

TOWARDS A COMMON GROUND

TOWARDS A COMMON GROUND: FREE-TRADERS, ENVIRONMENTALISTS AND THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT (NAFTA)

Lisa M. Benton
Graduate Student
Department of Geography
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13244

ABSTRACT In geography, there has been a great deal of recent research examining the impact of international trade on the environment and natural resources, but there has been less attention given to the impact and importance of the environment and the environmental movement on international trade. This paper addresses the latter and argues that the environmental community is increasingly participating in public discussions regarding trade policy. To support this contention, this paper will examine the debate about the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the environment. It is argued that the NAFTA debate exemplifies how environmental issues have become an important factor in international trade policy. The NAFTA debate brought together two distinct communities: free-traders and environmentalists. Far from being two exclusive communities, this paper will assert that economics and the environment must be seen as interdependent forces which will increasingly interact with each other. This interaction is best highlighted in discussions about sovereignty and sustainable development. This paper will conclude that environmental concerns will continue to impact international trade; economists can no longer ignore concerns for environmental quality and protection.

In geography, there has been a considerable amount of recent work on the expanding international economy. This area of study has prompted many geographers to investigate the impact of the international economy, and in particular trade, on localities, resource use and resource degradation, development models, exploitation, and the exacerbation of poverty (Bhagwati, 1993; Blaikie and Brookfield, 1987; Watts and Pred, 1992 are examples). But there has been much less attention focused on the impact of environmentalism on the international economy, and in particular trade. In this paper, I want to shift the focus from a discussion on the impact of international trade on natural resources, to a discussion on the impact of the environment on international trade. The recent debate about The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) highlights just how important the environment has become in international trade policy negotiations. In focusing on the debate about NAFTA and the environment. I will not examine the details of the trade agreement itself; instead I will explore the ways in which environmental concerns are becoming a more important elements in international policy. This paper is divided into three parts. **Part one** will provide a brief introduction to the NAFTA debate. **Part two** will explore the NAFTA debate as a intersection of two distinct communities: free-traders and environmentalists. I will first focus on the rising influence of the environmental movement, and its expanded agenda that now includes international issues. Then I will

turn to the interaction between free-traders and environmentalists on the NAFTA issue. **Part three** examines the NAFTA debate as a forum for a discussion of wider social concerns about quality of life, definitions of sovereignty and sustainable development. Let me begin with a brief introduction to the NAFTA debate

PART I: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NAFTA DEBATE

In November of 1993, the United States Congress approved the NAFTA, a text of some two thousand pages. The NAFTA will bind more than 370 million people together in a \$6 trillion economy, connecting U.S., Canadian and Mexican economies into a unified regional market stretching from the Yukon to the Yucatan.

In viewing the NAFTA as merely a text which outlines the details of a free trade system, we are looking only at what Geertz (1973) calls a "thin description". A thin description ignores a variety of interesting questions about the impassioned public debate over the fate of the NAFTA. In this paper I want to "thicken" our description. The NAFTA document (like a map, a landscape painting, or any other text) is socially produced. It embodies a form of knowledge (in this case definitions of economic development and environmental protection) and power (the ability to apply that knowledge), and so NAFTA's significance extends beyond the articles and side agreements which outline free-trade. Viewing NAFTA as a "thick text" reveals wider political, economic and social debates about trade, economic opportunities, investment in developing countries, environmental protection and the quality of the environment.

The NAFTA debate was as complex and divisive as any in recent memory. In fact, there were multiple debates revolving around NAFTA— from the debate over whether NAFTA would result in US job losses or gains, to public health and safety issues, to NAFTA's implications for environmental quality. Of the many debates, however, labor and environmental arguments were the two most vocal and well organized. From the beginning of negotiations, the media focused an unprecedented degree of attention on environmental considerations, helping to accentuate public interest in environmental concerns. NAFTA would be "good" for the environment by improving the environmental status quo in Mexico, said NAFTA supporters. NAFTA would cause accelerated environmental degradation, claimed NAFTA opponents. One economist wryly noted, "Everyone is wrapping themselves in the green flag" (Stokes, 1992). The environmental debate became one of the more conspicuous debates as Congress faced the impending vote in the summer and fall of 1993. The actual ratification of the NAFTA, however, is the end result of a process set in motion several years earlier.

PART II: FREE-TRADERS AND ENVIRONMENTALISTS

There used to be two distinctly polarized communities: traders and environmentalists. On one side of the barricade were the economists, shaped by free-trade theory and worried about a return to protectionism. Free-traders were certain that strong measures to protect the environment would hinder business competition. On the other side were environmentalists who worried that free-trade undercuts existing environmental protection laws (Wathen, 1993; 10). Between these two communities lay a chasm of language, background, cultures and goals. For example, "dumping" in the trade community means selling exports below market prices; to environmentalists, "dumping" means putting waste into rivers, oceans, or soil (Esty 1993; 47). Moving beyond these linguistic differences has proved no

TOWARDS A COMMON GROUND

small task. Ironically in the debate about NAFTA and the environment, the interaction between the two not only highlighted their differences, but it also showed that these two communities are searching for common ground. Let me set the context for the clashing of these two communities on the NAFTA issue.

Prior to the NAFTA debate, environmentalists had not had much of a role in trade policy making (Esty, 1993). Up until the 1980s, environmental protection in the United States was categorized as a domestic issue. Environmentalists put their energy and expertise into confronting local or national environmental problems. International issues of foreign policy (such as trade), on the other hand, supplanted domestic environmental objections; trade agreements were judged exclusively on economic terms. More recently, however, we have found ourselves positioned at the intersection of these two policy areas (McAlpine and LeDonne, 1993). One reason is the recognition that environmental quality is linked to economic activity; another is that many environmental problems are no longer only domestic problems, but are international as well. Environmental concern about the implications of NAFTA came to the forefront because concern over the environment has become a formidable factor in American politics. Indeed, "NAFTA marks the first time in the history of trade negotiations that environmentalists were part of the negotiation process" (Audley, 1993:192). Hence, the debate about whether NAFTA would be "good" or "bad" for the environment is important as a process (of conflict, debate and compromise) that is as revealing as the finished product (the document).

The Rising Influence of the Environmental Movement

The environmental movement has emerged as among the most powerful social movements of the late 20th century. Political pressure to consider the environment in economic decisions has increased tremendously. Consider the following examples. In the twenty-four years since the First Earth Day, environmental organizations in the U.S. have seen a tremendous increase in membership and budgets. For example, the Sierra Club doubled its membership during the 1980s, claiming 629,000 members by 1990 (Sierra Club, 1993a). The Sierra Club's budget grew by as much as tenfold to exceed \$44,000,000 by 1989 (McCloskey, 1992; 83). Many other environmental organizations witnessed similar increases in the past twenty-four years. Greenpeace boasts over one million followers in the US, and commands a international budget of \$100 million (Scarce, 1990).

It has also become politically fashionable to be Green. A 1990 Gallup survey found more than 76% of the American public considered themselves environmentalists (Dunlap 1992:113). Politicians and business elites have responded to such numbers. In 1988, George Bush's presidential campaign billed him as "the environmental president". Almost every politician calls him/herself an environmentalist, including both the former and current President. Businesses have integrated environmental aspirations with economic goals (the explosion of "Green" products, for example). The environment has also become a worthy subject in our nation's most popular news magazines. *Time* named the Endangered Earth as "Planet of the Year" in lieu of its famous "Man of the Year" for 1988 (Ibid.). Even Earth Day 1990 was a grand spectacle in which environmental organizations joined forces with the media and even corporate America—millions of American participated.

In June 1992, the United Nations sponsored the Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, a gathering which included more than 100 heads of states. The U.S. along with 156 other countries, signed the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21. The signatories agreed to foster "sustainable development" by attempting to reconcile economic growth and environmental quality. In

part this reflected the heightened profile of international environmentalists (a group whose constituency includes economists and development specialists) who now forcefully argue that economic development can no longer be isolated from environmental quality (See Daly, 1977; Ekins, 1992). NAFTA became the first test of Mexican and US commitment to the Rio principles.

In the debate over NAFTA and the environment, the cultural and political divide between free-traders and environmentalists shrunk. This is likely to continue, for the environmental movement will not fade away anytime soon. Positive public attitudes toward the environment have persisted and grown for 25 years—through periods of inflation, oil shocks and recessions (Reilly, 1994:9). "In the past decade green politics has moved from the fringe of voluntary environmental pressure groups and green parties into mainstream party politics, manifesting itself in debates over defense, energy production, transport, settlement and places of work, housing, and social services" (O'Riordan, 1989: 80). Thus the 'environment' will become more embedded in the political culture as a permanent force—a force the trade community must reckon with (Ibid.). The NAFTA environmental debate was not a one time aberration, but emblematic of this new political force.

Clashing Cultures: Free-traders and Environmentalists

Trade policy negotiators initially attempted to dismiss environmental concerns as peripheral or as a cover for protectionism, but reluctantly found themselves addressing environmental issues and grappling with a complex community (McAlpine and LeDonne, 1993: 205-207). Trade negotiators, Congress, business elites and even Presidents Bush and then Clinton scrambled to address environmental issues.²⁴ At the same time, environmentalists grappled with the unfamiliar territory of trade language (Esty, 1993:47). In the NAFTA debate, traders talked about the environment, and environmentalists engaged in trade policy analysis. As the chairman of the Sierra Club observed "we've never really dealt with trade issues, so we are all learning" (Greenwire, 9/20, 1993). The NAFTA environmental debate unearthed a set of cultural and political differences in which concerns about environmental quality played a significant role. The confrontation of these two communities forced each into a dynamic interaction with ideas about economics and the environment. It is precisely this process of confronting differences which inched the trade and environmental community beyond the chasm and onto common ground, if only briefly.

It may be convenient to dismiss the environmental debate as merely window dressing for business and political elites who hoisted the 'green' banner, not out of conviction, but to sway those voters still sitting on the fence. There would be some truth to that. But to evaluate the environmental community as a group of irrelevant, unsophisticated actors is to ignore the political victory they achieved by placing these issues on the table. When the Sierra Club released its "Analysis of the NAFTA" in October of 1993, major newspapers and wire services covered the press conference. Additional environmental groups held similar press conferences to announce their NAFTA position. One NAFTA opponent noted, "Protection of the environment and our jobs can't be dealt with as afterthoughts. They're at least as important as trade issues themselves and need to be negotiated as an integral part of the treaty (Hightower, 1993:100). More than 50 articles in major newspapers and magazines addressed NAFTA and the environment. *The Nation* explored "NAFTA—the View From Tijuana". A *Fortune* headline read "How Zealous Greens Hurt Growth" and the *National Journal* touted "The New Eco-nomics" and "The Road From Rio". Even the *Atlantic Monthly* asked "What Price Economic Growth?". The debate about NAFTA and the environment, it seemed, was omnipresent. *The Economist* asked "Should Trade Go Green?" and *The National Law Journal* queried, "Critics Ask if NAFTA is 'Green' Enough". An issue of *Challenge* criticized "NAFTA as Social

TOWARDS A COMMON GROUND

Dumping"; *Environment* featured "Prospects for a Green Trade Agreement" and an *Amicus Journal* headline read "Trading Away the Environment?". Other such headlines pertaining to the NAFTA environmental debate appeared between June and November of 1993.

The NAFTA debate, which had focused initially on issues of free trade and commerce, expanded to include labor and environmental interests. Opening up a public discourse is a victory of sorts, for this pressure made environmental concerns an issue in the NAFTA debate. A *Los Angeles Times* article noted "the mere fact of the discussions is a triumph for the coalition of more than 50 U.S., Mexican and Canadian environmental and labor groups that have been pushing the subject to the forefront" (Darling, 1992; B-5). Finally, Vice President Al Gore called NAFTA's inclusion of environmental standards "a history-making achievement to have the endorsement of environmental standards written into the language of the trade agreement itself." (Roberts, 1993). These examples point out the political victory achieved by the environmental community. "This debate has changed for all time the way that future trade deals will be made" noted Carl Pope, Executive Director of the Sierra Club (Sierra Club, 1993c). The environmental community appears committed to making the environment a factor in future trade negotiations.

But the NAFTA story doesn't end there. The environmental debate was more complex than the clashing of two cultures—free traders and environmentalists. Underlying the disagreements over the specific limitations of the NAFTA is something more subtle and perhaps more profound. NAFTA became a forum for a more general and public discussion of concepts such as sovereignty and sustainable development. These discussions showed that both free-traders, economists, labor coalitions and environmentalists are wrestling with definitions of "sustainable development", growth, free-trade, and prosperity. In examining the NAFTA position papers of many environmental organizations, I found that sovereignty and sustainable development were indeed two criteria on which these groups based their analysis of NAFTA. I highlight these criteria because these ambiguous terms can embrace a variety of concerns—from environmental degradation, to the debt of developing countries like Mexico, to poverty, to general views about economic and political structures and institutions. I want to now explore the NAFTA debate by examining sovereignty and sustainable development, because the way in which various groups defined and interpreted NAFTA's ability to effectively carry out objectives (especially sustainable development) was a quiet but potent part of the political process in the NAFTA debate. Thus the debate about NAFTA and the environment was as much a *philosophical* question as it was an *economic* one.

NAFTA and Sovereignty

There is no clear meaning to the term sovereignty. This ambiguity did not stop some environmental groups from viewing NAFTA as a threat to US sovereignty because they NAFTA defined sovereignty as "the will of the people to *protect the environment*". (Free-traders might define sovereignty as the will of the people to pursue prosperity) The Sierra Club, a NAFTA opponent, perceived the NAFTA as a threat to environmental protection because it was seen to threaten US environmental standards since the NAFTA incorporates the jurisprudence of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The GATT, introduced in 1947 is the major international agreement on trade rules, a framework for international trade policy, and a forum for dispute resolution. Under GATT, trading partners can appeal to an international panel if they believe conditions exists which promote an unfair advantage, and a member nation can challenge a domestic law of another member as a barrier to trade. For many environmental groups, the concern over NAFTA and environmental sovereignty stemmed from the result of a previous international decision. In 1991, an international

panel of GATT trade arbitrators ruled that the US violated trade rules when it banned tuna imports from Mexico because Mexican fishing crews use purse seine nets which kill a high number of dolphins. According to the GATT panel, the US violated GATT articles by imposing a unilateral trade measure that discriminated against Mexico's method of production. American legislation which protected a species outside its national jurisdiction was ruled unfair. Environmentalists cited this ruling as a harbinger of what could happen with NAFTA (see Sierra Club, 1993b; Public Citizen, 1992).

The Sierra Club interpreted the GATT ruling to mean that NAFTA and free trade could encourage partners to relax their environmental standards in order to compete in the global marketplace and argued that should a NAFTA dispute panel find that a US environmental law interferes with trade, the US would either have to change the law or face sanctions against their exports (Sierra Club, 1993b). The Sierra Club worried more about the loss of sovereignty for US environmental laws, reflecting their philosophical position that the current political and economic system can adequately protect the environment, given commitment. In essence, they were concerned that the will of the people, as expressed in social and environmental laws, could be overruled because of business considerations. NAFTA supporters argued this was flawed legal reasoning.²⁵

Environmentalists who favored NAFTA argued that it was unfair to expect the NAFTA to resolve all the environmental problems of world trading rules established by the GATT (Reilly, 1993b). And they have a point. Resolving these issues of sovereignty and of cultural and technological differences will require extensive negotiation. Expecting NAFTA to definitively term "sovereignty" with regard to international environmental and trade concerns was perhaps expecting too much. But the issue of sovereignty does raise difficult questions with regard to international forums. Global citizenship will require a rethinking of identity and authority, and it will also require a consciousness that our community is both local and global. "It appears that the unwillingness of sovereign nations to surrender any of their closely held independence must be overcome before international agency can enforce a mechanism for genuine pollution prevention" (Warren, 1991; 176-177). At some level, however, the worry over sovereignty reveals more than just worries about domestic environmental protection. It is anxiety about global interdependence. Mexican prosperity means not only exports and growth for the U.S. The reverse is also true: poverty in Mexico affects the US through increased migration as people search for job opportunities this side of the border, political upheaval, debt default and ecological devastation. The NAFTA represented a vision and an acknowledgment of a hemispheric, even global, alliance. Wrapped up in the environmental debate about free trade and NAFTA were concerns about protecting 'American values', the power of local community decision-making, and about fear of a future of nebulous boundaries. Thus the issue of sovereignty and the NAFTA reflects our perceptions of the developing world: of the juxtaposition between economic development and cultural imperialism, by imposing our standards or institutional structures on others.

NAFTA and Sustainable Development

The other issue important to environmentalists in the NAFTA debate was that of sustainable development. Sustainable development, like "sovereignty", embraces a variety of issues (hence remaining a contested term). The concept gained international currency in 1987 through the publication of the United Nations Brundtland Report which defined the term as "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". This is a fairly loose definition, and, not surprisingly, sustainability can mean many things. There are many

TOWARDS A COMMON GROUND

dimensions to "sustainability"— environmental, social, ethical and economic. Sustainable development is a concept that has both economic and ecological and social parameters which are difficult to integrate (Redclift, 1987;36 [my emphasis]). The focus of "sustainability" as only economic in nature often obscures the contradictions that "development" implies for the environment (Ibid.; 2). The many variables to sustainable development means there is no one methodology nor praxis for its implication. Still, the term sustainability is becoming accepted as the mediating term that bridges the gap between developers and environmentalists (O'Riordan; 1989;93). Analyzing the principle of sustainable development is where many environmentalists began in their discussion of NAFTA (Audley 1993;193).

Free-traders and some environmentalists, especially those who excel at creating alliances with business, believe increased trade can promote sustainable development, provided environmental protection is accounted for. Even the Sierra Club, although opposed to NAFTA, was not opposed to expanded trade, "we believe that if governments build clearly defined, binding obligations for environmental protection into trade agreements, increased trade can help improve environmental quality (Sierra Club 1993b; 5). These conservative or mainstream groups do not believe institutional structures need to be overthrown: their versions of sustainable development are compatible with free trade and economic growth under the current system. In their definition of sustainable development economic growth is the means to increased social wealth and stricter environmental protection.

But to many radical environmentalists, such as Greenpeace, sustainable development requires major institutional transformations. Greenpeace felt that while the NAFTA preamble encouraged "sustainable development", the agreement did not promote this concept in actual provisions. They criticized the NAFTA chapter on energy deregulation, which encouraged investment into new petroleum sources and gave US and Canadian petroleum firms access to a once protected Mexican market. This, they felt, promoted even greater fossil fuel consumption and would lock all three countries into "extravagant and destructive patterns on energy consumption." (Greenpeace,1993). Greenpeace argued that NAFTA embodied the principles of economic development based on the Western model of resource exploitation: NAFTA encouraged a economy characterized by long distance distribution of goods and services, as well as decision making removed from those who bear the impact— ultimately unsustainable. A sustainable economy, they argued, is characterized by shorter lines of distribution, and locally owned production units where decision-making is shifted to local areas thus enhancing self-reliance and democracy (Morris, 1993; 103). Hence economic development under NAFTA would continue in the business-as-usual style, and "no amount of green paint.. will fix a trade deal that would enshrine an unsustainable model of development" (Ibid.). Greenpeace, unlike the mainstream Sierra Club, criticized free-trade as *incompatible* with sustainable development. This stance is consistent with their critique that the economic and political systems which support and encourage environmental degradation can not be reformed but must be fundamentally transformed. "Sustainable development, if it is to be an alternative to unsustainable development, should imply a break with the linear model of growth and accumulation that ultimately serves to undermine the planet's life support systems" (Redclift, 1987; 4). Radical environmentalists prioritize environmental, social and ethical considerations as foremost to sustainable development.

Democracy and public participation are integral to some discussions of sustainable development. Nearly all environmental organizations opposed to NAFTA were critical of the behind-the-doors conduct in which the NAFTA negotiations were carried out. Environmental groups were concerned about the fact that the public was shut out to the NAFTA dispute-resolution settlement process since this restricted democracy and the public-right-to-know laws. The process of including

local decision-making is especially important to direct action or grassroots groups like Greenpeace who argue that to achieve true "sustainable living", decision-making must occur locally, not centrally (Devall and Sessions, 1985). In Greenpeace's view, all but three of the 111 advisors invited to participate in the NAFTA negotiations represented large corporations, and opined the trade deal for read like an "international bill of rights for transnational corporations" (Greenpeace, 1993). They criticized the negotiation process for devaluing and ignoring the concerns, interests and experiences of many of the poor people in Mexico and the border region.

Coming to a consensus with regard to sustainable development involves discussions about the importance of local places, broad participation in decision-making, and about how economies and cultures interact. Environmentalism, as a social movement, challenges prevailing cultural (and economic) values by exploring new meanings for these words. In the NAFTA environmental debate, the positions taken by various groups pointed out that these terms are contested even among environmentalists. Regardless of the contentiousness of the term sustainable development, the NAFTA debate revealed that how people understand their relationship with their environment is essential to a more 'sustainable development' (Redclift, 1987). Discussions over sovereignty and sustainable development, while not conclusively drawn, nevertheless widened the perspective on human-nature relationships.

CONCLUSION— GREENING THE NEW WORLD ORDER?

As George Bush initialized the NAFTA, he noted "The Cold War is over. The principal challenge now facing the United States is to compete in a rapidly expanding global marketplace". He set two objectives, once seen as irreconcilable, for the Post Cold War world: economic development and environmental protection. They appear to be important objectives in the current Administration as well for in June of 1993 Clinton established the President's Council on Sustainable Development. The Council is charged with developing bold new approaches to integrate economic and environmental policies. As we have seen, in meeting that objective, the Council will actually need to define the term. This involves soliciting opinions from a variety of representatives from industry, government, environmental, labor and civil rights organizations. Hence the meaning of concepts such as sovereignty and sustainable development will be created through a conflictual process over social, economic and political goals. The NAFTA signaled the beginning of this process on a national, even international scale.

It is clear from the NAFTA debate that the trade community can expect to confront issues of sustainable development, sovereignty and environmental protection. This is because sustainable development is now as much an economic as an environmental goal (Bramble and Porter, 1992; 315). Environmentalists were divided on the NAFTA issue, but they all agree on one thing: there remains much to be done to integrate environmental concerns into the international trade regime. With the growing recognition that more environmental problems are international in scope, there is also increasing recognition that international trade mechanisms have not considered the global commons. Environmentalists appear to be united in their dissatisfaction of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to address international trade and environment (Sierra Club, 1993c). Whether environmentalists supported or opposed NAFTA, the debate opened up both a domestic and international dialogue on trade and the environment. Environmental concerns, while not at the center,

TOWARDS A COMMON GROUND

are no longer on the periphery of national economic policy. The political implications are now making themselves apparent.

NAFTA is more than just a document. It is emblematic of much of the new momentum in the international economy. The multiple debates about NAFTA opened up a broader discussion about what Americans want in their economic and political future, catalyzing debates over economic growth and environmental quality. Concerns about the environment and about 'sustainable development' have emerged as important elements in general public discussion. The NAFTA debate shifted these concepts from Ivory Tower into wider circulation. NAFTA demonstrates the role that environmental issues can—and will—play in the development of international economic and trade policies. As other nations negotiate for more open economic markets, NAFTA may be their model for addressing environmental issues.

In both the academy and the trade community, economists have been reluctant to give the environment the attention it deserves. In part this is because many economists clearly do not see the environment as a problem for economics, even if economics causes problems for the environment (Redclift, 1987; 39). In the NAFTA debate on the environment, however, we realized that economists can no longer ignore questions of environmental quality and protection. While it is true that international trade has impact on the environment, it is also true that "the environment" through environmental activism has and will continue to impact international trade policy. NAFTA is thus one example of a policy issue which economists and geographers need to research further.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Audley, John. 1993. "Why Environmentalists Are Angry about the North American Free Trade Agreement". D. Zaelke, P. Orbuch, R. Housman (eds.) *Trade and the Environment: Law, Economics and Policy*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Bhagwati, Jagdish N. 1993. "Trade and the Environment" *The American Enterprise* 4:42-9 May/June.

Blaikie, Piers and Brookfield, H.C. 1987. *Land Degredation and Society*. London, New York: Methuen.

Bramble, Barbara and Porter, G. 1992. "Non-Governmental Organization and the Making of US International Environmental Policy" in Hurrell, A. and Kingsbury, B. (eds.) *The International Politics of the Environment*. Oxford: Claredon Press.

Daly, Herman. 1977. *Steady-state Economics*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Co.

Darling, Juanita. 1992. "Environmental, Labor Groups Make Voices Heard". *Los Angeles Times*, Friday, August 7; B-5.

Devall, Bill and George Sessions. 1985. *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered*. Salt Lake City, UT: Peregrine Smith Books.

MIDDLE STATES GEOGRAPHER - VOL. 28, 1995

Dunlap, Riley. 1992. "Trends in Public Opinion toward Environmental Issues: 1965-1990" in Dunlap, R. and A. Mertig (eds.). 1992. *American Environmentalism: The US Environmental Movement 1970-1990*. Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.

Ekins, Paul. 1992. *The Gaia Atlas of Green Economics*. London: Gaia Books Ltd.

Esty, Daniel C. 1993. "Integrating Trade and Environment Policy making: First Steps in the North American Free Trade Agreement". D. Zaelke, P. Orbuch, R. Housman (eds.) *Trade and the Environment: Law, Economics and Policy*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Hightower, Jim. 1993. "NAFTA— we don't hafta" *Utne Reader* July/Aug pp. 97-100.

Greenwire. Greenwire is an on-line computer information network which offers daily reports in the form of environmental news summaries. I used the following Greenwire reports: September 16, 1993; September 20, 1993; October 6, 1993.

Greenpeace. 1993. "NAFTA: Trading Away Tomorrow" Washington, DC: Greenpeace.

McAlpine, Jan C. and LeDonne, Pat. 1993. "The United States Government, Public Participation, and Trade and Environment." D. Zaelke, P. Orbuch, R. Housman (eds.) *Trade and the Environment: Law, Economics and Policy*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

McCloskey, Michael. 1992. "Twenty Years of Change in the Environmental Movement: An Insider's View". in Dunlap, R. and A. Mertig (eds.). 1992. *American Environmentalism: The US Environmental Movement 1970-1990*. Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.

Morris, David. 1993. "How About a Fair Trade Agreement?" *Utne Reader* July/Aug. pp. 100-13.

O'Riordan, Timothy. 1989. "The Challenge for Environmentalism" in *New Models in Geography*. R. Peet and N. Thrift (eds). London: Unwin-Hyman.

Public Citizen. 1992. *Why Voters Are Concerned: Environmental and Consumer Problems in GATT and NAFTA (A Briefing Book)* November. Washington DC: Public Citizen, Inc.

Redclift, Michael. 1987. *Sustainable Development: Exploring the Contradictions*. London and New York: Routledge.

TOWARDS A COMMON GROUND

Reilly, William K. 1993b. "Free Traders and Environmentalists: Differing Goals, Conflicting Cultures". lecture at Stanford University, October 13.

Reilly, William K. 1994. "I'm Gonna Make You a Star: A New Approach to Protecting the Environment in American and Around the World". lecture at Stanford University, February 9.

Roberts, Jerry. 1993. "Gore Says Sierra Club is 'Simply Wrong' about Trade Pact". *San Francisco Chronicle*. September 27.

Scarce, Rik. 1990. *Eco-Warriors: Understanding the Radical Environmental Movement*. Chicago: Noble Press, Inc.

Sierra Club. 1993a. Sierra Club Public Information, membership statistics. San Francisco: Sierra Club.

Sierra Club. 1993b. *Analysis of the North American Free Trade Agreement and the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation*. October 6. Washington, DC: Sierra Club.

Sierra Club. 1993c. "Press Release: House of Representatives Trades Away Environment with Pro-NAFTA Vote", November 17 Washington, DC.

Stokes, Bruce. 1992. "The Road From Rio" *National Journal*. May 30 1286-87.

Warren, Lynda. 1991. "Transboundary Pollution in International Law" in *Law, Policy and the Environment* R. Churchill, J. Gibson and L. Warren (eds.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Wathen, Tom. 1993. "A Guide to Trade and the Environment". D. Zaelke, P. Orbuch, R. Housman (eds.) *Trade and the Environment: Law, Economics and Policy*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Watts, Michael and Pred, Allen. 1992. *Reworking Modernity: capitalism and symbolic discontent*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

ENDNOTES