them electorally. This coalition let to Noel Dempsey replacing Vincent Brady as the Junior Minister with responsibility for the OPW. However, Minister Dempsey was 'marked' by a key political ally of the Burren Action Group, Labour's Michael D. Higgins, who became Minister for Arts, Culture and the Gaeltacht, with responsibility for Heritage.

Despite a request from the Action Group's solicitor not to develop the Mullaghmore site before the Judicial Review, the early weeks and months saw considerable activity there (*Clare Champion* January 1992). A car park was cleared and sewage works commenced as well as foundations and structures for the Centre itself (Colleran 2003 2). However, two of the NGOs with which the Action Group had created links, WWF and An Taisce, challenged the European Commission's decision to provide £27 million in Structural Funds for the Centre, through the European Court of Justice (ibid.). This approach provides an interesting example of an Irish environmental movement using European legislation and processes to support their challenge, a somewhat under utilised strategy for Irish environmental campaigns. Undoubtedly, these NGO's had enough resources which made such action easier. Nonetheless, the Court ruled against the NGOs and the OPW gained access to all EC information on Mullaghmore (ibid.).

One strategic success for the Action Group came in February 1993, when the Irish High Court, in the person of Justice Costello, halted the development of the Mullaghmore site, due to the following reasons:

- The OPW's lack of relevant statutory powers to build which gave rise to an injunction against further building
- The unconstitutionality and illegality of the planning permission obtained by the OPW (McGrath 1996 34)

The Action Group had won a major victory against the OPW and was awarded costs. The state's response was to enact legislation legalising all previous OPW developments under the Local Government (Planning and Development) Bill 1993. The Act also covered all other state agencies (Colleran 2003 3). The BAG also won a victory when the OPW's appeal was overturned and the injunction upheld.

However the legal process also went against the Action Group and in June 1994 the High Court ruled that the state and the OPW had the right to re-commence work at the site under the State Authority Management Act. Over the course of the winter the Labour/Fianna Fáil government gave way to the 'Rainbow Coalition' of Labour, Fine Gael and Democratic Left, with Michael D. Higgins becoming Minister for Arts, Culture and the Gaeltacht with responsibility for Heritage. The Heritage aspect of this Ministry included areas of heritage which involved the OPW and Minister Higgins used his power to veto a response to the OPW by Clare County Council for more information on the Visitors' Centre, effectively suspending the project (McGrath 1991 96).

By March of 1995 the state abandoned plans to complete the centre and Minister Higgins withdrew the OPW's planning application to Clare County Council while simultaneously stating that he wanted the Mullaghmore site to be restored. In addition, the Minister commissioned a Management Plan for the Burren National Park within the context of an overall Strategy Plan for the North Clare region with Conservation Guidelines (Colleran 2003 4). The restoration of the site was to incorporate existing car parks as part of the Management Plan and that the majority of EU funding would be retained as part of a new centre built with greater consensus and input from the community. Some money was delivered from the fund to pay for the demolition of the partially built centre at the Mullaghmore site (McGrath 1991 97). Of course this decision drew heavy criticism from those in favour of the site, such as the Support Group and local Fianna Fáil politicians. This contestation of how Mullaghmore could have been represented through an interpretative centre was still strongly felt with many supporters of the centre arguing that planning permission would have been forthcoming from Clare County Council and the centre would have been of great benefit to the Community. Minister Higgins and the Labour Party were accused of being biased against the project (ibid.) demonstrating the extent to which the BAG had forged successful links with those in power, such as Michael D. Higgins, who had openly supported their cause. A decade after the Mullaghmore contestation appeared to reach a resolution the issue re-emerged as the state announced that it would employ the firm of Croskerry Solicitors to reclaim the state's legal fees to the amount of €35,000 from the seven plaintiffs to the Burren Action Group's High Court challenge in 2000. The decision caused considerable dismay amongst the Action Group advocates who had moved on with their lives. Many observers felt that the decision to seek financial redress by the state was part of a wider campaign by the authorities to create unpalatable conditions for high profile activists in order to deter future activism by concerned communities. The pursuit of the balance of the state's legal fees in the Mullaghmore case can be seen in the context of other anti-activist initiatives by the state such as the 2004 National Monuments Act and the Infrastructural Bill which was due to be announced in 2006.

The government's new Infrastructural Bill was designed to fast-track the type of major infrastructural projects which second-phase environmental groups have opposed since the 1990s (Leonard 2005). These projects have been at the heart of community opposition to state policy and include interpretative centres such as

Mullaghmore and Wicklow, sewage treatment plants such as that which led to the Save Galway Bay' campaign in the early 1990s as well as plans for incinerators and superdumps contained in the state's regional waste plans. While certain local protests about small-scale or low-impact technologies such as wind turbines or phone masts caused problems in the pre-construction phase many of these issues petered out after the erection or completion of the project. However, large-scale projects such as heritage centres, roads or incinerators were met with considerable opposition during the decades either side of the Millennium. The protracted nature of these disputes and the extent to which projects were delayed resulted in attempts by the state to create legal and financial impediments to environmental activism. While these issues were contested in a legal framework there was a political subtext to the cases contested by activists and the state in recent years.

In addition to infrastructural projects the distinctive sites of heritage which dot the Irish countryside have faced considerable degradation. Successive governments have attempted to address this threat by implementing a regulatory framework for Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) through the EU Habitats Directive. Emerging from the social constructionist and discourse analysis approaches that became a feature of EU state bureaucracies since the 1970s the regulatory discourse of environmental protection was introduced as an attempt to circumvent territorially based environmental disputes (Hajer 1995). One of the core elements of this institutional response to degradation and community concern is the concept of a proactive and reflexive response to ecological regulation. By the 1990s EU member states had embraced ecological modernisation (EM) in an attempt to address widespread perceptions of regulatory failure and democratic deficit. EM approaches to environmental regulation combines sustainable development with cost efficient regulatory models, ideas which informed the bureaucratic implementation of wildlife and heritage zones across the European Community (Leonard 1999 11).

By implementing forward looking environmental regulations for conservation and heritage areas member states planned for a rejuvenation of the process of environmental regulation implementation. However, this standardised approach did not take on board areas of unique distinction such as the Burren, a region without equal across the world due to its unique flora and fauna and fragile ecosystem. The hoped for reflexivity which was anticipated through the adoption of a regulatory discourse approach to conservation was further hampered by the Irish state's ongoing performance as an environmentally 'laggard' state (Weale 1992) which failed to provide any significant input into the formulation of European Union environmental policy.

Furthermore, the horizontal dialogue necessary to make a regulatory discourse approach successful has been conspicuously absent from the state's approach to environmental policy implementation. In many instances, such as Mullaghmore, a heightened awareness of local concerns on both sides would allow the state to anticipate inflammatory problems rather than embroiling the sate or Office of Public Works in a protracted dispute. One of the central features of ecomodern practice is increased consultation in order to facilitate more efficient implementation practices. The Mullaghmore case demonstrated the problems which emerge in

the absence of dialogue on the ground as competing interests respond to a perceived gap in existing understandings of local issues. By failing to address either set of diachronically held grievances the state was merely widening the extent to which perception of a democratic deficit regarding an overly technocratic approach to conservation was held.

Of course, the failure of regulatory conservation as a discourse is not a recent phenomenon. In the USA conservationists competed directly with Federal authorities over control of the Minnesota national park. After a century of contested lobbying, Congress passed legislation to create the park. However, the existence of opposing sets of interests each maintaining that they were taking on the mantel of environmental advocates led to a dispute between both competing sets of interest and the authorities. What resulted was a series of legal challenges to federal attempts at land acquisition in the area in order to evaluate wildlife habitats. A central feature of the dispute was whether the area should be used as a recreational and tourist amenity or preserved as a wildlife sanctuary (Lewicki et al. 2003 94). As in the Mullaghmore dispute the lack of consultation compounded local interest group responses to an environmental issue that required an element of local knowledge due to the distinctive nature of the region. However, the Minnesota case resulted in the appointment of an independent mediator, the type of consensus building approach the Irish state has successfully utilised throughout the Northern Ireland Peace Process and the creation of the social partnership neo-corporate model. The inability to apply mediation to environmental conflicts disputes such as the one at Mullaghmore is thus all the more perplexing.

There were striking similarities in the framing processes surrounding the Minnesota and Mullaghmore disputes. In both cases some sections of the population feared that tourist infrastructure would have negative environmental impacts in addition to challenging traditional ways of life in the hinterlands surrounding the intended heritage parks. Opposition to tourism and heritage infrastructure in both areas was taken despite anticipated economic benefits from increased visitor numbers. Each case presented expertly organised defence of space arguments with the added component of unique local ecological characteristics which would be threatened by any development. Furthermore, the officials who represented the authorities in both cases were framed as uncaring technocrats with little understanding of or feel for these ecological treasures. However, both campaigns also faced trenchant opposition from local economic interests who saw benefits from the expansion of tourism in cases of wilderness. For local tourist interests these areas represented an untapped resource which could ignite economic growth while simultaneously introducing a conservation plan through the development of heritage parks.

Both the Minnesota and Mullaghmore disputes were characterised by a great deal of emotive debate with a residue of resentment dividing locals into for and against camps. Those in favour of development in both cases were quick to dismiss opponents as ‘extremists’ and ‘yuppies’ in the Minnesota case (Lewicki et al. 2003 101) or as ‘blow ins’ and ‘outsiders’ in the Mullaghmore dispute. The involvement of US federal officials or EU bureaucrats in the disputes served to cause further

resentment particularly when local politicians stirred up populist opposition to environmentalists in order to appeal to local economic interests. The two cases also featured the issue of heritage becoming a political issue at government level with opposing parties championing causes for electoral gain. One strategic difference which separates the two cases was the tactical purchasing of land within Minnesota national parklands in order to complicate the federal compulsory acquisition process. Ultimately, legal challenges proved to be the most successful strategy for both campaigns.

Anthropologist Adrian Peace wrote about the 'contested space' of Mullaghmore which is embedded in an unwritten cultural code that can at times defy characterisation. He cites a definition of the contested space as a location where 'social positions are defined by differential control of resources and access to power' (Low & Lawerence-Zúñiga 2003 in Peace 2005). This analysis of a territorial distribution of power allows us to understand the mobilisation of the campaign to protect the Burren in addition to the counter-mobilisation by sectional interests to develop the site. For Peace, rapid growth and social change in Ireland have led to the rural landscape across the nation becoming 'perennial site for struggle' (Peace 2005 496). The onset of disputes such as the one at Mullaghmore has, for Peace, led to a display of previously unconscious sentiments that were shaped from national interaction with local hinterlands and landscapes. This unspoken cognisance of space has a very personal basis formed within the core of personal or family experiences in an area. When that area is as geographically unique as the Burren this sense of psychological mapping and definition becomes all the more resonant. Peace divided the competing sets of protagonists into two groupings. The first of these is 'The Supporters Camp' whose view of the area around Mullaghmore is one of an 'old crag' which could be exploited for its tourist value. The other group are characterised as 'the Opposition Movement' who perceive Mullaghmore as 'a sacred site' (Peace 2005 498–502). This group was a collection of disparate groups that came together under the umbrella of the Burren Action Group (BAG).

Peace highlights the fact that the BAG was 'well endowed with middle class cultural capital' (ibid.). However, he fails to acknowledge that supporters and activists from both camps came from across the class and social divides. It could be said that members of both groups recognised that the Burren was a sacred site and that it could also be a resource for tourist activity. It was the siting of the Interpretative Centre that became the focus of attention. For 'supporters' the site should be in the heart of the Burren to increase its tourist attraction in a county characterised by its location as a tourist destination. One local travel agent, Gearóid Mannion explained his own views on the issue. For Mannion, Mullaghmore was indeed a select area with a sacred aspect to it. For many locals it was a place of pilgrimage where a sense of spiritual rejuvenation could occur in the manner of their forebears. Locals had interacted with the stony landscape of the Burren through the ages and now this interaction could potentially be linked with the tourist infrastructure that had made Clare a renowned destination for travellers including Shannon Airport and Bunratty Castle. Mannion also felt the nature of tourism had shifted from Irish Americans looking for 'packages' towards a more globalised traveller who wished to experience

nature first hand. Therefore the Interpretative Centre needed to be closer to the source. A sensitive siting of the interpretive centre would facilitate new forms of eco-tourism, as the 'backpacker' type of traveller would make their own way through the Burren unless a tourist trail was provided for them.

An ideological dichotomy between 'supporters' and 'the opposition' was outlined by Adrian Peace (2005 498). The supporters' camp brought together the 'institutional pillars of conservative, petit bourgeois mentality … wedded to a conservative capitalist dogma' (ibid.). And yet this view hardly characterises young indigenous entrepreneurs such as Mannion whose own life is as intertwined with the landscape as any who took part in the debate. So it would appear that something less ideological and more socially complex occurred during the Mullaghmore dispute. Ultimately, the landscape at Mullaghmore was recognised as a fragile and distinctive setting which would be best left in its pristine state. In April 2005 new plans to manage the Burren National Park were unveiled under the auspices of the EU backed 'Burren Life Project' which aims to:

> develop the region under a sustainable framework in order to conserve the habitats and species designated under the EU Habitats Directive and to empower farmers to adopt land management practices to achieve a favourable conservation status for the Burren. (*Irish Times* 4 April 2005)

In addition, Clare County Council and Shannon Development announced their 'Burrenbeo' plan which would improve signage throughout the area as well as infrastructure and visitor management at eight 'viewing points' alongside increased development of driving routs to more 'robust' destinations (ibid.). This integrated response was welcomed by the spokespersons of both camps. Local TD and Junior Minister Tony Killeen of Fianna Fáil welcomed the announcement as 'the most significant development in tourism related initiatives to take place in the Burren' (ibid.) since the dispute began. Meanwhile, the Burren Action Group's spokesperson Professor Emer Colleran also welcomed the initiative stating that 'it was long overdue … and is to be welcomed as long as the proposals are open to debate and involve all of the stakeholders in the community' (ibid.).

Conclusion

The Mullaghmore and Minnesota disputes can be analysed to provide better understandings of the critical features of regional conservation disputes. While these campaigns can be located within the context of the economic and political control over the land and natural resources (Lewicki et al. 2003 116) and the relationship between property rights and the implementation of policy (McGrath 1996 25), ultimately the disputes have been characterised by competing sets of deterministic territorial frames which led to them being protracted. In each case local citizens have had to respond to policy initiatives which lacked local knowledge and provide alternatives which could be integrated into local lifestyles and

hinterlands. In other words, sustainable development would appear to require a degree of local consultation and input in order to realise any desired sustainability through conservation.

In both cases local experts were required to assess the extent to which local ecosystems could absorb heritage park development infrastructure. In fact local experts such as Professor Colleran were performing a plethora of services in their voluntary capacities as environmental advocates. In Professor Colleran's case these services included ecological impact assessment, the auditing of ecosystems, proposing viable alternatives to established heritage plans and stewarding of local conservation efforts. This was in addition to maintaining a campaign with social, political and legal ramifications while performing her duties as a professor of chemistry and director of an academic research centre. As in many local disputes such commitment to environmental protection defines a form of public service which affords advocates such as Emer Colleran with an enduring respect from the public which most politicians can only dream of. However, the success of individual or groups of advocates and volunteers should not come at the price of a complete withdrawal or abdication of state or local authority responsibility for regulatory discourse capacities in cases of conservation or heritage. Perhaps these are in a dualistic role for both the Environmental Protection Agency and watchdog groups such as An Taisce in future heritage disputes through the introduction of extensive public consultation processes before, during and after the implementation of heritage policy initiatives. This open ended dialogue should be readily achieved in a pluralist society and include:

> practical deliberation between and among environmentalists, developers, farmers, industrialists and officials from distinct, perhaps competing, subdivisions of government parties who are conventionally thought to be antagonists. (Sabel et al. 2005 117)

By recognising that nature is only a resource when it is afforded stringent protection throughout any development or amenity phase future heritage regulation may serve to transform attitudes while conserving environmental goods and creating an innovative form of policy discourse which embraces grass-roots and economic interests. The Mullaghmore dispute also serves as a reminder of the valuable contribution of environmental advocates to issues of heritage which have a complexity about them which go beyond matters of economy and development.

Chapter 11
Anti-incineration: Galway, Meath and Cork

Introduction

The onset of the accelerated growth that became synonymous with the 'Celtic Tiger' economy in the 1990s had many repercussions across the regions. One result was a series of discursive contests which emerged as a consequence of local opposition to the development of the state's regional waste management plans. We can locate these waste disputes within a wider dynamic which envelops the multilayered regulatory frameworks of the European Union, the Irish state and local authorities. The critical circumstance which gave rise to these local contests was the lack of any pre-existing waste-management infrastructure or policy at the onset of affluence and inherent consumerism in Ireland (Fagan 2003 68). As consumption increased so did the state's waste crisis as an ongoing over-reliance on landfill, at rates of over 90%, became unmanageable.

The primary reasons for this waste-management logjam were twofold. On the one hand European Commission (EC) regulations compelled the state to introduce changes to their waste-management strategy that embraced the EU's waste-management hierarchy which prioritised reduction, reuse and recycling and placed landfill as the least favoured option. On the other hand, local communities were protesting about the location of new landfills or 'superdumps' in their areas at a time when many regional landfills were beginning to reach capacity. While localised responses to waste management issues have been dismissed by adversaries as emanating from a NIMBYist or 'not in my backyard' approach, the emergence of a grass-roots response to the waste crisis has also been acknowledged as part of 'a networked governance' (Fagan 2003 69) in response to the inadequate or under utilisation of the communication and partnership models contained in existing state waste regulations.

The emergence of a national network of opposition to the infrastructural waste projects of the state occurred in the second phase of environmental campaigning in Ireland (Leonard 2005 111). This extension of local campaigns from their inception and focus into a national network addressing a range of issues can be acknowledged as a type of 'ideological development' (Szasz 1994) synonymous with anti-toxics and anti-incinerator campaigns worldwide. The broad spectrum of issues which

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

were embraced by Irish anti-incinerator groups included health risks, democratic deficit and the growth of a movement from local campaigning extending the NIMBY or local focus of a campaign and embracing national and global issues (Leonard 2005). This emergent mobilisation of second-phase environmental activism drew on the resources, political opportunity structures and framing processes of first phase anti-multinational groups. The achievement of the campaigners in delaying the implementation of infrastructure has been acknowledged although licences for some regional incinerators were granted in late 2005.

Background

The last decade of the twentieth century saw a dramatic increase in community challenges to the infrastructural projects of the state. Environmental and community groups focused on many issues with Waste Management projects and roads coming to the fore as the primary objects of campaign activism. These campaigns corresponded with a number of events which shaped Irish society in the 1990s. Without doubt, the two major events of this decade of change were the Peace Process in Northern Ireland and the emergence of an affluent, consumption-driven society which became characterised as 'the Celtic Tiger' (O'Hearn 1999). As the economic experience accelerated growth a waste-management crisis ensued. The establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1992 was an attempt to deal with the state's previous regulatory failure in the light of the increased responsibilities which followed on from the increase in environmental directives emanating from the European Commission (EC). While the EPA was criticised by some commentators for prioritising growth of environmental protection a waste management framework was put in place by the agency to deal with the regulatory and infrastructural deficit surrounding waste solutions nationwide. This regulatory framework for waste included the following initiatives:

- Waste Management Act
- 1998 Waste Policy Statement *Changing Our Ways*
- 2000 *Millennium Report*
- 2001 Regional Waste Management Plans (Leonard 2005)

The regulatory framework embraced the concept of ecological modernisation (EM) whereby the best available technologies would be applied to the processes of pollution reduction and prevention with costs and even profits factored into the equation. A system of Integrated Pollution Control (IPC) was introduced to facilitate the promotion of eco-modern techniques and expertise throughout the industrial sector. Local communities were also to be included in the new waste management regime with municipal and domestic recycling schemes being introduced alongside the new regulatory framework. This 'top down' approach to the introduction of a regulatory waste framework experienced two main setbacks a series of 'bottom-up'

campaigns of resistance from communities opposed to the siting of superdumps or incinerators in their vicinities together with a continued prioritisation of economic growth and industrialisation by the state and the Industrial Development Authority (IDA).

The continuation of the state's emphasis in the imperative of economic growth over environmental protection caused many to question the new regulatory regimes being introduced. In addition, the lack of public consultation with communities over the introduction of proposed projects such as incinerators caused many activists to become concerned at the growing democratic deficit surrounding the state's neo-corporatist model. While this model of social partnership brought the state, trades unions and industry together autonomous middle-class professionals were growing increasingly alienated by the siting of unwanted infrastructural projects in their communities (Leonard 2005).

While often characterised as 'NIMBY' or 'Not in My Backyard' forms of local resistance many of the community campaigns which emerged in the 1990s would move 'beyond NIMBY' (Szasz 1994) into a wider network of environmental resistance which had links to anti-war and anti-globalisation networks. Furthermore, the 1990s brought opportunities for Irish grass-roots environmentalism which had not previously existed and which emerged from the increased levels of education and expertise now found throughout Irish society as the brain-drain phenomena of mass emigration was reversed. This led to increased resources for communities including:

- Returned emigrants with experience of campaigns abroad.
- Increased networks, both domestic and global, due to internet technologies.
- Increased hostility from the state due to a series of social and political 'scandals'.
- Wider understanding of environmental issues due to media and education.
- The cultural phenomenon of environmental activism resulting from pop-culture concerns with Greenpeace, the Rainforest, World Hunger and Global Warming.
- The increased autonomy of the new middle class in Ireland who became 'floating voters' and were less restricted by family ties to maintain political parties.
- International advocacy researchers who had globalised their activities to campaign against transnational corporations (TNCs). These experts were available in person or on-line to communities to provide a scientific response to technocrats of the state or industry.

In this regard, many campaigns could not be strictly perceived as NIMBYist due to their ability to construct wider networks via the internet. The creation of knowledge-flows across the globe meant fewer campaigns could be isolated by the authorities or portrayed as acting merely out of self interest. Over time, environmental campaigners would emerge from their activist base in attempts to influence the political landscape either locally or nationally. Two such campaigns were undertaken in Galway and Meath by anti-incinerator activists in the aftermath of the state's introduction of its regional waste plans in late 1999.

Galway for a Safe Environment (GSE)

The state's regional waste plans included three options: landfill, which was the destination for over 90% of the country's waste, recycling and incineration. The inclusion of plans for an incinerator at certain named locations in and around Galway city caused local middle-class professionals to instigate a campaign of opposition to what was initially the siting of the plant but which would emerge into an anti-incineration campaign with extended links regionally and globally while attempting to influence the 2002 General Election (Leonard 2005). GSE opened up three main frames as part of their campaign:

- Highlighting health risks.
- Emerging from NIMBYism.
- Highlighting democratic deficit (ibid.).

These three frames sometimes merged into each other as GSE's leadership attempted to politicise their campaign by moving 'beyond NIMBY' (Szasz 1994) and single issue activism into a political entity which could mobilise dissent amongst the public while accessing the political structures of the mainstream parties in government and opposition. The initial phase of their campaign gave rise to a series of protests, marches and media appearances which allowed GSE to highlight the issue of health risks posed by incinerator emissions. GSE's health-links frame provided many protest links frames and also provided many potent images for the anti-incinerator activists to manipulate in order to create issue salience amongst the public. All aspects of community politics were integrated into GSE's anti-incinerator ménage, including exploiting anti-abortion sentiment still prevalent after recent debates. GSE prioritised the image of dioxins in baby's milk as one of their main health-risk concerns.

Furthermore, GSE outlined the damage caused to European agricultural processes when exposed to incineration to exploit another cultural frame based on existing mistrust of toxic multinationals in rural areas. In doing so, GSE were able to extend their cultural frame to embrace rural environmental sentiment while also preventing a rural/urban divide, something which would have benefited their opponents. This strategy resulted from the prior experience of one GSE committee member Aine Suttle, who had experience of anti-incinerator campaigns in Canada. Her links to the international anti-toxics campaigner, Dr. Paul Connett, would provide GSE with a vast resource of scientific data which provided the basis of their health-links frame. In fact, GSE were able to provide a great deal of information on incineration to the public, local politicians and media sources, to the extent that the interest driven data came to shape the debate with the state and industry being forced into a reactive stance. At the height of their campaign GSE were holding major public meetings debating the issue live on the evening news while their petition against incineration received 22,000 signatures in a city of only 70,000 (the county of Galway has an approximate population of 200,000 in total).

This mobilisation of support was also reflected in the extent to which GSE influenced local councillors who went on to reject the regional waste plan. Many councillors stated that GSE's campaign had influenced their decision while many reported an upsurge in voter concern on the issue. The state's response to this rejection of their waste policy was to rescind the decision-making powers of all regional councils on waste management issues, a move which provided GSE with the political opportunity of extending their democratic deficit frame. For GSE and their supporters the state's initial approach to pushing through incineration without consultation or referring to any potential health risks in the regional plan was one example of a lack of accountability or transparency on the issue. However, the removal of the councillor' powers allowed GSE to politicise their campaign by attempting to gain wider access to the political structures on a national level. The opportunity for that strategy presented itself through the 2002 General Election.

As the dynamic of the political opportunity structure surrounding the anti-incinerator campaign continued to shift GSE were able to extend their democratic deficit frame gaining further leverage during the general election campaign in the spring of 2002. Having decided against running their own candidate in order to facilitate supportive political figures from the mainstream GSE began to merge their three main frames into an anti-Fianna Fáil offensive. This emergence from a single issue protest into a wider involvement in national politics saw GSE achieve their most significant level of political access while also contributing to an eventual trailing off of their campaign in the aftermath of the election due to activist fatigue. While Fianna Fáil had targeted three seats in Galway West, GSE created strategic alliances with one government party candidate, Noel Grealish of the PDs and one opposition party candidate, Niall Ó Brolcháin of the Greens. Both were first time candidates who had offered high profile support to GSE throughout their anti-incinerator protest (Leonard 2005).

One of GSE's most decisive strategies was their plan to have all parties remove any mention of support for incineration from their election manifestos. This strategy afforded GSE significant access to the policy formation process at a point when the parties were most vulnerable to ecopopulist sentiment in the pre-election period. Due to a range of variables such as the vagaries of proportional representation, external and internal party rivalries and the clientelist nature of the Irish political system GSE were able to gain increased leverage during the election campaign resulting in all parties, except Fianna Fáil, removing incineration from their waste management manifestos. Indeed, parties went on to clarify their anti-incineration credentials in the hope of maximising support from the ecopopulist lobby. GSE also maintained their emphasis on the health-risks frame with the support of international anti-incinerator spokesperson, Dr. Paul Connett, who made a series of high profile public appearances in the run up to the election. As GSE's frames began to overlap the scientific expertise of Dr. Connett was utilised to reinforce the prevailing anti-Fianna Fáil sentiment as he called on Environment Minister Noel Dempsey to resign claiming the government had 'rejected democracy' by ignoring GSE's campaign (Leonard 2005 164). Both Connett and GSE were able to present an alternative

waste plan which prioritised the 'zero-waste' process, emphasising re-use, reduction and recycling. Zero waste was also promoted by Dr. Niamh Clune of the Zero Waste Alliance Ireland who claimed that vested interests are less than forthright about the safety of incinerators. She also claimed that in spite of repeated plant upgrades and the introduction of new flue gas treatment technologies, municipal incinerators remain unsafe and unnecessary technologies. However, GSE's attempts to influence the 2002 General Election had mixed results for both their own campaign and their political allies. In the run up to the vote in Galway-West GSE had set out their position regarding support for the Greens and the PDs in order to have a link to either potential coalition in the post-election phase. This strategy, however, alienated many Labour and Fine Gael supporters who had been active throughout GSE's campaign. Furthermore, it created a degree of friction within GSE itself as its committee was made up of people of various political beliefs from eco-feminists to radical republicans. It also put some distance between GSE and high profile political figures such as Labour's TD, Michael D. Higgins and local councillor, Catherine Connolly, who would go on to become Mayor of Galway in 2004. Both of these figures had been very supportive of GSE's campaign and would have expected a stronger endorsement from GSE.

Ultimately, it was the pro business Progressive Democrats who benefited most from GSE's campaign as he took the third seat from Fianna Fáil in a surprise result. Local media reports attributed the PD's ability to attract a 'green' vote in Galway-West as a factor in their success citing their candidates' stance on incineration as significant (Leonard 2005 175). In the final analysis, the return of the Fianna Fáil/PD coalition to power spelled an effective defeat for GSE's attempt to politicise their campaign. As the demands of striking a deal on a programme for government would come to prevent the PDs maintaining their anti-incinerator stance GSE's campaign lost momentum and the campaign was effectively co-opted by the local Green party as key members withdrew due to campaign fatigue. Essentially, GSE's key alliances had proved to be no more than a 'perceived' opportunity (Tarrow 1998) rather than the key leverage which would lead to their campaign influencing policy at a national level. Nonetheless, while municipal incinerators for Cork and Meath were announced in November 2005 any such plans for Galway have been delayed, with Fianna Fáil keeping one eye on the potential populist backlash in a future election.

Meath No Incineration Alliance (NIA)

At the same time as GSE were having their initial meetings concerned citizens in County Meath formed the No Incineration Alliance (NIA) in November 2000. The Leinster Regional Waste Plan (LRWP) contained provisions for an incinerator at Duleek, Co. Meath. The NIA was established in order to raise awareness around the issue through advocacy research and submissions, the first of which was lodged to Meath county council in March 2001. When the council granted planning

permission for the incinerator despite over 5,000 objections the NIA appealed. The NIA's committee had taken the decision early in their campaign to use the legal process in order to challenge plans for an incinerator. The NIA also gained national prominence alongside anti-incinerator campaigns in Cork and Galway for their public demonstrations and marches but found that an outbreak of 'foot and mouth' disease hampered their mobilisation during the spring and summer of 2001 (*Socialist Worker* May 2001). While the NIA was Drogheda based, Duleek was primarily a rural area. The concerns of local residents were heightened by Indaver's appealing of the conditions set out in their planning permission which stipulated that waste for the Duleek Plant would only be taken from the North East Region (www.Indaver.ie 29 August 2001). In the summer of 2002 the NIA's Eric Martin attempted to take out an injunction to prevent An Bord Pleanála from convening an oral hearing on the Duleek plant (ibid.). Martin would later take a High Court challenge against Indaver on behalf of the NIA. However, neither strategy proved to be successful. Martin was faced with a legal bill of €200,000 as a result of Justice Smyth's ruling; an outcome which demonstrates the risks taken by community activists who, when acting as named individuals on behalf of their community and environment, can be found liable for huge legal bills. These costs were awarded against Martin despite statements by government Ministers such as Michael McDowell and Dick Roche claiming they would oppose incineration in their own Leinster constituencies; an indication of the geo-political and populist spatial planning that surrounded the citing of incinerators around the country.

The NIA framed their submission to the 2002 oral hearing around health risks to people living in the vicinity of the plant. The NIA utilised existing data from communities affected by incinerators around Europe and the USA. As Duleek was within the designated heritage site surrounding the Boyne Valley the NIA extended their framing process to include a detailed frame which highlighted the ecological risks posed by the plant. By taking this strategic route the NIA were able to go 'beyond NIMBY' (Szasz 1994) by encompassing ecocentric concerns. In addition the NIA's ecological frame enabled the mobilisation of consensus amongst the region's tourism and agricultural interests. The NIA were also able to mobilise rural sentiment through this frame galvanising their populist campaign by presenting their case as one of rural community versus urban technocrats and polluters, particularly as waste from Dublin was earmarked for the Duleek plant. The site at Duleek was deemed 'fundamentally inappropriate' (NIA October 2002) for a development such as an incinerator. The site was zoned for agricultural purposes and the NIA highlighted the risks posed by the ingestion of dioxins through the food chain as had been demonstrated in European cases. Furthermore, the NIA argued that Ireland's 'green' image as a producer of dioxin free foods would suffer as a result of the development making the plans economically unviable. The NIA set out their ecology frame in the appeal by highlighting risks posed to the area's wetlands and areas of conservation:

- visual intrusion
- impact on Tourism and Heritage

- impact on ground water
- traffic impact
- property devaluation
- failure to consider alternative sites (NIA October 2002).

The first three points were derived from the NIA's ecology frame while the second encompassed more traditional, localised concerns for a NIMBY group. However, the NIA were able to emerge from any accusations of NIMBYism by extending their framing process to include wider concerns such as tourism, heritage and agriculture while maintaining an essentially localised core which drew on rural sentiment. However, much like the rural campaigners of the Womanagh Valley in Cork during the 1980s (Peace 1994), the NIA's rural populist frame did not translate well during the oral hearing process despite their establishment of cultural action frames. Another approach, undertaken as part of the appeal was outlining of the inadequacies in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) particularly in an area of fragile wetlands such as the Boyne Valley. The NIA raised the essential issue of contamination of the water table and underlying aquifer. The NIA combined ecocentric and anthropocentric concerns on this issue detailing both the risk of ecological degradation as well as the risk posed by contamination of the local drinking water supply.

The NIA's framing process also involved applying the EU's own waste hierarchy, which placed incineration and landfill last, against the plans for an incinerator. According to the activists the state's waste plans contravened the EU's waste hierarchy by promoting incineration over recycling. The NIA were also able to demonstrate the problems posed by the lack of planning for waste separation which would increase the toxicity of any subsequent emissions from the proposed plant. The NIA extended this institutional, regulatory frame by also highlighting the fact that incineration contravened the UN's own principle of sustainable development due to the contribution of emissions made to greenhouse gasses and ozone depletion. The costs of incineration also ran counter to the goals of sustainability. One interesting strategic plank of the NIA's campaign was their decision to run a candidate in the 2002 General Election. Unlike GSE, who attempted to influence the election externally, the NIA put forward the Independent Anti-Incineration candidate, Pat O'Brien. However, much like GSE, O'Brien's campaign effectively took on the mantel of being anti-Fianna Fáil. O'Brien also highlighted the growing concerns of Fianna Fáil backbenchers on the issue as ecopopulist protest votes cut into Fianna Fáil majorities in some constituencies. O'Brien accompanied a Green party delegation to Environment Commissioner, Margot Walstrom's office in Brussels to make a complaint about the government's waste plans. As Meath lacked a Green party candidate the path was clear for the NIA to put O'Brien's name forward whereas the Green's Dan Boyle in Cork and Niall Ó Brolcháin in Galway had been closely connected with local anti-incinerator campaign in those constituencies.

The last decade also gave rise to a series of environmentally related issues which contributed to a wider mobilisation of community-based campaigns. While these grass-roots responses were varied in size and duration they came in an era where

public affluence, expertise and disenchantment with the establishment combined to create a prevailing sense of ecopopulist dissent across the country. There were many factors which surrounded this response ranging from institutional initiatives through to enhanced communications due to the onset of the internet. For its part the state placed a priority on changing public attitudes towards environmental issues through the introduction of the EPA in 1992. Although the EPA has been criticised by some commentators for its pro-industry leanings (Taylor 2001) its presence on the national scene provided a focus for environmental regulation and disputes which may not have been addressed were it not in existence. Furthermore, the external pressure placed on the state due to EU environmental directives provided ecological issues with a degree of exposure which they otherwise might not have been afforded.

The Irish Green Party made gains during this period, emerging from *An Comhaontas Glás* into a party with representatives in both the Dáil and the EU Parliament. Nevertheless, this emergence has sometimes led the party away from the grass roots as the leadership at times attempted to justify its presence to potential coalition partners. The most notable exceptions to this can be seen in the election of representatives such as Cork TD, Dan Boyle, who was integrally involved with CHASE in the campaign against incineration in Cork Harbour. However, despite the depth of feeling which similar campaigns aroused in Cork and Meath the Greens were unable to further capitalise on anti-incinerator sentiment in the 2002 General election.

The local elections of 2004 were a different matter and here the Greens experienced a national upsurge in their vote gaining council seats nationally. However, while the Greens doubled their number of local authority seats, reaching nearly 15% in affluent Dublin suburbs such as Malahide and Lucan, their share of the vote was less than 1% in rural constituencies such as Mid Roscommon, Tuam in Galway and the Glenties in Co. Donegal. The Greens also suffered the setback of losing two MEPs in the European election (Kavanagh 2004 81). The Green party's failure to gain a foothold in rural Galway occurred despite using opposition to the state's plans to site a 'superdump' in the east of the county. A campaign of opposition emerged to contest the landfill which had links to GSE the city-based anti-incinerator campaign. GSE's committee were concerned from their inception in 2001 that the state would attempt to play rural and urban campaigns off each other, a strategy their members had witnessed in North American campaigns (Leonard 2005). These concerns led to the formation of the Galway Safe Waste Alliance (GSWA) which was comprised of GSE together with anti-landfill groups from rural areas such as Ballinasloe, New Inn and Newbridge. The GSWA provided Galway City and County councils with a joint submission on the Connacht Waste Plan (CWP) in 2002. The submission put forward their case for rejecting the CWP as well as providing an alternative plan. The GSWA framed their rejection of the state's regional waste plan around a series of issues dealing with landfill

- Rejection, on environmental and economic grounds, of the transportation of toxic ash from a city-based incinerator to a landfill in east county Galway as this was contrary to the EU Proximity Principle.

- Lack of updated site selection for CWP and lack of regard for health risks posed by landfill.
- Increased road traffic in rural areas.
- Insufficient attention to archaeological and heritage sites in the area.
- An underestimation of people's willingness to recycle (GSWA Submission 2002).

The GSWA's Alternative Plan included the framing of their position around the EU's own environmental principles of sustainability in waste management with emphasis on The Proximity Principle which emphasised that communities should deal with their own waste locally and that toxic waste shouldn't be transported to other destinations for treatment. The GSWA used the institutional frame to present a viable alternative. Their links with 'Zero-Waste' advocate, Dr. Paul Connett, provided the Group with valuable information on alternative waste management processes which had been introduced in Australia and Canada. Elements of the GSWA's campaign included court cases, lobbying public representatives along with the submissions and petitions against the CW However, perhaps the GSWA's greatest legacy is the partnership the group created across the urban and rural divide, an indication of the potential for cooperation and increased networking amongst environmental groups. This community-based campaign was built from existing grass-roots networks in the county, drawing support from disparate groups such as the 'Tidy Towns' committee in Newbridge to international figures such as Dr. Connett. The Galway Safe Waste Alliance also took on the mantle of local advocacy researchers, taking part in a visit to a 'model' landfill in Swindon, England, which was organised by Galway County Council. According to the group, this visit 'failed dismally' to diminish local concerns about municipal landfilling 'realising our worst fears and further convincing us that we will not accept a dump' (Newbridge Action Committee October 1999). The Newbridge-based 'Safe Waste' activists maintained a website which included details of the GSWA's major events while also providing information on alternatives such as recycling.

Other anti-landfill groups emerged in this period in Kerry, Cork, Clare and Longford. These groups voiced their opposition to Ireland's 93% reliance on landfill as its primary waste option, a figure which was second only to Russia (O'Sullivan 2000 21). Most of these campaigns involved local individuals taking a legal action against the local authority on behalf of the community, an indictment of the authorities' approach to consensus building and cooperation, two principles contained in the regional waste plans. Many of the legal actions led to the temporary or permanent closure of dumps in these vicinities exacerbating the national waste crisis. Local campaigners framed their challenges around issues such as nuisance factors, agricultural impacts and breaches of existing legislation. Threats to tourism and heritage were also prominent in many anti-landfill actions. The case taken by residents against Clare County Council over the proposed dump in Doora, near Ennis, led to a 23-day hearing where the campaigners highlighted environmental impacts rather than focusing solely on anthropocentric issues such as property prices, while the action taken against the Carrowbrowne dump outside Galway City

highlighted breaches of the planning laws (ibid.). Many of these events took place against a backdrop of the dramatic changes which occurred in Ireland in recent years. A book by the *Irish Times* Environmental Editor, Frank McDonald and James Nix, *Chaos at the Crossrods* details the major issues which surfaced in the decades either side of the Millennium. The issues highlighted incorporate a diverse range of problems associated with accelerated growth such as urban sprawl, uneven development, one-off rural housing and the conservation of heritage. Located at the core of these off-shoots of the boom economy is competing understandings of sustainable development. Sustainability is defined by the beholder and can be re-interpreted by state officials, technocrats, community activists or environmentalists. This has led to policy anomalies such as the introduction of the plastic bag levy in 2002 which visibly reduced pollution levels across the roadways of the countryside; while the state was threatened with a series of legal actions from the European Commission for non-compliance with 128 Directives. These actions involved failure to comply with legislation involving the protection of wildlife and nature, pollution, waste and sewage treatment (McDonald & Nix 2005 12).

The problems of sprawl, one-off housing and property values have confounded spatial planners and set the state at odds with An Taisce. The nature of the one-off rural housing debate set populist rural sentiment at odds with the 'official environmentalism' (Tovey 1992b) of An Taisce. As the debate about property rights and visual amenity became keenly contested throughout 2004 and 2005, An Taisce's opposition to building in scenic areas at An Bord Pleanála hearings led to calls from local authority officials that the body's proscribed status should be de-listed (MacDonald & Nix 115). The government's concern at its poor electoral performance in some rural areas during the 2004 local elections led to a rethink on legislation that would proscribe building in sensitive areas, an example of the strength of rural sentiment during the political opportunity posed by the onset of elections. While property location and values continued to be controversial topics in both rural and urban areas the government's expansive National Development Plan (NDP) has created a further controversy regarding the extensive road building projects which were at the heart of the state's vision of the built future. The emergence of the Green party in government may provide a new direction in some aspects of the state's developmental planning.

Cork Harbour for a Safe Environment (CHASE)

The area surrounding Cork Harbour has long been a site of contestation regarding environmental disputes. As the second most populated city in the Republic of Ireland Cork has experienced uneven bursts of planned development in between decades of neglect. The perceived imposition of industrial projects in residential or scenic areas has exacerbated the sense of grievance held by many in Cork in relation to state or multinational activities. In the aftermath of keenly contested disputes involving the Raybestos Manhattan plant and dump in Ovens and Merrill Dow's

factory in the Womanagh Valley during the 1970s and 1980s environmental networks were embedded in the local community. The political opportunity for further environmental campaigns emerged in the wake of the announcement of the state's regional waste plans in 1999. The inclusion of a provision for municipal and industrial incinerators in Cork Harbour led to the development of a campaign of opposition that grew from a local response by Ringaskiddy residents through to the emergence of Cork Harbour for A Safe Environment (CHASE). The campaigners embarked on a considerable drive against the state's plans for incineration which would eventually lead to CHASE offering support for the Green's successful candidate in the 2002 general election. In addition, the CHASE campaign established a comprehensive set of issues with which they framed their objections, aided by the expertise of Dr. Mary O'Leary, who became the campaign's spokesperson. This evolution from a concerned residents group to a campaign of national significance demonstrates that CHASE is one of the leading advocacy groups of recent years.

Background

In August 2001 the Ringaskiddy and District Residents Association (RDRA) released a document called *Ringaskiddy – A Living Community not a Toxic Dump*. This document charts the development of the area from the 1970s as the state and local authorities invested heavily in the infrastructure necessary to attract heavy industry to Cork Harbour. Multinationals such as Pfizer and Beechams were drawn to the area by the state's attractive investment packages. The process involved a phase of accelerated development which led to the loss of large tracts of the rural hinterland, transforming Ringaskiddy into a built-up, industrialised zone with little regard for complementary planning. Although this process was completed over two decades the local community remained rooted in its rural origins and displayed elements of rural fundamentalism during the many campaigns against multinationals that occurred in the 1970s and 1980s.

While there are obvious economic benefits emanating from this transformative process the costs in regard to health risks and increased pollution combined with the loss of local hinterlands have had an effect locally. The feel of village life of Ringaskiddy was lost and localised practices in the areas of agriculture and fishing were impacted significantly. The area has also seen local infrastructure and social capital eroded while visually 'emission stacks and exhaust plumes dominate the skyline' (RDRA 2001 20). For the residents 'community' is determined by 'common place and common purpose' (ibid.). The imposition of an industrial zone on their area, together with the lack of enforced pollution contracts, was seen as a threat to the future of that community. Seen in this context, Indaver's plans to build two incinerators east of Ringaskiddy were described as 'ludicrous' (ibid.). The Ringaskiddy community felt that it had conceded enough in the name of development and growth. By establishing a community protection frame the RDRA were drawing on aspects of rural fundamentalism to establish a basis for their opposition that was rooted in the local environment.

The residents' second frame was built around the health threats posed by incineration. By utilising the latest available material on these threats the RDRA set out the risks faced by those living near incinerators, including concerns about the affects on respiratory and immune systems as well as heart disease and reproductive deformations. These affects stem from the pollutants in incineration emissions, many of which are non-degradable. As well as airborne inhalation these pollutants can be ingested through local food produce grown in contaminated soil. The RDRA sourced this material from the latest studies by the University of Essex. The residents also used material from other scientific sources such as The Lancet Medical Journal report on students in Belgium, who were shown to have a high level of pollutants and dioxins in their systems, having grown up near incinerators. One suggestion drawn from the report put forward by the Irish scientists who reviewed the Belgian study was that it would be wise 'to embrace better technology in dealing with waste than burning' (RDRA 2001 6). In November 2001 the Irish subsidiary of the Belgian Incineration Company, Indaver, applied for planning permission to build a Hazardous Waste Incinerator at Ringaskiddy in County Cork. The local community, which had been mobilised in previous environmental campaigns such as the opposition to Raybestos Manhattan in the 1970s, prepared for yet another campaign. By the summer of 2001 the Ringaskiddy and District Residents Association (RDRA) began to mobilise a campaign of resistance to the proposed incinerator. The RDRA produced a pamphlet entitled *Enough is Enough* which set out their arguments against the siting of incinerators in the area.

The state's response to this external pressure was the introduction of a series of regional waste plans towards the end of 1999. Euphemistically referred to in the literature as 'thermal treatment plants' this option for regional incinerators provided further political opportunities for environmental campaigners who wished to oppose the state's waste policies. While this opposition has been characterised as 'parochial, subjective and emotional' (Wynne 1996 62) or 'ruled by selfish NIMBYism' (Davies 2004 86) recent studies have demonstrated that environmental campaigners who have targeted the state's plans for regional incineration have been innovative, articulate and politically astute in the way they mobilised resources and exploited political opportunities (Leonard 2005). Crucially, community campaigners against incineration in Ireland have been able to forge links with key experts in the areas of science and politics while in some cases maintaining the tried and tested legal challenge route as a strategic manoeuvre to support their campaigns. Essentially, anti-incinerator campaigns in the Irish case have mobilised communities and experts against the state's waste policy by exploiting the combination of rural sentiment and democratic deficit that has surfaced in Ireland in the recent post-scandal tribunal era. The Cork Harbour residents outlined in a document the risk from the ash residue which must be landfilled. According to their document, filtering and transportation process increased the risk of airborne pollution. In addition, no landfill site for such toxic ash existed in Ireland. Local concerns about dump sites from toxic plants dated back to the campaign against Raybestos Manhattan in the 1970s so the group asked where Indaver planned to locate such a site. According to the residents the two incinerators proposed for Ringaskiddy

would produce 34,000 tonnes of ash residue creating a considerable secondary issue around the provision of a landfill for this fly-ash which few communities would be likely to want in their vicinity. Further concerns were expressed regarding the extension of any landfill in order to facilitate an intake of toxic waste from across the country. Plans for an all-Ireland toxic incinerator and dump had been previously put forward by the state and the Northern Ireland office for a site in Derry in the 1980s (Allen 1992) and the RDRA feared a similar plan was possible in Ringaskiddy. Concerns were also raised by the residents regarding the capacity of the plant and its subsequent affect on road transport in the area during construction and operation (RDRA 2001 11). The group put forward a series of conclusions on the issue including the following criticisms of Indaver's plans:

- Inconsistencies between the criteria for site selection between the Co. Meath site and that proposed for Ringaskiddy.
- Emissions risk to local population,
- Risks to existing industry in the area,
- Risk posed by toxic ash (ibid.).

By the autumn of 2001 a new organisation, Cork Harbour for a Safe Environment, had been established broadening the extent of anti-incinerator mobilisation and enveloping the often radicalised Cork Harbour area. This mobilisation of existing residents and anti-toxics campaigners under the umbrella of CHASE provided the basis for a united front against both Indaver and the state over plans for incineration in the area. In order to reinforce this extensive mobilisation CHASE framed their arguments around the health risks posed by dioxins. The provision of expertly sourced data about the health risks provided anti-incinerator groups with their most potent image and engendered a good deal of public empathy and support. CHASE also outlined an economic frame stating that incineration would be expensive while competing with the more sustainable process of recycling. In order to appeal to the widest support base possible they argued that cancer rates near Belgian incinerators were noticeably higher over a three mile radius. The group noted that any plant located in Ringaskiddy could potentially affect outlying areas such as Cobh, Monkstown and Carrigaline, heavily populated areas where concerns over health risks had often been raised in relation to Cork Harbour's many toxic industries. CHASE also put forward arguments outlining actions taken by the Belgian government to reduce reliance on incineration as well as the EU's ban on the use of fly-ash in building materials on landfills, highlighting the potential problem of fly-ash disposal (CHASE 2001 2). CHASE was determined from an early stage to frame their campaigns around a wider community response that extended beyond local communities such as Ringaskiddy and Carrigaline. This framing process focused on certain issues to facilitate the clarity and saliency of the campaign. The primary frames of CHASE's campaign were as follows:

- Community wide opposition to the state's plans for 2 incinerators in the Cork Harbour area.
- Further opposition to all seven of the incinerators proposed nationally in the state's regional waste plans.

- The highlighting of the health, environmental and economic implications of incinerators.
- The promotion of public debate on the waste issue together with the provision of safer non-incineration alternatives such as recycling (ibid.).

A democratic deficit frame was opened up by CHASE, who claimed that the Minister for the Environment had 'forced through' legislation for the seven regional waste plans (ibid.). The group's campaign was extended into the realm of electoral politics in the spring of 2002 when CHASE exploited the political opportunity which arose from that year's general election. They targeted the Fianna Fáil which was the party of Environment Minister Noel Dempsey, author of the regional waste plan. A campaign of local press statements condemning Fianna Fáil for their pro-incineration waste policy was undertaken in the Cork press. In addition CHASE activists held a protest at the launch of the Fianna Fáil election manifesto at Government Buildings. The protestors were joined by anti-incineration campaigners from across the country and held up placards condemning the government's "Buy and Burn" waste management policies (CHASE 2002 1). The CHASE chairman highlighted Fianna Fáil's solitary stance on incineration:

> We are calling on Fianna Fáil to read the writing on the wall. Fianna Fáil are now isolated as the only political party allowing incineration as part of its environment policy with the PDs and Fine Gael rejecting incineration in the last few weeks due to the swelling tide of public opinion. (ibid.)

They were still concerned about plans in the PDs manifesto to implement a form of incineration, known as the Herhof Refuse Derived process, in certain Dublin local authority regions. CHASE attempted to highlight the potential instability in the coalition over the incineration issue focusing on the PDs' commitment in their election manifesto stating that no incinerators would be built in Ireland (PD election manifesto April 2002). CHASE also opened up a democratic deficit frame after the FF/PD coalition was returned to power. One of the plans forwarded by incoming Environment Minister, Martin Cullen, was a proposal to fast-track waste-management and infrastructural projects directly to An Bord Pleanála thereby removing an individual's or communities' rights to oppose or appeal planning permission for projects such as dumps or incinerators. The opposition and/or appeal strategy had long been used with degrees of success by environmental campaigners who cited objections based on the threat of health risks or ecological degradation. In itself, the lodging of appeals usually served as an important statement of intent by fledgling movements or campaigners while also serving as an initial mobilisation strategy which notified both the authorities and local community about the issue itself.

Echoing many environmental groups across the nation CHASE Chairperson, Sean Cronin, said that 'Minister Cullen's fast-tracking proposals were anti-democratic and anti-community responsibility' (CHASE 2003 1). Invoking the fact that the regional waste plans called for increased community input Mr. Cronin outlined the ambivalence in the Minister's position on this issue 'He either believes in community participation or he does not and this measure would indicate strongly that he does not'

(ibid.). CHASE was also keen to highlight the undemocratic and unsustainable nature of the Minister's regional waste policy claiming that his rejection of zero waste went against the democratic issue of public choice and participation in local decision-making. The Minister had rejected those who favoured a 'zero-waste' approach to waste management as 'short sighted and dangerous to their communities'. Zero-waste was a process that prioritised the reduction, reuse and recycling approach to waste, an option which was then at the 'most favoured' apex of the EU's waste hierarchy. CHASE was also quick to point out that incineration and recycling were competing processes, as one approach took waste away from the other, making the Minister's plans to introduce them together both uneconomic and unsustainable. Furthermore, CHASE learned that incineration needs to generate increased amounts of waste to make profits for the private sector rendering waste-reduction plans as problematic. They outlined the 'Zero Waste Plan for the UK', forwarded by Greenpeace, as an ideal alternative to introduce in Ireland, removing the need for an expensive technology such as incineration. The Zero Waste study detailed the feasibility of this approach presenting figures for required state funding and policy initiatives in order to make the plan work. CHASE called on the Irish Government to accept this approach as a safe and sustainable alternative while simultaneously decrying the state's waste plans as 'medieval solutions', i.e. burying or burning our household rubbish. They also outlined the fact that many UK local authorities had adopted zero waste as a target, as had many major corporations such as Honda, NEC and Hewlett Packard (ibid.). The campaign was continued by CHASE participating in the oral hearing held by An Bord Pleanála at the Neptune Stadium in Cork in September 2003. While oral hearings were a common feature in Irish environmental disputes the 'rural discourse' of early anti-multinational campaigns was often lost in the formal legal arena (Peace 1997). However, CHASE was able to emerge from existing rural sentiment by using scientific experts, such as Dr. Gasten Tusscher, to demonstrate the universal nature of the health risks posed by the dioxins found in incineration emissions. By extending their health-risks frame in this manner CHASE was able to contest the arguments put forward by the state while also highlighting the health affects which would be faced by all in the Cork Harbour vicinity if the incinerations came into operation.

According to Dr. Tusscher a series of worldwide problems with the dioxins, furans and PCBs that are contained in incineration emissions have been recorded. Health affects resulting from the ingestion of these toxins have included high mortality rates, diminished IQ levels and higher instances of respiratory problems. Italian studies outlined high instances of foetal disruption and liver damage after accidents at the Seveso incinerator (CHASE 2003b 1). Alliances with local politicians who shared their concerns were forged by Chase complementing the health experts such as Dr. Tusscher and providing a broader front for their anti-incinerator campaign. One such politician was the Fine Gael TD, David Stanton, who told the oral hearing that he saw no need for a national waste incinerator. Deputy Stanton praised businesses in the Cork Harbour area for their successful attempts at controlling production line waste and he argued that an incinerator would disrupt this process. Accordingly, he called on Bord Pleanála to refuse permission for the plant

(ibid.). By opening up their network circuits to mainstream politicians such as Deputy Stanton CHASE was able to extend their framing profile to incorporate common sense, pro-business arguments based on economic principles, which located their campaign within the sustainable principles set out by the EU as well as the state's own National Hazardous Waste Management Plan.

One significant political ally for CHASE was the Green Party candidate, Dan Boyle, who successfully contested the 2002 general election in Cork South Central. Boyle actively participated in their protests against incineration and benefited from the support of activists and sympathisers during his election campaign. As a councillor Boyle had lodged an objection on behalf of the Green Party against the Ringaskiddy incinerator. This objection presented several arguments against the proposed plant, including the problems of toxins, transport, proximity of housing and the fact that incineration undermines recycling (Green Party 3 January 2002). The Green Party stated that they would put waste management to the fore of any negotiations for government in any post-electoral discussions. Boyle also questioned the role of the incinerator company, Indaver, who had claimed that the arguments put forward by CHASE were misleading. Boyle claimed he had made representations to Indaver on behalf of his constituents but that he had not received any reply from them (Green Party 13 January 2002). Boyle claimed that Indaver was attempting to misrepresent CHASE's stance on the issue as part of a wider contestation of expertise between an advocacy campaign and the corporate sector. Furthermore, Boyle questioned plans to bring the Health and Safety Authority (HSA) into the planning process for the incinerator. Boyle also stated that the incineration issue was too great a concern to the public to be presided over by an underfunded HSA (ibid.). During the election campaign Boyle returned to the subject of incineration claiming that Indaver's highly paid for Public Relations was unable to present their side of the issue as clearly as a citizen's group such as CHASE, whose validity was based on higher concerns (ibid.).

Boyle had been expected to have to fight for his seat, with former mayor Deirdre Clune (Fine Gael) and disabilities campaigner Kathy Sinnott contesting the final seat. However, Boyle received 4,956 first preferences and outpolled candidates from both Fianna Fáil and Fine Gael as the Greens benefited from an electoral surge, rising from two parliamentary seats to six nationally. Boyle would continue to support CHASE after the election but the fact that the Fianna Fáil/PD coalition was returned to power meant that the issue of incineration still loomed over Ringaskiddy. Throughout 2003 CHASE continued their campaign using their political and scientific alliances to open up a new front which would lead to an oral hearing on the issue. In their submission to the hearing, Campaign chairperson Mary O'Leary set out the group's objection to the granting of a licence for the Ringaskiddy waste incinerator. CHASE also took the opportunity to criticise the EPA's absence from the hearing as the group's submission was delivered. The Cork activists also raised concerns about the lack of transparency in the licensing process, arguing that the EPA presided over events as both 'judge and jury'. In addition, the campaign highlighted the fact that the EPA was able to exonerate itself from any responsibility for its own decisions due to changes in

the EPA charter (O'Leary 2003). These issues were seized upon by CHASE to highlight the accountability deficit surrounding the EPA's remit, as the lack of public accountability caused poor policy planning and implementation.

CHASE again took the opportunity to set out their main concerns such as the fact that neither the EPA nor Indaver had addressed concerns raised by both the protestors and the EPA over issues such as the treatment and disposal of contaminated sludge from the incinerator (ibid.). For Cork environmentalists the lack of clarity from Indaver in the treatment of sludge called into question any other issues of toxicity surrounding the incinerator such as emissions. The campaign was able to highlight mistakes in the categories of hazardous waste which the company would be dealing with at the plant that allowed them to call into question all of the statistics being put forward about toxicity levels. Campaigners also raised concerns about evidence of Belgian emission levels being breeched on several occasions by the company (O'Leary 2003). The campaign set out six main objections to the plant in their submission. These concerns included the following:

- Risk to public safety
- Lack of confidence in the company
- Contamination of the harbour
- Terms of the Draft Licence
- Classification of waste
- The health issue

Each aspect of the core objections allowed the campaigners to develop their main frames surrounding each transparency, health risks and the raising of doubts about both Indaver and the EPA in the public's minds. Together these frames provided the campaign activists with the resources to construct a cultural narrative which merged with existing public concerns about risk society, democratic deficit and the state's carte-blanche approach towards facilitating multinationals (O'Leary 2003 3). The campaigners developed the objections put forward in their submission to the hearing from these main frames. The Cork campaign raised concerns about the problems surrounding the technology of incineration which, they claimed, was 'problematic and prone to fires' (ibid.). The group relied on the expertise of senior chemical engineers to contest Indaver's own expertise on incineration technology. Another concern was the nature of the waste being accepted into the incinerator which relied on customer statements regarding its suitability and safety for incineration. Any mistakes could have a devastating affect on the Cork Harbour area according to the activists. The campaigners attempted to contrast the professionalism of the community's response to these concerns with what they perceived to be a less than forthright approach to the issue from Indaver or the EPA (ibid.). The anti-incinerator activists highlighted the refusal of the Chief Planning Inspector at the An Bord Pleanála hearing who stated that he could not guarantee that there was no risk to public safety from the plant. CHASE also raised the question of whether the EPA were duty-bound to accept information on health risks from sources other than the applicant company in order to maintain the EPA's stated core values of 'integrity, independence and professionalism' (ibid.).

One of CHASE's main framing tactics was to create a lack of confidence in Indaver and the EPA's handling of the licensing system. The activists were aware that they could provide scientific expertise which would counter Indaver's own data. The group were able to draw on the long-standing mistrust and resentment of toxic multinationals which had emerged during the first phase of environmental campaigning in Ireland in the pre-boom decades of the 1970s and 1980s (Leonard 2005). One of the approaches taken by the campaigners to build on the resource of existing mistrust of both multinationals and the state in the Cork Harbour area was to point out weakness in the licensing process such as the EPA's reliance on data from Indaver alone as well as the lack of qualified or experienced staff for the proposed site. The group were also able to play on people's existing concerns about 'risk society' (Beck 1992) in relation to dioxins, toxic ash and the threat of flooding at the plant.

CHASE were quick to highlight some of their concerns about the terms of the licence such as the fact that the EPA required Indaver to build a second municipal incinerator without gaining planning permission for a domestic waste plant. This condition was included despite the fact the Cork County Council had refused planning permission to Indaver and had rejected a material convention of the County Development Plan (CDP) or planning permission for the plant. The terms of the licence also went against the Cork Area Strategy Plan (CASP) which called for the rejuvenation of Cork Harbour as a civic amenity following on from the clean-up of 'dirty industries' in the area (CHASE 2003 6). The group were also able to extend their 'democratic deficit' frame by highlighting the manner in which the licensing terms ignored the wishes of democratically elected councillors in the area. The campaigners extended their health affects frame by outlining the Health Research Bureau's (HRB) report on the affects of incineration on human health which sets out the problems that arose from the lack of adequate risk assessments for waste facilities in Ireland (ibid.). They also raised concerns about Indaver's reclassification of what they considered to be hazardous waste as well as detailing the 100 meter high toxic ash mountains which come from European incinerators (ibid.). The recommendations of An Bord Pleanála's senior planning inspector, Philip Jones, provided a detailed breakdown of the factors which militated against the granting of a licence for the plant. The senior inspector's report refused planning permission on the following grounds:

- The inadequate Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).
- An incinerator would go against prevention targets in the National Waste Management Plan.
- Lack of a hazardous waste landfill site.
- An incinerator ran counter to the Cork Waste Management Plan.
- The site was zoned for enterprise and industry.
- The plant was contrary to Cork County Council's objective for stand alone industries in the area.
- The plant was inappropriate to the development of Cork Harbour.
- The plant would be visually obtrusive.

- The scale of the development was unsuitable to the site.
- Proximity to high density housing in the area.
- Excessive traffic.
- Existing congestion in the area.
- The road network in the area was deficient.
- Risk to public safety (*Irish Times* 17 January 2004).

By the following January An Bord Pleanála decided to reject the report, overturning the findings of its own senior inspector, Mr. Philip Jones, who had also presided over the oral hearing. CHASE chairperson Dr. Mary O'Leary outlined the group's concerns:

> We are completely shocked by this decision. The case we put forward at the oral hearing was extremely strong…the question must be asked that if, in light of all this and against the inspector's recommendation, a project is allowed to proceed – what is the value of having a planning process at all? (CHASE Press Release 16 January 2004)

The group returned to the mobilisation of the local community to reinforce their campaign after this setback. As over 30,000 people had lodged objections to the plant public opinion was running high after the An Bord Pleanála decision. The group also responded to the planning reversal by re-establishing their framing process in a document entitled 'Comments on proposed incinerator in Ringaskiddy'. This document set out several main frames which were significant at that point of the campaign. These frames built on the campaign linking health affects and democratic deficit with concerns about the planning process. CHASE's concern with the disregard shown to local and national development plans was heightened in the wake of the overturning of An Bord Pleanála's Inspector's report and the fact that the second incinerator was exempt from planning laws. This overruling the democratic process allowed the protestors to extend their democratic deficit frame. In addition, CHASE were able to extend their health affects frame beyond its initial concern about dioxins due to the exclusion of health issues from the planning process, the lack of health monitoring and the lack of further research into potential health affects arising from the plant. The group opened up a framing angle around the location of the plant mobilising grievances about the special positioning of toxic incinerators in an area affected by flooding and erosion, with an inadequate road infrastructure, in proximity to the densely populated and industrialised area. The campaign also highlighted what was seen as 'unreliable' advice from the Health and Safety Authority to the Planning Authority.

The Cork activists opened up a discursive frame which set out to erode public confidence in the waste licensing process. Here CHASE could utilise existing concerns about democratic accountability and risk society to challenge the licensing system. According to the campaigners the waste licence facilitated increased risks from larger amounts of waste to be burned in an expensive process which made no provision for any clean-ups in the aftermath of potential problems at the site. Further concerns were raised about unqualified staff, the inadequate Environmental Impact Statement and the lack of health-risk assessments. In March 2004 the Ringaskiddy and District residents' association along with eleven harbour residents

lodged an application to the High Court for a judicial review of An Bord Pleanála's decision. The High Court appeal was adjourned on four separate occasions and in October 2004 no judge was available to hear the case as the authorities procrastinated over their response to the challenge. A protest was held outside the Dáil that same month along with other anti-incinerator groups from across the country. A letter of protest was handed in to Environment Minister Dick Roche as the campaign maintained a public profile throughout delays surrounding the High Court hearing. A second oral hearing into the licence for the Ringaskiddy plant took place between the 14 February and 1 March 2005. CHASE was joined by groups such as the Cork Environmental Alliance (CEA), the Ringaskiddy Residence Association and An Taisce at the hearing which was held at the Cork Great Southern Hotel. The presentation put forward by CHASE focused on five main issues drawn from the discursive action frames established during the campaign:

- Lack of a monitoring body for health affects
- Objections of An Bord Pleanála's Inspector due to risks to public safety
- Concerns about the integrity of the oral hearing process
- Concerns about the incinerator company
- Lack of planning permission for a second incinerator at the site (CHASE Press Release 14 February 2005)

The oral hearing also received presentations from chemical engineers who claimed that inadequate separation of waste could lead to explosions in the incinerator, a problem which would be increased due to the lack of experienced staff at the plant. Further concerns were raised about the absence of the EPA's Board of Directors from the hearing despite repeated calls by the objectors for them to attend, as the EPA board had the ultimate decision-making powers regarding any decisions over waste licence. The board's absence did however strengthen CHASE's framing of the integrity of process issue and allowed the group to further decry the EPA's behaviour throughout the dispute. CHASE exploited the political opportunity which emerged from their integrity frame by extending this position into a critique of Enterprise and Employment Minister Michael Martin who was TD for the Ringaskiddy area. His absence from the hearing was also criticised by the group who claimed 'the silence from Minister Martin is deafening' (CHASE Press Release March 2005). Minister Martin had gone on record as opposing the incinerator but the activists were in no mood to let any government representative off the hook 'The absence of the Minister from the EPA Oral Hearing at this late stage, day 12, is an indication of the lack of concern the Fianna Fáil minister has for his Constituents' (ibid.). The extension of the integrity frame into a wider critique of the government was demonstrated in press releases from April and June 2005 that criticised the government's attempts to introduce a National Infrastructure Board that would fast-track major infrastructural projects and free up the planning process. The protestors contrasted this with the state's lack of haste in establishing departmental responsibility for health-risk monitoring. According to the campaign members of the community who objected to infrastructural projects due to health or environmental concerns were 'key stakeholders' in the process. Their removal

from the planning process would be a loss to society which valued transparency, according to the group. For the Cork campaign the National Infrastructural Board (NIB) represented a 'further erosion of democracy' (CHASE press releases April and June 2005).

However, on 25 November 2005 the EPA announced its decision to grant a waste licence to Indaver Ireland to operate a 100,000 tonne municipal waste incinerator at Ringaskiddy. CHASE announced their anger at the move but claimed it came as 'no surprise' due to previous decisions of the EPA. According to the campaigners the EPA 'had not fulfilled their legal obligations and have exposed the public to unnecessary harm' (CHASE press release 25 November 2005). The subsequent explosion at an oil storage depot in Hemel Hempstead in the UK, which shrouded parts of London in a toxic fog, was seized upon by CHASE as an example of what could happen at the Ringaskiddy plant. The Cork Environmental Alliance (CEA) were critical of what they saw as the EPA's 'manipulation' of the waste licence issue accusing the agency of issuing their most controversial 'bad news' announcements 'during periods of least media attention' in August or at Christmas (*Ireland from Below* November 2005). CHASE chairperson Mary O'Leary, summed up the emotive response of anti-incinerator campaigners in the area 'the last time Cork was burning we could blame the Black and Tans. This time the burning is just a bit more refined' (ibid.). For their part Indaver Ireland was just as apprehensive about the campaigners who opposed them. Their managing director, John Ahern, claimed he was 'terrified' of the Cork campaigners 'who had given the company a tough time' (ibid.). Ahern also claimed he felt that previously existing sentiment which had built up from the asbestos plant controversy in the 1970s led to the strength of opposition the company had encountered and that the company and CHASE 'should have met more often' (ibid.).

Conclusion

The major campaigns against incineration in Ireland that have occurred in a variety of locations including those at Galway, Meath and Cork are studied in this book. Other anti-incineration campaigns have taken place in Poolbeg, County Dublin, in County Clare and in Wexford. While many of these protests were undertaken at the sites proposed for incinerators the campaigns extended beyond their initial single issue dispelling the notion of anti-incinerator campaigns as being merely NIMBYist in focus. The campaigns in Galway and Meath differed in their tactical approaches. One of the main areas of distinction was the use of ecological expertise on the aqua-life and plant life of the Boyne Valley, which NIA used to create a heritage frame. This allowed their protest to move beyond the single issue of being simply anti-incinerator and falling into the NIMBY trap. Another strategic area where NIA and GSE differed was on taking legal action. GSE considered this option but took the decision to gain leverage from the political opportunity of the 2002 general election. NIA took the legal hearing route in the form of a case taken

by environmental advocate Eric Martin. The judicial review of An Bord Pleanála's decision to grant a licence for an incinerator at the Duleek site places the ecology of the Boyne Valley and specifically the limestone reserve and aquifer at the centre of its opposition. By linking heritage and health frames NIA presented an extensive set of arguments against the incinerator planned for their area despite the outcome of the hearing.

GSE's campaign was influenced by the more politicised members of its committee who took the view that any campaign against incineration should exploit political opportunities such as the 2002 general election to challenge the coalition government and Fianna Fáil specifically. However, the reversals suffered by the 'Soldiers of Destiny' in the 2004 local elections demonstrate the leverage that campaigns can achieve at the local level. The anti-incinerator campaigns in Galway and elsewhere have also led to the mobilisation of a community-based environmentalism which has forged networks nationally and internationally. The campaign against incineration in Cork can be located within the overall context of a series of ongoing campaigns by residents in Cork Harbour and its environs stretching back to the Raybestos Manhattan dispute in the 1970s. Essentially, Cork Harbour has been a site of disaffected protest by local citizens who carried concerns about the environmental and health risks posed by the state backed industrial sector through what has been identified as the two phases of environmental protest in Ireland. The Cork environmental protests occurred throughout both of these stages which included first phase anti-multinational campaigns which had a radical left influence and second-phase anti-infrastructural protests which were influenced by the anti-globalisation movement. In the first phase the state's pre-economic growth concern for multinational-led development at almost any cost forced many communities to view the consequences of a toxic industry locating in their area. In the second phase, the post-boom era, the state's attempts to introduce waste management and roads infrastructure in the wake of hyper-consumption resulted in campaigns of opposition from local communities concerned about the environmental and health risks posed by waste technologies or urban sprawl (Leonard 2005 45). While CHASE undertook a series of strategies to highlight their concerns about the health affects posed by incineration they were unable to prevent the announcement that licences for two incinerators for the area would be granted.

The reason for this setback is complex and has its basis in the state's planned development of the Cork Harbour region which dates back to the late 1960s. As Ireland's manufacturing sector declined in the wake of globalisation the imperative to develop Cork Harbour as a hub for US chemical and pharmaceutical industries increased. One of the core infrastructural projects required to make this form of regional development work is an industrial incinerator which can cope with the massive outflow of toxic waste produced by chemical industries. By opposing both the industrial and municipal incinerators planned for Cork Harbour CHASE found their campaign targeting the state's industrial development plan for the region in addition to the state's waste management plans. While leverage in relation to political structures may have been achieved through events such as the onset of elections or

highlighting local grievances the battle for Cork Harbour was one which the state could not afford to lose. Ultimately, while CHASE vowed to continue their campaign in light of the granting of the licence for an incinerator in the area strategically their campaign may need to be reassessed with a focus on emissions monitoring replacing the goal of preventing incinerators in the long term.

Chapter 12
Resources: The Rossport 5 (Shell to Sea)

Introduction

In a review of *The Quest For Environmental Justice* Christopher Rootes highlights what he calls a 'characteristically incisive' contribution from American eco-activist Chris Foreman who argues that 'environmental justice is less about disparity of risk than about community empowerment' (Rootes 2006 138). However, this bold statement is qualified by the claim that communities are more likely to respond to the threat of 'serious risk' to their area in order to maintain their common interest over any other environmental issue. Looking further back in our own history we know that rural or peasant society had many occasions to strike out in common cause as has been noted by Michael Peillon who has noted the significance of the 'land wars' of the 19th century as a key determinant of social change in that era. Peillon locates the Land League within the context of a rural social movement that attempted to address not only economic change but also less tangible issues such as 'insecurity' and 'resentment' (Peillon 1982 60). The rise of the Land League represented a resistance campaign of collective action by the farmers (ibid.) which drew on tactics such as boycotting, ambush and even assassination. The west of Ireland had a long history of radical activism:

> The power of community interests to assert themselves … was grounded in a long tradition of activism. (Varley & Curtin 2006 441)

Populist collective action in the west had its roots in localised attempts to gain leverage with authorities in a lineage that could be traced back to pre-Famine times. In parts of the west, the Irish language was still spoken, old traditions were maintained and scientific or technological advances still competed with traditional practices in rural areas. Holding true to the ideals of community and tradition allowed western communities to resist the worst excesses of modernity, and provided a clearer understanding of the ethical values now lost to those who embraced industrialised 'modernity', creating a localised form of 'ecopopulism'. By rejecting the constraints of consumer driven capitalist growth in order to protect the environment, ecopopulists have moved beyond the single issue that motivated local mobilisation, going beyond parochial fear in order to embrace a wider sentiment of ethically derived hope, and in the process becoming the environmentalists with

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

'feelings for nature' (Smith 2005 146–148); embracing the role of 'denizens' (ibid.) who advocate for nature as a result of this ethical transformation. This position is articulated by Shell to Seas Micheál Ó Seighin, who claims that local resistance goes beyond the economic and stems from deeper concerns about democratic deficit and degradation of place. In the case of Micheál and Caitlín Ó Seighin, this emphasis is articulated through a localised discourse which reflects underlying concerns for the hinterland:

> I just love the place, the history of it, the people the songs, the stories and the way of life here … when I was growing up we were full of stories about our own area in particular … there is a means of connecting with this place through the Irish language … with Irish the entire area is a unity, whereby the place where thing happen becomes part of the event itself … in telling anecdotes you find yourself spatially establishing them all the time … as a language that is not borrowed but indigenous, its idioms and dialectic difference have been honed to represent and describe a world always changing which has the effect of tying the people together. (Garavan et al. 2006)

Such attitudes were borne of a community that had a lineage of local resistance to outside interference which arose from political acquiescence in Dublin. In the latter half of the 19th century, the Land League succeeded in mobilising rural dissent in Irish society and nowhere is this sentiment more deeply felt than in County Mayo, home of Michael Davitt. From the Land League Irish farmers gained rates and tenure rights long before the foundation of the Irish state. Other social phenomena such as the rise of the cooperative movement alongside the 'meitheal system' of pooled labour share their origins with collective mobilisation of the farmers of the West of Ireland with a link between Davitt's movement that can be traced through subsequent groups such as Muintir na Tire, the Irish Farmers Association (IFA) and the 'Save the West' campaign of the 1960s and 1970s. With the commencement of the laying of a gas pipeline through the heartland of the Erris coastline in North Mayo the underlying psyche which has its roots in prior rural collective action was resurrected. The resulting Shell to Sea campaign has witnessed the mobilisation of rural sentiment in addition to something far more 'visceral' in the words of Mark Garavan the campaign's spokesperson.

While the attempt to lay the pipeline represented an invasion of space for many locals this trespassing on a space that is seen as 'sacred' by some including the Rossport 5's Micheál Ó Seighin who has noted the 'continuum' between those who agitated through the Land League in the past and the wider community who feel threatened by the gas pipeline project today. This dispute centres on the location of an onshore gas pipeline, which has led to the imprisonment of local protesters in a conflict which gripped Irish society and won the support of Ken Saro Wiwa's brother, alongside other concerned activists from Nigeria, the UK and Norway (Leonard 2006). The region includes a series of beaches and bogs which incorporates a Natural Heritage Area, a designated Area of Special Scenic Importance and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The area is surrounded by the Blue Stack Mountains to the north and Benbulben to the east, with the heritage site at the Céide Fields home to one of the world's earliest agricultural sites. The drinking water is drawn from local lakes, and the traditional fishing and farming communities have

populated the area since prehistoric times (Connolly & Lynch 2005). The local bay is home to whales, dolphins and other sea life. This sensitive ecosystem and traditional community are now threatened by the mass excavations and digging of the multinationals intent on exploiting the vast resources of natural gas off the Mayo coastline. However, locals want the gas to be processed offshore, reducing the environmental degradation and risk. This dispute has its basis in the lack of consultation with, and understanding of, this *Gaeltacht* community which is rooted in its ancient region.

Background

The debate about natural resources ignited with a vengeance in the aftermath of the announcement that Shell were to build a gas pipeline from the Corrib field 80 km offshore through the townlands of County Mayo in 2001. Five local men were imprisoned for 94 days as a result of their campaign against the pipeline which widened the mobilisation of support for the men and their families from around the nation and beyond. The campaign also saw the re-awakening of some of the rhetoric of the past as the spirit of the 19th century nationalist leader Michael Davitt was evoked at rallies across the country. The story of the 'Rossport 5' as Micheál Ó Seighinn, Vincent McGrath, Phillip McGrath, Brendan Philbin and Will Corduff came to be known in the summer of 2005 caught the nation's imagination while the Shell to Sea campaign mobilised mass support at protests and rallies across Ireland. The deals made by successive governments with multinationals were highlighted in a rousing speech given by left wing TD Michael D. Higgins to a Shell to Sea rally in Galway in August 2005:

> I'm glad we're having a seminar on this issue, it's badly needed in this country. I was involved in the Resource Protection Campaign in 1973. At that time, Energy Minister Justin Keating, signed away the licences for bounty-payment. Then the state had the right to participate in decision making about resources. The people must be allowed to have ownership and maintain controls over the companies doing the drilling. Our resources are finite so the state should be involved. In 1977 Keating lost his seat and Jack Lynch's Fianna Fáil government came in on a populist wave of support. Now, Keating was criticised by us- but now the people got people like Ray Burke. There is now an absence of moral courage. I hear people speaking of Michael Davitt; well the people of the left said that our resources shouldn't be taken from us.
>
> The five men in jail are a reflection on law and morality because they wanted to protect their families. The injunction is flawed because the state hadn't given permission for the pipeline. These men have contempt for an injunction that is based on a lie. The government should ask for the injunction to be lifted. Minister, it's not your gas. You will have to buy it from the company; I suppose we poor peasants should be on our knees and carry the multinationals. Every aspect of this deal stinks! It should face a tribunal of inquiry. This project should be examined in all its aspects. Shell speaks of their projects in Africa where the poorest companies have their resources taken from them by colonising multinationals. Here in Ireland Davitt's heart was broken. He said 'the end will come – but the people will be gone'. There is a need for a change of consciousness. We must show solidarity for the men and their magnificent families. They have but one small demand – that the gas is cleaned at sea.

> There is something ugly happening in Ireland when people now have affluence and land. Some of our politicians have behaved outrageously. This should not be about personalities; we should oppose the culture of greed. They have sold off our resources, our gas, our fisheries. They're not ours anymore. This is the culture of greed they voted for. I support these men and their families. I demand their release and this entire story must go before a Tribunal and I'm speaking as President of the Labour party one of whose founders was Michael Davitt. (Michael D. Higgins, TD, August 2005).

The campaign of the Resource Protection Group (RPG) was involved in disputes about mineral resources in the 1970s and 1980s. This left wing group which included a young Michael D. Higgins as one of its spokespersons was critical of the Labour party Industry and Commerce Minister Justin Keating's plans to develop oil and gas resources. Under Minister Keating's terms set out in 1975 the state would retain a 50% stake in any development of our offshore resources without having to play exploration costs. Keating was influenced by the Norwegian government's state oil company Statoil and hoped to launch a partnership with the multinational sector (Connolly & Lynch 2005 9). This partnership was heavily criticised by the Resource Protection Group who maintained an ideologically driven opposition to any involvement by the multinational sector in the resources of the state which they claimed ultimately belong to the people of Ireland.

However, the Irish electorate were less concerned about resources at that time and in 1977 elected Jack Lynch's Fianna Fáil government on a populist ticket that included plans to develop all available resources to stimulate economic growth. Keating's successor Des O'Malley established the Irish National Petroleum Corporation (INPC) in response to the global oil crisis which had seen a dramatic rise in the cost of petrol. By 1985 Labour energy minister Dick Spring reduced state dividends and participation in offshore explorations (ibid.). However, by 1987 Fianna Fáil was returned to power and Ray Burke became energy minister. Burke had been criticised for the manner in which he drew off the new conditions for drilling licences which were seen as being too favourable to the industries (Campbell December 2002). Sinn Fein TD Martin Ferris claimed Burke 'was responsible for the rape of our natural resources' (ibid.). SIPTU's Joe O'Toole has claimed that under the new terms established by Burke the inclusion of onshore pipelines was critical to the commercial success of any offshore find (ibid.). It was the issue of the onshore pipelines running alongside the homes of the Rossport 5 which would ultimately ignite that controversy.

In 1986 the Corrib gas field was discovered off the Mayo coast. It was the second largest in the country after the Kinsale field which was the subject of some controversy in the 1970s. In 2001 primary applicants Enterprise Oil in conjunction with Statoil and Marathon applied to the Department of Marine and Natural Resources for a lease to develop the Corrib Field at an estimated cost of $400 million. Marine Minister Frank Fahey claimed the news was 'most opportune' due to the decline in the Kinsale Field which had provided much of Ireland's indigenous gas supply (www.corribsos.com 16 January 2001). Planning permission for a processing plant at a 400 acre site at Ballinaboy was granted in August 2001 while a petroleum line was agreed in November of that year. At the same time the government announced new compulsory purchase orders for inland pipelines that allowed

private land to be occupied over the objections of the owners (Connolly & Lynch 2005 14). Here the state was facilitating land occupation directly and whereas past disputes such as Tynagh mines were characterised as exploiting people's ignorance of their rights now the state was actively consorting with industry against local landowners through their law-muting capacity. Clearly the state had hoped that local opposition could be stymied when faced with the law making capacity of the state. By March 2002 an amendment to the Gas Act allowed commercial industries entry to private lands under the new compulsory acquisition rights (ibid.). The An Bord Pleanála oral hearing against the planning permission for the onshore terminal had commenced at this point. An Bord Pleanála's senior planning inspector, Kevin Moore, concluded that the site was inadequate claiming that Rossport was 'the wrong site' from the perspective of 'strategic planning…government policy on regional development…minimising environmental impacts and sustainable development' (ibid.).

Enterprise Ireland (EEI) responded to these findings by announcing it would delay the laying of the offshore pipeline in order to address the concerns of An Bord Pleanála (RTÉ News July 2002). In the autumn local residents in Rossport, along with environmentalists and political figures, announced that they would be 'renewing their opposition to the terminal' (corribsos.com 23 October 2002). Having put their case to the oral hearing the objectors made the decision to extend their campaign. Plans were made to make a submission to a second oral hearing in November when An Bord Pleanála reviewed EEI's reappraisal of the safety and suitability concerns raised previously. The Rossport objectors had already opened up a network of 'political circuits' (Tilly 2004) which embraced local farming and fishing groups as well as local politicians such as the Independent TD Jerry Cowley. However, other local groups such as the Council of the West had called for support to be shown for the gas pipeline. The Rossport objectors also found support from Sinn Fein who criticised the Taoiseach for meeting the President of Shell Oil in October as TD Caoimhghin O'Caoláin queried whether the meeting had any bearing on the proposed critical infrastructure Bill particularly in light of Shell's 'special treatment' on royalties (www.corribsos.com 14 October 2002), criticism which the Taoiseach denied.

On the 27th of November the English television station Channel 4 ran a news item which questioned the plans for an onshore pipeline and terminal in County Mayo. The report claimed that locals had faced pressure to sign over their property and that the deal with the Royal Dutch Shell company was 'unprecedented in Europe' (*The Irish Examiner* 27 November 2002). Records were produced in the report which raised allegations of political interference and pressure being brought to bear on Mayo County Council's planning committee while it was also revealed that Fianna Fáil received donations from two of the companies involved in the Corrib Field operation. The Channel 4 report was critical of the manner in which Ireland's national resources were being given away without any revenue making its way back to the Irish taxpayer with the Corrib deal giving a poorer return than similar deals signed in Nigeria (ibid.). In December the connection between Ireland and Nigeria was strengthened by the appearance in Ireland of Dr. Owens Wiwa,

brother of the murdered author and anti-oil industry activist Ken Saro Wiwa, who backed the campaign against Shell. The campaign had an international context which ran from Norway to Nigeria and the Rossport campaigners were able to exploit this. The campaign had a major success in April 2003 when An Bord Pleanála upheld its inspector's decisions due to the pollution risk to local rivers. EEI expressed their disappointment at the decision and stated that the whole project for the Corrib Field gas supply would be reconsidered. The holding of a second oral hearing by An Bord Pleanála was in itself unprecedented and the hearing was the second longest in the board's history (www.corribsos.com *Project Timeline*). The Taoiseach, Bertie Ahern, met with senior Shell executives to reassure them but confirmed that the project would have to go through the national planning process.

Undoubtedly, state and multinational frustration at the delays caused by community objectors to planning hearings contributed to plans for a National Infrastructural Board (NIB) which would fast track major projects such as the Corrib Field through over objections of local campaigners. EEI responded to the upholding of the ruling by submitting a new planning application to Mayo County Council for an onshore gas terminal which included plans to resource large tracts of peat land from the area around the site. By this time EEI had changed their name to Shell E&P Ireland. The complexity of the debate about developing resources was characterised at this point by the concerns about the project expressed by former government advisor TK Whitaker who had a holiday home in nearby Bangor (*The Guardian* 29 May 2004). Mr. Whitaker was seen by many as the architect of Ireland's economic success dating from his period as senior civil servant in the Sean Lemass Fianna Fáil government of the 1950s and 1960s. The Lemass/Whitaker plan for multinational-led development through direct foreign investment was credited with establishing the foundation and patterns of Irish economic rejuvenation. It was most telling that this renowned figure, with a background in state facilitated multinational-led growth, was expressing concerns about a project such as the Corrib Field. While Lemass was often quoted with stating that 'a rising tide lifts all boats' in regard to his economic policies perhaps the tide had turned against local communities as the state and their multinational partners placed profits over people, environment and resources.

The Corrib Field project became an issue in the 2004 European elections. Sinn Fein's candidate for the Connacht/North West constituency called for a full investigation of Shell in Ireland (Sinn Fein Press Release 23 April 2004). He accused Shell of inconsistencies about the extent of their reserves. Sinn Fein stated that while they were not opposed to developing the country's national resources they wanted any development to benefit the Irish people (ibid.). However, despite these concerns Mayo County Council granted planning permission for the onshore terminal on the 30 April 2004. Although the permission was dependent on seventy five conditions imposed due to environmental concerns Shell stated they would be appealing many of these. Local campaigners were appalled particularly in the wake of serious landslides in the peat-bog areas around the proposed site during heavy storms in the previous winter (*The Guardian* 29 May 2004). The objectors announced that they would appeal the decision. However, in October 2004 An Bord Pleanála granted

Shell planning permission for the gas terminal at Ballinaboy. While Shell made plans for the immediate commencement of work at the site campaigners disgusted by the decision assessed their options. Events in 2005 would see the issue explode onto the national scene.

Framing the Argument

The Shell to Sea campaign was able to draw on the expertise of Mayo academic Dr. Mark Garavan a lecturer in the Castlebar campus of the Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology. Garavan's own Ph.D. thesis *The Patterns of Irish Environmentalism* focused on the mobilisation of environmental disputes in Ireland so he was in an ideal position to offer his advice on mobilisation. However, the Shell to Sea campaign extended its framing process to embrace a much wider discourse than previous Irish environmental campaigners had allowed for including a near militant exposal of 'defence of space' sentiment combined with a strong expression of cultural nationalism as the rhetoric of Mayo nationalist Michael Davitt emerged alongside the traditional rallying cry of 'The West's Awake'.

The main frames of the Shell to Sea campaign emerged around this combination of local populism and a wider expression of cultural nationalism alongside traditional campaign focus points such as health and safety concerns

- The dangers and risk posed by the pipeline
- Local duty to defend families and property
- The unsavoury behaviour of the multinational and the state
- The misrepresentation of facts on the issue
- The prioritisation of corporate profits over local concerns

The risk frame highlighted the dangers posed by the onshore gas pipeline which was planned to run alongside the homes of many families in Rossport. Minister Noel Dempsey confirmed in a written reply in the Dáil to Deputy Michael Ring that such a pipeline would be unparalleled in Ireland, Europe or elsewhere. The rated pressure of the pipeline would exceed that used by An Bord Gas nearly five times while the gas that would be transported through the pipeline with unrefined oil and water could cause blockages and be risk prone with obstructions occurring far from the gas field where they could be treated (www.corribsos.com June 2005). A further concern raised by the Mayo campaigners was the lack of any material benefit for the local community that was bearing the brunt of these risks as all of the gas would be piped through the county into larger cities such as Galway and Dublin. In this way the campaigners were able to extend their risk frame by increasing the sense of 'shared grievance' (Klandermans 1988) surrounding local identity, sense of place and sense of exploitation which was running high throughout the county. For the Shell to Sea campaigners this approach would have the double negative affect of having all profits repatriated to Shell while the chance to develop the west's gas supply would also be lost to the country's sprawling urban area.

Shell attempted to serve their state-backed Compulsory Acquisition Orders (CAOs) on locals in the Rossport area in January 2005. By March the company had applied to the High Court for restraining orders against local landowners the five men and their neighbours Monica Muller and Brid McGarry. Subsequently shell began excavating peat from the proposed refinery site around nearby Ballinaboy. Amid chaotic scenes diggers began to sink into the bog while heavy vehicles crashed on the inadequate roads surrounding the area. Locals were unable to get past heavy machinery on the one narrow road into the area. As Shell planned for 70 truck movements a day for 3 months confrontations became inevitable. Local residents turned for help to a sympathetic local TD, the Independent Jerry Crowley, who claimed that the 'people of Erris who have been compelled to have the Corrib gas upstream pipeline adjacent to their homes are scared out of their minds' (Connolly & Lynch 2005 43).

The High Court Action taken against the Rossport residents restrained the named defendants from refusing to allow pipe-laying on their lands. The landowners had been summoned to the High Court on four separate occasions at great personal cost. The landowners had sought evidence of the CAOs in due course before they would allow entry to their lands. This evidence was held back for up to 2½ years (www.corribsos.com 10 June 05). A further attempt to gain entry to the lands at Rossport was followed by the summoning of five local men to the High Court. Willie Corduff, Micheál Ó Seighin, Phillip McGrath, Brendan Philbin and Vincent McGrath were all charged with breaching the interim order of the court after the men confirmed to Justice Joseph Finnegan that they could not abide by the terms of the Court Order (Connolly & Lynch 2005 45). In a statement to the court Micheál Ó Seighin summed up the men's position in the following statement 'The farms form the basis of the identity of the people. Monetary compensation cannot compensate for undermining the social identity of the people' (ibid.).

The five were jailed for contempt of court despite, as Ó Seighin would state from prison, the fact that the constitution under Articles 40 and 43 demand that the State protect the fundamental rights and property of every citizen (www.corribsos.com 5 July 2005). With their incarceration the Rossport 5 would become the news story of the summer. Most papers held daily updates of the campaign and the men and their families took on celebrity status. As the men were taken away to prison local supporters surrounded the men's land to prevent Shell from gaining access. The campaign took on a new momentum.

Shell to Sea: The West's Awake

The imprisoning of the 'Rossport 5', as they became known, changed the minds of many locals who had previously favoured the terminal. The Shell to Sea campaign began to mobilise on a wider level as picketing, rallies and placarding were extensively stepped u The significant alliances which the families had forged took up the campaign as key figures such as Dr. Mark Garavan of the Galway-Mayo Institute

of Technology, Pádraig Campbell of SIPTU and Jerry Cowley TD organised the committee. Another mobilisation strategy of the campaign following the men's imprisonment was the placing of pickets on Shell or Statoil petrol stations around the country. In addition, a series of rallies were held nationwide that drew thousands of ordinary people who wished to express their concern about the imprisoning of the five men. Shell's terminals were also the target of organised blockades by environmentally minded 'ecowarriors' such as the 'Cork Pagans', while ecological societies from the University sector were also prominent at many of the campaign's events. This wider support base gave rise to a mobilisation of support unparalleled in previous environmental campaigns. Support for the Rossport 5 came from all levels of Irish society including the Labour Party, Sinn Fein, The Greens, local TDs Jerry Cowley (Independent) and Michael Ring (Fine Gael), left-wing political groups, SIPTU, the Irish Cattle and Sheep Farmer's Association, the *Gluaiseacht* anti-globalisation network, Louth and Sligo County Council as well as activists such as Robert Ballagh and musicians such as Christy Moore (www.corribsos.com *Who's Who*). This cross section of support allowed Shell to Sea to extend their framing process to incorporate a much wider remit as oppositional politics and cultural discourse were embraced. This progression from a single issue 'backyard' dispute into an extensive form of ecopopulist dissent corresponds broadly with 'the transition from NIMBY to ecopopulism' (Szasz 1994) which environmental campaigners had been attempting over the various campaigns of the last four decades. The fulcrum of this evolution was, undoubtedly, the imprisonment of the five men. However, while similar fates have been meted out to protestors in recent years it must be said that the Rossport 5's eloquent statements in defence of their actions during their 94 days in Cloverhill Prison won a great deal of public support for their cause. Even though the men were fully committed to their cause they were shocked at their treatment claiming that they were only seeking justice:

> We were put in prison for protecting ourselves. They said we broke the law but we only broke an injunction that shouldn't have been there. We never did any harm. We were just trying to protect our families and rather than listen to us they put us into prison for 94 days. (Phillip McGrath, interview with Rory Hearne November 2005)

While the camp at Rossport continued to attract sympathisers and grass-roots activists from around the country and abroad the Shell to Sea protests continued with events occurring at an almost daily rate. On the 22 of July a National Day of Protest was called against Shell and Statoil. While localised picketing was opposed organised pickets occurred at stations in Wexford, Galway, Kilkenny, Athlone and Wicklow in 1 day. A national petition was organised as thousands put their signature or e-mailed in messages of support to the Shell to Sea web site. Their web page provided the campaign with a powerful tool in the highly computer-literate Ireland of 2005. Grass-roots bloggers and activist web sites such as 'indymedia' and Ireland from Below gave prominence to the campaign and links between protestors across the globe were established via the internet. It could be said that this new communication technology provided the links to environmental circuits which were lacking before the late 1990s. Internet technologies opened up possibilities for

environmental campaigners such as Shell to Sea that also facilitated their ability, not just to gain media coverage but to shape the news and influence the public perception of the debate. Such power is unwieldy unless applied well and Shell to Sea ran a compelling campaign. The Shell to Sea web site was a mobilising resource in itself providing updates and messages from the men and their families. Moreover, it set out a series of strategies which activists would support, such as suggesting participation through:

- Inviting activists to Rossport and the Mayo Solidarity Camp to learn more about the issue.
- Supporting the Shell to Sea All-Ireland speaking tour.
- Financial donation and Fundraising.
- Contacting the Media, Letters to the Press.
- Getting Unions, community groups, religious groups, etc. to support the campaigns.
- Poster and Flyer distribution, with posters ready for downloading from the Shell to Sea web site.
- Organising meetings, protests and blockades and boycotting Shell and Statoil.
- Signing or distributing the Shell to Sea petition which was also online and could be downloaded.
- Asking radio stations to play some of the songs written and recorded for the campaign such as "The Rossport 5 song". A DVD was also distributed by the campaigners.
- Contacting government ministers, including the Taoiseach, with e-mail addresses being provided.
- Contacting the Norwegian ambassador or government directly with e-mail addresses supplied (www.corribsos.com).

The provision of this array of campaign strategies on the Shell to Sea site allowed the campaign to circumvent established media outlets and provided the widest range of involvement for the public from petition signing to the organisation of blockades. By mobilising their campaign in this extensive manner Shell to Sea became a resource in itself as the centrepiece to a burgeoning grass-roots eco-movement which encompassed locals, environmentalists, students and political activists in a manner not witnessed since the Carnsore anti-nuclear protests.

One response from the state to the controversy was the announcement of a safety review of the Corrib gas pipeline by Natural Resources Minister Noel Dempsey. The minister stated that officials had inspected Shell's onshore site and that in his opinion a serious breach of the consents given to Shell had occurred. In the hope of resolving the dispute the Minister ordered the dismantling of the length of gas pipeline that had already been assembled at the site. In August Shell announced that it would lay off 128 workers at the site. Minister Dempsey's initiative included the establishment of a technical group to monitor the Corrib gas project which included senior civil servants, geographers, engineers and legal experts (*Irish Times* 5 July 2005). As the men completed their first month in prison, Shell were coming under increased pressure to lift their injunction to allow the men to go free, particularly in the wake of the breach of its technical consents (ibid.). Legal attempts were made

to free the men due to the fact that Ministerial consent had been given for preparatory work only, rather than the construction and installation at the site. Opposition leaders also called for the men's release. Shell to Sea spokesperson Mark Garavan cautiously welcomed the Minister's intervention although the campaign noted the timing of the announcement on the eve of a major rally in support of the men and in the week of their latest court hearing (ibid.). The end of July saw a significant upsurge in campaign activity. The National Rally in Dublin attracted over 2,000 people including Sinn Fein leader, Gerry Adams. Pickets were arranged in diverse locations such as the Norwegian embassy in Brussels and the McGill Summer School in Donegal where Minister Dempsey was confronted by Shell to Sea protesters. Over 1,000 people picketed outside Shell petrol stations that month, some of them organised by Sinn Fein. However, the campaign was beginning to cause political fallout for figures outside the government. In particular, Fine Gael leader and Mayoman, Enda Kenny, was coming in for criticism about his lack of support for the Rossport men and their families. Kenny was constrained by the fear of being accused of pandering to local populism for electoral gain rather than focusing on the development potential of the Corrib Field, particularly in an unemployment black spot such as County Mayo.

While the government parties also faced their dilemma the situation for the leader of the Opposition was more complex. Kenny was roundly criticised for sitting on the fence on the issue, particularly by Independent TD Jerry Cowley who had become an effective spokesperson for the Shell to Sea campaign. Mr. Kenny's plight was compounded by the longstanding support given to Shell to Sea by Mayo Fine Gael TD Michael Ring. Both Ring and Cowley were also critical of Mayo County Council for not backing the Rossport men, stating that the council had voted against gold mining at Croagh Patrick in the past despite the threat of legal action from the developer in that case (*Irish Times* 20 July 2005). In early August the wives of the five men staged a sit-in at the Council's offices in Castlebar. The sit-in, which lasted 6 hours, came after Caitlín Ó Seighin, Mary Corduff, Aggie Philbin and the two Maureen McGraths, together with local landowner and objector Brid McGarry had made appeals on behalf of the Rossport 5 for the Council to hold an emergency meeting on the issue. As consultations went on the women were joined by family members, friends and musicians, as well as by Shell to Sea spokesperson Mark Garavan and TD Jerry Cowley. In the interim an emergency meeting was agreed. While the protesters were pleased with the outcome they again criticised Enda Kenny for not clarifying his position on the issue (*Irish Times* 4 August 2005). This outcome was tempered by the news that the Minister was allowing Shell to proceed with its pipeline only days after ordering the pipes to be dismantled. The jailed men issued a statement from prison condemning the announcement while Jerry Cowley called for the Minister's resignation, claiming that Shell had not responded to the Minister's request for clarification on Shell's obligations. Local Fianna Fáil councillors in Mayo also condemned the Minister's decision. Mark Garavan criticised the announcement and claimed that the government's valuation of the project was wrong, stating that '35, at most, will be employed here on the Corrib Field when construction is complete' (*Irish Times* 3 August 2005).

Further criticism of the state's policies was highlighted in a local news feature on the issue by an American energy regulator. All concerned parties including the protestors, industry and the political sector were constrained by the lack of 'uniform safety requirements for gas pipelines', a policy which was 'at odds with international practice' (*Western People* 9 August 2005). The article contrasted safety regulators in the USA for gas pipelines that emanated from two government agencies including an Office of Pipeline Safety with what was called 'a frightening lapse' (ibid.) in the Irish regulatory framework. Pipelines in the USA are also protected by a 'certificate of public convenience and necessity' (ibid.) words which would have a ring of irony to the imprisoned Rossport men. Public enquiries and written submissions were an integral part of the licensing system in the USA. As the men spent their 50th day in jail they must have found such regulatory discrepancies to be very questionable. While Shell negotiated with Mayo County Council on the issue the men offered to engage in dialogue with Shell if the Court injunction against them was lifted. Andy Pyle, Shell Ireland's chief executive, claimed the injunction was a matter for the courts but welcomed the men's statement nonetheless. Shell claimed it would be open to legal challenges if it relinquished the injunction, something which was rejected by many including Labour Party leader Pat Rabbitte. As Shell continued to negotiate with Mayo County Council their chief executive, Andy Pyle insisted that the company 'had to preserve its legal position' (*Irish Times* 20 August 2005). One strategic response of the men in prison was their claim that Shell's refusal to lift the injunction was preventing them from preparing their case for the full hearing on the issue and that as Shell had suspended work on the site the injunction now made no sense. The men accused Shell of not being interested in dialogue and said that they were obliged to defend their families as the state had refused to do so. According to Mark Garavan Shell 'were more interested in their strategy than the law' (*Irish Times* 21 Aug 05). The men accused Shell of 'vindictiveness' (ibid.) for not withdrawing the injunction claiming that they could not impede work at the site while it was non-operational. Councillors and Community groups from Mayo called for the injunction to be released while Labour Leader Pat Rabbitte stated that the continued imprisonment of the men was 'bordering on becoming a national disgrace' (*Irish Times* 31 August 2005).

The summer ended with a series of events organised by the Shell to Sea campaigns. Protests were held outside the corporate tent hosted by Fianna Fáil at the Galway Races while blockades and picketing continued in Galway, Cork and Dublin. At this stage Shell to Sea had established links with many environmental groups around Europe and participated in events such as 'EcoTopics' in Moldova and the Glastonbury Festival in the UK. Another significant development in the extension of the campaign was the pressure which was brought to bear on Statoil and the Norwegian government. Pickets were held at Norwegian embassies and in September 2005 family members and Shell to Sea supporters went to Norway where they met with representatives of Statoil and the government while supporters picketed the Norwegian embassy in Dublin. Shell to Sea were seen to make the point that the Norwegian tax payer would benefit from 36% of any revenue from the Corrib Field while the Irish taxpayer would receive no benefits at all.

The protestors were also keen to exploit the political opportunity which arose from the Norwegian general election campaign that was underway at the time. A further extension of the campaign's international frame was the links created with the Nigerian resource activists including the brother of Ken Saro-Wiwa, Dr. Owens Wiwa, who joined the march to the Dáil in support of the Rossport 5. The march coincided with the men's appearance at the High Court as they approached 94 days in prison.

On 30 September 2005 High Court President Mr. Justice Finnegan freed the Rossport 5 to cheers from their families and supporters. Justice Finnegan stated that the injunction 'no longer served any useful purpose'. Council for the men, John Rogers SC, asked the court to also remove the order of committal claiming it to be 'coercive' and that the men should not face further sanction in the future. However, while the men offered an apology for breaking the court order they refused to give an undertaking on any future activities. In a further development Justice Finnegan indicated to Shell's council, Patrick Hanratty, that he wanted the company to address its breach of the Minister's licences but that he would not deal with that issue while the men languished in prison (*Irish Times* Saturday 2 October 2005).

As the men walked free with their jubilant supporters they vowed that their campaign would go on. The issue was set to continue the following month as Shell stated its intention to pursue the matter of a permanent injunction against the men and any other objectors to the pipeline. The safety review established by Minister Dempsey was also scheduled for that month. The Minister announced plans to appoint a mediator to negotiate with both parties (*Irish Times* 1 October 2005). The men made a triumphant appearance at the Shell to Sea rally in Dublin alongside supportive politicians and Dr. Wiwa. As they returned to Mayo traditional bonfires lit the way along their route back to Rossport. According to Micheál Ó Seighin the men's victory showed that 'Irish people expect a higher state of democracy and they expect more of their Government in relation to people's safety and welfare' (ibid.). The men also indicated their willingness to return to prison if necessary. Prominent campaign supporters such as TDs Jerry Cowley and Michael Ring indicated that the extension of the campaign into Norway during their general election had played a significant part in building the momentum that led to the men's release. The newly elected administration was believed to have instigated the meeting between senior Statoil executives and Minister Dempsey the week before the men's release in the wake of the visit of Shell to Sea and Jerry Cowley to Norway. Dr. Cowley said that his meetings with Statoil and the Norwegian authorities revealed that 'they did not know what was happening and were shocked by it' (*Sunday Business Post* 2 October 2005). Dr. Cowley felt that the men would have remained in prison but for his Norwegian trip and subsequent intervention. He said Shell to Sea supporters had met to work out the best way to get the men released. As the Norwegian government owned 71% of Statoil it was decided to bring the campaign to Oslo.

Cowley was able to plan the trip with the help of Norwegian journalists and trade unionists whom he had developed links with during the campaign. They supplied Shell to Sea with valuable details, contacts and lists of who to meet during

their time in Oslo, maximising the impact of their mission. They were able to get national exposure on Norwegian television as a result at a time when Dublin City Council were threatening to prosecute anyone who put up posters advertising Shell to Sea's Dublin rally. The most significant meetings during their trip were with Norwegian Oil and Energy Minister Thorid Widvey and Senior Vice President of Statoil Helga Hattested who would meet with Noel Dempsey a week after the Shell to Sea mission (*Mayo News* 4 October 2005). While the men celebrated with families and supporters they continued to plan the next phase of their campaign. They insisted that Minister Dempsey should participate in any talks between the families and Shell claiming that 'the state cannot remain neutral in this' (*Irish Times* 3 October 2005). The men thanked the public who had supported them with up to 150 cards while they were in prison. They were particularly grateful to Jerry Cowley but poured scorn on Fine Gael's Enda Kenny, stating they told him he had 'let them down' when they met (ibid.). The men won further support from the public for their eloquence and resolve on their release including the manner in which they highlighted conditions facing the inner city youth who were their prison mates in Cloverhill prison. The men claimed they got no special treatment in the prison but were well treated by their fellow prisoners.

In October one of the protestors, Micheál Ó Seighin, attended the Minister's Safety review where Minister Dempsey outlined a 'post hoc' justification of the government's strategy for the terminal. The men were critical of the hearing stating that it was 'an attempt to retrospectively suggest that consultation had occurred' (*Irish Times* Oct 13 05). Members of the Shell to Sea campaign and the other members of the Rossport 5 did not attend due to the constraints of the outstanding injunction. The review heard evidence that some of the initial objections to the project may not have been forwarded to the Minister's technical advisory group (ibid.). Other evidence at the review included a submission from a retired US Naval engineer who stated that a pipeline explosion would devastate everything within 250 yards of the pipeline releasing 'the equivalent of 3,500 tonnes of TNT. The absence of many of the Shell to Sea campaigners at the hearing was compensated for by the submissions of expert allies like the naval engineer David Aldridge as well as supportive groups such as the Erris Onshore Fisherman's Association and An Taisce. At the High Court the Mayo men accused the Minister of 'using the mediation process as a ploy' (*Irish Times* 25 October 2005). There had been no contact between the Rossport 5 and the Minister since their release from prison. The men stated that the Minister had helped Shell to lift their injunction to 'take the spotlight off the serious safety issues we were highlighting' (ibid.). The Shell to Sea campaign continued throughout this period with the five men making appearances at rallies and meetings across the country. The Solidarity Camp at Rossport continued to be a fulcrum of activity while up to 16,000 people had signed the petition organised by Shell to Sea. 31 of the 34 landowners affected by the acquisition orders for the pipeline had taken the side of the men by that stage of the campaign (ibid.). However, supporters of the gas project produced a list of over 40 organisations and Councillors who were in favour of the project for economic reasons.

Further claims of misrepresentation on the issue emerged in the aftermath of a survey conducted by Shell as part of the company's communication programme (*Irish Times* 17 November 2005). The survey which was criticised by Shell to Sea due to its coinciding with the state's mediation process involved selected participants being paid €50 to participate in recorded meetings. Some participants felt misled about the nature of these meetings claiming that they had thought they were food surveys or political debates (ibid.). While there may have been some degree of miscommunication around this survey Shell to Sea were able to portray the multinational as attempting to manipulate the local community on the issue extending their framing of Shell as a ruthless multinational and to incorporate allegations of 'underhand tactics' (ibid.).

November also saw the release of a report on the Corrib gas issue by the Centre for Public Inquiry (CPI). The report claimed that An Bord Pleanála was subjected to 'external pressure' on the issue, a claim it denied (*Irish Times* 24 November 2005). The report's executive summary put forward a number of findings. These included criticism of the state's handling of resources and royalties, its regulatory framework surrounding the introduction of the Compulsory Acquisition Orders (CAOs) and the gas pipeline, the location of the pipeline and terminal and the supervision of work carried out at the site. The report was also critical of the access provided for Shell executives to senior politicians, including the Taoiseach (Connolly & Lynch 2005). The Centre for Public Inquiry (CPI) would also become the centre of a political row due to accusations made by Justice Minister Michael McDowell about the alleged activities of the Centre's Executive Director, Frank Connolly. An independent report released in conjunction with the CPI's findings claimed that the onshore pipeline could rupture causing 'high fatalities' (Kuprewicz 2005 6). The Corrib pipeline was irregular 'due to its operational pressure, lack of historical data in the system evaluation, proximity to people and dwellings and deficiencies in the demonstration of maximum pipeline pressure' (ibid.). While Shell to Sea welcomed the CPI report the subsequent political row surrounding the Centre threw a cloud over its findings, further demonstrating the degree of complexity and political intrigue which surrounded this issue.

The government's own safety review's preliminary findings recommended limiting the gas pressure for the pipeline, while Shell rejected the accusation that hydrogen sulphide or 'sour gas', which had similar qualities to cyanide, would be released or corrode the pipeline (*Irish Times* 27 December 2005). The Company claimed that it would be 'unlikely' that concentrations of the toxic substance would reach dangerous levels at the site. Shell to Sea acknowledged the report but their web site promised a major escalation in their campaign of opposition including requests for 'gifts' such as night-vision goggles and bolt-cutters for cutting fencing (ibid.). Shell to Sea also announced that a major rally was planned for the spring of 2006 to coincide with attempts by Shell to recommence work at the site (ibid.). A roadshow was organised with the intention of building the Rossport Solidarity Camp by holding meetings at various points around the country. This series of meetings was organised to facilitate the mobilisation of the second phase of Shell to Sea's campaign promoting the Solidarity Camp for people who wished

to participate in the protest and who would be able to provide logistical expertise. While the camp was originally a spontaneous demonstration of support for the Rossport 5, Shell to Sea were prepared to extend their campaign into a much broader project of activism that could extend out to embrace the anti-globalisation grass-roots movements with which it had opened up links. This intent can be seen from the following posting on the Shell to Sea web site:

> This is a major opportunity to defeat an environmentally hazardous development and the struggle thus far has already been an inspiration to many people around the country. Victory will have a significant radicalising affect, not just on a remote corner of Mayo, but across the island. (www.corribsos.com)

Academic activists were following on an established thread which had been defined by Professor Blackith during the Carnsore Point protest and were carried on very effectively by prominent figures such as Professor Emer Colleran at Mullaghmore.

Conclusion

While the dispute at Rossport was initially about Shell's onshore pipeline being located near a number of local homes, it has long since moved away from that single issue and has come to represent a range of concerns and responses. These responses have come to mean different things to those involved while attempts to comprehend the events at Rossport can be seen to be almost as intrusive as Shell's pipeline. While many in North Mayo harbour fears about the imposition of the pipeline this fear does not always extend to a full understanding of whether the pipeline is safe or not, nor what economic benefits it may or may not bring. According to Mark Garavan many locals 'simply do not want it'. The pipeline represents an unwelcome intrusion into their land and community. It is this very sense of place that the Shell to Sea campaigners wish to protect and the threat posed by outsiders has reawakened a determined resistance in the North Mayo community that has its roots in Davitt's Land League identity born of the past with little concern for notions of 'progress'.

A higher standard has been set in North Mayo, one that values family and community. This form of moral framing has a subconscious element to it which has been instinctively unleashed in many Irish disputes over time. A subsequent sacrifice to defend the blood lines rooted in the hinterlands has been witnessed over many centuries in Irish history, and has become a primary aspect in the development of *rural sentiment*. The Rossport men's near 100 days in prison and the traumatic effect this injustice had on family and neighbours can be understood from this perspective. This trenchant stance has been acknowledged by Shell who has appointed local spokespersons to try and comprehend the depth of feeling directed against them. Alternative routes for the pipeline have been suggested to try to meet peoples' concerns. Shell have also apologised for any 'mistakes' they had made during the dispute, and hinted that alternative routes for the pipeline may be

considered in the wake of the Advantica report on the subject of Corrib Gas (*Irish Times* 5 May 2006). The dispute continued to gain headlines throughout 2007 as protestors and police clashed at the site. In May 2007, the Shell to Sea campaign was recognised as Will Corduff was awarded the Goldman Environmental prize. The award was a timely acknowledgement of the efforts of the Rossport families in the protection of their local community and environment.

Chapter 13
Roads: Glen of the Downs, Carrickmines and Tara

Introduction

Campaigns against the development of major motorways through environmentally sensitive areas have long been a feature of environmental movements across the developed world. This form of anti-infrastructural protest gained prevalence in the late 1980s and 1990s when members of US Earth First began a series of protests around Europe. The most famous of these occurred at the Newbury by-pass and at Twyford Downs in the UK. The direct action of anti-roads protesters attracted a radical element to the environmental cause that were willing to take extreme measures, such as chaining and tunnelling, to prevent construction continuing. Earth First's international mobilisation of local, single-issue anti-roads campaigners turned the nature of roads protests on its head. Where once local voices struggled to be heard Earth First's experience in radical action provided a number of experienced and committed activists for an issue that could be ignited anywhere that roads developments were being undertaken. Following on from the defence camps in Greenham Common, where a women's coalition had protested about the stationing of Trident missiles in the 1980s, the British anti-roads protests laid the foundations for the anti-globalisation protests of today, linking committed activists across Europe and North America in a common cause which combined opposition to growth economics with ecological concepts. The campaigners used internet technologies to link global groups around local issues and set the tone for ecological activism in subsequent years. In Ireland, local activists emerged with their own approach of holding a vigil for woodlands under threat from roads.

In time, the focus on the Irish state's increased road building capacity has led to three main anti-roads protests. These occurred at the Glen of the Downs in County Wicklow, Carrickmines in County Dublin and at Tara site by the Hill of Skryne in County Meath. All three protests emerged at a time when the state was attempting to develop the commuter hub around Dublin city. The case of Tara and the Skryne Valley would lead to a heated debate about the manner in which heritage is dealt with in an age of rapid growth as the ancient site of Tara came under threat from the state's Critical Infrastructural Bill. This Bill which was introduced in the wake of a series of environmental campaigns has been seen by many as an attempt to stymie such collective responses in the future.

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

Glen of the Downs

As the construction of this burgeoning roads network began to encroach on sites of archaeological importance a network of campaigns began to emerge to contest these developments. One of the first of the protests occurred at the Glen of the Downs in County Wicklow. This campaign came after the Twyford Downs protest in the UK, a dispute that established some of the strategic frameworks utilised by roads protests which provided some of the impetus for Irish campaigners. Emerging from radical groupings such as the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and the Hunt Saboteurs the UK anti-roads groups used a form of militant direct action that was not previously associated with eco-protests (Garner 2000 146). The most notable tactical innovation of the UK roads protestors was their use of direct action by what came to be known in the media as 'eco-warriors'. These were groups of committed activists who occupied sites to halt progress after building had commenced. Amongst the tactics employed by the 'eco-warriors' in the UK and USA were 'lock-ons' or the chaining of protestors to mechanical equipment or trees. Protestors built camps in tunnels or trees making further construction work or arrests difficult. This tactic provided the media with an event to focus on in a way that oral hearings never could. Such dramatic tactics were not used in Ireland, as local environmentalists and students held vigils at the site where trees were under threat.

The Glen of the Downs dispute emerged in the aftermath of the relocation of thousands of people from Dublin to the outlying counties of Wicklow, Kildare, Meath and Wexford. As these new commuters became ensnared in notorious bottlenecks around the perimeter of the capital the National Development Plan (NDP) presented planners with a series of options to improve traffic flows with rezoning, leading to the doubling of the population of commuter belt villages within half a decade (McDonald & Nix 2005 60). With rezoning proving to be a controversial issue in many of the planning tribunal's local resistance to roads building was rising. However, the tactics of the 'eco-warriors' together with the satirical depiction of some of these campaigners in the tabloids meant that potential alliances between activists and local communities were not easily established. One account of the eco-warriors camp at the Glen of the Downs illustrated the gulf which existed between the conditions endured by activists in contrast with the occasional visit by a sympathetic councillor:

> Conditions at the Glen of the Downs in Wicklow where the 'eco-warriors' have staked their ground are miserable, tough and unforgiving. Around 30 people are living permanently on site in specially built tree houses … The rain is unrelenting and there is nowhere to shelter … It is hard to believe anyone can live in these conditions … The warriors are annoyed that some people have called them dirty. To wash with hot water they would sometimes be invited by locals to use their showers … There are no toilet facilities so they use a hole which has been dug in the ground … you are in darkness most of the time. (*The Examiner* 1999)

While the eco-activists' plight was bad the occasional unrest and court appearances of activists kept the Glen of the Downs protest in the news; it would ironically be the courts that ended the protest as the activists were threatened with imprisonment

if they breached undertakings not to occupy lands at the Wicklow site. As the activists' protest petered out the €85 million dual carriageway through the Wicklow hills was completed.

While this initial instance of anti-roads activism was unsuccessful the stance of the eco-activists did lead to the establishment of a number of links with the subsequent campaigns and initiatives while a cultural challenge to the dominant way of life was initiated. Though many found the 'deep green' alternative lifestyle of the eco-warriors too extreme, student groups and environmental protection groups were influenced by the Glen of the Downs campaign as environmentally sustainable existence became a feature of many young activists' lives.

The onset of internet technologies during the 1990s led to the establishment of web sites dedicated to providing a resource for activists and researchers. Among the most interesting of these were *An Talamh Glás* and *Ireland from Below* established by the academic and activist Laurence Cox and the writer/activist Robert Allen along with other environmentalists. Allen had been a founder of Earth First Ireland and linked with others at the inception of the protest in Wicklow. This activist group mobilised a campaign by touring universities, while their web sites provided a forum for the establishment of links between the myriad campaigns and societies which were agitating for the environment. These web sites were collectively maintained with input from environmental activist/writers such as Derry Chambers and Allen, who has become the most prominent writer on environmental issues in Ireland today. As an alternative culture emerged links between new age practitioners, feminists, ecologists and political radicals lead to a series of initiatives, conferences and workshops on grass-roots approaches to building a new modernity at the turn of the millennium. These linkages provided an activist base for many campaigns in the first half decade of the new century including the anti-war alliance, the Rossport 5 dispute and the second major anti-roads protest at Carrickmines Castle in County Kildare.

The Carrickmines dispute gave rise to a combination of environmental and heritage protection frames as a new wave of academic activists came to the fore linking professional expertise regarding local archaeology and heritage with an articulate defence of community and landscape.

Carrickmines

Plans for an interchange for the M50 at Carrickmines were included as part of the south-eastern motorway development and led to an extensive archaeological excavation around the site of the 13th century castle in the area. Evidence of significant artefacts was found by an international team of experts after a 2-year investigation led to an occupation by a group of concerned activists who had been involved in the roads campaign. This group, which came to be known as the 'Carrickminders', had two main strategies to prevent the M50 development. The established method of taking a legal action was the first. However, the second strategy drew upon

approaches undertaken by the eco-warriors a decade earlier as the Carrickminders attempted to prevent the development by occupying the site of the ancient castle. The legal frame established by the roads protesters utilised the National Monuments Act as a vehicle to prevent further works at the site. The Carrickminders also challenged Duchas, the national heritage agency and Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown Council in relation to the archaeological licence for the excavation (*Irish Examiner* 17 February 2002). The group's spokesperson Ruadhri McEoin had staged a month long sit-in at the site and claimed that sections of the castle's wall had been dismantled by workers at the site contravening the Monuments Act.

The Carrickminders had forged alliances with both the National Museum and local Green Party TD, Ciaran Cuffe, with both giving their support to the group's legal challenge. The extension of the dispute into one which set the National Museum at odds with the state's heritage agency provided the protestors with the weight of one official environmental entity while the Green Party's support was more pronounced due to that party's electoral successes in the 2002 General Election. Another political figure to lend his support was local Fianna Fáil Councillor Barry Andrews, who complained about the wall removal to the Gardai. The fact that land deals around the site came under investigation during the Flood Tribunal into corruption added to the sense of crisis surrounding the roads project.

Ultimately, the National Roads Authority (NRA) announced that the dispute had led to costs for the South-Eastern motorway running into an extra €10 million with the project being delayed by over a year (RTE News 6 January 2004). Transport Minister Seamus Brennan reacted to this overrun by welcoming the High Court's dismissal of the protestors' legal action while the NRA called for the reform of the state's heritage laws to prevent similar actions in the future (ibid.). A European Commission report on the dispute criticised the lack of any attempt to find an alternative route for the motorway, the role of Dachas in favouring the development over its remit to protect heritage and the lack of a proper concern for archaeological sites (McDonald & Nix 2005 157, 158).

For their part the Carrickminders submitted an alternative plan for the motorway as well as the development of a heritage park at the Carrickmines site. Environment Minister Martin Cullen's response to the dispute was to amend the legislation for the preservation of national monuments providing increased ministerial powers in similar cases to allow for demolition of sites to facilitate infrastructural projects. Both the Carrickminders and their political and academic allies were appalled at this outcome claiming it would allow developers to bulldoze sites of heritage for expedience and profit.

Tara and the Skryne Valley

The contentious subject of the destruction of an ancient heritage site to facilitate a roads network again emerged as a result of plans to build a dramatically imposing tolled intersection for the M3 motorway near the ancient heritage site at the Hill of

Tara in conjunction with an extension of the M2 motorway at the nearby Hill of Skryne in County Meath. Both of these developments had parallels with the roads disputes in the Glen of the Downs and Carrickmines Castle as like Wicklow and rural County Dublin, Meath had become a primary location on the extensive commuter belt surrounding the capital. In the 2006 census, it was revealed that over 80% of the population of County Meath travelled to work by car, indicating the extent of pressure on existing roads in the areas around Tara. The region had become a busy commuter belt destination for young professionals unable to afford property in Dublin. As property prices in Dublin city continued to increase significantly land prices in rural areas of Leinster surrounding the capital also came to a premium. With the government now emboldened by the amended National Monuments Act of 2004 conservationists were astounded by the news that the ancient Celtic site at the Hill of Tara was threatened by a roads development. This news came in the wake of four decades of destruction of the country's monuments and ancient hill forts in an era when the east coast's rural way of life was giving way to an aggressive agri-business sector alongside an increase in urban sprawl.

While successive governments had prioritised rural development the need to conserve sites of scenic beauty on heritage value contributed to a debate on the right of rural families to build houses in the countryside. While concerns about 'bungalow-blight' emerged during the first phase of environmentalism in the 1970s and 1980s rural communities that had witnessed a traumatic demographic haemorrhaging throughout their history remained defensive of their surrounding hinterlands. By 1999 the National Spatial Strategy had identified that 15,000, one-off houses were built in that year alone accounting for up to one third of the state's housing output (IPC 2003). As the issue's salience increased through extensive media coverage of disputed planning applications calls were made to limit planning permission in scenic areas. This response represented another incarnation of the contest between official and populist environmentalism (Tovey 1992b) with the planning lobby and heritage groups such as An Taisce at odds with local communities who were the key stakeholders in the disputed regions.

Rural communities were alarmed to find that policymakers considered the extent of rural housing development to be unsuitable (McDonald & Nix 2005 112). With housing prices soaring in urban centres many urban dwellers were seeking to build in rural areas, a trend exacerbated by the influx of returning migrants who had left the country during the 1980s. An additional component to the debate was the increase in land value at a time when domestic agriculture was beginning to decline making selling land for housing developments an attractive proposition. As rural housing increased the additional infrastructure such as roads, electricity and water necessary for burgeoning communities, served to increase both the extent of ecological and visual degradation and costs to the state for the provision of services. As most employers, such as the multinationals, tended to locate near urban centres commuting and the inherent loss of social capital became a further concern.

One of the main areas for antagonism identified by the Irish Planning Institute (IPI) was the inconsistencies contained within the planning process across the country and within local authority regions (IPC 2005). An inconsistent planning

culture was exacerbated by the clientelist political system whereby local councillors supported individual cases to attract electoral support. The uneven nature of the clientelist brokerage system had increased the sense of frustration experienced by unsuccessful applicants for planning permission and furthered the onset of rural hostility which many felt precipitated a backlash against the government coalition parties at the 2004 local elections.

Despite the announcement of guidelines on rural one-off housing in March of that year the issue had also given rise to a series of attacks on the heritage watchdog, An Taisce, a group that became the focus of some unsettled councillors' wrath in the run up to the local elections. The fact that An Taisce was singled out for criticism provides an indication of the confused and emotive nature of the one-off housing debate particularly in light of evidence which demonstrates that the heritage group was involved in appeals in less than 1% of cases (McDonald & Nix 2005 14). Ultimately, there has been a growing recognition of the need for landscape and heritage protection in areas of scenic beauty across the country. While urban planning has become regulated a system of environmental assessment has been called for to prevent further abuses of the planning process in relation to inappropriate developments.

The 'Save Tara' campaigners framed their arguments around a number of issues. The primary frame of the campaign was based on the heritage value of the area with the mobilisation of international and national academic support to testify for the area's near-sacred significance. One gathering of academics to protest at the Tara site brought together Professors of history, Celtic Studies, archaeology and anthropology from Europe and North America to petition the government to reroute the motorway. Further support for the campaign was offered from the *Sunday Tribune* newspaper which featured a series of articles on the issue. The academic/heritage frame established an understanding of the international importance of the site which contained artefacts that could reveal layers of information from prehistoric times through to the Middle Ages. The campaigners were able to engage with political allies such as the former Taoiseach, John Bruton, who had represented Fine Gael in Meath as a TD. Mr. Bruton called for the rerouting of the M3 away from the 'globally unique' site calling it a 'sacred space' (McDonald & Nix 2005 188). The combination of academic experts and political allies was strengthened by the emergence of the 'Artists for Tara' group which provided the campaign with high profile supporters such as the actor Stuart Townsend who arrived from Hollywood to offer his help (www.showbizireland.ie 11 October 2004).

Townsend referred to the plan as 'a travesty' and was praised by protest organiser Vincent Salafia for raising the profile of the protest. According to Salafia the support of celebrities afforded the campaign greater media attention and would allow incoming Environment Minister Dick Roche "a chance to understand what is at stake here at Tara" (http/www.breakingnews.ie 10 October 2004). Another tactic which emerged from the academic heritage frame was a submission to the Joint Committee of the Oireachtas on Environment by two professors of archaeology from NUI Galway, Joe Fenwick and Conor Newman. These academics framed their arguments by linking economics and heritage claiming the valuation by the

NRA of €20 million to have an archaeological resolution was considerably undervalued (McDonald & Nix 2005 189). An alternative route east of Skryne and nearer to Dublin was put forward by the academics.

The political opportunity afforded by the Meath by-election in 2005 was seized on by the campaigners with the local Fianna Fáil candidate who supported the M3 being defeated. Environment Minister Dick Roche announced further excavations and enhanced landscaping along the proposed route as well as limiting commercial developments in the area. However the fact that the M3 was allowed to go ahead despite the cultural arguments of the campaigners was decried as 'an act of vandalism' by concerned archaeological spokespersons (ibid.). The Tara campaigners also took a High Court challenge to the M3 route through their spokesperson Vincent Salafia. Part of this legal action involved the extension of the heritage frame which involved depictions of the site as an area of national, archaeological and mythical/spiritual significance. Salafia was intent on promoting the heritage angle to prevent other issues such as NIMBYism, property values or alternative routs emerging as competing frames during the dispute. Another spokesperson, Muireann Ní Bhrolcháin, was also keen to promote the heritage as the pivotal issue in the dispute giving it primacy over secondary concerns about the role of the state agencies or the future of transport in the area (Allen 2006 11).

As in Carrickmines and the Glen of the Downs the Skryne Valley was part of the commuter belt around Dublin which the state and private developers had earmarked as an area of potential developments that could address the insatiable demands of property buyers priced out of the capital and its environs. While some form of decentralisation had been mooted to alleviate the demand for living space throughout the Pale, no real attempt had been made to allow people to live and work in rural areas across the country. The Tara campaigners' tactical approach of promoting heritage conservation rather than attempting to address urban sprawl was visionary in this context, as solutions to the housing, transport and amenities needs of commuters have escaped many in the planning and political sections. On the other hand, a heritage discourse had succeeded in previous environmental disputes, most notably at Mullaghmore.

The strategic direction of the Tara campaigners was one of protecting the Hill of Tara from both road developments and the enforced archaeological digs which were a requirement of such developments. The whole of the Skryne Valley was part of an area of national heritage that needed to be protected from inappropriate developments. The campaigners produced arguments for alternative transport plans, that were railway rather than road based, for the area claiming much of the line was still in existence (Allen 2006 12). Their legal challenge alleges that the state was in breach of its 'constitutional duty to protect the heritage of Ireland' (ibid.). Their campaign had heightened understandings of relevant issues as they had extended it into the political sphere through the Meath by-election in 2005 by interaction with local councils and at government level.

The campaign had also gained considerable coverage in the media. In an interesting parallel with the 'No Nukes' protests at Carnsore nearly 40 years previously, a musical tour helped to raise awareness about the issue. The 'Magentic Music

Tour Tunes for Tara' had spread the word across Ireland and the Continent while the campaign's cultural frame had embraced the support of Ireland's burgeoning New Age community (ibid.). The cultural frame's most notable contribution was the 'Artists for Tara' group which was led by the renowned Celtic artist Jim Fitzpatrick, designer of many famous Thin Lizzy album covers amongst others. Former Hot House Flowers singer Liam Ó Maonlai also released a song in support of the Tara campaign, called *Tara's Eye: Money-Mad Mile*, which was written by Steve Cooney. The establishment of an extensive cultural frame has reinforced the heritage-based arguments of the 'Save Tara' campaigners, and the campaign has won the support of thousands of artists, academics and concerned citizens, support which was reflected in the hundreds who marched in Tara Watch's 'Love Tara' parade in Dublin, in July 2007.

Conclusion

The introduction of the 2004 National Monuments Act placed major constraints on conservationists who planned to challenge infrastructural projects of the state which impinged upon heritage sites around the country. From the state's perspective the Act, like the Infrastructure Bill which was introduced subsequently, provided an opportunity to circumvent the incidents of protest that delayed projects and contributed to escalating costs. These costs came in the wake of the state's investment of over €6.8 billion alongside the €12 billion contributed for roads by the private sector (MacDonald & Nix 2005 286). This combination of state and private funding for roads, when combined with the ideologically charged adversarial approach to environmentalism taken by the neo-liberal Fianna Fáil and Progressive Democrat coalition, created the conditions whereby the ethical considerations appropriate for a heritage site such as the Hill of Tara were reduced to no more than an economic afterthought. The rejection of the High Court challenge by environmentalist Vincent Salafia in March 2006 can be placed within that wider ideological context of the unified rejection by industry and the state of any moral, ethical, legal or environmental consideration of heritage sites as having a universal significance that went beyond the infrastructural needs of one generation.

Furthermore, the weight of the High Court ruling has implications for all environmental activists. The findings of Mr. Justice Smyth criticised the timing of Vincent Salafia's challenge and rejected his argument that the challenge was delayed due to Salafia's involvement in the Carrickmines protest. Therefore the findings in this case charge environmental activists with a responsibility to match the agendas of those who wish to cause environmental degradation or harm to heritage sites, rather than acknowledging the voluntary contribution of concerned members of civil society who wish to raise objections to infrastructural projects. And while the significant financial overrun that had come to characterise roads projects in the Republic benefit no one, many of these problems were caused by the lack of available land rather than by the relatively small number of environmental

protests involving roads projects. For instance, there were no environmental protests surrounding the construction of the Dublin Port Tunnel and yet its costs practically doubled from €220 million to €580 million (MacDonald & Nix 2005 289).

While the state and its industrial partners should provide a value for money roads infrastructure for the tax payer, the state is also charged with maintaining a concern for the country's heritage and the well being of its citizens. Yet the current climate has produced an atmosphere where personalised hostility is directed at advocates such as Vincent Salafia whose expertise was pronounced at the High Court to be *locus standi* or not entitled to a hearing. Salafia was portrayed as a solitary, arrogant protestor intent on delaying critical infrastructure, in one media report of the High Court Action which characterised his actions as 'almost pathologically vexatious' (*Daily Mail* 2 March 2006). The fact that Salafia was one member of a campaign which united locals, Irish and international academics and gained support from celebrities, demonstrates the extent to which a significant number of the population shares Salafia's concerns. If the weight of the system is turned on advocates the constraints on environmental activism become too great and a sector of civil society, already excluded by the existing structures of social partnership, becomes increasingly alienated. This form of neo-corporatist exclusion by the state and industrial interests is alien to the core tenets of a pluralist society where the contribution of elements from civil society is recognised as a significant layer in the structural composition of life in a democracy. The disputed road became the focus of further protests in 2007 when a significant site was found at Lismullen, near Tara. As John Gormley became the first Green Party Minister for the Environment in June of that year, tensions emerged between campaigners and the new Green TD. However, the appointment of noted archaeologist Conor Newman as a special advisor on the Tara issue did much to dispel these concerns. However many would say that the loss of such a valuable heritage site, named as one of the world's most endangered sites by the World Monuments Fund in May 2007, would seem to be unacceptable in a civilised society purported to value its ancient heritage.

Chapter 14
Conclusion: Mapping the Consequences of Environmental Activism

Introduction

Throughout this examination of collective responses to environmental threats a number of framing processes, strategies and types of campaign have been identified. But what are the consequences and outcomes of the various environmental campaigns witnessed n Ireland since the Carnsore point protests? Without doubt, the Irish environmental movement has made an impact on Irish society. We can examine the impact of grass-roots campaigners more effectively by applying the six most beneficial outcomes of environmental activism as identified by Freudenburg and Steinsapir in 1992. These six beneficial outcomes can be summarised as follows:

- Increased community control over public health.
- The introduction of eco-efficient processes by the corporate sector.
- Increased regulation or elimination of toxins from the production processes.
- The establishment of wider support networks for communities that were once isolated.
- Increased environmental and heritage awareness amongst the wider community.
- The expansion of civic participation in environmental decision-making.

A number of potentially harmful projects have been delayed or abandoned due to environmental campaigns. These include the nuclear power station planned for Carnsore as well as multinational industrial plants such as Raybestos Manhattan's asbestos plant and dump in the 1980s in addition to the more recent campaigns against incinerators or the Shell pipeline in Mayo in this category. And while these industries and their state sponsors have decried the abandonment or delay of such projects all of the campaigns covered in this book have increased civic awareness of environmental, health or heritage issues. The Mullaghmore dispute and the more recent anti-roads protests led to substantial national and international debates about how we perceive and conserve heritage sites in an age of accelerated development. Furthermore, each of these campaigns have contributed to the awakening of local knowledge and concern about hinterlands allowing for an augmentation

L. Leonard (ed.), *The Environmental Movement in Ireland.*

of community derived 'social capital' that politicians and commentators have come to value so highly.

Politically, successive environmental campaigns have strengthened the responses of civil society from the grassroots up, bolstering pluralistic discourses at a time when that aspect of democracy has come under threat from a variety of sources including an increasingly technocratic state and a body-politic damaged by a series of planning related scandals. Environmental social movements have benefited mainstream politics in Ireland as witnessed by the rise of the Green party in local, national and European elections over the last decade. One distinctive outcome of environmental conflict has been the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1992. The EPA was originally criticised for its location of a regulatory framework within the context of the state's industrial development policies (Taylor 2001) but the agency has come into its own over time and is now a leading component of institutional environmentalism in Ireland spanning a range of ecological, educational and regulatory responses. However, some distance remains between the EPA and many grass-roots campaigns and the bridging of this gap remains an outstanding issue for all levels of environmentalism in the Irish case.

Our understanding of 'successful' outcomes for movements has been shaped by Gamson (1975) and Burstein et al. (1995) who have identified that 'realisation' and 'influence on policy' (state action) are the key factors in campaign impact assessment. These concepts have been further developed by Amenta and Caren (2004 463) who have perceived the distinctions inherent between actual achievement of stated goals and the achievement of certain 'advantages for constituents'. Inevitably, movement success has therefore become synonymous with state acknowledgement and response to movement grievance. However, the subsequent achievement of aspects of a campaign's aims has also been recognised as a long-term result of collective action particularly when outcomes result from 'unintended consequences' (Amenta & Caren 2004 463). Changes to policy or adoption of movement aims as part of state policy can be part of this process. The formation of Irish environmental policy could be viewed as emerging in a dualistic response to bottom-up grass-roots agitation on the one hand in addition to 'top down' EU legislation on the other. In the Irish case its populist political make-up lends itself to the attainment of some leverage for movements particularly at local level. However, the economic imperative of the state still dominates at policy level despite the occasional opening up of political opportunities at times of elections (Leonard 2005).

At the same time the overall achievements of environmental movements have benefited all in Irish society rather than just campaign participants. On the other hand some negative consequences of environmental activism can be witnessed in the increasingly technocratic approach to infrastructural disputes. They have led to policy responses such as the Critical Infrastructural Bill which may constrain future collective action on environmental issues. It remains to be seen as to whether single-issue candidates from movements or advocates running for the Green Party will achieve enough political power to influence policy decisions in future governments.

Cultural Outcomes

Dunlap Riley (1992) has claimed 'history will surely record the environmental movement as among the few that significantly changed our society'. In the Irish case the environmental movement stands alongside other new left movements such as feminism and civil rights as the main political issues of recent decades. At a time when core values have faded for mainstream parties primarily concerned with maintaining economic growth it has been the new social movements of environmentalism, feminism and civil rights that have shaped a coherent response to a society that was in transition. There has been little attention paid to the cultural consequences of environmental movements. Where social movement literature has examined this (Hart 1996) and (Earl 2004), three main areas of cultural impact have been identified in the following areas:

(i) The social-psychological
(ii) Cultural production
(iii) Collective community or world views (Earl 2004 511–518)

The literature on social-psychological impacts and the works on cultural production examined have tended to focus on changes to values and beliefs arising from movement activity. The third area has examined the 'creation of new collective identities' (ibid.) or subcultures where the very praxis of participation has a transformative affect on people's lives.

Many social groups have come to understand themselves through the transformative process of collective action and in the Irish case we have seen the manner in which local identities are strengthened by collective resistance to perceived threats from outsiders. This form of collective identity transformation demonstrates the interactive relationship between local communities, emergent movements and their hinterlands. Moreover local identities are strengthened when communities respond collectively in defence of their territory. This form of social-psychological bonding may lead to a period of intensive transformation of local identities that may last for generations. The projection of a collective 'us' versus a sometimes less than tangible but threatening 'them' becomes a significant component in the context of social-psychological collective identity building in areas where both the community and their environment are threatened.

The process of establishing potent cultural, moral and social frames lies at the heart of any successful cultural transformation (or re-awakening) of local sentiment during the course of environmental disputes. Wider cultural references such as the anti-nuclear concerts by Bruce Springsteen and Crosby, Stills and Nash were replicated in the Irish case. Over the decades since Carnsore Point one participant, Christy Moore, has become the embodiment of cultural integrity from his work with Moving Hearts through to his solo work. The emergence of celebrity advocates has become a feature of Irish social movements. U2 front man, Bono and his wife Ali Hewson have been involved in campaigns such as Drop the Debt and Adi Roche's Chernobyl Children's Project. While Bono's advocacy alongside Bob

Geldof has become a feature of global advocacy on a range of issues from debt reduction to AIDS prevention, the work of Ali Hewson and Adi Roche as advocates for children of the devastated Chernobyl region presents a twofold cultural frame (i) aiding the children who have suffered from the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear plant meltdown in addition to (ii) presenting a very humane and moral representation of the dangers of nuclear power.

This form of advocacy comes at a time when the experienced environmentalist J. F. Lovelock, author *Gaia a New Look at Life on Earth* (1979) has more recently written an article claiming that 'Nuclear power is the only green solution' (*the Independent* May 24 2004). The Irish state agency Forfar has argued about the need to embrace nuclear power as an environmentally friendly alternative to fossil fuels. Essentially the dichotomy between institutionalised initiatives aimed at sustaining economically driven growth and cultural responses to the risks created by such policies has become a feature of the politics of the new millennium. The cultural consequences of movement activity are often impacted on in a wider manner by the involvement of celebrity advocates in an era when much emphasis is placed on the role of celebrities in shaping culture. In many cases the emergence of an environmental issue only gains public attention due to depictions in popular culture. The anti-nuclear movement benefited from the films such as *The China Syndrome* and *Silkwood*, which featured the 'whistle blowing' story and tragic death of Karen Silkwood while more latterly films such as *Erin Brockovich* have presented a similar tale of an anti-toxics legal advocate. Szasz (1994) has examined the emergence of toxics as an issue from the 1970s onwards with the chemical spills or illegally dumped and leaking chemical drums becoming a staple item on the evening news, in television action dramas, documentaries and even cartoons. In many ways, anti-industrial or environmentally friendly framing has become a cultural signifier of the times; part of a persuasive symbiotic process that has led to even the most heavily polluting industries attempting to rebrand themselves as eco-friendly dolphin lovers.

And while this may have led to a co-option of green issues within a politically correct cultural milieu alongside other new left movements the cultural persuasiveness of this form of environmentally charged cultural capital makes the heavy handed attempts to impose infrastructural projects on Irish communities all the harder to understand particularly at a time when An Taoiseach, Bertie Ahern, is calling for increased community-based public participation (*Irish Times* 15 April 2006). Ultimately, this study of Irish environmental movements has highlighted the significance of the 'discursive opportunity structure' (Gamson 2004 249) surrounding community responses to environmental risks. As with the concept of 'political opportunity structure' discursive structures are not fixed but have a 'variable element' (ibid.) where cultural framing becomes a primary source of discursive capital with discursive opportunity structures becoming the 'playing field in which framing contests occur' (ibid.). In the Irish context a left-leaning anti-capitalism and anti-militarism informed many of what have been termed 'first-phase' environmental disputes in Ireland (Leonard 2005). This has been combined with a strong sense of identity that is grounded in rural discourse creating

a strong sense of opposition to first phase, multinational projects in the 1970s and 1980s while contributing to the emergence of new middle-class opposition to second-phase state sponsored infrastructural projects in recent decades (see Table 14.1).

The initial campaigns that came to define first-phase disputes were the conservation campaigns aimed at saving Georgian Dublin and Woodquay and the anti-nuclear protest at Carnsore Point. Campaign leaders including Mary Robinson or Petra Kelly were able to draw on existing moral and cultural frames in the process of creating a discursive response to plans for nuclear power in Ireland. The Carnsore Point protest benefited from wider symbiotic understandings of the perils of nuclear power created by US and European anti-nuclear protestors in addition to the wider representation of the nuclear issue that were becoming part of popular culture. The linking of the Donegal uranium mining issue with the energy debates surrounding the state's plans for Carnsore brought together the anti-war and environmental camps at an early stage. However, while local populism played some role in the Tynagh mines dispute the inability of the local population to create the momentum which would go beyond the economic rationale for mining at Tynagh contributed to the horrors that followed during the mining process and the scarred, poisoned site when it was eventually abandoned. The Tynagh Mines case and the subsequent degradation that occurred at the site and across its surrounding waterways and hinterlands should serve as a reminder to those who argue that communities should comply and take whatever economic benefits accrue from such acquiescence.

The one environmental campaign that can be seen as having a successful outcome for the movement involved was that of the Burren Action Group at Mullaghmore. Through a series of legal actions combined with a comprehensive understanding of the fragility of the Burren's ecosystems the BAG campaign achieved its goal of preventing tourist infrastructure from impinging on the Burren. It also contributed to an ongoing debate about the nature of heritage, identity and development both locally and internationally. The Mullaghmore campaign provides an illustration of the significance of expertise for any environmental group that finds itself in dispute with the interests of local authorities or the state.

The importance of new middle-class expertise has also been demonstrated as a key aspect of the anti-incinerator campaigns in Galway, Meath and Cork. The ability of these groups to contest the scientific data of the host industry or the state may not prevent incinerators being built in Ireland but this form of interest-led advocacy has informed concerned communities, industry and state officials about the potential risks of any incineration process that does not comply with strict processes of waste separation. In addition, the cultural importance of the reuse and recycle component of waste management has been reinforced by the anti-incineration campaigns, all of which presented recycling-led alternatives that would challenge the 'throw-away' syndrome so conspicuous in contemporary consumerism.

The debate about resources which first emerged in the 1970s and 1980s has resurfaced as part of the Shell to Sea campaign. This campaign has re-invigorated the sense of community in Mayo and across rural Ireland, an identity that can be

Table 14.1 Campaign Outcomes

	Political	Social	Cultural	Legal	Institutional	Economic	Scientific
No Nukes Carnsore Point	Policy Abandoned	Inter-group Networking	Issue Salience Unions & Environmentalists United	Moral and Legal Issues debated	Nuclear Energy option abandoned	Energy policies altered	Nuclear arguments abandoned
Anti-Toxics Anti-Multinational Cork	State emphasis on TNC led development maintained	Increased Networking	Divergence between Unions & Environmentalists	Legal actions, Legal threats against campaigners	IDA Policy on TNC development maintained	State policies on TNC Development maintained	Interest-led debates on toxics begin
Anti-Mining Tynagh, Donegal, Croagh Patrick	State resources sold off	DUC and Carnsore Campaigners Networking	Rural Defence of Space campaigns	Compulsory Purchase Laws enacted	State resource agencies established	Resources sold off	Debates about Uranium and Cyanide
Heritage Mullaghmore	State policy on interpretive centre defeated	Successful challenge to state policy	Raising of Awareness about Heritage	EU Legal Option utilised by Campaigners	OPW challenged Policy abandoned An Taisce's source	Tourism policy altered	Increased understanding of ecological issues
Anti-Incinerator GSE & NIA	Regional Waste Management Policy delayed	Mobilisation & Networking of Anti-Incinerator groups	Increased participation by Community Groups	Legal Challenges against Incinerator Licenses	EPA and An Bord Pleanála hearings	Waste plans shift towards recycling	Increased understanding of dioxins & waste flows
Anti-Incinerator CHASE	Contestation of Regional Waste Policy	Re-emergence of Cork Environmental Campaigns	Increased Community participation in Chase Campaign	Legal challenges by CHASE	An Bord Pleanála hearings	Waste Plans for Cork pivotal to State	Increased understanding of wider issues involving incineration
Resources Shell to Sea	Developing Campaigns of Resistance	Emergence of Rural Political Movement	Wider Rural Sentiment Articulated	Imprisonment of Rossport Five	EPA Ruling, Human Rights Group Interest	Gas resources held by multinational	Debates about Resources
Glen of the Down, Carrickmines, Tara/Skryne Anti-Roads	Direct Action Campaign Against Infrastructural Projects	Mobilisation of New Wave of Environmental Movement	Debates about Development and Heritage	Legal challenges against Routing of Motorways	Roads Authority developing Nationwide Roads Network	Emphasis on private transport despite energy crisis	Ecological and Energy issues raised Roads & Heritage Issues Linked with Climate Change

traced back to the agrarian agitation of the Land League. The territorial response of the North Mayo community to the perceived threats of the gas pipeline set to run across their lands is an instinctive one. The injustice surrounding the jailing of the Rossport 5 mobilised a wider response among the Irish populace which was growing angry at increased collusion between state and industrial interests at the expense of local communities.

The sense of grievance at state indifference to local or national heritage informs the anti-roads disputes. The current obsession with private car ownership over public transport has an ideological base. When combined with the destruction of heritage at Tara or Carrickmines or environmental degradation at the Glen of the Downs a new ideological response has emerged that draws on wider discursive challenges to articulate a coherent position based on a sense of environmental justice and conservation of the past. We can locate the campaigns covered in this study within the context of what Tovey (1992b) has termed 'populist' environmentalism. Emerging from a wider network of anti-war and moral campaigners the anti-nuclear protestors who staged the festivals at Carnsore point achieved enough leverage to have the state abandon its nuclear energy policy. Socially a network of environmental actors was established that was all-Ireland and international in its make up. Culturally this network provided the fledgling Irish environmental movement with a unifying issue and the anti-nuclear issue maintained its salience for campaigners and public over a number of years.

The campaign succeeded in opening a debate on a number of moral issues, many of which were covered in *A Nuclear Ireland*? With the abandonment of the nuclear energy option alternative approaches were examined by the state and in time the Irish state became a long-time opponent of the British nuclear industry. Scientifically, in the Irish case, arguments in favour of the nuclear option were abandoned until the recent energy crisis engendered a resurfacing of this exchange with prominent environmentalists such as James Lovelock suggesting nuclear power as an alternative to fossil fuels. The anti-toxics campaigns which occurred in Cork at locations such as Ovens, Ringaskiddy or the Womanagh Valley and were written about by Adrian Peace emerged as part of the first phase of anti-multinational campaigning in pre-growth Ireland (Leonard 2005). These successive events can be analysed in the context of a number of anti-multinational campaigns in Ireland throughout the 1970s and 1980s involving multinationals such as Raybestos Manhattan, Merrill Dow, Merck Sharp and Dohme, DuPont and Beechams (Allen & Jones 1990; Peace 1993, 1997; Allen 2004; Leonard 2005, 2006). These campaigns are a part of the 'cycles of protest' (Tarrow 1994, 1998; Snow & Benford 1992) that form part of the interconnected sense of grievance in many rural and suburban areas. Campaigns established framing processes derived from this extensive sense of grievance at the location of multinational plants that were perceived as posing a pollution risk.

One unfortunate result of the emergence of community-based campaigns against multinationals was the opening up of a divergence between community-based environmentalists and the trades unions, a gulf that had previously been bridged during the Carnsore anti-nuclear campaign. Disputes about the siting of toxic waste plants

opened up the now familiar legal action or oral hearing approach for environmental campaigners and led to the establishment of the EPA in 1992. While communities gained access to expertise about toxics as a result of their campaigns the state never abandoned its policy of multinational-led development. However, the onset of the 'Celtic Tiger' saw the emergence of IT-based technologies as a more popular form of multinational development with polluting industries facing constraints from the EPA on EU legislation and fines. The issue of resources, either on- or offshore has never been satisfactorily resolved in the Irish case. The Shell to Sea campaign in some ways characterises the ongoing dilemma of Irish resource management. While many European countries have developed energy policies that included resource partnerships with industry the Irish state has sold off all of the resources in the hope of making short-term, small economic gains. As a result approaches to the development of mines such as Tynagh, Donegal or Croagh Patrick led to a great deal of community opposition and in the case of Tynagh mines, extensive ecological degradation. And while the type of resource has varied from mineral to uranium to offshore gas the heavy-handed approach of the state-backed industries involved, alongside the seemingly reckless sell-off of our natural resources, led to a heightened sense of rural territorialism and a discursive process whereby communities reassessed their hinterlands when threatened by outside projects. The response of the state has been to introduce stringent laws to facilitate the compulsory acquisition of land in addition to the establishment of a series of agencies to deal with resource management, many of which seem to favour industry over local concerns.

The Mullaghmore heritage dispute provides us with the best example of a campaign that achieved a successful outcome. The campaign led to a reversal of the state's plans to build an interpretative centre in the Burren. In addition, a wider debate about economic, social and cultural aspects of tourism and heritage was entered into by the supporters and opponents of the centre. When combined with the Burren Action Group's ecological expertise and ability to utilise national and European legal frameworks as sympathetic, discursive and strategic framing patterns were established which provided the campaigners with a successful outcome. Furthermore, national and international interest in the heritage and ecology of Ireland was rekindled. However, the dispute created a dichotomy between local groups opposed to or in favour of the interpretative centre and exposed tensions between local interests that favour economic environment over such interests. The anti-incinerator disputes in Galway, Meath and Cork had mixed results for local campaigners. In Galway no incinerator has been built at this point. However, licences for incinerators were granted for Meath and Cork in late 2005. While all three campaigns came to be involved in the 2002 general election campaign GSE engaged with a wider group of candidates from both government and opposition parties. This, in addition to the concerns of local politicians who feared an electoral backlash on the issue may have led to plans for a Connacht regional incinerator being shelved. However, the Meath and Cork plants were pivotal to the state's waste management policy which was based on a combination of incineration, landfilling and recycling.

While recycling levels achieved in Galway would make incineration unviable the multinational sector was demanding thermal treatment for industrial waste. The sites at Meath and Cork were adjacent to major urban centres thus creating the momentum for the granting of licences in these areas. While GSE forged political links NIA in Meath and CHASE in Cork took the legal route, a tactic that diminishes any sense of community-based sentiment in the context of any subsequent oral hearing (Peace 1993). However, all three anti-incinerator campaigns as well as those in Clare and Poolbeg, Dublin have raised awareness about the issue of dioxins. The introduction of incinerators as part of the state's waste management plans is linked to the wider consumer society which produces waste flows that have led to the exportation of Irish waste to destinations in Asia. These moral issues must be addressed as part of any comprehensive solution to the issue of waste management in the future.

The Shell to Sea campaign has raised the complex issue of a community response to an infrastructural project based on both a sense of grievance about the intrusion of the project in the area and fears about the safety of the gas pipeline. The response of the North Mayo community has emerged from a historically derived sense of place which has been articulated as part of a wider discursive framing process that links cultural nationalism with community-based environmentalism. Politically the issue can be traced back to the long standing state policy of selling off resources while facilitating land acquisitions by partners. Local political response has been mixed with Independent TD, Jerry Cowley, supporting the Shell to Sea campaign while mainstream councillors and TDs were ambivalent or chose to favour onshore development. From a populist perspective the rural or agrarian politics of the Land League has been rekindled while the Shell to Sea campaign has developed an international support network from Ireland to Norway and Nigeria.

The initial phase of rural-based community politics which was synonymous with the campaign in its early years has been extended to wider links with a new wave of direct action environmentalists who emanated from the anti-roads or anti-war alliances. The jailing of the five men who challenged the onshore pipeline in their community became the defining event of the campaign as the 'Rossport 5' and their families won a great deal of sympathy and support from the general public. Both the state and subsequently, industry have come to recognise the extent of support Shell to Sea had achieved thus a mediation process was undertaken. This process, chaired by former trades unions' leader Peter Cassells, has been criticised by Shell to Sea spokesperson Maura Harrington. Protestors have converged at the Rossport Solidarity Camp in the area and remain resolute in their stance. They are hopeful of a future where local voices will be heard on this issue. Their protest is part of a culture of mobilisation which has become a feature of modern society (Cox, L. 1999b). The successive anti-roads campaigns which occurred at the Glen of the Downs, Carrickmines and Tara/Skryne had their inception in the wider anti-roads protests undertaken by Earth First in the late 1980s. This form of direct action has become a feature of the new wave of environmental activism in Ireland; one that combines opposition to growth-based ecological degradation with wider

issues such as opposition to the War in Iraq. However, the direct action wing of the anti-roads campaign has also extended its wider networks with second-phase anti-infrastructural campaigns including anti-incinerator groups and the Shell to Sea protest. In addition, the anti-roads protestors have extended the debate about heritage in an era when even significant sites such as the Hill of Tara are coming under threat from development projects. A wider debate about the future direction of the nation in a post-growth, post-materialist phase has been embarked on in the wake of these second-phase campaigns. The history of environmental campaigns in Ireland indicates a need to address certain deficits which remain a feature of Irish society:

- Understanding the significance of the landscape and hinterland for rural communities in the face of infrastructural projects, which are imposed without consultation. This provides a backlash borne of local populist feeling, which I have termed 'rural sentiment', which is actually a form of environmental or ecological social capital.
- There is a need to recognise communities in the planning stage. This may sound obvious, but in the rush to avoid objections, local support is by-passed with subsequent problems at the implementation stage. Public partnerships need to be established to address local fears, rather than blaming locals for having concerns about risks, real or perceived. This has been the basis for two of our political success of late, as represented by the Programme for Social Partnership and the Good Friday Agreement. Unfortunately the nature of Social Partnership as it stands is primarily economic (IBEC, Unions and the State) and actually leads to the exclusion of non economic groups such as rural communities, women's groups, children's advocates, the marginalised, the disabled, who have come to form opposition movements in response to this exclusion.

Despite their best efforts, An Taisce isn't always representative of local communities. As a result environmental issues are perceived as an unwelcome agenda by both communities and the state. However, An Taisce is represented in Partnership, and on the EPA board. The EPA should be the vehicle for all of these disputes, but is diluted by Government appointees. Ultimately these disputes such as Shell to Sea or Tara pit communities and their advocates (usually part time university staff or lawyers who are environmentally minded) against the might of the social partners (State, IBEC and Unions) as well as the multinationals. While no one disputes the need for infrastructure-roads, gas pipeline or electricity pylons, a democratic deficit remains which ultimately needs to be addressed through local consultation at the planning stage. This may be time consuming, but it would in one movement strengthen our pluralistic democracy.

We began this book by reiterating John Barry's speculation as to whether 'it would be an exaggeration to proclaim that we are all greens now' (Barry 1999). However, the first decade of the new millennium has witnessed a growth in green awareness across the island of Ireland. While few have contributed as much to this phenomenon as Barry himself, his combination of environmental activism, politics and academics provides a key indicator of where environmentalism can continue to

grow as a progressive aspect of socio-cultural and political change throughout Ireland. Of course, major issues remain for all of us to consider. The ongoing fuel crisis, debates about energy alternatives ranging from wind power to nuclear energy and the moral issues of waste flows and emission trading all remain contentious issues for the Ireland of the future. It remains to be seen whether or not this once green nation will live up to its image as an island of unspoilt natural beauty, populated by communities rooted in the soil. The environmental campaigns which have contributed to this debate may be based on an instinctive concern for community and hinterland but they have also increased our knowledge of the issues surrounding a rapidly changing Ireland. By reconsidering a community-based engagement with the landscape which characterised the past these campaigns have become a movement that may hold the key to our environmental future.

Bibliography

Allen, K. (2000). *The celtic tiger: the myth of social partnership in Ireland*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Allen, R. (1992). *Waste not want not*. London: Earthscan.

Allen, R. (2004). *No global: the people of Ireland versus the multinationals*. London: Pluto.

Allen, R. (2006). *"There will always be a Tara" Ireland from below* (Vol. 2). Dublin: IFB.

Allen, R., & Jones, T. (1990). *Guests of the nation the people of Ireland versus the multinationals*. London: Earthscan.

Andersen, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: reflections on origins and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Amente, E., & Caren, N. (2004). The legislative, organisational and beneficiary consequences of state orientated challenges. In D. Snow, A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *Blackwell companion to social movements*. London: Blackwell.

Ansell, C. (2003). Community embeddedness and collaborative governance in the San Francisco Bay area environment movement. In M. Diani, & D. McAdam (Eds.), *Social movements and networks relational approaches to collective action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bahro, R. (1994). *Avoiding social and ecological disaster: the politics of world transformation*. Bath: Gateway.

Baker, S. (1990). Irish environment. In W. Rudig (Ed.), *Green politics 1*.

Baker, S. (1998). The nuclear issue in Ireland: the role of the Irish nuclear movement. *Irish Political Studies*, *3*.

Barry, J. (1999). *Rethinking green politics: nature, virtue and progress*. London: Sage.

Barry, J. (2007). Environmental movements in Ireland; north and south. In John Macdonough, Tony Varley, & Sally Shortfall (Eds.), *A living countryside? The politics of sustainability in Ireland*.

Barry, J., & Wissenburg, M.L.J. (Eds.) (2001). S*ustaining liberal democracy: ecological challenges and opportunity*. London: Palgrave.

Bax, M. (1976). *Harpstrings and confessions: machine style politics in the Irish republic*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Beck, U. (1992). *Ecological politics in an age of risk*. London: Polity.

Beck, U. (1996). *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. London: Sage.

Bilton, T., Bonnett, K., Jones, Lawson, T.K, & Skinner, D. (2002). Stanworth, M. Webster, *A introduction to sociology* (Vol. 4). London: Palgrave.

Bookchin, M. (1980). *Towards an ecological society*. Montreal: Black Rose.

Bookchin, M. (1995). *Renchanting humanity*. London: Cassel.

Borgetta, E., & Borgetta, M. (1992). *Encyclopaedia of sociology* (Vol. 4). London: Simon & Schuster.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). (the Three) Forms of capital. In John G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research in the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). London: Greenwood.

Breen, R., Hannon, D., Rottman, D., & Whelan, C. (1990). *Understanding contemporary Ireland*. London: Macmillan.

Burnstein, Einwohner, R., Hollander, J., (1995). The success of political movements a bargaining perspective. In C. Jenkins, & J. Klandermans (Eds.) *The politics of grassroots environmental conflict*. New York: St. Martin's.

Campbell, P. (2002). Press conference for the campaign for the protection of resources. Dublin: CFPR.

Carmin, J. (2003). *Resources, opportunities and environmental action in the democratic transition and early consolidation periods in the Czech republic environmental politics*. Vol.12, No.3.

Carroll, J., & Kelly, P. (1980). *A nuclear Ireland?* Dublin: Transport and General Workers Union.

Cassidy, F. (1998). Making the point. *Sunday Tribune*, Dublin, August.

Castells, M. (1983). *The city and the grassroots*. London: Edward Arnold.

Castells, M. (2001). *The network society* (Vol. 1). London: Blackwell.

Coakley, J., & Gallagher, M. (Eds.) (1999). *Politics in the republic of Ireland* (3rd ed.). London: PSAI.

Colleran, E. (1989). Paper presented at the Aquaculture Conference. Galway: University of Galway Press.

Colleran, E. (2000). History of the proposed visitor centre/gortaka entry point for the Burren National Park. http//burrenay inst 2000.html.

Commins, P. (1986). Rural social change. In S. Clancy, Prundy, K. Lynch, & L. O'Dowd (Eds.), *Ireland a sociological perspective*. Dublin: Sociological Association of Ireland.

Connolly, F., & Lynch, R. (2005). *Fiosrú: the great corrib gas controversy*. Dublin: Centre for Public Inquiry.

Connolly, L., & Hourigan, N. (2006). *Social movements and Ireland*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Connolly, L., & O'Toole, T. (2005). *Documenting Irish feminisms*. Dublin: Woodfield.

Connolly, L. (2003). *The Irish women's movement*: *from revolution to devolution*. London and New York: Macmillan/Palgrave.

Cox, L. (1997). Structure, routine and transformation movements from below at the end of the century. In C. Barker, & M. Tyldersley (Eds.), *Fifth international conference on alternative futures and popular protest*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Coyle, C. (1994). Administrative capacity and the implementation of EU environmental policy in Ireland. In S. Baker, K. Milton, & S. Yearly(Eds.), *Protecting the periphery environmental policy in peripheral regions of the EU*. London: Frank Cass.

Cronin, M. (2000). *Across the lines travel, language, translation*. Cork: Cork University Press.

Crossley, N. (2002). *Making sense of social movements*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Curtin, C. (1986). The peasant farm and commoditisation in the West of Ireland. In N. Long (Ed.), *The commoditisation debate*. Wageningen University, The Netherlands.

Curtin, C., Haase, T., & Tovey, H. (1996). *Rural poverty in Ireland a political economy perspective*. Dublin: Oak Tree.

Curtin, C., & Shields (1998). Community action and the state. In Clancy et al. (Eds.), *Irish society sociological perspectives*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

Curtin, C., & Varley, T. (1987). Agricultural co-operatives and rural development in the west of Ireland. *Eire – Ireland 24*(3).

Curtin, C., & Varley, T. (1995). Community action and the state. In Clancy et al. (Eds.), *Irish society*.

Curtin, C., & Wilson, T. (1987). *Ireland from below: social change and local communities*. Galway: Galway University Press.

Dalby, S. (1998). *The nuclear syndrome victory for the Irish anti-nuclear power movement*. Dublin: Dawn Train No. 3 Winter 1984/1985.

Davies, A. (2003). Waste wars-public attitudes and the politics of place. In waste management strategies Irish geographies (Vol. 36 (I)). Dublin: University College.

Davies, J. (1962). Towards a theory of revolution. *American Sociological Review*, *XXVII*.
Dearing, J., & Rogers, E. (1996). *Agenda setting*. London: Sage.
Della Porta, D., & Diani, M. (1999). *Social movements: an introduction*. London: Blackwell.
Diani, M. (2003). Leaders or brokers? positions and influence in social movement networks. In M. Diani, & D. McAdam (Eds.), *Social movement and networks, relational approaches to collective action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Doran, P. (2007). Absent-friends of the earth: minding the gap in Ireland's social partnership. Paper presented at the 3rd Annual SSRC International Conference, Galway, March.
Douthwaite, R. (1992). *The growth illusion how economic growth has enriched the few, impoverished the many, and endangered the planet*. Dublin: Lilliput Press and Green Books.
Dryzek, J. (1997). *The politics of the earth environmental discourses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Dryzek, J., Downes, D., Hunold, C., Schlosberg, D., & Hernes, H.K. (2003). *Green states and social movements environmentalism in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany and Norway*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Earl, J. (2000). Methods, movements and outcomes methodological differences in the study of extra-movement outcomes. *Research in social movements, conflict and change*. London: Blackwell.
Earl, J. (2004). The cultural consequences of social movements. In D. Snow, S. Soote, N. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements*. London: Blackwell.
Eckersley, R. (1992). *Environmentalism and political theory towards an ecocentric approach*. London: University College London Press.
Eisinger, P. (1973). The conditions of protest behaviour in American cities. *America Political Science Review*, *67*, 11–28.
Fagan, G.H. (2003). Sociological reflections on governing waste. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, *121*.
Feehan, T. (1991). *Environment and development in Ireland proceedings of a conference held at UCD, 9–13th December 1991*. Dublin: The University College Dublin Environment Institute.
Fillieule, O., & Jiminez, M. (2003). The methodology of protest event analysis and media politics of reporting environmental events. In C. Rootes (Ed.), *Environmental protest in western Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Fine, G. (1995). Public narration and group culture. In Johnston, & Klandermans (Eds.), *Social movements and culture*. London: UCL.
Friedman, D., & McAdam, D. (1992). Meanalities, political, cultures and collective action frames. In A. Morris, C. McLurg, Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement*. London: Yale University Press.
Friel, L. (2005). The other end of the rainbow gold mining comes to Tyrone Belfast. *An phoblact/ republican news*.
Gamson, W. (1975). *The strategy of social protest*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
Gamson, W. (1988). *International social movement research* (Vol.1). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
Gamson, W. (1992). The social psychology of collective action. In A. Aldon, & C. McClurgh Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Gamson, W. (1998). Political discourse and collective action. In Klandermans et al. (Eds.), *From structure to action*. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
Garavan, M. (2004). The pattern of Irish environmentalism. Unpublished thesis, Galway: National University of Ireland.
Garavan, M., Corduff, W., Corduff, M., Seighin, M.O., Seighin, C.O., McGrath, P., et al. (Eds.) (2006). *The Rossport 5: our story*. Wicklow: Small World Media.
Garner, R. (2000). *Environmental politics Britain, Europe and the global environment* (2nd ed.). London: Macmillan.
Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Green, B. (1996). *Countryside conservation landscape, ecology, planning and management* (3rd ed.). London: EandFN SPON.

Green Party of Ireland (2007). *Fairness and prosperity a green approach to the economy*. Dublin: Green Party of Ireland.
Green Party of Ireland (2007). *Previous generation: Ten reasons why nuclear power makes no sense for Ireland*. Dublin: Green Party of Ireland.
Grove-White, R. (1993). Environmentalism: a new moral discourse for technological society. In K. Milton (Ed.), *Environmentalism: the view from anthropology*. London: Routledge.
Habermas, J. (1972). *Legitimation crisis*. London: Routledge.
Hamilton, D. (1992). *Inward investment in Northern Ireland*. Report no. 99. Belfast: Northern Ireland Economic Council.
Hardiman, N. (1994). Class, community and sexual divisions in county Mayo. In C. Curtin, M. Kelly, & L. O'Dowd (Eds.), *Culture and ideology in Ireland*. Galway: Galway University Press.
Hart, S. (1996). The cultural dimension of social movements a theoretical assessment and literature review. *Sociology of Religion*, *57*.
Hajer, M. (1995). *The politics of environmental discourse: ecological modernisation and the policy process*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Haugaard, M. (1997). *The constitution of power a theoretical analysis of power and structure*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Heffernan, T.F. (1988). *Woodquay the clash over Dublin's viking past*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
Hirst, P. (1993). Associational democracy. In D. Held (Ed.), *Prospects for democracy North South, East, West* (pp. 112–117). Cambridge, MA: Polity.
Holmes, R., & Kenny, M. (1994). The electoral breakthrough of the Irish greens. *Environmental politics* (Vol. 3, No. 2). London: Frank Cass 218–225.
Inglehart, R. (1977). The silent generation in Europe inter-generational change in post-industrial societies. *American Political Science Review*, *65*, 991–1017.
Inglehart, R. (1997). *The silent revolution changing values and political styles among western public*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Irish Times Editorial (2007). *Green manifesto. Irish Times*, Dublin, 2 May 2007, 21.
Irish Times Editorial (2007). *Green party to join coalition. Irish Times*, Dublin, 14 June 2007, 17.
Jenkins, J. (1983). Resource mobilisation theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *9*.
Jessop, B. (1990). *State theory: putting the capitalist state in its place*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
Kavanagh, A. (2004). The 2004 local elections in the republic of Ireland. *Irish political studies* (Vol.19, No. 2). London: Routledge.
Klandermans, B., Kriesi, H., & Tarrow, S. (Eds.) (1988). *From structure to action international social movement research* (Vol. 1). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
Klandermans, B. (1989a). International social movement research. *Organisation for change* (Vol. 2). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
Klandermans, B. (1989b). Grievance interpretation and success expectations the social construction of protest. *Social Behaviour*, *4*, 113–125.
Kelleher, C., & O'Mahony, A. (1984). *Marginalisation in Irish agriculture*. Dublin: An Foras Taluntais.
Kiprewitz, R. (2005). *The proposed corrib onshore system an independent analysis*. Dublin: CPI.
Kitching, G. (1989). *Development and underdevelopment in historical perspective populism, nationalism and industrialisation*. London: Routledge.
Kitschelt, H. (1986). Political opportunity structures and political protest in four countries. *British Journal of Political Science*, *16*.
Kreisi, H. (1989). The political opportunity structure of the Dutch peace movement. *West European Politics*, *12*, 295–312.
Kreisi, H. (2004). Political context and opportunity. In D. Snow, S. Soule, & H. Kreisi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements*. London: Blackwell.
Koopmann, N., & Stratham, (1999). Political claims analysis integrating protest event analysis and political discourse approaches. ICS Leeds AC, UK.

Kousis, M. (2002). Environmental impact of tourism. In J. Barry, & E.G. Frankland (Eds.), *International encyclopaedia of environmental politics*. London: Routledge.
Laver, M. (Ed.) (2001). *Estimating the policy position of political actors*. London: Routledge.
Leonard, L. (1999). *Ecolaiocht na hEireann: Irish environmental policy*. Unpublished M.Phil. master's thesis. Galway: National University of Ireland Galway.
Leonard, L. (2003). *The new technologies of communication and environmental protest*. Review of Postgraduate Studies (Vol. 11). Galway: National University of Ireland Galway.
Leonard, L. (2005). *Politics inflamed: GSE and the campaign against incineration in Ireland*. Greenhouse Press Ecopolitics series (Vol. 1). Drogheda: Choice Publishing.
Leonard, L. (2006). *Green nation: the environmental movement from Carnsore point to the Rossport 5*. Greenhouse Press Ecopolitics series (Vol. 2). Drogheda: Choice Publishing.
Leonard, L. (2007). *Media and protests the utilisation of communications technologies by environmental movements*. Dublin: Irish Communications Review.
Lewicki, R., Gray, B., & Elliot, M. (2003). *Making sense of intractable environmental conflicts*. London: Island.
Low, S., & Lawrence- Zúñiga, D. (2003). *The anthropology of space and place locating culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Lyotard, J.F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: a report on knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Manning, H., & Rootes, C. (2000). The tainted triumph of the greens the Australian national election 9 October 2004. *Environmental Politics* (Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 403–408). London: Frank Cass.
Mair, P. (2001). Searching for the positions of political actors a review of approaches and a critical evaluation of expert surveys. In M. Laver (Ed.), *Establishing the positions of political actors*. London: Routledge.
Marsden, T., Murdock, J., Lowe, Minton, R., & Flynn, A. (1993). *Constructing the countryside*. London: University College Press.
Martell, L. (1994). *Nature and society: an introduction*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
McAdam, D. (1982). *Political process and the development of black insurgency 1930 – 1970*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
McAdam, D., McCarthy, D., & Zald, M. (1988). Social Movements. In N. Smelser (Ed.), *Handbook of sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (1977). Resource mobilisation and social movements. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*.
McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (Eds.) (1996). C*omparative perspectives on social movements, political opportunities, mobilising structures and cultural framing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
MacDonald, F. (1985). *The destruction of Dublin*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.
MacDonald, F., & Nix, T. (2005). *Chaos at the crossroads*. Kinsale: Gandon.
McGrath, B. (1995). *The mist-covered mountain change, conflict and identity in Ireland's countryside – the case of a planned development at Mullaghmore, Co. Clare*. Unpublished master's thesis. Galway: National University of Ireland Galway.
McGrath, B. (1996). Environmentalism and property rights. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, *6*, 25–48.
McWilliams, D. (2005). *The pope's children: Ireland's new elite*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.
Melucci, A. (1985). The symbolic challenge of contemporary social movements. *Social Research*, *52*.
Mol, A., & Sonnefeld, D. (2000). Ecological modernisation around the world: an introduction. *Environmental Politics*, *9*.
Mooney, J., & O'Brien, S. (2007). Kenny backs greens. *Sunday Times*, 29 April, p 2.
Morris, A., & Staggenbory, S. (2004). Leadership in social movements. In D. Snow, S. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements*. London: Blackwell.
Mullally, G. (1997). Treading softly on the political system: The Irish greens in the 1997 general election. *Environmental Politics* (Vol.6, No. 4). London: Frank Cass.
Mueller, C. (1999). Protest event analysis. Mobilization No 4 (z).

O'Brien, S. Aherne (2007). Jubilant ahern targets greens. *Sunday Times*, 27 May, p 1.
Offe, C. (1984). *Contradictions of the social welfare state*. London: Hutchinson.
Offe, C. (1987). Changing boundaries of institutional politics: Social movements since the 1960s. In C.S Maier (Ed.), *Changing boundaries of the political*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
O'Hearn, D. (1999). *Inside the celtic tiger: the Irish economy and the Asian model*. London: Pluto.
O'Leary, M. (2003). Submission by CHASE to the EPA Oral Hearing on the expanding of a Draft Licence for a toxic waste incinerator at Ringaskiddy, Co. Cork. Cork: CHASE.
Oliver, Myers, D. (1998). *Diffusion models of cycles of protest as a theory of social movements*. Montreal: Congress of the International Sociological Association.
O'Dowd, L, Wilson (Eds.) (1996). *Borders nations and states: frontiers and sovereignty in the New Europe*. Aldershot: Avebury.
O'Riordan, T. (1981). *Environmentalism*. London: Pion Zedn.
O'Riordan, T. (1988). *The politics of sustainability*. London: Earthscan.
O'Sullivan, J. (2000). *An approach to resolving the current waste crisis* (Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 20–25). Dublin: Irish Environmental and Planning Law Journal.
O'Toole, F. (1994). *Blackhole, greencard: the disappearance of Ireland*. Dublin: New Ireland Books.
Peace, A. (1993). Environmental protest, bureaucratic disclosure: the politics of discourse in rural Ireland. In K. Milton (Ed.), *Environmentalism: the view from anthropology*. London: Routledge.
Peace, A. (1997). *A time of reckoning: the politics of discourse in rural Ireland*. London: Routledge.
Peace, A. (2005). A sense of place, a place of sense: land and a landscape in the west of Ireland. *Journal of anthropological research winter 2005* (Vol. 61). New Mexico: University of New Mexico University Press.
Peillon, M. (1982). *Contemporary Irish society: an introduction*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.
Pepper, D. (1993). *Modern environmentalism: an introduction*. London: Routledge.
Phyne, J. (1996). Biological warfare salmon fishing, angling tourism and the sea trust dispute in the west of Ireland. *1989–95 Irish Journal of Sociology*, *6*.
Piven, F., & Cloward, R. (1997). *Poor people's movements*. New York: Panteron.
Putnam, D. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
Reckman, (1979). *Naar een strategie en methedioek vor sociale aktie*. Baain: Bosch and Keurig.
Rootes, C. (1997). Environmental movements and green parties in western and eastern Europe. In M. Redclift, & G. Woodgate (Eds.), *International handbook of environmental sociology*. Cheltenham and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
Rootes, C. (2006). Book review of C. Foreman's the quest for environmental justice. *Environmental politics* (Vol. 15, No. 1) London: Taylor & Francis.
Rootes, C. (1997). *Shaping collective action structure, contingency and knowledge*. In R. Edmondson (Ed.), *The Political context of collective action power, argumentation and democracy*. London: Routledge.
Sabel, C., Fung, A., & Karkkainen, B. (2005). Beyond backyard environmentalism: how communities are quietly refashioning environmental regulation. In J. Dryzek, & D. Schlosberg (Eds.), *Debating the earth, land and sea*.
Scott, A. (1990). *Ideology and the new social movements*. London: Unwin Hyman.
Scruggs, L. (1999). Institutions and environmental performance in 17 western democracies. *British journal of political studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Smelser, N. (1962). *Theory of collective behaviour*. New York: Free.
Smith, M. (2005). Citizens, Denizens and the *res publica:* environmental ethics, structures of feeling and political expression. *Environmental Values*, *14*: 145–162.
Snow, D., & Benford, R. (1992). Collective identities and activism. In A. Morris, C. McLeurg, Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory*.

Snow, D., Burke, R., Warden, S., & Benford, R. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilisation and movement participation American. *Sociological Review* 51464–51481.
Snow, D., Soule, S., & Kreisi, H. (Eds.) (2004). *The Blackwell companion to social movements*. London: Blackwell.
Solomon, M. (2002). *Consumer behaviour* (5th ed.). London: Prentice-Hall.
Stammers, N. (1999). Social movements and the social construction of human rights. *Human Rights Quarterly*, *21*(4).
Storey, D. (2001). *Territory: the claiming of space*. London: Prentice-Hall.
Szasz, A. (1994). *Ecopopulism toxic waste and the movement for environmental justice*. London: Minnesota.
Szasz, A. (2007). *Shopping our way to safety how we changed from protecting our environment to protecting ourselves*. London: Minnesota.
Tarrow, S. (1994). *Power in movement social movements, collective action and politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement social movements and contentious Politics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Taylor, G. (2001). *Conserving the emerald tiger: the politics of environmental regulation in Ireland*. Galway: Arlen.
Taylor, G., & Flynn, B. (2003). It's green, but is it of a light enough hue? Past performance, present success and the future of the Irish greens. *Environmental politics*, *12*(1): 225–232.
Taylor, L. (1989). The mission: an anthropological view of an Irish religious occasion. In C. Curtin, & T. Wilson (Eds.), *Ireland from below social change and local communities*. Galway: Galway University Press.
Tilly, C., Tilly, L., & Tilly, R., (1975). *The rebellious century 1830–1930*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Tilly, C., (2004). *Social movements 1786–2004*. London: Paradigm.
Tovey, H. (1992b). Environmentalism in Ireland. In M. Clancy, Kelly, J. Wiatr & R. Zoltaniecki (Eds.), *Ireland and Poland comparative perspectives*. Dublin: University College.
Tovey, H. (1993). Environmentalism in Ireland: two versions of development and modernity. *International Sociology 8*(4), 413–430.
Tovey, H. (2002). *A review of escaping the global village by Niamh Hourigan*. Dublin: *Irish Journal of Sociology*.
Tovey, H., & Share, P. (2003). *A sociology of Ireland* (2nd ed.). Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.
Tovey, H., & Share, P. (2007). *Environmentalism in Ireland movement and activists*. Dublin: IPA.
Tucker, R. (1988). *The Marx-Engels reader*. New York: Norton.
Turner, R., & Killian, L. (1990). *Collective behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Van der Heijden, H.A. (1997). *Political opportunity structure and the institutionalisation of the environmental movement environmental politics* (Vol. 6, No. 4 Winter). London: Frank Cass.
Varley, T. (1988). *Rural development and combating poverty*. Galway: Social Science Research Centre.
Varley, T. (1991). Power to the people? Community groups and rural revival in Ireland. In N. Hardiman, & C. Whelan (1984) Politics and democratic values, C. Whelan (Ed.), *Values and social change in Ireland*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.
Varley, T., Boylan, T., & Cuddy, M. (Eds.) (1991a). *Rural crisis perspectives in Irish rural development*. Galway: Centre for Development Studies, University College Galway.
Varley, T. (1991b). Book review of R. Allen and T. Jones guests of the nation: the people of Ireland versus the multinationals. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, *1*:184–187.
Varley, T., & Curtin, C. (1999). Defending rural interests against nationalists in 20th century Ireland: A tale of three movements in J. Davis (Ed.), Rural change in Ireland, Belfast.
Varley, T., & Curtin, C. (2006). The politics of empowerment, populism, and partnership in rural Ireland. *Dublin Economic and Social Review*, *37*(3): 423–446.
Walsh, E., Warland, R., & Smith, D. (1997). *Don't burn it here grassroots challenges to trash incinerators*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania University Press.

Weale, A. (1992). *The new politics of pollution*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Whiteman, D. (1990). The progress and potential of the green party in Ireland. *Irish Political Studies*, *5*.

Whitty, T. (1988). Jobs at any price? *Earthwatch*, No. 8.. Bantry: Earthwatch Ltd.

Wilson, J. (1973). *Introduction to social movements*. New York: Basic Books.

Yearley, S. (1995). The shaping of the environmental movement in Ireland. In P. Clancey, S. Ruddy, K. Lynch, & L. O'Dowd(Eds.), *Irish society A sociological perspective*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

Acronyms

ALF	Animal Liberation Front
ASI	Areas of Scientific Interest
ATM	Anti-Toxics Movement
BAG	Burren Action Group
BNPSA	Burren National Park Support Association
BNFL	British Nuclear Fuel Limited
BATNEEC	Best Available Technology Not Entailing Excessive Costs
CASP	Cork Area Strategy Plan
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CHASE	Cork Harbour for a Safe Environment
CND	Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
CWP	Connacht Waste Plan
CONSERVE	Council for Nuclear Safety and Energy Resource
DUC	Donegal Uranium Committee
EM	Ecological Modernisation
EEC	European Economic Community
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environmentally Sensitive Area
ESB	Electricity Supply Board
ESF	European Structural Fund
FOE	Friends of the Earth
GAA	Gaelic Athletic Association
GSE	Galway for a Safe Environment
GWSA	Galway Safe Waste Alliance
Gold EIA	Gold Environmental Impact Assessment
GSE	Galway for a Safe Environment
HAS	Health and Safety Authority
HD	Habitats Directive
HRB	Health Research Bureau
IDA	Industrial Development Authority
IFA	Irish Farmers Association
IPC	Integrated Pollution Control
INPC	Irish National Petroleum Corporation

ITGWU	Irish Transport and General Workers' Union
MA	Mining Awareness
MEG	Mayo Environmental Group
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NDP	National Development Plan
NEB	Nuclear Energy Board
NHA	National Heritage Area
NIA	No Incinerator Alliance
NIES	Northern Ireland Electric Services
NIMBY	Not in my backyard
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRA	National Roads Authority
NSA	Nuclear Safety Association
NSC	Nuclear Safety Committee
POS	Political Opportunity Structure
RDRA	Ringaskiddy Residents and District Residents Association
RM	Resource Mobilisation
RPG	Resources Protection Group
SCM	Student Christian Movement
SESI	Solar Energy Society of Ireland
SFADCo	Shannon Free Airport Development Company
TNC	Trans National Corporation
THORP	Thermal Oxide Reprocessing Plant
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
WISE	World Antinuclear Service on Energy
WVPA	Womanagh Valley Protection Agency
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Index