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Advertising

LET'S SAVE THE REST OF OUR FORESTS
EAST GIPPSLAND
Some Recreational Vehicles cost the Earth . . .

Ours DON'T

Inner City Cycles is a touring/commuting specialist bike shop, owned and operated by four cyclists for whom bicycles are more than a marketing concept. We sell everything, from nuts and bolts to complete custom tour bikes. Be dazzled by the super-subtle decor. Speak with the revitalised staff.

And that's not all. The bookshop is also expanding its already excellent range of books, magazines, posters, cards, stickers, badges, etc. To do this it needs to clear as much of its present stock as possible. Shelf space is at a premium. This may be your last chance to pick up some of this civilisation's most amazing book bargains. But be quick. By the time you read this it may be too late!

F.O.E. BOOKSHOP SALE — THE NEXT BEST THING TO LOOTING

ENDANGERED SPECIES CONFERENCE
May 11 & 12, 1984
University of Sydney

Why save endangered species?
Animals and plants under threat
National and international protection
Trade and smuggling
The marine environment
Case studies (eg crocodiles, dugongs)

Speakers from the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service, National Botanic Gardens, conservation groups, industry.

Registration: $40
(concessions available)

Contact: Endangered Species Group, ph 02-272523 or c/- Total Environment Centre, 18 Argyle St, Sydney, 2000.

Cover design: Lin Tobias

***** $2.00 recommended retail price, ISBN 0311-1372. All material in Chain Reaction is copyright Chain Reaction 1984. All rights reserved. For permission to reprint articles or graphics please write to the editors who will give all possible assistance. Views expressed by authors are not necessarily those of the publisher.

Contributions to Chain Reaction are invited. Please try to send items typed, on one side of the page, double spaced and with wide margins. Keep a copy. We do not have sufficient resources and people to return manuscripts. These few guidelines help in bringing out the magazine better and faster. The June-July 1984 edition will be published in early June. Deadline for feature articles is 27 April. For the August-September edition, deadline is 22 June 1984.
Two Videos from The Sydney Filmmakers Co-op

WhiteWashed
A 20 minute video documentary about the removal of Aborignal children from their families.

Settle Down Country
Over the past fifteen years, Aboriginal people throughout Central and Northern Australia have been moving back to their traditional country in small family groups. Described by white Australia as the outstations or homeland movement, Central Australian blacks refer to these places as their "country camps" or simply "settle down country."

Using archival footage, this documentary focuses on the Pintupi people who, in the 1950s, were removed from their desert land, 700 kilometres west of Alice Springs, to settlements such as Papunya in the Northern Territory. It was expected they would assimilate with Western culture.

Rental: $40

The Forests of East Gippsland
"The Forests of East Gippsland" was produced by the Victorian Forest Action Council in conjunction with the Australian Conservation Foundation.

The book is 32 pages (230 rings) and contains 62 colour plates including a recent satellite photo of East Gippsland. The photos in the book depict four major plant associations to be found in areas proposed by N.F.A.C. and A.C.F. for inclusion in National Parks. Fifteen photographers have contributed to this work. There is a useful location map at the front of the book showing reference points and the areas proposed for inclusion in the National Park system.

Rental: $20

Send to:
Other items (specify)
ORDER FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Post Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Forests of East Gippsland</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 217, KINGS CROSS, NSW 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phone: (02) 330721

The Stumbleum Syndrome
By Laurie Arons

An important new book which...

...Dissects ASIO's case against David Combe and Hope's whitewash of ASIO and ASIS

...Suggests why Hawke and the NISC swallowed ASIO's case against Combe, tracing its link with policy reversals on uranium and other key issues.

...Traces the Security Establishment's history and its anti-union, anti-Labor bias.

...Exposes the ASIO/ASIS threat to democracy and civil liberties.

Special Offer to Chain Reaction readers
An autographed copy of the book will be posted to you for $5 (normal price posted is $5.70). Send cheque/money order to:


Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
Postcode ____________________________
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ALTERNATIVE DEFENCE STRATEGIES FOR AUSTRALIA

A National Conference at
The University of Queensland

6-8 JULY 1984

The principal guest speaker is GENE SHARP, Director of the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions, Centre for International Affairs, Harvard University. His masterwork is a book titled 'The Politics of Nonviolent Action' and his most recent book is 'Making Europe Unconquerable: The Potential for Civilian-based Deterrence and Defence.'

Other speakers include PETER KING, Department of Government, University of Sydney; ANDREW MACK, Strategic Defence Studies Centre, ANU; ALFRED SUMMY, Division of External Studies, University of Queensland; BRIAN MARTIN, Department of Mathematics, ANU; RACHEL SHARP, School of Education, Macquarie University.

This conference will provide an important forum for consideration of the nonviolent options in defence planning for Australia.

CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT
SCHOOL OF EXTERNAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

Please send more details about the national conference, ALTERNATIVE DEFENCE STRATEGIES FOR AUSTRALIA to:
NAME ______
ADDRESS ______
POSTCODE ______

Send to Mr Peter Grayson
Continuing Education Unit
University of Queensland
St Lucia Qld 4067
Telephone (07) 377 4040

Risky Business

Leeds Animation Workshop (UK) 1981
Running time: 15 mins col/opt
Rental: $15

RISKY BUSINESS is an amusing, lively and informative animated film which deals with health and safety at work. The film follows the perils and persistence of Carol, who becomes the union safety representative at her factory plant. Neither glib nor dry in its treatment of the problems in ensuring a safe working environment, the film raises important questions. How useful is protective clothing? Should we adapt the people to the factory or the factory to the people? How can we resolve the conflict between Safety and Profit?

Pretend You’ll Survive

Leeds Animation Collective
(UK) 1980
Running time: 8 mins col/opt
Rental: $15

A vivid, thought-provoking animated film that looks at the catastrophic implications of the nuclear weapons industry.

PRETEND YOU’LL SURVIVE tells the story of one woman and her nuclear nightmares. The film exposes the absurdity of “civil defence” in the face of nuclear war. The original music is a lively parody of patriotic songs of the forties.

At first the heroine is lulled by glossy images of consumerist delights, then she is placated by illusions of survival after a nuclear explosion. Eventually her fear and dread are directed into positive political action. She realizes we must “Protest and Survive.”

Both films are available for sale or rental from:
Sydney Filmmakers
Co-operative
(P.O. Box 217, Kings Cross, NSW 2011, (02) 330 072)

Cultural Boycotts

The Campaign Against Racial Exploitation (CARE) held its 1984 national conference in Melbourne on the weekend of the 10 – 11 March. The conference called for an intensification of action in support of the cultural, sporting and economic boycott of South Africa.

CARE national convenor, Jim Gale, reported that the cultural boycott had been effectively launched in Australia by the picketing of Elton John during his recent visit. In 1983 Elton performed at a number of concerts in Bhopal, South Africa, against the cause of the anti-apartheid movement and the United Nations declaration of a cultural boycott. Jim Gale commented:

This kind of action is already underway in Europe and the United States and has the support of many leading entertainers. It is a movement that will grow, and the effect of making many people think for the first time about apartheid.

The meeting was addressed by Eddie Funde, Chief Representative to Australasia and the Pacific for the African National Congress (ANC) – an organization promoting racial equality throughout Africa. He called for an immediate cessation of all economic investment in South Africa and an end to the importation of goods from South Africa which Australia itself produces.

It is ridiculous for Australia to be importing iron and steel, coal, raw materials from South Africa. Why are these goods produced by some Australian companies? Because they are cheap due to the super-exploitation of black South African workers. Funde reminded the meeting that 1984 has been declared by the African National Congress 'The year of women of South Africa.' It is the 30th anniversary of the inception of the Federation of South African Women (FSAW). This multi-racial group of Indian, African and white women was established to campaign against the 'pass laws' which require all women to carry identification cards.

Within South Africa women's organizations will be intensifying their struggle against apartheid in response to the call which has gone out from the ANC Women in Australia are urged to lend their active support to these efforts, many of whom suffer triple oppression in South Africa – as women, as workers, and as blacks.

The CARE meeting passed a number of resolutions on behalf of Aboriginal, Southern African and general race issues in Australia. They pointed, in particular, to an upsurge in propaganda by racist groups and pledged the work of CARE and its affiliates to combat this.

Jim Gale said:

There are now fears that pressure from mining interests may result in the Maralinga Bill being re-shaped into a form that removes a dangerous precedent for all Aboriginal claims. We know that proposals unacceptable to Aboriginals such as mining exploration without compensation, the immediate drawing up of a registry of sacred and therefore secret, ultras and the vesting of the mining rights with the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs are being talked about.

We support the Bill in the form that it was when it was presented to and agreed by the Aboriginal community involved.

Contact: Campaign Against Racial Exploitation
PO Box 51
Kensington Park SA 5068
Tel: (08) 332 6474

Eddie Funde.
Civil servant jailed
Sarah Tisdall, a junior civil servant in the British Foreign Office was sentenced to six months’ imprisonment under the Official Secrets Act in early April this year (1984) for leaking two documents.

Partizans
After food production, mining comes second as the most financially significant activity on Earth. There are few groups concerned with the consequences of mining at large, rather than the effects of one or two specific mines. The Centre for an Alternative Mining Policy in Wisconsin, USA, is the longest standing. Tinto-Zinc (RTZ), the seventies and its import of Australian yellowcake in into Britain and the USA.) it

The big apple park
Hau River.
Eight months after the historic Franklin High Court victory, the Wilderness Society has launched an audacious plan for the protection of the entire western Tasmanian wilderness.

The proposal for a Western Tasmania National Park was launched on 9 March in Hobart. It was a half-time solution to the wilderness crisis of 1982. The new proposal had a one-year deadline to secure a wilderness plan for the whole half-time solution to the wilderness crisis of 1982. The new proposal had a one-year deadline to secure a wilderness plan for the whole.

It’s a great deal for a group of the 1982 wilderness crisis. The wilderness crisis that year and succeeding years saw significant representations of ‘disturbed’ shareholders at annual general meetings. Newly cut down the company to court to forest for the 1982 annual general meeting.

The society is employing full-time activists to prepare a management plan and containable tourist potential for the area. The society will, of course, continue to oppose further intrusions into wilderness. The wilderness crisis has been reported in the Hobart Mercury. The wilderness crisis has been reported in the Hobart Mercury. The wilderness crisis has been reported in the Hobart Mercury. The wilderness crisis has been reported in the Hobart Mercury.

The proposal is for a park that would protect the remaining South-West, the remote west coast and the untouched alpine moorlands of the Central Plateau. Declaration of the park concept in Tasmania will, of course, ensure that the park is protected for future generations. The proposal is to be debated in the Tasmanian Parliament and will be presented to the Deputy Commissioner of the park.

The Taxation Office has frozen the bank account of Robert Burrowes. On 27 November 1983, he refused to pay 9,856 shilling on his income tax assessment for 1982-1983. In a letter to the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation, he explained his action as a protest against Australia’s military expenditure and its support for the arms race. This support is evident through the government’s promotion of uranium mining and acceptance of foreign military bases on Australian soil, he said.

In 1982 – 1983, 9.8% of the Australian government’s budget was allocated to military expenditure. Mr Burrowes withheld this portion of his tax assessment ($146.07) and instead donated equal shares of the money to organisations dedicated to ending the nuclear arms race and to alleviating some of the problems which the world’s massive military spending helps to cause – Third World poverty, environmental destruction and widespread injustice.

In his letter, Burrowes requested consideration of the introduction of a Peace Tax Fund so that people who had a conscientious objection to paying for war could direct their money to a peace and development fund. He has had strong support for this idea, which is being promoted by overseas countries as well, from several organisations.

In response to his war tax refusal, Burrowes received a letter from the Assistant Commissioner of Taxation, James McTigue, telling him that he was required to pay $146.07 from his bank account.

On 22 November 1983, Burrowes received a letter from the ATO about his decision to charge him, but not the Guardian, showed the mixture of malice and weakness that was characteristic of bullies. It was clearly intended to warn everyone that there was a ‘new convention in the country’, a convention of authoritarianism, he said.

In 1984, the Greater London Council (GLC) decided to disinvest their 670,000 share in RTZ after three years. The company was sold to the mining group Tinned, which has already been successful in London and in Canada.

Partizans most spectacular event was probably the International Tribunal of 1981, where a jury representing shareholders in the corporation sat to hear representations of the Aboriginal mining support group, the Aboriginal Land Council to ‘do something about RTZ who hold a majority of the company’s shares’.

Partizans are about to take up the expected arrival of Cruise Coates, (Labor Tasmania) and Alan Missen (Liberal Tasmania) at the 1982 annual general meeting.

The group are about to take up the expected arrival of Cruise Coates, (Labor Tasmania) and Alan Missen (Liberal Tasmania) at the 1982 annual general meeting.

The group are about to take up the expected arrival of Cruise Coates, (Labor Tasmania) and Alan Missen (Liberal Tasmania) at the 1982 annual general meeting.

On 22 November 1983, Burrowes received a letter from the Assistant Commissioner of Taxation, James McTigue, telling him that he was required to pay $146.07 from his bank account.

On 22 November 1983, Burrowes received a letter from the Assistant Commissioner of Taxation, James McTigue, telling him that he was required to pay $146.07 from his bank account. On 22 November 1983, Burrowes received a letter from the Assistant Commissioner of Taxation, James McTigue, telling him that he was required to pay $146.07 from his bank account. On 22 November 1983, Burrowes received a letter from the Assistant Commissioner of Taxation, James McTigue, telling him that he was required to pay $146.07 from his bank account. On 22 November 1983, Burrowes received a letter from the Assistant Commissioner of Taxation, James McTigue, telling him that he was required to pay $146.07 from his bank account.
Cruise into Fremantle

This year's (1984) visit by warships and submarines will bring Cruise missiles into Fremantle harbour, W.A.

In the past, visiting warships have carried nuclear weapons, but they have not been used for combat purposes, and the risk of accidental nuclear discharge is real. However, the visit of the American submarine USS Richelieu and the nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine USS George Washington this year is set to change that. American Cruise missiles are to be deployed as part of the US nuclear triad. The Richelieu will make the visit, but there is a chance that the George Washington could be included.

The visit of these vessels will provide an opportunity to highlight the dangers of such deployments.

Give back Gimbat

There is still a great deal of uncertainty surrounding the future of Kakadu National Park. When the proposal for Kakadu Stage 2 went through cabinet earlier this year it contained proposals for a large tourist park.

The idea of a tourist park in such a sensitive area has caused some concern. It was also suggested that the tourist impact could be minimised by spreading tourism throughout the park.

The ecological and cultural significance of the area was certainly not considered - a widespread tourist park would do much more damage to the region than concentrated development in less sensitive areas.

The proposal which went through federal cabinet cannot be seen as an acceptable statement of use for the park.

Another area of concern is an establishment of an advisory committee to look at management of Kakadu National Park. The advisory committee is Darwin-based and has no Aboriginal representation.

The good news is that on 13 March, 1984, the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service (ANPWS) issued a report in support of the revocation of the Gimbat and Goodparla pastoral leases. This is the first step in the establishment of an advisory committee to look at management of Kakadu National Park.

Opposition ban

The United Kingdom Ministry of Defence is investigating ways of dealing with civil servants and members of the armed forces known to disagree personally with government policy.

The issue was discussed in February at a meeting of senior ministry staff chaired by Sir Clive Whitmore, former principal private secretary to the Prime Minister.

Senior officials want to identify staff who are not right- or left-wing extremists but who are opposed to the policies of the present administration. Under the new proposals, any civil servant who is a member of the opposition parties or even suspected of being one could be removed from a job which is regarded as sensitive.

The proposal is subject to widespread controversy, the restriction could go beyond membership of, or sympathy with, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.

In the June-July edition of Chain Reaction, we plan to publish the annual listing of activist organisations.

Activist Contacts

This is now News Weekly's newsletter of the ultra-right Nationalistic League. It is a recent addition to the list of neo-fascist groups who have been involved in the recent increase in right-wing extremism.

The list of activitists contacts is available on request.

If your group wants to be part of the 1984-85 Activist Contacts, send us information on your group including contact address and telephone numbers. Send these details as soon as possible, by 7 May 1984 at the latest, to:

Activist Contacts, Chain Reaction, Room 14, Floor 4, 37 Swanston St, Melbourne, Vic. 3000.

Subscription

Please add me/us to Chain Reaction's subscription lists:

□ for the next six editions — $12
□ for the next twelve editions — $24

Gift subscriptions

Please send Chain Reaction's next six editions, as a gift from me, to:

(Name) ...
(Address) ...
(Postcode) ...

Donation

I want to support Chain Reaction's work. Here is a $... donation.

Multiple subscriptions

□ Please send me five copies of each of the next six editions of Chain Reaction — $39 (schools, libraries, students).

International subscriptions

□ Send me Chain Reaction at normal rates. Air mail, double normal rates. Pay in Australian currency.
Dear Friends of the Earth

Please find enclosed my membership fee of $6... (as per rates below).

Name: 
Address: 
Telephone: 

Membership fees: NSW $20 ($13 concess.), Vic $24 ($18), WA $15 ($7.50) or whatever you can afford. Old $15 ($10); SA, NT, Tas, ACT $10 or whatever you can afford. Chain Reaction is sent free to all members of Friends of the Earth and some groups also send members newsletters and provide discounts at their bookshops. Enquire from your local FOE group. Make cheques payable to Friends of the Earth and post to the group nearest you - see list above. Donations are very welcome.

Friends of the Earth
ADELAIDE 120 Wakefield St, Adelaide, SA 5000
BLUE MOUNTAINS 9 Harvey St, Katoomba, NSW 2780, (047) 62 2701
BOURKE 328 Bourke St, Melbourne, Vic 3000, (03) 221 7392
BROOKLYN PO Box 683, South Brisbane Qld 4101 (07) 44 1516 4H
CANBERRA PO Box 1875, Canberra City, ACT 2600; 118 Lewin St, Lyneham, ACT 2602 (02) 47 8686
COLLINGWOOD 366 Smith St, Collingwood, Vic 3066 (03) 419 8700
DARWIN PO Box 2120, Darwin, NT 5799 (089) 61 6222
ELTHAM PO Box 295, Eltham, Vic 3095 (03) 435 7100
LA TROBE UNIVERSITY c/- The SRC, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Vic 3083 (03) 479 2977
MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY c/- SRC, Macquarie University, North Ryde, NSW 2113
NEWTOWN PO Box 169, Newtown, NSW 2042 (02) 671 2139
NORTHERN YORK PENINSULA c/- Valinor, 734 Moonee Mines, Moonee, SA 5548 (08) 26 2013
OAKLEIGH 69 Warialda St, South Oakleigh, Vic 3166
PENINSULA PO Box 319, Seaford, Vic 3198
PERTH 790 Hay St, Perth, WA 6000 (08) 201 5942
PORT PIRIE PO Box 7, Port Pirie, SA 5540 (08) 34 2609
RYDE 18 Kelstoa St, North Ryde, NSW 2113 (02) 88 2429
SYDNEY Floor 2, 787 George St, Sydney, NSW 2000 (02) 211 3963
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND c/- SRC, University of New England, Armidale, NSW 2351
UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY PO Box 364 Westmeath, Building, University of Sydney, NSW 2006
UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA c/- SRC, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, WA 6009
WHYALLA 77 Meares St, Whyalla, SA 5600 (086) 46 2467
CHAIN REACTION Room 14, Floor 4, 37 Savanton St, Melbourne, Vic 3000 (03) 63 5965
NATIONAL LIASON OFFICER Nick Thibauter, c/- 366 Smith St, Collingwood, Vic 3066 (03) 419 8077

We've got lead out of petrol and whales will probably still be around for our kids to enjoy. We're working hard for a better world tomorrow. We need your support now to continue our work. Join us.

Indian fictions
Interview with Salman Rushdie

Salman Rushdie was born in Bombay in 1947, the year of Indian independence. At the age of 14 he moved to Britain and has since published a number of books. His Booker prize-winning novel Midnight's Children provides a fictional account of the struggle for Indian independence and a critique of the subsequent rule of Indira Gandhi, focusing on the sterilisation programs carried out during 'the Emergency' in the early seventies.

In March this year (1984) he visited Australia as a speaker at Writers Week during the Adelaide Arts Festival. Chain Reaction's Susan Mueller spoke to him in Melbourne.

I was quite fascinated by the characterisation of Indira Gandhi in your book. Finding it unusually critical. Would it be right to say that you see her as stifling a lot of the potential of Indian people?

Yes, certainly in the period which the book deals with. There's no doubt that 'the Emergency', as she called it, was a period of totalitarianism, of state terror, in which appalling things were done to people. At the moment there's an enormous revisionist impulse at work in India to falsify what happened during those years. Mrs Gandhi now claims that there were no forced sterilisations. She has created a kind of miasma around, an enormous cover-up around. Mrs Gandhi now claims to be democratic. I think the problem with Mrs Gandhi is that her as absolute ruler than her father ever was. Indira is much more an absolute ruler than her father ever was. She has created a kind of miasma around herself which I think is clearly very unhealthy for a country which claims to be democratic. It is obvious that she is now trying to establish succession for the next generation. This is like the Kennedy dynasty only much more unscrupulous and much more powerful.

So the sterilisation of Midnight's Children was real as well as symbolic? Yes, you see, what I tried to do, not just in the book but in most of what I do, is to find images which make me more intense things that really happen. It seems to me that if you do it like that, using very heightened metaphor, it is effective because it gets through.

I also wanted to ask you about Mahatma Gandhi, who is greatly romanticised during 'the Emergency'. As she calls the creation of a monarchy disguised as a democracy. I found this strange because I have seen quite critical things about Gandhi's use of nonviolence where it's described as a method aimed at maintaining the Indian elite.
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There's two things to say about Gandhi which actually contradict each other. He's a very, very complex figure. There's no doubt what he did do was to make the independence movement a mass movement in a way that it was not before he came on the scene. It is therefore important to say that the independence of India was made possible by the mass base he established. However, there is no doubt that Gandhi. If you look at him in conventional political terms, is a figure of theortex right and was, for instance, financed all his life by the richest people in India.

At one stage Gandhi was called in to mediate in a textile strike. He was called in not by the workers but by the bosses and his reaction to the workers' strike was to go on hunger strike himself, threatening not to come off till they went back. Such was the respect in which he was held that they did. Now, it is quite possible to see this as a betrayal of the trust the people had in him. Gandhi's opposition to trade unionism in India is well known — he opposed it always and fiercely. So he's a very odd fish.

What he's not, in any conventional sense, is a saint. I think the problem starts in India, because in India we have always had a tendency to deny recently great men — sometimes before they're even dead. Gandhi is an interesting man, a very important historical figure. There are many things for which one should be grateful to him and there are many things for which one should criticise him fiercely — just like any other political figure. It would be nice if he could be considered just as a human being — the problem is that it's almost impossible, in India, at least.

I find the situation rather incongruous. So much of the peace movement is concerned with challenging social structures and yet these people too get caught up in a romanticised notion of Gandhian nonviolence.

The problem with nonviolence as a philosophy is that it didn't even work in India. It wasn't actually the thing that brought about the independence of India. Most of the views were quite different to Gandhi's in this respect. He wasn't quite as insistent on the practice of nonviolence, although he used the rhetoric. Certainly the independence of India was achieved with some violence. Nonviolence was also effective in India, but it was a specific tactic used against a specific enemy at a specific moment and the idea that one can generalise from it is very very dangerous. When Richard Attenborough permitted the film Gandhi to be used to open the Philippines film festival the newspapers stated that the pacifist in the hills should learn Gandhi's message and come down and lay down their arms and proceed nonviolently. That's just an example of a situation where, if one attempts to extrapolate the message of nonviolence indiscriminately, it can end up somewhat unfortunate.

Yes, I'm not sure that nonviolence is going to be the answer to the Nicaraguans or the people of El Salvador.

There are many cases in which it is just completely irrelevant. The problem of one belonging to the peace movement, one is supposed to espouse the idea of peace. The problem with Gandhi and nonviolence is that it was effective in India because it had a meaning there — it grew out of a number of concepts integral to Indian philosophy and religion. What you have to do is find ideas which grow out of your own soil and not to borrow them.

Is there a peace movement in India? It's rather worrying in a way. In India it's all too far away. They have other things to worry about, more immediate things, like starvation. The big issues in India at the moment are the growth of religious extremism and regionalism, which is raising fears of the Balkanisation of the country.

The bomb, although India is sort of a member of the nuclear club now, is not an issue in spite of attempts by some people to make it one. There is an attitude which it very common in many countries of the Third World which is that the peace movement in some way serves the interest of the people already in the nuclear club. Possession of nuclear weapons becomes a national pride. This is of course a terrible distortion, but it exists in the same way that many Eastern Europeans see the peace movement as an ally of totalitarianism. That is probably the major problem in the peace movement. So far we have not really succeeded in forming a united front across the Iron Curtain. So there is this problem that the peace movement is seen in Eastern Europe and the Third World in a somewhat different way.

Many people would argue that the biggest threat of nuclear war comes from the Third World. I'm not sure that the biggest threat does come from that actually — I think the biggest threat clearly comes from the war going on itself. It is clear that NATO is committed to first use of weapons — they even admit it. So the most dangerous nuclear power in the world at the moment is the Western alliance, not the Russians, but the Israelis, not the Iranians, not Gaddafi, but NATO. So, yes, I don't think the problem is in the Third World, the problem is in the so-called 'First World'.

There's still an enormous amount of myth-making surrounding the nuclear industry. We live in a moment, especially in the West, when the right wing is very largely in control — England, America, Germany and others. When the right is in power it uses this kind of language, so that's not particularly surprising. I agree there's a lot of mystification around nuclear weapons.

I remember seeing AJP Taylor, the historian, talking about nuclear weapons and he made a very simple point. He said that if you look at the history of weapons, all weapons starting from the sling-shot, the more weapons that exist the more certain it is that they will be used. It applies to sling-shots, cannons and it also applies to nuclear weapons. The idea that by somehow increasing the number you acquire some kind of balance of terror, which keeps the world safe, is a complete fallacy. It's kind of a statistical fallacy. If the numbers go on increasing, the possibility of use goes on increasing.

But the pro-nuclear lobby still has an enormous amount of resources to put up against the peace movement. I agree, but I think things are changing. For instance, there's no doubt that in England in the last three to four years there's been an enormous shift in attitude against nuclear weapons. I think that it is important to exclude despair from one's point of view because despair serves the interests of your enemy. I think one of the problems of our age is that we have fallen into the trap of believing that entropy rules, and things always get worse. If you look at the history of the human race you see that what has happened is that things have not got unbelievably worse, but they have improved! The idea that we are helpless in the face of great forces seems to me to be necessary to resist.
Environmental destruction occurs because the capitalist system demands that development and production continue for the maximisation of private wealth. In our capitalist society the profit motive means that resource development has occurred at an ever increasing rate, risking damage to the environment. This obviously has very serious ramifications for the environment. Structural changes in many industries (forestry, mining and agriculture) has created unemployment and many more workers are in danger of losing their jobs.

As a result of this situation, environmentalists need to address this and other issues in their analysis. This has occurred in some areas of the environmental movement. For example, the antiuranium movement continues to discuss the problems of uranium mining with the trade unions. Many trade unions belong to antiuranium groups. There have also been attempts by environmentalists to build a working relationship with the timber unions. This is important because the reasons for unemployment in the timber industry and the causes of forest destruction are often directly related—more technology, greater centralisation of sawmills, monopolisation of the industry by a few large companies, and the capital intensive nature of the industry.

However, building a working relationship between the timber unions and environmentalists is an extremely difficult task. It has certainly been complicated by the blockade of the Forest People (also known as the Nomadic Action Group) at Errinundra in eastern Victoria early this year. Conservationists felt that the action taken by the Forest People had irretrievably damaged any hope of talking to timber workers about the future of their jobs or arriving at a common strategy to protect employment and the viability of the local economies dependent on the timber industry.

The capitalist economic order and environmental presentation are incompatible. To apply ad hoc and indiscriminate action to a process as well entrenched as capitalism denies the logic of this incompatibility. It also denies the existence of other social problems which are inadmissibly linked with environmental destruction. Unemployment and social inequality are examples of issues which should be included in any environmental strategy for social change. If we operate on the assumption that environmental destruction is not isolated and is in fact inherent in any system based on the capitalist mode of production, then as environmentalists we should be looking at goals and objectives which are compatible with bringing about an end to capitalism.

Activists from Friends of the Earth (Canberra) in a paper called A Strategy Against Nuclear Power describe strategy at... linking the analysis of an issue with goals and objectives. Choosing a strategy, it is implemented through appropriate actions. An action is a "once-off" event such as a rally, march, blockade or lobbying a particular politician. A method, such as lobbying in general, refers to all actions of a certain type. Actions are coordinated together into a campaign. The campaign gives direction to a series of events.

The paper then goes on to point out that... the goal of stopping uranium mining must be closely linked in the goal of basic structural change in the state, capitalism, patriarchy and the division of labour... The broader objectives for an anti-nuclear movement must include mass participation in decision making rather than elite control; decentralising the distribution of political power into smaller, local groups, and bring about self-reliance based on environmentally sound technologies.

These objectives can be expanded to include the aims of social control of capital: ensuring that capital is directed into areas of social benefit through the socially responsible use of technology; a policy of full employment stressing such principles as industrial democracy and worker cooperation; decentralisation and self-management at the local community level; the provision of public services based on an understanding of local community and regional needs; the preservation of natural resources through recycling, the promotion of lifelong goods with emphasis on repair and maintenance; safety and pollution controls which emphasise quality of life, preservation of the environment and safety of the work environment; and transport policy giving ready access to amenities and fuel efficient forms of mobility (eg mass transit systems, bicycles and pedal power).

To energy program based on efficient use of non-renewable and decentralisation of energy production—through insulation, community heating programs, solar and wind power. Social change however, does not occur simply because we have an understanding of the capitalist system and have identified a list of goals and objectives to work towards. The important thing is to put these things into a framework for participatory action. By action. I don’t mean the implementation of an ad hoc blockade which will have little overall benefit. Action in this context means becoming actively involved in the labour movement: consultation with community organisations, support of worker actions and publication of material which means actively supporting actions which are aimed at bringing about a change to the capitalist order even if that activity cannot be immediately identified as related to preservation of the environment.

Environmentalists cannot afford to isolate themselves from other social movements any longer. Too often the aims of environmentalists and the aims of workers are portrayed by the media, business and industry as conflicting. If it is understood that this is one method by which capitalism exploits and controls workers, then actions will no longer be seen as conflicting, or even as separate from one another. Environmentalists have not always done this...
AUSTRALIAN CONSERVATIONISTS succeeded in their efforts to protect the Franklin River wilderness.

What is the way to win? How may we want to achieve our goals? What is the development of a strategy, how groups can function well, what tactics to employ, and how to develop and maintain a vigorous style?

Leigh Holloway makes some suggestions for fun, well-organised and effective campaigning.

The author: Leigh Holloway has worked full-time on environmental campaigns in Australia for the past twelve years, most recently as fundraiser with The Wilderness Society.

1. GOALS

FIRST THERE NEEDS TO BE AGREEMENT on goals. Usually this is the easiest stage, but not always, and it cannot be taken for granted. Goals may change as events unfold. Demands may need to be modified and extended.

For a group to operate well there must be confident endorsement of the goals from supporters, be they actual members or not. Without that backing activities will falter: with support ventures can flourish.

Everyone needs to feel that the process of community action. Learning by trial and error is far too slow and wasteful of opportunities for the many problems our society faces. More deliberate efforts to refine our campaign skills and develop our confidence are greatly overdue.

This article is about the campaigns of environmental pressure groups, primarily to develop a strategy, how groups can function well, what tactics to employ, and how to develop and maintain a vigorous style.

10. POWER

LIKE IT OR NOT, POWER IS WHAT politics is all about. While it is true that spreading inaccurate information can destroy the credibility of a group, be very wary of placing all your faith just in being ‘right’. That is not enough. You need to build demonstrable power. Politicians and companies do not care whether you are right or wrong. Indeed they know that most people find self-righteousness offensive. But they, and the media, are not much interested in that consideration either. They want to see whether you have support, because support is power, and it is power that they respond. Yet power is a tremendously common feeling in our ‘democratic’ society. To a degree, it is, but ours is supposed to be a democratic society. To a degree, it is, but it cannot be. You will need to defend your goals from supporters, be they actual members or not. Without that backing activities will falter: with support ventures can flourish.

11. FACE-SAVING

THERE IS LITTLE ADVANTAGE in painting your opponent into a corner. Governments do change policies. So do companies. They tend not to admit mistakes, however, and it can often be wise to provide face-saving opportunities. Sometimes the most intimidating opponents can suddenly become amazingly vulnerable. It can be worth encouraging them to offer to negotiate. The reality is that community groups, more often achieve success through a somersault by government than through the demise of that authority.

12. ZAP!

THE ELECTRIC ENERGY OF A high-powered campaign cannot be maintained endlessly. Expect the tempo to rise and fall. Just be ready to recuperate. The difficulties you face can be prepared to look way ahead. Where does your group want to be in a year or two?

13. QUESTIONS

YOU WILL FIND IT FRUITFUL to challenge every aspect of the campaign. Question everything. Treat it as you may see, in a Horizon Boulevard or on Broadsheet, or in a month or two, are open to questioning. As soon as this happens with numerous Australian community groups. Of course, it is useful.

14. RIGHTS

YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO EXPRESS opinions and for campaign for change. Our society should be organised to cherish and nurture that freedom. It isn’t. You will need to defend your right to express views and to seek change.

A campaign, in the context of this article, is an organised effort by a person or group to achieve a goal of benefit to the community. That may be to protect a park, stop a freeway, clean up a river, argue for renewable energy, or to achieve some other change to government or corporate policy.

Very often community groups and individuals choose to take on what is termed a ‘single issue’. This report seeks to aid those people. It is not an overall strategy to change the world or deal with every conceivable situation. Nor is it an academic work.

The intent is to supply a general introduction to effective campaigning.

15. PRIORITIES

IT IS USEFUL FOR A GROUP TO list all the things which might be attempted and to assess the available people and other resources for implementation. List the top priority actions. Those may be worthy of encouragement. As soon as this happens with numerous Australian community groups. Of course, it is useful.

16. RESOLUTION OF SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, economic and political conflicts almost always takes far longer than any of the parties expects. Be prepared to look way ahead. Where does your group want to be in a year or two?

17. SCENARIOS

ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT and difficult stages of a campaign is the development of scenarios by which your goal can be achieved. These visions of success often involve many different twists and turns of events. All scenarios are speculative, and therefore never final nor ‘correct’.

It is not a simple matter of putting forward one likely set of events. You may need to take into account various possibilities for action by the parties to a conflict. Even then, if you have several scenarios which aid campaign planning. Their development should dominate large companies or become powerful through professional association, or unions. These people have excellent resources to help them invest. At the other extreme some groups may want to start action on an issue is to be handled.

18. BUDGETS

A BUDGET IS A STATEMENT of expected income and proposed expenditure for a given period in the future. It is a planning aid. It should be open to modification, if need be often.

It is frustrating, mystifying, exciting, depressing, enlightening and ultimately stimulating. Without a convincing vision of success you will lack the motivation.

You have a right to express opinions and for campaign for change. Our society should be organised to cherish and nurture that freedom. It isn’t. You will need to defend your right to express views and to seek change.

Power is distributed very unequally in Australia. For example, some people own massive media empires, others dominate large companies or become powerful through professional associations or unions. These people have excellent resources to help them invest. At the other extreme some groups may want to start action on an issue is to be handled.

19. TIMETABLES

TO ADD IN THE DEVELOPMENT of scenarios, plans and priorities, it is helpful to write up a timetable on a big noticeboard, not just on some scrap of paper. Put everything on it. Let everyone involved see it.

Major conflicts tend to run for several years, despite early announce- The electric energy of a high-powered campaign cannot be maintained endlessly. Expect the tempo to rise and fall. Just be ready to recuperate. The difficulties you face can be prepared to look way ahead. Where does your group want to be in a year or two?
QUESTION EVERYTHING

Effective campaigning requires much questioning. Challenge everything. "No" is a word you should learn not to hear. Effective campaigning is the art of miracles - otherwise the campaign would not have been necessary. Be undaunted. Persistent people get things achieved.

Start by reviewing your position, and review it often. What is the real issue? What is the position of the opponents, and government? What is the timing? Who comprises your group? What are your demands? What has been done? How are you and your actions perceived? Who are your supporters? What have you planned? How can things change? Possible compromises, maneuvers, delays and moratoria?

What further information can be obtained?
Who makes the decisions on this issue? Who, Why?
Who advises the decision-makers? How can your group influence the influential?
Where does support come from? For the influential?

A group does not exist without its membership. Every member is important - and no-one is more important than you.

Make sure that your work adds to the effectiveness of the group. Find out the best way you can help. That is easiest if you can make a relevant, even if irregular, contribution to the group.

Do all you can to encourage others to join in the work too. There is no use expecting that someone else should do all the recruiting. All of us can help our organisations grow to become more effective.

Retain the pressures to make a spectacular but only short-lived contribution to a group. "Burn out" of volunteers is common and a waste of those whose competence and energy is so greatly needed. Make sure you organise your volunteer work so that it is sustainable. You are too important to get worn out, and it is so easy to suffer from exhaustion. As one who so often has the job of organising others, I hesitate but encourage volunteer involvement. See it as a deliberate process - working out who may be able to help, encouraging them to do so, and giving support to allow individuals to gain skills.

A huge amount of learning is intrinsic to any campaign group. Few people have the skills at the outset. As the work progresses everyone ought to be learning amazing new skills. Training programs should be run for volunteers to learn more advanced skills - in areas like dealing with the media, research, lobbying, office administration, publicity and funding.

It is important to structure activities so that volunteers are familiar with the purpose and results of their work. With this understanding people are likely to remain active.

People do not only join a group, however, to have an effect on some issue. They are looking for a friendly environment, encouragement and assistance to learn and develop skills, enjoyable social interaction and satisfaction through achievements. It is important that the group provides this.

The Escalation of a Campaign may make it necessary to engage staff - administrative staff to keep the group operating efficiently, consultants in some specialist area, or a professional campaign director.

Expectations of such staff are, almost without exception, unreasonably high and the conditions of employment greatly unfair. People are asked to work for very low salaries, in chaotic conditions, for extremely long hours, and without the usual rights of employees such as workers compensation insurance or holiday pay. Some miserable attitudes remain common.

Only employ staff when the whole group is sure that is necessary. Do not employ staff unless you are prepared to be fair and ready to treat people as you would expect to be treated in more conventional employment. Attempts to treat women staff after employees have begun work are usually too little, too late, and too wrong.

Our groups should welcome the growing number of other experienced activists and provide fair opportunities for them to be involved in our mutual advantage. The next few years will see decisive changes in the employment of new staff by community groups, as unionisation becomes more common and as more people learn that short-sighted exploitation and 'burning out' help no-one.
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1 PRESSURE

THE PROCESS OF MOUNTING pressure on your opponents to achieve your goals demands deliberate planning. You need to identify likely supporters for your campaign and discuss your options with...
what cashflow problems may arise. Then you need to work out ways around the problems - by raising loans, deferring some ventures, or whatever.

It is very important that you maintain good relationships with suppliers (such as printers, newspapers, etc.) as you will require their continuing service. Make sure you keep a reputation for reasonably prompt settlement of accounts.

The key to fundraising is in giving a good case for the money and how it will be used. Positive messages can be presented explaining the needs and people will be generous. Explain why you need money now.

The Wilderness Society (TWS) has been especially adept at fundraising for their Franklin campaign, which at its peak was costing around a million dollars a year nationally. TWS prepared a catalogue to mail to tens of thousands of supporters, offering high quality items such as Christmas gift-giving. The response was overwhelming. People wanted to support the campaign and were given a comfortable way to do so.

Direct appeal letters for funds also meet with tremendous response for The Wilderness Society and Australian Conservation Foundation. Simple things like a campaign and reply envelope boost response rates dramatically because they make it easy.

What must be clear - to every supporter - is that their part in the campaign is crucial, and that includes their financial role. Make good use of your regular supporter newsletters to report finance needs and tell how funds are being utilised. Don't presume that everyone knows these needs.

A precious resource of a community group is the accumulated name and address lists of supporters. These should be treated as valuable and always maintained.

When people give to a cause they feel good about being generous. It is necessary for campaign groups to make their gratitude clear and prompt. Thank donors and waste no time in doing so.

If your foundation is one of good quality and provide good services, such as prompt delivery.

If you keep systematic records of all your transactions, you will require their continuing service. Make sure you keep a reputation for reasonably prompt settlement of accounts.

When it comes to things like renewal of membership fees or subscriptions, or even requests for donations, address each supporter personally and do not rely on obscure notes in the group newsletter - a ticket box or some such confusion. Draw attention by letter to the need for continued support.

Funding is a topic on which there are many useful books. Start with the free Direct Mail Advertising in Australia kit from Australia Post's marketing department.

6. TRAINING

ALL OF US CAN CONTINUE TO learn about and use effective campaigning. It is one of the saddest findings to emerge from the campaign. Professionals will usually be flatterd to be invited to help with training and give their time freely. Be careful to usefully direct which opportunities are of good quality and provide good services.

We spend so much time criticising governments for the absence of an agenda and for incompetence. We need to take care that we heed our own advice.

BE PREPARED TO WORK VERY hard, for a long time, to win. That is, almost always, vital. Showing more tenacity than your opponents - bolstered as they are by money and resources - is quite a feat. But it is the only way. You can't count on luck.

So the work should be structured to be fun. People must enjoy the campaign. Please do not repeat the same ideas, even good ones, until they become a bore. That is a common mistake of campaigns. Be imaginative and attempt new things.

At the same time, don't make the assumption that good ideas will not work twice. A well-proven basic strategy is essential. Just be sensitive to when an idea's time has passed.

A MAJOR REASON WHY THE Franklin River campaign succeeded was because the conservation movement put its message thoroughly across, persistently, convincingly and beautifully. Always your message needs to be stated simply and clearly, even if elaboration is needed later. Work out what your prime purpose is and be prepared for future support and business. Too often these valuable allies are taken for granted.

The success of the Franklin campaign raises the question: is such a waste of time, energy and resources. When people give to a cause they feel good about being generous. It is necessary for campaign groups to make their gratitude clear and prompt. Thank donors and waste no time in doing so.

If you keep systematic records of all your transactions, you will require their continuing service. Make sure you keep a reputation for reasonably prompt settlement of accounts.

When it comes to things like renewal of membership fees or subscriptions, or even requests for donations, address each supporter personally and do not rely on obscure notes in the group newsletter - a ticket box or some such confusion. Draw attention by letter to the need for continued support.

Funding is a topic on which there are many useful books. Start with the free Direct Mail Advertising in Australia kit from Australia Post's marketing department.

6. TRAINING

ALL OF US CAN CONTINUE TO learn about and use effective campaigning. It is one of the saddest findings to emerge from the campaign. Professionals will usually be flatterd to be invited to help with training and give their time freely. Be careful to usefully direct which opportunities are of good quality and provide good services.
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So the work should be structured to be fun. People must enjoy the campaign. Please do not repeat the same ideas, even good ones, until they become a bore. That is a common mistake of campaigns. Be imaginative and attempt new things.

At the same time, don't make the assumption that good ideas will not work twice. A well-proven basic strategy is essential. Just be sensitive to when an idea's time has passed.
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If you keep systematic records of all your transactions, you will require their continuing service. Make sure you keep a reputation for reasonably prompt settlement of accounts.

When it comes to things like renewal of membership fees or subscriptions, or even requests for donations, address each supporter personally and do not rely on obscure notes in the group newsletter - a ticket box or some such confusion. Draw attention by letter to the need for continued support.

Funding is a topic on which there are many useful books. Start with the free Direct Mail Advertising in Australia kit from Australia Post's marketing department.

6. TRAINING

ALL OF US CAN CONTINUE TO learn about and use effective campaigning. It is one of the saddest findings to emerge from the campaign. Professional
Hope is not some nebulous luxury. Hope of success is more vital than any strategy or tactical point. It is crucial to ensure that those who will support your campaign become aware and remain hopeful—and only the scent of victory can give you this.

Earlier in this article an argument is presented for the development of scenarios. I must reiterate the importance of these needs to building hope. As important are general attitudes to volunteer workers and campaign planning. There must be a determination to encourage everyone to participate energetically and the means provided for that activity.

Many unsuccessful groups have a notable, indeed astounding, capacity to spend energy and time on stopping people (within their group) from doing things. Successful groups, on the other hand, should be realistic about their activities by various groups of supporters. Now I am not suggesting people run around in every direction. But there are many ways to approach each problem and the greatest success frequently comes from diverse approaches to problems.

The enthusiasm of supporters is precious and delicate. Heavy-handed directives are destructive to a campaign. We have to show trust and confidence in one another as a basis to work together, recognising differences and allowing for them. Better the pain of that process than a demise of active support.

Expect conflict within your group. Regard it as both healthy and productive. It is inevitable. It demands patience and cooperation. With goodwill, even quite severe internal conflicts can exist without halting an effective campaign. What remains paramount is to keep the situation in perspective and remember who you are really up against.

Don’t let your group get confused, not even temporarily. And to achieve your goals you need all your friends, even those with whom things are sometimes difficult.

Even such a hugely rewarding association as that between The Wilderness Society and the Australian Conservation Foundation has not been without its thorny moments. But real cooperation has been possible, through each group recognising the other’s valuable contribution and each getting on with their work.

That said, let me qualify this encouragement of diversity. Having a community action to have an impact, it needs strong support. It is amazing how readily such advice can be forgotten as individuals or small groups proceed with their pet project.

When you are involved in being effective, you need to involve other people. There needs to be sensitivity to local communities and the legitimate interests of others, for example, those who may feel their jobs are at stake. It is hard to think of anything to do to make back long-term progress for a campaign than rush, ill-considered intrusion into a community. The difficult search for common ground is worthy effort.

We cannot expect to achieve every change which may be desirable instantly. While long-term goals are necessary, to reach them a step-by-step approach is essential. Given our always limited resources, it makes sense to have all the supporters of a cause get together and discuss plans and then pursue agreed priorities. It is possible to build a campaign of diverse but not conflicting actions.

When should community groups use the mass media, and when should they avoid it? Chris Harris gives some suggestions on how to use the media, and how not to let it use you.

The mass media is the quickest and easiest method of communicating with middle Australia, but not necessarily the most effective. No matter how many sympathetic journalists work within it, it is primarily a money-making enterprise which is hierarchical and conservative. Given that using the media is time consuming and potentially frustrating, it is important to consider whether the mass media is the correct method for communicating your message, rather than simply assuming that any publicity is good publicity.

It is possible to use the mass media to tackle conservation issues against their interests. For instance the Fairfax companies and Herald and Weekly Times control most of the shares in Australian Newspirate Mills (ANM), and this firm controls substantial cheap power and timber interests in South-west Tasmania. These companies would be unlikely to favourably cover any conservation campaign threatening the interests of ANM. Similarly, some issues are inherently more news-worth than others, and this should always be considered. It is pointless spending hours trying to get mass media publicity if the issue is not or cannot be made newsworthy.

Controversy and sensation sell newspapers, and it is the media who will focus on the sensational aspect of any issue, simplifying and trivialising what are frequently complex, difficult, but worthy of our attention issues. Do not therefore receive coverage. Finally, some issues are inherently more newsworthy than others and this should always be considered. It is pointless spending hours trying to get mass media publicity if the issue is not or cannot be made newsworthy.

Controversy and sensation sell newspapers, and it is the media who will focus on the sensational aspect of any issue, simplifying and trivialising what are frequently complex, difficult, but worthy of our attention issues. Do not therefore receive coverage. Finally, some issues are inherently more newsworthy than others, and this should always be considered. It is pointless spending hours trying to get mass media publicity if the issue is not or cannot be made newsworthy. The following are some general rules for dealing with the media:

Always treat journalists as professionals, and even if they are friends, don’t expect them to compromise their impartiality. Never suggest how to write stories or ask for favours. You should get to know their interests and biases. Ensure whether what you are saying is on or off the record. Never say anything to a reporter that you don’t want reported, unless you have specifically said that it is off the record.

Make certain that you provide all the necessary background information to reporters in a simple and concise form. Remember they may be dealing with several issues in just one moment. Give such stories good coverage. More careful with criticism and praise. If you really have been misreported or unfairly treated, don’t hesitate to complain but always make certain that you have your facts right. Conversely, don’t hesitate to praise a ‘good’ story as being balanced and fair. Remember that misreporting is not necessarily bias— it may be a mistake.
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Consensus decision making is being increasingly used by groups within the Australian anti-nuclear, environment and disarmament movements in recent years. In this article, Howard Ryan looks at some of the problems encountered by anti-nuclear groups in the USA which have used the consensus process.

Consensus is a method for group decision making widely used in the anti-nuclear, feminist, and environmental movements, and in cooperative and alternative communities. It tends to be most popular in counterculture-oriented sections of these movements and has been particularly used in the direct action wing of the anti-nuclear movement. Consensus is a direct outgrowth of non-violence, which affirms respect for the individual within a group, and creates a spirit of trust and cooperation. 'says' the Abalone Alliance Direct Action Handbook. Of the various expressions of non-violence, consensus where used is probably the most crucial in terms of affecting the day-to-day activity of the movement.

Under consensus, a group does not vote but discusses and minds proposals until everyone agrees to them. Practically speaking, it’s unanimous voting. For most decisions consensus is not hard to achieve, at least not in small groups, but it gets tough when the issues are controversial, regardless of group size. The cutting edge of consensus is that each group member has the power to block, or veto, a decision. The group must then look for alternatives the blocker can accept, or else persuade that person not to block. Often objects are encouraged to stand aside, or abstain, rather than block, the latter considered somewhat extreme course. But the ultimate power of blocking even when not actually exercised, has heavy influence in the whole consensus process.

Groups that make decisions by consensus, which applies to all the political groups I’ve worked with for the last five years, tend to regard the process with a sort of spiritual reverence. I mean it is worshipped. The suggestion that a vote be tried, even a straw vote, can draw reactions of hostility and moral indignation in consensus-using groups. I can also empathise with this because I was once a lover of consensus myself.
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Consensus is a method for group decision making widely used in the anti-nuclear, feminist, and environmental movements, and in cooperative and alternative communities. It tends to be most popular in counterculture-oriented sections of these movements and has been particularly used in the direct action wing of the anti-nuclear movement. Consensus is a direct outgrowth of non-violence, which affirms respect for the individual within a group, and creates a spirit of trust and cooperation. "says" the Abalone Alliance Direct Action Handbook. Of the various expressions of non-violence, consensus where used is probably the most crucial in terms of affecting the day-to-day activity of the movement.
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Groups that make decisions by consensus, which applies to all the political groups I’ve worked with for the last five years, tend to regard the process with a sort of spiritual reverence. I mean it is worshipped. The suggestion that a vote be tried, even a straw vote, can draw reactions of hostility and moral indignation in consensus-using groups. I can also empathise with this because I was once a lover of consensus myself.
A further problem with consensus is the taking of a larger organisations to make changes.

Consensus works to discourage disagreement and raising of controversial issues. It recognises that our conflicts and needs can be expressed in non-threatening ways. Consensus ensures less democracy than it promises to.

While majority voting in mainstream institutions and hierarchies is no doubt often competitive, divisive, and insensitive, the same is not true for a vast number of progressive and community groups with common goals and cooperative commitments. In fact, a recurring theme in my interviews, which directly contradicts the claims of consensus advocates about voting.

Some consensus proponents believe that our world is divided into two: the votes for and the votes against. The majority vote to be literally immoral, forcing one another. The above would not encourage equality, consensus allows the group to be stuck and blocked.

An important one and there is a felt need to accept the decision of another. The decision is a win or lose model, in which it takes to 'win' than with the issue is more than to have all merely feel they can 'live with' another proposal. One does not have to vote to win.

In consensus meetings, there's often an underlying tension. Everyone's afraid of being part of a larger project, that is exciting to us. The distinction is important because many movement people come to believe that only through using consensus, and abiding by certain non-violent codes, may we enjoy this feeling of 'being a part'. When meetings become grinding marathons which don't prepare better for heavy going.

But I am hoping to at least encourage method is not coercive like voting and it is more democratic. D. Elton Trueblood writes that the Quaker method of decision (which is where consensus originates) involved the 'use of love and persuasion as against force and violence. The overpowering of a minority by calling for a vote is a kind of force' which breeds resentment. Similarly. The Wall Street Action Training Handbook says: 'Consensus allows us to recognise our areas of agreement and to act together without coercion or force. One does not have to vote to win.'

It is more crucial to have more discussion and participation. Advocates about voting.

Those involved in working anti-nuclear work as part of a local neighbourhood chapter or affinity group often derive a special feeling of collectivity and belongingness. It doesn't happen always, but if the chemistry is right in a group there is a certain powerful and exciting energy. This energy has been mystified in the movement. It's been put up on an altar and labeled the 'spirit of consensus'. It is much less of a problem in small groups doing independent projects. Voting ultimately allows more issues and concerns to be raised, while consensus, not intentionally but actually, suppresses conflict and discourages open debate.

The small group solution? Consensus is much less of an artificial block to group to block, it still holds the majority of the movement simply had lots of autonomous groups. Voting ultimately allows more issues and concerns to be raised, while consensus, not intentionally but actually, suppresses conflict and discourages open debate.
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Within the anti-nuclear movement, consensus is not particularly feminist. Most of the Cobbers-Tingaringy National Park will be proclaimed during 1988. The main reason for this action is the anti-nuclear movement's desire to protect areas that they consider to be of ecological and historical significance.

Howard Ryan has been heavily involved in the anti-nuclear movement. In fact, anti-nuke and peace activists commonly equate consensus with 'feminist process'. Such equations are misleading. The many feminist groups who use voting rather than consensus are hardly being 'less feminist'. The anti-nuclear movement is a more informal as feminists assert the need for equality and eliminating power abuse, consensus is in fact an improvement. The consensus process popular in feminist groups is considerably superior to that of the broader model of 'participatory demo-

The anti-nuclear movement owes consensus to two main sources: the tradition of the Quakers, or Society of Friends, and the feminist movement. The American Quakers. Several Quakers have written that consensus should be aimed at finding what is best for the group as a whole in terms of our identity with 'God'. By all accounts, consensus has served the Quakers fairly well over three centuries. There is a recurring theme in the Quaker tradition of emphasizing a participatory, non-authoritarian way of living. The Quakers believe that God is present in all people and that everyone has a right to speak. The group style primarily from the New Left (not known for its feminism) and it has been a recurring theme in American social movements.

Consensus did, however, apply the New Left's challenge to old-style left authoritarianism in a more thorough and encompassing way. Male dominance in groups, and the politics of kitchen and bedroom, came under scrutiny: there was more anti-concurrence about process and the subtle ways people use power; personal emotion and the effects of daily life were recognized for their political content and value. The new feminism, and gay liberation counterpart, brought together the biggest advances in both movements, thoughts since Marx and Engels criticized capitalism, and the left is still trying to sort it all out.

A tendency in anti-nuclear groups is to say that whatever is done is in the public's interest and needs above those of the individual. This is a consensus that the group style primarily from the New Left (not known for its feminism) and it has been a recurring theme in American social movements.

Consensus means that the group style primarily from the New Left (not known for its feminism) and it has been a recurring theme in American social movements.

Consensus needs to be explored and differences between individuals and group needs, which is often a bitter pill to swallow. The feminist movement should work hard to make the group style primarily from the New Left (not known for its feminism) and it has been a recurring theme in American social movements.

References and addresses for groups mentioned in this article are available from Chain Reaction.
to the approval of mining in cases where the mineral is import-replacing and/or of strategic significance. Conservation is not given a look in. If the government was serious about protecting these areas of national park, stating that a "significant feature" where no mining activity of any type will be permitted they should join the WMC-BP right now exactly where any activity would be completely out of the question. One would hope this would be the whole proclaimed park.

If the government sees this as not possible due to the WMC-BP's prior claims to the area, then three more years of intensive exploration is not likely to turn the tables. Unless public pressure somehow becomes a dramatic force in this issue, the areas of Cobberas-Tingaringy with economically viable mineral resources will be mined.

New guidelines

The certain exploitation of this one national park is, also, not the only worrying aspect of the government's announcement of last December. For so-called 'strict new guidelines' such preshring little protection from mineral exploitation is afforded to both proclaimed and proposed National Parks. Directly related to this, the amount of emphasis being placed on employment through exploration, and the economic worth of schemes, is slaming in areas which are reserved for their conservation value.

As conservationists in Victoria are too painfully aware, exploitative industries in national parks are almost common place. Logging, grazing, and mining activities take place in no less than ten national parks including Bogong, Otways and Snowy River parks as well as the proposed Cobberas-Tingaringy park. Yet all the guidelines say about mineral exploitation in proclaimed parks is that the government's policy is opposed to it. The Labor policy reads:

If those areas designated as being of prime conservation value will be used consistently, grazing, or other commercial activities allowed in areas which are high in mineral potential, exploration and mining would almost certainly have already begun, then the policy of opposition to mining in national parks would have been redundant. In an area where economically viable mining could take place, it will be considered even if the area is not given national park status.

When this statement is coupled with the fact that almost all of Victoria is covered by an exploration licence of one sort or another, and that in areas of high mineral potential, exploration and mining have already begun, the policy of opposition to mining in national parks is thus shown to be not worthwhile. In any area where economically viable mining could take place, it will be considered even if the area is not given national park status.

Examples of national parks:

 examples of national parks: logging, grazing, mining and tourism.

Examples of exploitation of national parks:

- Logging, grazing, mining, and tourism.
- The government has decided not to proclaim all of Cobberas-Tingaringy. The same arguments that have been used could easily be crafted to justify mining within the park. Doubtless, it is a matter of time before such a scenario emerges.

Examples of exploitation of national parks: logging, grazing, mining and tourism.
A case for simply living

I write to you for pursuing the debate on limits to growth by publishing Keith Redgen’s reply to Ted Trainer’s original article. It is a debate which needs to be heard and one which I would like to contribute to with the following tentative observations.

Finally I must comment on Keith’s apparent conviction that in any case the solution is impossible because people are so obsessed with the pursuit of affluence and growth that they will not accept de-development and voluntary simplicity. Of course they won’t — at present — but we have to work hard for a long time getting people to understand that the pursuit of affluence and growth is in fact destructive, that it is a major source of all the big problems, that this economy has to be scrapped, and that a satisfactory alternative way can be conceived. At best I think this will take two decades and maybe we do not have that long. But either we tackle this gigantic task of public education and discussion leading to a level of understanding and commitment that will sustain the enormous structural change involved in phasing out unnecessary industries, decentralising, providing subsidies and assistance for change to more co-operative and self-sufficient ways, etc. Unfortunately if these structural changes are to be made at all smoothly (they will have to involve the state heavily) this would mean that people are to get reorganised there will be far less need for the imperative of people to cut down their consumption but the capitalist system that produces mass-poverty is not one I wish to dispute. If one grants its truth, the vast disparities of consumption, of which our consumer society is one side of the coin, must then be seen as a by-product of that capitalist system. Within this context, Trainer’s case can be restated. The old crisis of capitalism (such as were witnessed in the 1890s and 1930s) are no longer the greatest danger, having been surpassed in potential for damage by the new crisis of capitalism (with features such as pollution and depletion of resources). Redgen dismisses too easily the threat of this new crisis, suggesting that we could survive it if we planned well and used alternative energy sources. However there are few cases of either of these changes coming about, at least not before great damage has been done. Catastrophe continues to stare us in the face. Indeed it is very difficult to see any solution to the problem, and it is for this reason that the debate is so important. It does not seem enough to say abolish capitalism and all will be well. As Redgen remarks, wealth is an extremely powerful symbol in our society, and it is hard to see how socialism could change this, at least in the immediate future.

Whatever the solution, it would seem that the simply living strategy must be part of it, (for the middle classes, not for the poor) only part, alongside other forms of political action.

Firstly, it can be of practical educational value, illuminating the amount of wealth generated by the capitalist system, and pointing to the damage this has done to our environment, and to how it has separated us from each other. Living simply need not involve dropping out, but it does necessitate community action, recycling.

Secondly, part of the solution to the crisis of consumption facing us lies in international redistribution of wealth and resources. Simply living is a money saver, releasing money to help the Third World struggle. Charity, has, and rightly so, got a bad name, but not all money giving is charity. In a period such as ours when the problems are enormous, one cannot afford to wait for the revolution to solve them. The need for immediate reform is desperate and so is the corresponding need for our financial support for politically aware environmentalist and aid groups.

Stephen Howes

Melbourne
Antarctica - inaccessible, inhospitable, a desert of ice with the coldest, windiest and driest climate in the world - is the world's last remaining continent of near-pristine wilderness. The campaign to save Antarctica has not, however, strongly attracted the attention of the conservation movement, and only a few committed environmentalists in the USA, Britain, New Zealand and Australia have strived together over the past ten years to achieve their aim of the total protection and preservation of the Antarctic environment.

Most of these environmentalists have recently reassessed their approach to that struggle and have shifted from the previously used World Park strategy. Grows of anger and howls of 'sellout' coming from some quarters have prompted Lyn Goldsworthy to write this article, which attempts to explain the reasons behind this reassessment.

Before the Antarctic Treaty nations (generally known as Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties and hereafter referred to as ATCPs) decided to negotiate a regime for minerals, the Antarctic had been under the de facto protection of its seemingly economic uselessness. The campaign to declare the region off-limits to mining was primarily based on economic tones: the protection of the Antarctic environment would be ensured. It was seen as a simple solution for an area considered to be of unique importance in terms of its wilderness value.

In the light of the negotiations for a regime to govern mineral activity within the Antarctic, environmentalists desperately need to find new strategies by which to present their demands. It is essential if we are to be successful in achieving our original, unaltered, pristine wilderness.


World Park office

The Day After, directed by Nicholas Meyer, produced by Bruckheimer-Papazian, 35mm, colour, 125 minutes. Available from Village Roadshow. Tel: (03) 61 3811

Reviewed by Peter Christoff

The impact of any film depends on the context in which it is interpreted. This is a banal point, but one which is central to the assessment of the effect The Day After has had in the USA, in Europe, Britain and Australia.

The Guardian Weekly (18 December 1983)

Some thirty million people watched the American film The Day After, when it was shown on British television at the weekend. The twice-weekly soap opera, Coronation Street, attracts about a million more and often première shows more excitement than did the attempt to portray the aftermath of a nuclear war.

Various reports from the USA emphasised that public opinion polls showed, after the screening, a slightly increased support for President Reagan and no effect, or probably an adverse effect, on the peace movement. Three months after the release of The Day After, there was no sign of it in the media. After screening to a television audience of over 10 million people, it seems to have sunk without a trace.

One film by Steven Spiegel (No 48:1983) - a West German weekly magazine, reported:

A film like The Day After sized the patriotism which many Americans feel, simul­taneously the horror, which the film presents its viewers, creates a defensive response which the film cannot overcome. A film by American psychologist, Robert L. Lydon, has called "psychic numbing": a film which can no longer make its message effective. The Day After fills this vacuum.

By other accounts, the defensive response is a little more active. In the USA, TV broadcasting, which followed directly after network screening in the USA, the power of the Presidency and its wisdom was reaffirmed. One of the participants, General Daniel Graham, said:

"The alternative to the American broadcast (Company's) horror show is the cultural momentum behind the peace movement. Those who wish to exist without those everyday reminders of potential nuclear catastrophe, the film's familiar terrain is also alien and not immediately digestible, despite our constant diet of American television cartoons.

Yet the similarities between the film's world and those of its Euro­pean and Australian viewers - not to mention our nuclear industry, which is our nation from nuclear destruction. Our culture of capitalism in the present 'nuclear age' is becoming increasingly universalised. Viewers of the film on any of these continents would find the social forms familiar. The film builds towards the eruption of World War III through scenes of banal domesticity (trusty husband, Father and Daughter, Husband and Wife, Young Love) juxtaposed with scenes of banal militarism (military sites in farmland, an air force command post taking off from a local airfield) and culminates in the disturbing and moving image of missiles being launched against the USSR. This however necessarily has a different effect on the imagination and surpressed fears of those who live within this environ­ment to that of the American audience.

Despite this, the commodity between ourselves, crude caricatures of whom inhabit this film, and the real people they in turn represent, enables the film to draw us into sympathy with the human condition. It is through their condition of powerlessness that the film's characters have the potential to gain the identification of all viewers.

The film reaches its peak at the moment when the missiles are being launched and it is at this point that it could have successfully made a strong and direct political comment on the substantial issues of the arms race and America's participation in it. Instead, and especially from this point on, The Day After operates as a device for blunting political comment and debate on disarmament.

It is here, then, that we should look...
At the destructive impact of the film, an effect which has been more pronounced in the USA because of its extensive advertising, which exploits a 'natural' relationship to that audience. To apologize for the film's shortcomings, as Phillip Adams has done, is to ground the film within the American media conventions and the political overtones of the American television broadcasting establishment, is to extenuate what ultimately was a calculating cinematic opportunism. The film has, incidentally, though not accidentally, become an instrument of neutralization directed at the Freeze movement in the States. "Freeze" was the strategy adopted by the USA disarmament movement to reinstate Reagan's policies for Cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe and developing new armaments such as the MX missile.

Likewise, to regard the film as merely forgotten or 'forgettable' (as does the Guardian's writer and others), is to underestimate the degree to which this film can itself actively suppress concern over the realities. The breakdown of fundamental social behaviour which occurred in Hiroshima does not happen here.

With its glamorous pyrotechnics, the film has initiated its own genre of 'holocaust/terror' films (eg, the first part of 'The Testament') which exploit the process of trivialising the unholy in order to achieve a plausible future. The central issue of our time is not to be considered -- and the film certainly does consider it -- depersonalised as a political fashion which rapidly becomes political nonsense.

The film operates elsewhere to obscure attempts to genuinely define a critical response to the question. We should now be talking about the effects of the film, not about its moral content. The film has initiated, or at least is utilised by, an army of critics who make everyone listen and give the exasperated answers to their right. It is all illusion and we are on the side all the way.

Our hearts are with her too, but, at home in the real world, it is easier to think about cruise missiles in the abstract or to get carried away with the ethical implications of a particular issue. The film, in effect, trashes, or at least immensely misleads one into an expectation of a survivable, and in parts almost beautiful world of 'America the Innocent'. Children, haul this question into focus. Neither Cruise nor Pershing missiles exist apart and cannot be integrated into, or made fulfilling, the grid of American social behaviour which occurred in Hiroshima.

From the film Silkwood.

Silkwood was one of those little girls. She was an ordinary American worker in a mundane job in a nuclear plant, who became concerned with the company they employed her to protect nuclear safety procedures. But their vigilance was not rewarded; the investigation into the Karen McGee company's attempt to falsify the results of property checks and subsequent death are now part of anti-nuclear lore. Out there in the real world, democratic heroes don't win.

But in Mike Nichols' Silkwood, this point is somehow lost. The problem -- and the success -- of the film lies in Meryl Streep's bravura performance in the title role, a tall poppy amidst the almost braying horde of hometown6 alumns of Oklahoma. Whatever the real Karen Silkwood, Meryl Streep's version is so tremendously brave, perceptive, witty and more involved in investigating the nuclear industry has been aired too intensely to make the audience above the mental level of TV. In real life, Karen Silkwood was one of those little girls. She was an ordinary American worker in a mundane job in a nuclear plant, who became concerned with the company they employed her to protect nuclear safety procedures. But their vigilance was not rewarded; the investigation into the Karen McGee company's attempt to falsify the results of property checks and subsequent death are now part of anti-nuclear lore. Out there in the real world, democratic heroes don't win.

But in Mike Nichols' Silkwood, this point is somehow lost. The problem -- and the success -- of the film lies in Meryl Streep's bravura performance in the title role, a tall poppy amidst the almost braying horde of hometown6 alumns of Oklahoma. Whatever the real Karen Silkwood, Meryl Streep's version is so tremendously brave, perceptive, witty and more involved in investigating the nuclear industry has been aired too intensely to make the audience above the mental level of TV. In real life, Karen Silkwood was one of those little girls. She was an ordinary American worker in a mundane job in a nuclear plant, who became concerned with the company they employed her to protect nuclear safety procedures. But their vigilance was not rewarded; the investigation into the Karen McGee company's attempt to falsify the results of property checks and subsequent death are now part of anti-nuclear lore. Out there in the real world, democratic heroes don't win.

Karen McGee's machinations take rather a back seat during all this. They are never named, but the French have a saying that Karen's relationship with Dolly, who is under the impression that she is in love with her. Was it Dolly who told the executives about Karen's recordings? In the end, one may ask, what does it matter? Only, perhaps, to those who can aver anything about America, for or against. What happens in the end, however, is the most interesting part of the film. Is it a comforting thought, that the attack on the nuclear plant in the love-seat, a restful little red farm in the countryside, a parade of junk food and chain-smoking. The filmmaker obviously has a strong sense of place -- whole life histories seem to collapse into one thin line of blue. It is difficult to imagine a middle-aged woman screaming with pain and handwriting on the front porch swing or that of a middle-aged man screaming with pain and handwriting on the front porch swing or that of a middle-aged woman screaming with pain. The filmmaker obviously has a strong sense of place -- whole life histories seem to collapse into one thin line of blue. It is difficult to imagine a middle-aged woman screaming with pain and handwriting on the front porch swing or that of a middle-aged man screaming with pain and handwriting on the front porch swing or that of a middle-aged woman screaming with pain.

The film can itself actively suppress concern over the realities. The breakdown of fundamental social behaviour which occurred in Hiroshima does not happen here.

With its glamorous pyrotechnics, the film has initiated its own genre of 'holocaust/terror' films (eg, the first part of 'The Testament') which exploit the process of trivialising the unholy in order to achieve a plausible future. The central issue of our time is not to be considered -- and the film certainly does consider it -- depersonalised as a political fashion which rapidly becomes political nonsense.

The film operates elsewhere to obscure attempts to genuinely define a critical response to the question. We should now be talking about the effects of the film, not about its moral content. The film has initiated, or at least is utilised by, an army of critics who make everyone listen and give the exasperated answers to their right. It is all illusion and we are on the side all the way.

Our hearts are with her too, but, at home in the real world, it is easier to think about cruise missiles in the abstract or to get carried away with the ethical implications of a particular issue. The film, in effect, trashes, or at least immensely misleads one into an expectation of a survivable, and in parts almost beautiful world of 'America the Innocent'. Children, haul this question into focus. Neither Cruise nor Pershing missiles exist apart and cannot be integrated into, or made fulfilling, the grid of American social behaviour which occurred in Hiroshima. It is difficult to imagine a middle-aged woman screaming with pain and handwriting on the front porch swing or that of a middle-aged man screaming with pain and handwriting on the front porch swing or that of a middle-aged woman screaming with pain. The filmmaker obviously has a strong sense of place -- whole life histories seem to collapse into one thin line of blue. It is difficult to imagine a middle-aged woman screaming with pain and handwriting on the front porch swing or that of a middle-aged man screaming with pain and handwriting on the front porch swing or that of a middle-aged woman screaming with pain.
World Park proposal could not be described as encouraging. To many nations 'World' implied internationalisation, a concept to which they were vehemently opposed, and 'Park' conjured up so many images as to be virtually meaningless. Environmentalists were also unable to agree on a proposal, except for the brief initiative by New Zealand, to take up the proposal seriously. Despite this, they continued to push the idea as they believed it to be the best strategy through which to achieve the protection of the Antarctic environment.

The first time that the World Park concept looked untenable was when the Living Resources Code was adopted by the Consultative Parties in 1980. A - a fish harvesting treaty - was being negotiated. Because, on paper at least, the Convention sets out to ensure that the concept of the environment is the world below the 69th parallel, it is not seen as a major setback to the implementation of a total protection goal. It was believed that fishing and protecting the Antarctic environment were not necessarily mutually exclusive activities. However, the initiative to negotiate the minerals regime was seen immediately as a direct threat to the World Park concept. Conservations had interpreted the absence of mineral exploration and exploitation provisions within the Antarctic Treaty system as a null agreement against such activity. (This was not actually a realistic interpretation of the Treaty during the original drawing up of the Antarctic Treaty provisions in the late 1950s, and should not be assumed to be true.) The initiative was perceived as an indication that there was significant interest in mineral development, and as a move away from the universal goals of peace and harmonious scientific cooperation towards monopoly control of Antarctic resources.

Environmentalists gloomily predicted that sovereignty disputes and freedom of access claims would prove irreconcilable and would eventually result in the breakdown of the Antarctic Treaty system. They saw this as a breakdown that was undesirable, however, inadequate, the Treaty promised environmentally sustainable provisions such as the Clean Air Act, and the environmentalist movement had already demonstrated its strength in the 1970s and 1980s. The ATCPs avoided the issue during the original drawing up of the Antarctic Treaty provisions in the late 1950s, and should not be assumed to be true.) The initiative was perceived as an indication that there was significant interest in mineral development, and as a move away from the universal goals of peace and harmonious scientific cooperation towards monopoly control of Antarctic resources.
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