ant and affordable option to an unpleasant set of alternatives. This, too, is an ethical issue.

The NAEP's ethical objectives are tough, and it has not delivered on them. Indeed, its journal lends credibility to attacks on sustainability and denies the importance of people and localities in US professional environmental thinking. It is typical that the last page of volume one encourages US environmental professionals to go to a conference in Sweden in July 2000 and, having flown to Copenhagen, to rent a car so as to "be one of the first people to experience the new bridge connecting Sweden with the rest of Europe." Those European environmental professionals who worked for five years to point out the enormous environmental damage this bridge will cause will no doubt feel rewarded to know that it will give their US colleagues a pleasant driving experience on their way to discuss "how a green corporate philosophy can have a positive effect on profitability and stock value."

John Whitelegg is professor of environmental studies, Liverpool John Moores University.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

A Reply to John Whitelegg: Silence About a Destructive Power

In the referenced article, John Whitelegg lambasts the United States environmental profession, *Environmental Practice* as a publication, and several of the authors personally. I acknowledge his opinion and thank the editor for this opportunity to reply.

As a basis for you the reader to ascertain why two professionals may have two so widely variant points of view, I offer this. From the byline, Whitelegg is a university professor. I am not. I have worked for sixteen years implementing environmental practice at the building permit level. The federal government, university research, and the philosophical thoughts of the great thinkers all place sustainable development within reach. At the level where a city official issues a permit to put a house on a lot in a subdivision, the tenets are untenable. This is my experience.

The reason I wrote the editorial ("Reflections on Sustainable Development," *Environmental Practice*, March 1999) in the first place was to illuminate this gap between esoteric thought and the implementable reality of daily life: to make people think. I wanted to make sure people knew that the theory of sustainable development has not yet been put into practice. But all is not gloom and doom. Improvements have been made. Are they sustainable improvements? Only time will tell.

The citations of success made by Whitelegg are valid, but only as indications of movement towards, not achievement of, global sustainability, and only within the limited confines of the parameters chosen: greenhouse gasses etc. The sustainability of even this advance is at risk as only this year the legislature of Florida eliminated the emissions inspections for our automobiles. This at a time when the air around Tampa Bay is still visibly orange. The sustainability of the air quality improvements in Florida has failed. This was and is the crux of my position. Development is an act of change. Sustainable is an adjective defining that act as being perpetual. It may be sustainable through the continued efforts of the creator (maintenance-driven sustainability) or it may be sustainable internally (autonomic). The latter class of developments has no representatives and the former has no assurance that the maintenance effort will continue.

Finally, the editorial simply said that we were not aware of any truly sustainable developments. None have been offered for consideration by the readership. I eagerly look forward to the day I can retract my statements and modify my position.

Thomas R. Cuba, PhD, CEP
Delta Seven Inc.
St. Petersburg, FL

Silence About a Destructive Power?

Professor Whitelegg has a good point; several of them. I too, as many of our members, am concerned about sustainable cultures and sustainable communities. However I join many others who believe that the term "sustainable development" is an oxymoron. He certainly has many good points about the need for the members of our profession to take active roles in bettering the world condition. But I believe he misses the point with his diatribe about the "last page of volume one." Yes, we were trying to encourage corporate environmental professionals to participate in a workshop on environmental management. His readers might have been better served, however, had he made reference to the first paragraph about the Summit. It read:

> The rise of a true global economy has challenged companies that conduct business on a world scale. One such challenge: to establish and implement corporate environmental policies across jurisdictions whose governmental, economic and cultural differences are as vast as the oceans that separate them. But with the challenge comes a new and rare opportunity: to provide leadership and direction in developing global environmental policy and management strategies. The Sweden 2000 Environmental Summit will provide a forum for individuals charged with worldwide corporate environmental responsibilities to share their experiences and to shape the future course of corporate environmental decision-making.

We believe that corporate environmental planners, more than most any other discipline around the world, can and do have direct effects on global environmental quality! We believe it is their responsibility both to their stockholders and to the public in general to take every step they can to implement positive environmental policies. We believe that it is their responsibility to act in ways that will benefit the public and NOT create more examples of environmental inequity.

But enough of the big picture.

Professor Whitelegg seems to be rather piqued about the suggestion we made that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1466046600001745 Published online by Cambridge University Press

visitors to the conference might "rent a car in Copenhagen and be one of the first people to experience the new bridge connecting Sweden with the rest of Europe!" Yes, we did suggest that. But we also suggested flying to Copenhagen and taking the boat or train to Malmö (over the bridge) and then taking the train to Ronneby. Either would certainly be more relaxing and environmentally responsible than driving!

But his real point seems to be the question about the debate about the bridge itself. I had the pleasure of working for several years with the Boverket (the National Physical Planning Agency) of Sweden when the discussion was nearing its peak. Yes, there were many people, both in Sweden and in the rest of Europe, who debated (heatedly, I might add), the question of the environmental impacts. It is not clear, from Professor Whitelegg's comments, whether he had discussed this with the former and the present Ministers of Environment of Sweden and Denmark. Yes, they, and the body of environmental professionals, politicians, and virtually everyone else (including spouses within the same families!) had very thorough, open, and often heated discussions of the pros and cons of the bridge.

It was not our intent to endorse the bridge. It was an advertisement! It was, however, our intent to invite professionals from around the world to come to Sweden to work together on corporate environmental managers' responsibilities. It was an opportunity for some of the participants to take a look for themselves and join the people at both ends of the bridge who are monitoring the bridge and its actual impacts as well as reading about the perceived impacts. Only time will tell. The point of the Summit was to encourage open and creative discussion among corporate environmental managers.

One thing Professor Whitelegg might add to the debate is a well thought out and thoroughly documented article comparing the perceived and actual impacts of the "bridge" and the "chunnel." I am certain that such an article would be a valued addition to *Environmental Practice.*

James A. Roberts, PhD, CEP
Former President of NAEP and
Current Co-chair, International
Committee, NAEP
Sacramento, CA

Charles F. Zirzow Scholarship Fund

On July 3, 1997, NAEP lost one of its most devoted members. Charles F. (Chuck) Zirzow was one of the seven original incorporators of the Association. He served as Secretary, Treasurer, and President of the Association. He served on the Board of Directors from 1975 until 1993, when he retired from the Board as Chairman of the Certification Review Board. He was present at every Annual Conference during that period, and served as Track and Session Chairman at many of the conferences. At the Annual Conference in 1997 he was recognized as a Fellow of NAEP, an honorary title which has been conferred on only two individuals to date.

The Association, in memory of Chuck, established the Charles F. Zirzow Scholarship Fund which has now accumulated, in the three years since his death, over $5000 in donations. The aim is to build the fund to a level which can provide significant support to students preparing for careers as environmental professionals.

Contributions to the Charles F. Zirzow Scholarship Fund can be sent to the NAEP National Office at the address on the inside back cover of this issue. Contributions are deductible, and will be gratefully acknowledged.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1466046600001745 Published online by Cambridge University Press