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International Conference 1988

Is our report about the Friends of the Earth International Annual General Meeting (AGM) in 1988, held in Krakow, Poland, Jane Banden and Dave Sweeney (Chain Reaction No 56) made an observation that I would like to comment on.

Jane and Dave describe the debate about the role third world groups play in the Friends of the Earth International network. According to their observations "a number of quite strong criticisms were raised by representatives of the third world groups." These criticisms were concentrated on becoming a member having only "very little advantage at present and often brings unexpected disadvantages." Jane and Dave seem to agree with that, stating "The larger western groups often use the fact that there is a high third world membership to gain credibility or prestige for their own groups, without assisting their southern partners.

In all, I would like to make clear that not all third world representatives express this criticism. It was expressed by two or three representatives only and on the other hand, the representative of FOE Ghana, Theo Anderson, made a strong point in warning his colleagues not to become too independent of the financial sources from the north. Another third world member group, Sahab Alam Malaysia, in its Annual report to the AGM, made clear how important FOE International has been for its activities, even more, for its existence. It faced a very difficult situation in the autumn of 1987, when three activists were arrested under the Internal Security Act and even an even on its activities was threatened. (mainly due to its support of the Penan in Sarawak and the residents of Bukit Merah against a Japanese factory, Asian Rare Earth producing radioactive waste). "The immediate response and mobilisation of support from FOE International was tremendous. In those trying weeks, SAM truly felt the solidarity of the environmental movement."

Jane and Dave do mention the direct assistance by FOE Netherlands, Sweden and the United States to southern groups, thereby moderating the picture. I would like to underline that the biggest FOE groups, the one based in London and with membership in England and Wales, through the years has been the biggest supporter from the network (also financially) to especially FOE Malaysia. And I would not like to forget the effort FOE Italy and again the Netherlands is making in assisting the movement in Eastern Europe. Eastern Europe is not the third world, surely, but the independent environmental movement in this part of the world is facing serious troubles well worth our attention.

Furthermore, I would like to make clear that apart from the Netherlands, England and the United States there are no real big organisations within FOE International, in the sense of having a large budget. Some groups, like Canada and Italy, are not a long moment at the moment, and they will be able to support FOE groups in other parts in the world more and more. But even within Europe a number of FOE groups are either very small or very much decentralised. The strength of FOE International lies within its decentralised structure, within its national groups having a political, critical attitude towards governments, companies and also to the moderate environmental and conservation organisations. This means that FOE groups working in the West, having a consciousness that the environmental problems in the third world are also the result of the unequal world wide economical relations, know that they have to take part in the global fight for a better environment together with environmentalists from the third world. Financial support is important and this kind of support is growing. But more definite in the long run will be the development of the international campaigns, conferences where people in the third world and in the west really find common goals and actions to fight the global destruction. That is what makes FOE International important.

John Hontelez, Chairperson
FOE International
Netherlands

You are invited to write letters to Chain Reaction with your comments on the magazine or any other issues of interest. Letters should be kept within 500 words so that as many as possible can be published. Longer letters may be edited. Write today to Chain Reaction, GPO Box 90 Adelaide, 5001, South Australia.

Greenhouse

Bill Kemp in his Chain Reaction Greenhouse (Chain Reaction No 57) made two salient points: Nuclear power isn't appropriate and efficient energy use is important. However, energy efficiency is only part of the solution to greenhouse problems. No matter how efficiently we use energy it needs to come from somewhere. But where? This question is left unanswered in Kemp's article. The answer is, of course, from renewable energy sources.

Small scale solar, wind and hydro technologies all have an important part to play. These technologies are developed, but government apathy and market place problems are hindering their introduction. Heightened public awareness of the compatibility between renewable energy and the environment contribute to widespread acceptance.

John Foster
Palin Beach, Qld

Environmental Action

Our workplace has recently established an Environmental Action group, which is an excellent way to meet like minded colleagues, share information, and initiate actions.

We've organised speakers, shown films, publicised rallies, instituted paper recycling and circulated information.

As the meetings are held at lunch times and there is no travelling involved, people who otherwise find it difficult to actively participate in environmental issues are able to. So why not start one?

Joanne Wright
Bendi, NSW

Economic Growth

In your most recent issue of Chain Reaction (No 57), Ian Grayson in his article says that no political party has a policy calling for a sustainable economy.

The Australian Democrats not only have a policy calling for a sustainable economy, I have spoken many times against the growth economy. I include a package of my speeches on this matter.

Margaret Dingle
Kensington Gardens, SA

Flying into the Greenhouse

I read Ashley Campbell's article 'Flying into the Greenhouse' (Chain Reaction No 57) with interest. However I was under the impression that air travel became the favoured method of overseas travel because of the vast amounts of oil required by ships, in other words ship travel was uneconomic because it was less energy efficient than air. All forms of overseas travel, except sailing ships, canoes etc, use fossil fuels in their operation, as do all forms of motorised land transport.

Ashley Campbell is incorrect in pointing out the environmental costs of travel but I think he has mistaken his target in favouring ships over aircraft.

John Coulter, Senator for South Australia

Footnotes

Thanks for the last edition of Chain Reaction, particularly the article about dioxin and organochlorides. It was informative, but I have a concern, Chain Reaction rarely uses footnotes or names of sources of information. Facts are pulled out of the air. I believe that you don't really pull them "out of the air", but it creates problems when I want to quote your quotations. I think when writing about issues, governments and companies it is useful to be able to quote that so and so's study showed such and such. Quoting sources adds weight to one's argument. I want my letters to be taken seriously, so I often quote others work. Also it is plain courtesy to acknowledge sources: good literary practice - even if it takes a little more time.

I look forward to increasing acknowledgment of sources in Chain Reaction.

Susan Moss
Balwyn, Victoria

EDITORS NOTE: Yes, we agree and will try to do so on all articles written by the editorial collective. However many articles Chain Reaction prints are unsolicited, and we do not always have the resources to provide footnotes if they do not accompany the article.
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2 • Chain Reaction
We won't be removing too many words from Chain Reaction, but we will be trying to make it easier to read by changing the typeface and removing some of the lines between and around the text. There will be other changes, their final forms are still being debated, and we hope that the new look will be easier for reading. And to those people who like the current look of the magazine and don't see any need for change, please give us a chance, and keep on reading our content, which we change with every issue. If you really don't like it after a few issues, you can buy a set of back copies to remember what the magazine really should be like.

We also hope to print Chain Reaction on recycled paper in the very near future, but there are a number of technical and supply obstacles at this stage. Meanwhile, if you want to recycle Chain Reaction, please pass it on to a friend.

Chain Reaction continues to be a magazine that tries to cover issues from an activist viewpoint, and although we can't cover everything, we do like to hear about events and issues from the people who are close to the action on as many different environmental fronts as possible.

If you're involved in a group working on an issue which might be of interest to the readers of Chain Reaction, send us a copy of a newsletter or just sit down and write your news. Chain Reaction accepts contributions in almost any form, from scraps of paper to computer disks. We prefer material on disks because it means that we don't have to type it in. Call us first to be sure that we can use your data and software type(s). We like photographs and graphics which are either self-evident or have good descriptions.

The next issue should contain the long-awaited Activist Contact List. Please contact us with the name and address of any group or groups working on environmental issues. We will not be able to include everything, but we'd like as much information as possible for making our choices.

The arrival that day in Adelaide of a shipment of yellowcake from the Roxby Downs uranium mine did make things a little hectic as a few of us went to the midnight protest action as well.

The current style, or something roughly similar to it, has been around since 1990, and we have had some feedback that the magazine is too wordy and is often daunting to readers. We have also found that there have been many style changes in small ways between editions of Chain Reaction, and in resolving these differences, and adding some bits we haven't used much before, we really came up with a quite different look.
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Australian links with deforestation
It has been revealed that there are Australian connections to the proposal to establish a massive eucalyptus plantation and pulp mill near Merauke in West Papua (Irian Jaya).

Indonesian non-government organisations are leading a campaign of opposition to the project which seems likely to result in the destruction of about 800,000 hectares of primary rainforest, the pollution of local rivers with dioxin and the displacement of the local Auyu people.

The Indonesian government has donated the title of the 800,000 hectares of land to the ASC corporation.

Also in Irian Jaya, the Japanese logging corporation Marubeni has succeeded in negotiating a contract with an Indonesian company, the Pindang Group, to provide roughly half the finance for a US$7 million mangrove wood-chip mill in Bintuni Bay which will be fed by logging of mangroves within a 133,000 hectare concession.

Marubeni was recently named "Tropical Forest Destroyer #1" by JATAN, the Friends of the Earth Japan's Rainforest Action Group. Marubeni is heavily involved with logging in Sarawak, Malaysia, being the importer of 90 per cent of the wood going into Japan from that area.

Mangrove felling operations like that at Bintuni Bay have already destroyed 30 per cent of Indonesia's original 4.6 million hectares of mangroves. Mangrove trees are mainly logged for conversion to wood-chips or charcoal for export to Japan and Singapore.

Indonesia's first mangrove logging operation began in 1972. By 1985, there were 14 companies operating in this area. The focus of this type of logging has shifted now to Irian Jaya, as much of the mangroves of Sumatra and Kalimantan have already been over-exploited.

In May Indonesian environmental groups organised demonstrations during the visit to Jakarta by the US Vice-President Dan Quayle. The focus was the role of US interests in deforestation and the pollution caused by tailings from the US Freeport corporation's copper mine in West Papua.


Untouched forest a better earner
On examination of the economic potential of an untouched patch of Peruvian rainforest, American biologists and economists concluded that the area of forest under examination would be worth more in dollar terms if left unlogged, if its fruits, nuts and medical products were harvested in sustainable ways. Tiny harvesting non-timber resources a one hectare plot at US$650, exceeded the profits available from logging or cattle farming by two to three times.

Source: Nature

Los Angeles goes for electric vehicles
The Los Angeles City Council (LACC) hopes to have 3,000 electric vehicles on the road by 1991, and 10,000 by 1995.

An Australian company, Elroy Engineering, is one of the seven finalists to supply the city with electric cars, vans and buses.

Elroy Engineering has developed 17 models of electric vehicle, ranging from large buses to commuter vans and cars. The company's vehicles use the conventional lead acid type of battery. The designer of the cars, Roy Lembruggen, explained that this is because lead acid batteries are the only proven, commercially available, and economically viable batteries. Despite this, Mr Lembruggen says that his company's vehicles easily meet the LACC standard of a 90 kph road speed and 90 km operating range.

He described the attitude of Australian governments to electric vehicles as one of apathy.

Recently the Democrats slammed the Australian car industry for its emphasis on the production of large cars. Victorian Democrat State President, Sid Spindler said: "In 10 years Australia's population has increased by 30 per cent, yet the number of cars has doubled! The companies are offering little in the way of smaller, more fuel efficient cars. Emissions from cars contribute 30 per cent of greenhouse gases in Australia."

Source: Electric Vehicle Progress, Australian Democrats.

Morgan forced to defend Roxby
Hugh Morgan, managing director of Western Mining Corporation, was recently forced to defend radiation control measures in place at the Olympic Dam uranium mine in South Australia, following criticism of WMC's unwillingness to fully disclose the contents of health and safety reports by both the Federal and State environment ministers. In an interview with the Adelaide Advertiser, Morgan claimed that working in the Roxby mine was "safer than driving a car."

John Willis, Greenpeace's international uranium campaign coordinator, recently on a tour of Australia, said Morgan's comments were "truly ridiculous." He stressed the point that the upper limit of allowable radiation dosage set in Australia (3.6 million curies) is one-tenth of that of the UK and Sweden by three times, and those recommended by some scientists and also Friends of the Earth (UK) by ten times. He said, "Scientists have discovered over the last couple of years that we've been underestimating the effects of radiation by as much as ten times."

A action carried recently by 300 delegates at the SA State ALP convention also questioned the adequacy of the exposure standards laid down in the Roxby Downs Indenture Radiation Act. WMC's unwillingness to disclose the health and safety reports alleged by Federal Environment Minister Graham Richardson, who shortly after saying that having more uranium mines could mean more money would become available for spending on pensions, made the holdow promise that he would try to force disclosure of the reports.

Greenpeace's John Willis said that "the secrecy surrounding the mine is unique. It is unlike the situation in any other democratic country with uranium mines." He argued that the only other uranium mine in the world about which information was being withheld was in Namibia, under the control of the South African military.

On a recent visit to the area, FOE Fitzroy's Ila Marks and friends were outraged to discover an un-fenced tailings dam with footprints in it. Ms Marks said, "It is horrifying to imagine that a worker may have gone home to his family with tailings slurry on his boots. It contains uranium oxide, Radium 226, and heavy metals such as arsenic, mercury, and lead."

Ms Marks also reported the re-alignment of a fence to encroach an embarrassing collapsed mound spring, which was apparently damaged by Roxby's water gathering operations. This was done without consultation with the local Aboriginal people who were seeking compensation for the damages.

Source: Adelaide Advertiser, FOE Fitzroy.
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Questions raised about fibreglass
Synthetic Mineral Fibres, or SMF, are among the latest substances to have come under the scrutiny of the Federal Government's National Occupational Health and Safety Commission (Known as the FOE). SMF, or sometimes MMFF, Man (sic) Made Fibre, is an umbrel- la term covering fibreglass and glasswool, ceramic fibres, and rockwool. These materials are mainly used in the construction and sheet metal trades. In May Worksafe Australia released a public comment draft national exposure standard (which suggests various threshold limits of exposure to respirable SMF fibres) and a code of practice (working practices and procedures for controlling respirable SMF fibres).

It seems as if some Australian politicians are astute enough to have antici- pated such difculties. Late in July, then Premier, Victoria's Environment Minister, called upon the retailers already supplying the bags to stop doing so until there was a full assessment of their environmental impact.

Plastic bags, whatever type, constitute a drain on the Earth's non-renewable resources. They throw a spanner in the works of any attempts to recycle anything. Even if recycled, glass fibres may possibly be carcinogenic to humans. "We are dealing with the same people who made asbestos," said a spokesman for the National Pest Control Association. And indeed, asbestos and fibreglass have the same effect on laboratory animals as asbestos, but it is not the actual material itself that causes cancers in humans.

The draft standard says: "Animal experiments and evidence from human studies have caused the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) to conclude that glasswool, rockwool and ceramic fibre may possibly be carcinogenic to humans." The ideal solution remains to eliminate the use of plastic products at its source, before the production of plastic.

Source: One Reader, May/June 1989; Not Man Apart, October 1988

"Manufacturers in the UK have killed more than 100,000 installation workers and they knew clearly from the mid 30s that this was deadly...they are profes- sional liars and professional killers.

"It should be recognised as a carcinogenic agent and the companies that own the buildings of Australian homes be covered to prevent contact with air that would allow fibres to float into homes."
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FOE Hong Kong taken over by eco-industrialists

The transformation that has overtaken FOE Hong Kong's newsletter appears to be a reflection of a hardly surprising shift of attitudes currently taking place in the Far Eastern bastion of free-market capitalism. One Earth, FOE Hong Kong's news-magazine has recently been transformed from a one page serve job to a slick and glossy 22 page product of corporat environmentalism sporting full page advertisements from such crooked and unscrupulous uglies as Shell, Barclays Bank, and Ciba-Geigy.

The editorial entitled 'Eco-industrialists', calls for a less confrontational style of environmentalism, proclaiming, "the time is right for co-operation with the new breed of eco-industrialists.'

Such an approach tends to gloss over the activities of many of these firms. For example, Shell and Barclays have massive investments in South Africa which serve to prop up the apartheid regime. Ciba-Geigy has a black history of putting profits before human lives with the marketing of known lethal pharmaceuticals to developing countries. The histories of the drugs cloquinol, phenoformin, butazolidin, and tanacetum are truly harrowing.

Particularly odious is the story of cloquinol, marketed in Japan and less industrialised parts of the world as an anti-diarrhoeal. Cloquinol induced a syndrome of toxic degeneration of the nervous system (SMON) that left the victim in severe pain, blind, paraplegic and with irreversible damage to the nervous system. Anwar Fazal, of the International Organisation of Consumer's (IOCU), writes that the cloquinol story has been described as 'the worst drug disaster in history', with cloquinol thought to have affected more lives than thalidomide. By the time Japan banned the drug in 1970, between 10,000 to 30,000 people had been permanently injured and nearly 1,000 had died.

Clioquinol is the subject of a book to be published by the IOCU by a Swedish paediatric neurologist, the late Dr. Olle Hannahson called Inside Ciba-Geigy (see Resources page 47).

Ciba-Geigy is also involved with the manufacture of two of the Pesticides Action Network's (PAN) 'dirty dozen' pesticides: Chlordimeform (or Galecrom), and DDT. Another piece of evidence about Ciba-Geigy's attitude to the environment leaked out of Switzerland late in 1986. Routine tests by an international agency monitoring water quality in the Rhine River revealed that Ciba-Geigy had in one 'discret' incident dumped 1.6 tonnes of herbicide into the river.

McDonald's is another company praised by FOE Hong Kong for its environmental awareness. McDonald's is well known for its role in the destruction of millions of hectares of rainforest in Central America and its production of millions of tonnes of non-biodegradable, non-recyclable styrofoam waste each year.

While one can only agree with FOE Hong Kong that at times it is indeed possible to 'catch more flies with honey than vinegar', at Chains Reaction we believe that FOE Hong Kong would be wise to avoid getting caught itself.

Another reason why we haven't learnt to accept corporate sponsorship is that companies may be keen to develop a good environmental image to cover up their unconscionable activities in other areas. Chains Reaction believes in making the links between the exploitation of people and the exploitation of the environment.

Whilst ecologists can manipulate the profit motive that drives industrialists to clean up their act, they must be aware that actions leading to bans in the home country will simply encourage the company to shift its operations to another part of the world.

FOE action on genetic engineering

In response to the release of genetically modified organisms to the environment at the Waite Institute in South Australia in July 1987, FOE Sydney has undertaken campaign and education work on the implications of genetic engineering.

It has produced a 64 page booklet which contains articles on many aspects of Genetic Engineering. However FOE Sydney believes that there still is an urgent need for much more detailed discussion and debate on the subject. Consequently, it has undertaken to hold an open and thorough Inquiry into all aspects of genetic engineering and its implications.

The Inquiry aims to:
- promote public discussion by providing a forum through which interested individuals and community groups can communicate;
- collate information and resources which arise from the Inquiry and distribute these widely;
- facilitate dialogue between individuals and groups who share concerns about the issues but, perhaps, have insufficient understanding of each others viewpoints.

FOE promote action on genetic engineering.

The first stage of the inquiry is planned to commence in late August or early September. If you are interested write to:

FOE Sydney, Genetic Engineering Inquiry
4th Floor, 56 Foster St
Surry Hills 2010
Ph: (02) 211 3923

Call it socialism, communism, anarchism or what have you, the future is flexible. All I know is that this present set up is about to collapse and history can't go backwards.
Is growth so bad?

Does all economic growth lead to environmental destruction. James Prest comments on Ian Grayson’s “Green Consumerism” in the last edition of Chain Reaction.

Ian Grayson’s article “Green Consumerism” [CR 57] displays a number of dangerous and simplistic misconceptions which appear to be widely held by environmentalists.

Grayson’s contention is essentially that there is an unshakable and direct correlation between economic growth and environmental degradation. He says: “Economic growth, even ‘green growth’ cannot be sustained for much longer without causing irreversible damage to the environment.”

I intend to take issue with this blanket rejection of economic growth. There are essentially two points to be made. First, it cannot be shown that growth per se automatically results in ecological disaster. The second is that there are a number of causes of environmental destruction other than economic growth.

There can be no doubt that we live on a planet with finite resources. But it does not automatically follow that economic growth will bring us to the abyss of planetary disaster. This common misapprehension usually arises because no effort is made to define economic growth.

If one picks up any economics textbook to examine how economic growth (per cent increase in GDP or GNP per annum) is calculated, the most perfunctory glance will reveal that there are several types of economic growth which benefit society and at the same time do not result in any appreciable environmental damage. Further, there are some forms of growth which can stem from repair of environmental damage.

For example, if the Federal government were tomorrow to announce a massive $3–4 billion increase in spending on health, housing, and education, this would raise the GDP, create economic growth, improve the lives of many people, and would do little to damage the environment. To continue the analogy, if the government were to spend $3 billion over the next five years on planting trees, this would create a lot of growth, and I doubt that anyone will suggest that tree-planting activity will throw us into the abyss of ecological disaster.

These comments are simply an attempt to point out the logical possibility (given the current system of national income accounting) of a simultaneous occurrence of growth and social or environmental benefit.

I am not one who worships at the ballyhooed altar of economic “pragmatism.” The depletion of non-renewable resources is a crucial issue.

I am also obvious that a reform of the methods of calculating the national accounts statistics is required. It is crazy to have an increase in growth which is then commonly assumed to represent an increase in national welfare coming as the result of running down the ecological capital upon which our economy depends. Herman Daly summed up the situation brilliantly when he said: “there is something fundamentally wrong in treating the Earth as if it were a business in liquidation.” I am also well aware that growth can not and should not be seen as an end in itself, or as an indicator of social welfare.

However, there are a number of cases where growth may not be such a bad thing. In a country with a growing population, surrounded by a world filled with 12 million refugees, growth may perhaps be a necessity. Questions of the distribution of the benefits of that growth of course must be considered. But if there are more people and the economic pie remains the same size then one must be aware that probably a number of people will become poorer.

Opponents of growth must also be aware that as our economy is no longer based so heavily on industrial production, it isn’t such a heavy user of resources. The industrial sector has contracted and the service sector has grown. The economic growth which is being generated in the service sector is a growth that is both labour intensive, and energy efficient.

I have mentioned above that some of the principal factors contributing to environmental degradation have been overlooked. Resource depletion and pollution are occurring at their present rates is happening faster than it should principally because the price currently placed on non-renewable resources is kept below their true cost.

It must be recognised that even if there were no growth occurring in the economy, decisions would still have to be made about the use of resources. Calling a halt to economic growth is therefore not a solution in itself. Environmental problems would not disappear if there was zero economic growth occurring.

The crucial issue remains that it’s the price of resources which determines how the players in the economy will be using them. On the whole, Australian governments have not yet created financial incentives for the rational use of resources such as air, water, soil and fossil fuels. If petrol and electricity were to cost more then people would act to limit their use of these resources. Recent historical experience shows that an increase in the price of oil will do far more to reduce its consumption than beating appeals to switch off lights and ride bicycles.

Before the OPEC oil price rise in the early seventies, in OECD countries, there was a 1.2–1.3 per cent increase in energy consumption for every 1 per cent of economic growth. Following the price hike energy efficiency became a necessity, and growth in oil consumption fell to 0.5 per cent per 1 per cent growth. It would be apparent to seasoned environmentalists that a decade of calls in Australia for solar power and energy conservation have done little to promote their use.

Raising the prices of resources at first appears an attractive solution. But its simplicity overlooks any possible concern for equity, and it also encourages us to continue to ignore questions of who is making the decisions, what mandate they have to make them, and on what criteria they are being made. If it is the present structure and orientation and ideological outlook of the economy that is creating the environmental problems, which it probably is, then a long-term solution is not attainable using only the price raising method described above.

What is actually needed is an economics which recognises that rational decisions about the use of resources cannot be made on the sole criteria of profitability. Government must intervene, making these decisions, but it still must be aware that being strong enough to harness the desire to make profit can be used to push the introduction of ecologically sound practices.

In such a reformed economic system the decisions of resource users would be tempered by the knowledge that government has given resources prices which reflect their true cost and scarcity. This amounts to establishing a functioning market where market failure previously existed.

While there may be much merit in aiming at consuming less resources, there is a problem that this is widely perceived as being an demand for people to stop consuming altogether. This is the implication of saying “even if we move to more environmentally acceptable products”, we will be unable to “stave off the impending environmental crisis.”

Asking environmentalists, a small section of society, to suddenly stop buying things, is hardly a credible way to “stave off the environmental crisis.” Everyone else in Australia will continue to consume in the way they have done in the recent past, seeing the example of green anti-consumers as the attitude of an unrealistic, utopian minority. Surely, if one was convinced of the need to reduce consumption in our society, it would be more intelligent to adopt methods more effective than mere exhortations, tired appeals based around “public education.” What is needed is not an attack on other environmentalists for being “yuppies” and consumers, but the articulation of an alternative economic policy.

Grayson claims that “many environmentalists are quite heavy personal consumers.” This is at odds with the obvious poverty of most activists. It can only be the big time operators such as Phillip Toyne to whom Ian Grayson refers when he says “I personally cannot take seriously those who adopt high profiles on environmental issues yet lead high consumption lifestyles...” Surely such people
"The problem is not with people making profit. It is with the scale of the development and the scale of the profit making."

A fundamental issue not presently being considered is who has control of the majority of Australia's resources — Australians, or overseas-based mega-corporations. Politically, this is an extremely volatile subject. Remember how the shit really hit the fan for the Whitlam government when Rex Connor tried to buy back control of our mineral resources.

The recent suggestion for the creation of a register of the economic values of all wilderness areas is a step in the right direction. Whilst there are some dangers inherent in this proposal, it must be an improvement on the present situation where these areas are assumed to be of no value. At least with this system there will be some numbers so that one figure can be measured against another. Developers will always be creating cost-benefit analyses, and things can only work out better if environmentalists can, in the name of realism, add a little more to the cost side of those equations.

And I've already discussed one immediately effective method of reducing environmental destruction — that of putting new prices on resources so that these prices reflect their true values. This entails a reform of the national accounts system used to calculate growth.

Another important part of getting such proposals on the agenda is to get some acceptance in the mainstream. This cannot be achieved if there remain countless individuals in the environment movement making overly simplistic attacks on capitalism or "industrial society." One must be aware that the environment in most non-market economies is more seriously degraded than in the West.

Another way of increasing credibility and acceptance in the decision-making arena is to make sure that the arguments of the environment movement can show that they are capable of avoiding making elementary blunders and displaying of profound ignorance about the workings of the conventional economic system — such as not knowing how GDP is calculated and what the current account deficit is.
It is a very delicate balance at the best of times and it is easily upset by the intrusion of such factors as recession, as we saw last year.

Treading the tightrope successfully means supporting the building of office towers, casinos and tourist developments, selling off mangrove swamps for the construction of marinas and, at the same time, adopting policies which just distribute enough spending power to the poor to avoid their being too much of a burden and to keep radical politicians out of office. Leaders like John Bannon, Bob Hawke and Margaret Thatcher perform this balancing act very well in times of good economic fortune based on high prices for minerals or farm produce — be it North Sea Oil, full order books for the arms trade, or submarines. Without these props they know they must expect trouble.

Avoiding trouble in countries like Australia has the joint effect of maintaining present inequalities and accelerating the degradation of the environment. We have to put up with the loss of wilderness, pollution and the rest to maintain the world safe for inequality.

The second and related problem of late industrial society is that growth has got to be used or we lose it. Instead of providing a growing demand for labour, a shrinking labour force in the 1990s will be able to produce a mountain of goods for those who have jobs and can afford to consume. Those who cannot can be expected to contribute to a permanent underclass of unemployed or poorly paid part-time workers.

In Britain, America, Japan and now Australia and New Zealand the underclass is already large. It consists often of migrant workers living in inner city areas or suburban pockets, or single parent families, or homeless children with a low rate of literacy and a high rate of drug addiction, suicide, violence and criminality. They are thought to be unlikely to form the vanguard of a revolution because they are marginal to the economy — some economists say their existence is the price modern society must pay for its success.

But the cost to society from which this large section of youth has been removed is enormous. "No go" areas are a result of increased social inequality.

*5 Chain Reaction*
There is much in the media these days about the 'state of the environment' and what individuals should do to fix it. However as Richard Grossman points out in an analysis of a TIME magazine feature, much of what is said places responsibility on individuals to fix something that is not always within their control. Companies and governments make decisions which set the framework by which individuals are constrained, and such decisions are not always made with consideration for health and environmental consequences. He argues that the current environmental crisis has been exacerbated by deliberate decisions of companies and governments to ignore advice from scientists, environmentalists and others of the long term effects of their activities.

In its 2 January 1989 issue, with the Earth gagged and bound in plastic on the cover, TIME's publisher wrote: 'Our editors decided the growing concern about the planet's future has become the year's most important story."

Now I think 'concern' is nice: it just does not make much of a story. Concern is another way of helping people and institutions that are culpable to get off the hook. When all are concerned, especially about abstract concept like 'the planet's future' being 'concerned' readily substitutes for action. It absolves one from dealing directly with the tangibles. The story TIME missed, of course, is the destruction of tangibles: towns, neighborhoods, communities, rivers, forests, soils, air, people, genes, flora, fauna, along with the real names and addresses of those doing the destroying (the US, USSR, German and Japanese Governments; Chevron, BASF, and Dow, to mention a few.) TIME's devotion to diversion in its special package is instructive: TIME does not distinguish between large scale industrial poisoners like governments and corporations, and individuals. There is no intimation that institutions make private, unilateral decisions that narrow the choices individuals can make. For example, paper companies only produce bleached milk cartons oozing dioxin; car companies only make vehicles; food monopolies offer foods riddled with chemicals. An individual driver may contribute petrol fumes to the air at each fill-up, but when refineries load tankers they emit tonnes of petrol vapors. TIME does not bother using proper nouns of even the most prominent polluters, except to refer to a few efforts in pollution control. Instead, TIME writers animate machines and structures: "Smokestacks have disgorged... factories have dumped... cars have guzzled... factories have dumped... forests have been denuded... lakes poisoned... underground aquifers pumped dry." TIME limits its analysis of causation to 'recklessness, carelessness, sloppiness, handling and profligacy.' It does not suggest there may be institutions, run by educated and well paid adults, which deliberately have chosen to manufacture destructive products in ways that discharge, guggle, derange, poison and pump dry. TIME does not mention that other adults—pillars of the community even, trivialize citizen claims of harm while justifying such production in the name of 'progress', 'growth', 'jobs', 'national security' and if necessary 'sacrifice'.

TIME ignores history. It matters not to TIME that most industrial and financial organisations, along with economists and policy-level government officials, opposed health and environmental legislation suggested by environmentalists since the early 1970s. TIME does not speak of worker and community resistance to poisoners and destroyers. TIME does not share with us that some scientists warned of destructive production, corporate dominance and government collusion. Dr. Barry Commoner, for example, in several essays written in the early 1960s published as Science and Survival (1967), documented the duplicity of the US Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defence, and the chemical-nuclear industry building nuclear bombs. He, along with others, also wrote of impending climate change caused by a few persons' private decisions to generate carbon dioxide, radiation and a growing list of industrial and military poisons. In addition, Commoner warned that science was in danger because the power of the poisoners and their protectors was growing: 'Scientists need to find new ways to protect science itself from the encroachment of political pressure... to resist the heavy and unconditional support of conclusions that conform to the demands of current political and economic policy.'

What did Commoner propose? 'Science can only reveal the depth of this crisis, but only social action can resolve it.' Now we are stealing from future generations not just their lumber and coal, but the basic necessities of life: air, water, soil. A new conservation movement is needed to preserve life itself.

The new social movement did arise. It accomplished much. What TIME does not ask, however, (just as the institutions that grew up with the movement do not ask) is why the destruction going on now has gotten worse.

The omission is logical: if TIME so inquired, it would have to admit that all these years of reasonable efforts have been inadequate; it would have to expose the polluters and throw away the platitudes it masquerades as solutions. But having defined the 'problems' in ways which blame the victims and conceal the causes, it can safely offer proposals that have little to do with actually stopping production of poisons, actually stopping destructive investments.**

For example, TIME calls for mobilisation of political will, international co-operation and sacrifice unknown except in war-time. During the second world war, however, taxpayers contributed $17 billion to corporate factory construction under that same banner of 'sacrifice'. We did not get a nickel's worth of ownership or any role in production decisions. Whose sacrifice does TIME have in mind today?

TIME calls upon our leaders to direct this mobilisation. But our leaders oppose citizens organizing to stop the poisoning now. What would TIME do with these leaders?

None of TIME's recommendations suggest anything to alter today's lopsided political relationships between the polluters and the polluted. This is true globally as well: 'international co-operation' is a euphemism for 'other countries have to co-operate with us.' Just as the status quo in our neighborhoods and communities, with regard to

Richard Grossman is the author of Fear at Work: Job Blackmail, Labor and the Environment. For details of this and other works write to: Wrench Plaza, 2nd Floor, 1001 Connecticut Ave. NW, Washington DC 20006, USA. This article was originally published in Earth Island Journal (United States), Spring 1989.

**But having defined the 'problems' in ways which blame the victims and conceal the causes, it can safely offer proposals that have little to do with actually stopping production of poisons, actually stopping destructive investments.
Green Independents

The rise of the Independent Greens in Tasmania to gain 18% of the statewide vote has sent shockwaves of concern through the major parties and entrenched green issues on the political agenda nationally. We asked Bob Burton for the details of the likely aftermath.

The size of the green vote is the largest recorded on a statewide basis anywhere in the world and makes Tasmania the only place outside West Germany where the Greens hold the balance of power. The explosion of the Independents onto centre stage in 1989 has been a long time coming. Their seat in 1989, to both in 1986 and five in 1989, the Independents have tapped into the green groundswell while the major parties ignored it. Under the Hare-Clark proportional representation system, members are elected to Tasmania's House of Assembly if they gather 12.5%.

In the last three years, the conservative Gray Government has raged over proposals to log the giant Wesley Vale National Estate Forests, the opposition has crystallised. Debates have been endless sessions of discussion. For the establishment, it is time to try and bring the outsiders inside and cut them off from their community campaign roots. The Greens have exhorted co-opting processes and the spoils of power. Ministerial positions, there for the taking, were not sought. Symbolic of the Independents' aversion to parliamentary privileges is the move to abolish the traditional perk of subsidised liquor for Ministers. With substantial philosophical differences between the Independents and the conservative Parliamentary Labor Party, there will be substantial differences on many policy issues.

The Greens will insist on more open government — access to information, the ability of citizens to participate in debates — with the political intent of strengthening the hand of community groups in countering the pervasive influence of big business upon public policy. Perks, backroom deals and secrecy, the hallmark of previous governance, will have a rough trot.

The ALP, with only 13 seats, needs all five Independents present to defeat on the floor of the house. Any backdown on the commitments, or implementation, of the Accord renders the ALP vulnerable to further erosion of support at the next election.

The fate of the program of reform hinges on two vital factors: whether the Greens allow the program of reform to be watered down, and the degree of obstruction from the conservative legislative Council. The Greens will undoubtedly be subjected to substantial pressure to be "reasonable", "responsible" and "willing to compromise" from the media, big business and conservative unions.

Who Are Tasmania's Independent Greens?

Dr Judy Lambert, National Liaison Officer, The Wilderness Society

The Accord between the Green Independents and Tasmania’s ALP contains a number of immediate gains for the environment movement, and some reforms to process which will strengthen the movement in the years ahead. The Accord was signed in 1989:

- The 130,000 hectare Denison-Spits area will be nominated for World Heritage along with 460,000 hectares Little Fishers Valley (just adjacent to the Walls of Jerusalem National Park) and the 6,500 hectare Hartz Mountains National Park;
- The Denison Spits and Little Fishers Valley will be gazetted as National parks;
- The 14,000 hectare Douglas-Apsey will be made a National Park;
- Belling and malting in Jacky's Marsh, the East Picton and Lake Ina will be permanently banned;
- land currently vested with the HEC will be substantially extinguished as part of the Wild Rivers National Park under the control of the Department of Lands, Parks & Wildlife;
- areas agreed to for the Minerals for World Heritage nomination have been released from any future agreements to be protected as National Parks (includes the Luncheon grounds, Furner's Creek, Gordon Range, Upper Wild and Waynathar Forests);
- the proposed Huon Forests woodchip will not be allowed to proceed;
- possible wilderness gains under the Accord: consideration of the Central Plateau, Campbell River area, the Eden range and Lower Gordon River catchments for inclusion within the area for listing as a priority;
- any National Estate forests within 20km of Tasmania’s borders that the ALP agrees to protect will also be nominated for World Heritage.

- a review of the alternatives to logging National Estate within the next year, with terms of reference, composition and structure to be agreed by the Premier and Dr Bob Brown;
- the World heritage Planning teams will prepare a report on the appropriate boundaries of a Western Tasmania World Heritage Area in consultation with the World Heritage Committee by 1989.

Details of the Accord

continued next page
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• also editorialised against the Greens rang to offer his congratulations. The Hobart Chamber of Commerce made contact seeking discussions, as did the Chamber of Mines. The grass roots rebellion against unwanted developments, which they had tried to crush, survived. The time had come for the establishment to try and limit the damage.

As time goes by, a new strategy of limiting the impact of the Greens is likely to emerge, focusing on a campaign of rhetoric and diversion of attention to energy-sapping parliamentary processes and committees and endless sessions of discussion. For the establishment, it is time to try and bring the outsiders inside and cut them off from their community campaign roots. The Greens have exhorted co-opting processes and the spoils of power. Ministerial positions, there for the taking, were not sought. Symbolic of the Independents' aversion to parliamentary privileges is the move to abolish the traditional perk of subsidised liquor for Ministers. With substantial philosophical differences between the Independents and the conservative Parliamentary Labor Party, there will be substantial differences on many policy issues.

The Greens will insist on more open government — access to information, the ability of citizens to participate in debates — with the political intent of strengthening the hand of community groups in countering the pervasive influence of big business upon public policy. Perks, backroom deals and secrecy, the hallmark of previous governance, will have a rough trot.

The ALP, with only 13 seats, needs all five Independents present to defeat on the floor of the house. Any backdown on the commitments, or implementation, of the Accord renders the ALP vulnerable to further erosion of support at the next election.

The fate of the program of reform hinges on two vital factors: whether the Greens allow the program of reform to be watered down, and the degree of obstruction from the conservative legislative Council. The Greens will undoubtedly be subjected to substantial pressure to be "reasonable", "responsible" and "willing to compromise" from the media, big business and conservative unions.

Present, 17 major companies dominate the economy — consuming 66% of the state's electricity, mining 90% of the minerals and accounting for 85% of the timber production. The very same companies which have provoked intense environmental controversies over the past 15 years.

However, the ALP, with only 13 seats, needs all five Independents present to defeat on the floor of the house. Any backdown on the commitments, or implementation, of the Accord renders the ALP vulnerable to further erosion of support at the next election.

The fate of the program of reform hinges on two vital factors: whether the Greens allow the program of reform to be watered down, and the degree of obstruction from the conservative legislative Council. The Greens will undoubtedly be subjected to substantial pressure to be "reasonable", "responsible" and "willing to compromise" from the media, big business and conservative unions.

The Greens will insist on more open government — access to information, the ability of citizens to participate in debates — with the political intent of strengthening the hand of community groups in countering the pervasive influence of big business upon public policy. Perks, backroom deals and secrecy, the hallmark of previous conservative labor and Liberal administrations, will have a rough trot.

The ALP, for its part, is likely to give the contents of the accord the same status as ALP policy — "more honoured in the breach than the observance" as Hamlet said. Much of the Independents' program will undermine the standing of entrenched business interests which dominate Tasmania's economy. At present, 17 major companies dominate the economy — consuming 66% of the state's electricity, mining 90% of the minerals and accounting for 85% of the timber production. The very same companies which have provoked intense environmental controversies over the past 15 years.
the alternative is a return to the polls

Labor Party, increasingly nervous about retaining their roots with their respective parties, for example, public disclosure of billions of power contracts and mining royalty payments; a ban on mining and exploration in National Parks; and a revolution in existing licence within World Heritage areas or National Parks:
- the creation of Marine parks;
- a woodchip export quota ceiling of 2,889 million tonnes per annum; and
- a full review of the Forestry Commission to abolish the concession system.

From Branching Out, newsletter of the Tasmanian Wilderness Society

countervailing pressures; to maintain and extend the reform agenda will depend on the ability of the Independents to retain their roots with their respective parties.

The Legislative Council, however, are likely to frustrate many of the proposed legislative reforms such as Freedom of Information and gay law reform.

Despite possible setbacks, the green momentum is unstoppable. Undoubtedly there will be ongoing intense debates, but the Greens will gain increased legitimacy. The Federal Labor Party, increasingly anxious about the election, is keen to ensure that the green/ALP connection is projected successfully onto the Federal level. Out of the fires of anti-conservation, which burnt so brightly seven years ago when Gray came to power, has come a bold new experiment. The ripples of hope from success in Tasmania will spread far beyond the island's shores.

Bob Barton is a researcher with The Wilderness Society in Hobart.

What Does the Tasmanian Result Mean for Mainland Australia?

Tasmania's Hare-Clark voting system has made possible a result which would not yet be achievable in any other Australian State or at the Commonwealth level. It is, however, a real measure to major political parties of whatever persuasion. Eighteen percent of preferences cannot be ignored by either the ALP or the Liberals, and comments from senior party representatives in the wake of the Tasmanian results clearly indicate that they recognize this.

That the ALP in Tasmania (an arm of the party not noted for its "green" tendencies in the past) has negotiated with the Greens an agreement which encompasses an impressive array of social, economic and environmental reforms is in itself a landmark. Both sides of the ALP/Green Accord will have strong incentives to make it work - the alternative is a return to the polls and a possible Liberal victory.

Far more rests upon the Tasmanian Accord than government in Tasmania. All around Australia both "Green" supporters and those who oppose "Green" politics will be watching at the success of the alliance. Environmental issues are high on the political agenda right now. Recent public opinion polls show that 9 out of 10 voters believe that there are real threats to the environment, and that environmental issues are second only to the economy among voter concerns.

Increasingly, voters concerned for the environment, peace and social issues are looking for new directions. If the Tasmanian Accord can succeed, then these people have new hope.

Groups such as The Wilderness Society will continue to do what they do best. Their role can best be filled by stimulating the already growing community awareness of social and environmental problems and by focusing public energies on solutions to these problems. Others may wish to choose to express their concerns through more direct involvement in the election process.

There are many in the conservation movement who do not believe a new political movement will do best. Their role can best be filled by stimulating the already growing community awareness of social and environmental problems and by focusing public energies on solutions to these problems. Others may wish to choose to express their concerns through more direct involvement in the election process.

Five Green Issues the ALP Won't Talk About

Suddenly all the political parties are turning green - or so they claim. They're very much in favour of recycling waste, planting trees, soil conservation and the like. But how do they behave when it comes to difficult issues? Peter Blacknell looks at the ALP.

The ALP has catered to the green vote (while claiming it has little influence) by protecting wilderness areas here and there. Let's see how the ALP stacks up. Judge the party by its record, not its rhetoric.

Nuclear Industry

The right wing of the ALP has re-opened the debate on Uranium Mining and the Nuclear Industry. They suggest that we increase the number of mines and add reprocessing to increase the export value of our ore. Senator Richardson suggests that:
- Uranium markets are increasing
- Australian safeguards are effective
- Nuclear Power is safe
- Nuclear Power can help solve the Greenhouse Problem

This despite the fact that the price of Uranium keeps dropping below the Australian floor price; the West German flag swaps which make nonsense of our safeguards claims; countries are cancelling orders or converting newly completed reactors; and energy conservation is 13 times as effective as reducing greenhouse emissions as building nuclear plants.

Arms Exports

In June 1988, the Government eased its arms export controls in the hope of doubling our arms sales. Government policies include encouraging commercial exploitation of ideas from the Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO); privatising some of the facilities of the Office of Defence Production; and stimulating foreign demand for Australian military products. The government's current defence policy will both expand the military industry and increase its exports. It becomes increasingly likely that Australia will supply oppressors with arms or other military services and that Australian military equipment will fuel arms races and flow to areas of tension between states.

National Parks

The SA ALP Government has effectively reduced the areas of National Parks designated for conservation and protection to one third of the existing area. Their promotion of "multi-use" areas and emphasis on tourism and recreation within national parks threatens wilderness areas such as Wilpena Pound and Flinders Chase. Many NFPS officers who disagree with the new parks policy can't speak out for fear of their jobs; others are adopting the new policies (initiated from the top) whole-heartedly. The ALP has reduced funding to parks, and insists that park managers produce redevelopment plans to raise funds to an appropriate level. In SA, even the Liberals have a better policy on the care of National Parks.

Land Rights

Shortly after the last election, the ALP abandoned the fight for land rights nationally: it has succumbed to pressure from the mining industry and the new right. At Kakadu, the ALP excused one third of Stage III (along the river) as a "conservation zone" to allow mining. Sufficiently by BHP at Coronation Hill. This threatens the entire world heritage wetland area downstream. Recently, the Jawoyn, traditional owners of the region, laid claim to all of the Stickered Country, which includes the Coronation Hill site. The Federal Government, worried that Federal Land Rights legislation might interfere with the NSP (which simplifies mining access), has called for two legal opinions. The ALP insists that park managers produce two legal opinions, and threatens to amend the federal Land Rights Legislation if it makes life too difficult for the mining industry.

US Bases

Despite the apparently "open access" policy as regards the nature and function of these foreign bases in Australia, the Government is not being candid about all of the functions of the bases. Nunnong, in its present form, is obsolete, and could be removed. Instead, the government has agreed to an upgrading and extension to the facility. Our foreign policy remains subservient to US goals, and we even had the temerity to try and bully New Zealand into accepting visits of nuclear-armed ships into their ports. At a time when even US cities are questioning the entry of nuclear-armed ships, we continue to welcome them in our ports.
Green light for the Right?

Until recently it was safe to con­clude that Mr Puplick’s stance was pure hype, automatically ignored by more powerful Coalition members. But now it appears that there may have been some genuine changes. The Libs have lost two elections partly because they have not been seen as green enough, and aren’t keen for this to become one of the reasons for a third loss.

The Coalition has perceived a genuine change in awareness of the environment issue and has moved to capitalise on this. The rash of media action has forced the Liberals to act. In April came John Howard’s announce­ment that the Coalition would back all Greenies now. Then came the Coalition’s environment policy re­view, planned to pre-empt the “galaxy’s greatest” environment statement from Mr Hawke. Mr Peacock’s concern that time brought back memories of Dr David Suzuki. Consider this: the world is losing wilderness areas and forests at an alarming rate. We face chronic soil erosion . . . our oceans and rivers are fast resembling polluted drain­ways . . . there are matters we cannot ignore . . . future generations will condemn us if we fail.

Having long refused to talk to envi­ronmentalists, the Liberals have begun to thaw out. This change began late in 1987 when the Libs arranged talks with the Wilderness Society. More recently, heavyies from the new Opposition line-up invited representa­tives of the more corporatist green groups over for dinner and drinks.

Evidence of mounting move­ment within the Coalition to weaken the longstanding “State’s Rights” poli­cy. The Coalition’s policy document now states:

A new federalist approach to envi­ronmental policy is pledged with a new co-operative method of dealing with World Heritage Listing ques­tions proposed. National responsi­bilities are clearly accepted.

Puplick has talked of withholding funding from states which inadequate­ly act to protect the environment. Yet the policy document still retains numerous contradictory references, such as “a co-operative approach,” “a matter for the States as they see fit,” and above all reiterates the Coalition’s rejection of what is seen as the “improper use of the external affairs powers.”

While the Opposition’s policy document states “our commitment to the protection and conservation of Australia’s natural environment and its unique flora and fauna is unquali­fied,” it is quite clear that this policy is qualified by indications of support for “multiple land use” policies such as mining in national parks. This type of policy is justified by reference to the myth that economic development and environmental protection are compat­ible aims.

The other significant failing of the Coalition’s document is the lack of timetables for specific action to be taken to deal with particular problems. There is no time line given for cutting down production of greenhouse gases, making cars more energy efficient and less polluting, and so on.

The turnaround from a 1987 pledge to abolish the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Depart­ment for the Environment isn’t aimed at bringing credibility to future discus­sions with envi­ronmentalists. Rather, it’s about making superficial changes which won’t cause policy conflicts, so that hesitant Liberal voters can place their votes without nagging doubts about the planet disintegrating.

The green light has been confi­ned to the Federal Liberal Party. The June reshuffle of the Victorian Liberal govern­ment involved giving the Environment portfolio to Mr Mark Barrell, one of the Libs’s toughest and most successful frontbenchers. In the past a transfer to the Environment portfolio would have indicated a demotion. But now, according to the Leader of the Opposition, Alan Brown: “I have elevated it to that [a higher] status by putting in one of my most senior and effective performers.”

But until quite recently one could have been confident in saying that no matter how green the Liberals went the National Party could be relied upon to lay waste to any of these initiatives. In Victoria, clear divisions had already appeared between Lib­erals and Nationals over the pro­posal for an Alpine National Park, threatening to jeopardise plans for a State coalition. And clashes between the National’s John Stone and the Lib­erals’ Chris Puplick had become common.

17 June found the new National Party leader, Charles Blunt, announcing to the annual gathering of Nationalists that we are proba­bly [the party] best equipped to make responsible decisions on environmen­tal matters. Mr Blunt then went on record as saying that “the environment should be above party politics.”

Mr Blunt also said that people regard the National Party as “the environment party” and that the National Party is the only party that can deliver genuine change to the overall orientation of Australian politics.

And before this, during the Tasmanian election campaign, one savoured the spectacle of Mr Bor­is Nicholls, Leader of the Opposition, and National Party Senator John Stone proclaiming that he too was an environmentalist. As Queensland National Party leader and Premier Mike Ahern said, “We’re all greenies in politics now. If you’re not green you don’t survive.”

However, it is still not hard to show that talk of a ‘greening’ of the Right is a lot of hot air. To get an accurate assessment of the situation one must consider:

- the record of past Liberal govern­ments;
- the motives of those providing financial backing to the Liberals;
- the recent overseas experiences with green conversions of Conservative leaders.

It is clear that the greening of the Liberals hasn’t gone that far because they haven’t realised that as long as “the environment cannot be separat­ed from decisions about economic policy. The Liberals completely fail to perceive this link. In actual fact the apparently separate areas of “eco­nomics” and “environment policy” are both about deciding what is to be pro­duced and how it is to be produced. The section of their policy document dealing with economics and the envi­ronment fails to discuss resource depletion, the incorrect pricing of resources, or the need to reform GDP calculations.

It comes then as no surprise to find that there have been few radical changes to the overall orientation of Coalition policy. The Coalition only wants to make a minimal change in order to deal with easy issues. Areas that are rarely seen as environmental such as urban plan­ning and design of public transport are unlikely to be taken on board by a Liberal government hell bent on pri­vatising whatever it can in order to provide tax cuts and interest rate write-offs for the rich.

In addition to privatisation, one must consider the environmental rami­fications of the Liberals’ wholehearted endorsement of deregulation. This would have disastrous environmental effects, and the experience of the USA under Reagan’s deregulatory mafia proves a clear example.

Consider the implications in the area of environmental health. Whilst
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the concept of environmental health is recopituated in the Coalition policy paper, it is unlikely that a Coalition government would be willing to con­front Corporate Australia ever its contrib­utions to our toxic waste dumps and daily exposure to carcinogens both at home and at work.

Another inextricably unworkable aspect of Liberal ideology is its unwillingness to accept the fact that government action is in many areas the only way to solve environmental problems. The perfect example is the Coalition’s opposition to compulsory container deposit legislation. The other side of this coin is a policy of reliance on voluntary action to pick up the tab. Witness the Greiner govern­ment’s method of cleaning up Sydney harbour — waiting until a group of volunteers decided the problem was so bad they had to do it themselves.

The greening of Australia’s conserva­tives must be seen as part of a trend that has already taken place in other countries. The experiences in the USA and Britain are a good illus­ration of the conservatives totally ignor­ing the links between economic poli­cies and the environment (see box).

The phrase “deathbed conver­sions” appears very applicable to the Australian scene. Every party now realises it must make some attempt to create the illusion of a credible envi­ronment policy if it wants to attain office. The Coalition strategy is one of taking superficial action on “mother­hood” issues in order to make positive continued inaction on larger, and less well publicised, but just as important problems.

Another monster obviously lurking within Liberal plans is a push for the expansion of Australia’s nuclear industry. The Fraser years saw Australia on the verge of building ura­nium enrichment plants, and the acceptance of the greenhouse effect as fact has already brought out a rash of nuclear advocacy on the Coalition’s part.

There is considerable evidence that the Green conversions haven’t been occurring everywhere throughout the conservative spectrum. Charles Blunt’s statements at the recent National Party conference mentioned above sat oddly with those made at the same function by NSW Deputy Premier Wal Murray. Mr Murray said words to the effect that the problems of ozone depletion and the greenhouse effect were unproven and that there had been “an orgy of environmental overkill.”

There remain those committed to saying what they have always said — the figures representing powerful corpo­rate, pastoral and mining interests. Most of these individuals have already been tagged by the media as members of the “New Right” — such as Hugh Morgan, Peter Costello, John Stone, Charles Copeman and John Elliott. Puplick refers to this group (the Far Right of the Liberal Party) as “the Uglies.”

These interests, which provide the majority of financial support for the Liberal and National parties, will obviously not be prepared to back a green programme which goes “too far.” The Liberal Party is unlikely to be willing to risk the multi-million dollar backing used to fund advertis­ing campaigns which give the Coalition a decided ALP edge. The Uglies, in the most fully disclosed election of 1984, the ALP spent $4.7 million as against the ALP's $7.1 million as against the ALP's $7.1 million as against the ALP's $4.7 million.

Much had also been made by Tony papers of Thatcher’s other announcement, such as cuts in sales tax on unleaded petrol and a $4.5 billion plan to have a 60 per cent cut in emissions by the year 2000. Pappal’s report makes it clear that this had been only achieved after years of consistent pressure from consumers and activists.

The backlash strategy could suc­ceed if the reactionary are willing to adopt the American Right’s think tank method. In the US, the American Enterprise Institute feeds 105 different newspapers each day with ready­made editorials.

In the light of this possibility and the current concentration of media ownership, I find it difficult to accept the confident prediction of one reassure the hope of the “leader of the American Right” of his success.

If we do not compromise our position ... then there can be no doubt that environ­mentalism will be as discredited tomorrow.

The Coalition’s strategists may soon see greater merit in this backlash idea, modelled on the deregulatory mania of the early Reagan years.

Hugh Morgan has already pushed the line that there is “a close connection between environmentalist successes and our country’s increasing impover­ishment.” Morgan intends to set himself and his friends in the extractive industries up as the defenders of pov­erless, ordinary folk, arguing that the articulate environmentalist will win politically, every time, over the ordinary working person with an empty head and his local community.

The backlash will get stronger if the economic situation gets any worse, and the media will dutifully pass on the “jobs or environment” lie. If only poorly articulated proposals for an alternative orientation of economic policy are presented the situation can only get worse. Conservatism will focus on no-growth proposals being put for­ward by environmentalists in an attempt to mislead the public that they represent a call for a decrease in the quality of life.
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Agent Orange Revisited

In 1985 the Evatt Royal Commission found that there was no connection between the exposure of Australian service personnel serving in Vietnam to Agent Orange — a herbicide cocktail of 2,4,5-T and their subsequent health problems and the birth abnormalities of their children. This finding was met with concern and disbelief by many in the scientific and general community. Paul Di Masi reports from a conference where the evidence on Agent Orange again came under scrutiny.

The conference Evatt Revisited, held in April 1989 at the Australian National University, brought together scientists and veterans in a unique opportunity to re-examine the evidence about Agent Orange. In doing so, it once again raised the issue of the link between herbicides, pesticides and human health.

Health officials and research scientists who supported the original findings by Justice Evatt doggedly defended their positions. Professor Donald McPhee of La Trobe University repeated his findings that there was no connection between pesticide exposure and birth abnormalities, stating that there was no known mechanism for such abnormalities to occur when the person was exposed.

Later speakers at the conference strongly put the view that it was possible for birth abnormalities to occur after the male parent had been chemically exposed. Others made the points that the Evatt Royal Commission had been overly legalistic, inflexible and often indefensibly narrow-minded in its acceptance and interpretation of the available scientific evidence.

Professor Aitken summarised the view of all but a handful of the conference participants when he stated that if Agent Orange was an individual then certainly, given the evidence in 1985, that individual should have been given the benefit of legal doubt and found not guilty.

However, given the nature of the compound and the economic and political forces behind it, it seemed more reasonable to give any benefit of this particular doubt to the individuals who may have been affected rather than to the politicians and corporations involved in the dispute.

The strongest speaker against the original Evatt findings at the conference was Dr. Jock McCulloch, a political scientist from Deakin University and author of a book on Agent Orange. In doing so, it once again raised the possibility of developing more serious symptoms later. Dr. Malcolm Barr, a Melbourne toxicologist, believes so.

Dr. Barr’s starting point was the effects of heavy metals on the nervous system. He went on to study the herbicide exposure of Vietnam veterans and found that their symptoms were consistent with some symptoms of both multiple sclerosis and heavy metal poisoning. The conclusion of symptoms is well known as motor neuron disease.

Dr. Barr claims that motor neuron disease is a barometer of environmental toxicity. A rise in the incidence of motor neuron disease suggests the presence of some toxic environmental agent, and so may be an early warning signal for other effects like cancers and birth defects in those exposed.

However, given the nature of the compound and the economic and political forces behind it, it seemed more reasonable to give any benefit of this particular doubt to the individuals who may have been affected rather than to the politicians and corporations involved in the dispute.

In later questioning, led by Vietnam veterans, Dr. Donovan did admit to some basic limitations in his study including only examining half of the available veteran population, the strong possibility of a skewing of his control (comparison) group due to their being in high risk occupations or localities, and only including birth abnormalities evident up to two weeks after birth.

Detecting Long Term Effects

We can only determine an advance whether a particular chemical causes ill health in humans by testing it, in a limited way, on animals. The actual effects of chemicals on humans only become known after sections of the population have been exposed for many years. Only then can long term, complex epidemiological studies show whether cancers or other health effects are related to exposure to a particular chemical and even then it may be impossible to prove a cause and effect relationship.

This is the process going on now in relation to Agent Orange and the health of Vietnam veterans and their families. The problem with this approach is that it always occurs after the fact of chemical exposure: often only after deaths. Is there an indicator of chemical exposure that will warn us in advance of the possibility of developing more serious symptoms later?

Dr. Barr’s starting point was the effects of heavy metals on the nervous system. He went on to study the herbicide exposure of Vietnam veterans and found that their symptoms were consistent with some symptoms of both multiple sclerosis and heavy metal poisoning. The conclusion of symptoms is well known as motor neuron disease.

Dr. Barr claims that motor neuron disease is a barometer of environmental toxicity. A rise in the incidence of motor neuron disease suggests the presence of some toxic environmental agent, and so may be an early warning signal for other effects like cancers and birth defects in those exposed.

He believes motor neuron disease is on the increase, based on the findings of recent studies presented by Professor Axelson to the Evatt Revisited conference. Dr. Barr’s work may lead to a reliable clinical indicator for severe environmental poisoning. Such a test could mean that remedial political and health care action can be taken much sooner than the usual 20 year lead time between the introduction of a particular chemical and the discovery of its toxic effects.
Orange. Dr. McCullock stated that the Evatt Royal Commission faced scientific, legal and political questions but chose to resolve them in a wholly political way.

**Politics not science**

Just imagine for a moment what would have happened if the Evatt Royal Commission had found in favour of the claims of Vietnam veterans that their health had been damaged by exposure to herbicides during their service. As well as the financial impact of paying out compensation to veterans, the finding would have severely embarrassed Australia in its relationship with the US (the 'ally' who did most of the spraying of herbicides) and undermined the US Government's attempts to hold the 'no claim' country responsible for the millions of kilograms of herbicides sprayed on their nation over the period of the US involvement in the war in Vietnam. Herbicide and chemical companies would have been embarrassed, as Agent Orange compounds were similar to many commonly used domestic and agricultural herbicides. There would have been a clamour of people wanting protection from and regulation of these substances.

The question is not how did Justice Evatt come to his findings but rather how, in fact, any other finding would have been possible. As Dr. McCullock said, 'The political context of the Royal Commission was defined by those commercial and governmental interests which stood to lose by a finding in favour of the Vietnam Veterans' Association.'

This political context helps to explain why 860 pages of the submission by Monsanto (the chemical company who manufactured Agent Orange) came to be incorporated — typographical errors included — into the Commission's final report. It also explains why the Evatt report's epilogue contains a savage attack on 'environmentalists' who are blamed for creating unjustified anxiety in the minds of veterans in an effort to advance their extremist agenda of restructuring society. It comes as no surprise to find it is another example of plagiarism — in this case the unattributed rewriting of a polemical text by a far right US sociologist called Elffron.

The findings of the Evatt Royal Commission have become a source of embarrassment for Australia internationally. Its structure, content and conclusions are all flawed. This was made very clear at the Evatt Revisited conference. As more and more evidence comes to light from long term epidemiological studies conducted overseas, the Commission's assertion that Agent Orange was not guilty of poisoning Australian service personnel who were exposed to it would be ridiculous — if it weren't so tragic for those veterans and their families who were and continue to be directly affected.

**Herbicides and Cancer**

A visiting Swedish sociologist, guest speaker at the Evatt Revisited conference, stated that there was a strong connection between herbicide usage and various forms of cancer. Professor Olav Axelson made it clear in his keynote address that there was a link between malignant lymphomas and exposure to phenoxy herbicides (like Agent Orange).

Whilst in Australia, Professor Axelson commented on the findings of the Evatt Royal Commission in an interview with ABC radio. He said that such a finding was not valid in 1985, and it certainly is not valid now as new evidence comes to light on the health risks involved in herbicide exposure.

Professor Axelson's presentation to the conference was based mainly on two recent Swedish studies which examined a variety of cancer sufferers and classified them according to occupation and evidence of exposure. From this it could be directly argued that we should consider similar levels of problem solving and social interaction capacities.

They are animals that live in a dynamic environment in which they fit perfectly. They surf through wave play with seaweed and travel for miles. They are also extremely family oriented — living in pods of relations on whom they depend for their survival; they spend their whole lives together. They are primarily marine animals, unlike many humans, who rely on sight. Sound has become a graphic tool for them: they can see through other animals so they know if a dolphin is pregnant or has just eaten. They also use their highly developed echo-location for hunting and catching prey.

When a collection boat comes along and seizes a pod member, all that is important to that dolphin is taken away and replaced with repetitive routines and concrete walls. No more can it hunt the living fish. The fish the dolphin now given have long been dead and frozen. To be fed the dolphin must now tail-walk on command. The sounds and textures of the ocean are lost to this animal. It is condemned to circle a concrete tank for the rest of its life. It no longer has its family, and the sounds that were so important to its survival now just echo off the wall of the pool.

The effect of this stress has been documented in marine parks all over the world. Evidence of dolphins with ulcers, neurotic dolphins and stress induced deaths abound. One dolphin in a glass sided pool developed a bleeding ulcer which cleared up when the window was covered. Another, less resilient, dolphin, smashed against the window until it lost consciousness and died. When the dolphin companion of a pilot whale died, the whale carried the body for days, refusing to eat until the body was taken away. Dophinaria overseas have been known to dispose of dolphins and call temporary replacements by the same name in order to hide the deaths from the public.

We take our children to the pool side and we watch as the dolphin pretends to be able to count, or sings the Blue Danube Waltz and is fed the dead fish for his performance. When we laugh and clap the 'cleverness' of the dolphin we are applauding the conditions the dolphin is kept in — divorced from his environment — and condoning his presence for our pleasure in the eyes of our children. For too long we have treated the dolphin as the friendly clown with a permanent smile. This has lead to tolerance of the slaughter of dolphins by tuna fleets, and their illegal killing by some fishermen even in South Australia. The time has come to call a halt to the outrageous treatment of these creatures and to the misinformation we are giving ourselves and our families.

We should respect the dolphin, the environment and ourselves and change our society's behaviour.

Australia has been involved in the captivity industry for many years. Recently, however, the marine parks have become less popular and are no longer financially successful. As public opinion has moved away from performing animals, legislation against dolphinaria has followed. The Senate Select Committee on Animal Welfare brought down a report on dolphins and whales in captivity in 1985, calling for the phasing out of the dolphinaria industry and the immediate banning of capture of dolphins for display. It found that the alleged advantages of marine parks did not justify the suffering of the animals involved. Following the report, both NSW and Victoria introduced anti-capitivity legislation, with Victoria banning the capture, import or display of all cetaceans. Two of NSW's three marine parks are soon to be closed.

After threats of closure through financial difficulty, SA's Marineland has narrowly escaped being developed into a larger facility. This would have involved the capture of at least five more dolphins. The company concerned
had already been rejected by Victoria after requesting permission to build a Marine Park that was to have included whales, and the onus was on the South Australian government to follow interstate trends away from dolphin capture.

Because the redevelopment required the capture of more dolphins from SA waters, considerable interest in the issue has been generated throughout the country. Greenpeace Australia, Project Jonah, and many other organisations actively lobbied the government to oppose the capture of more dolphins.

Many divergent groups united to prevent the capture. The Building Unions of South Australia decided to put a ban on the redevelopment of Marineland in order to prevent the capture of more dolphins. It was also felt that those concerned with the redevelopment were forced to move away from the exhibition of amusing clowns and towards a facility which would cater for the needs of the animals.

Finally the government decided that the redevelopment on planned would not proceed, and internationally as well as national interest was focussed on the fate of the six dolphins and the sea lions already in captivity in Marineland. The options facing the government are to send them to Sea World, to put them in a netted off area of the ocean, or to kill them. Quite apart from the danger of such a lengthy journey, the Sea World option must be considered a last resort. Last year five dolphins and a whole died at Sea World – management refuse to disclose details of the circumstances. The vet responsible for them put the Marineland dolphins’ chances of survival at only 40%. Surely this is not acceptable!

The other real alternative – an open-to-ocean concept – has drawn international attention. The captivity industry is at present a multi-million dollar business and any viable alternative to their treatment of dolphins is bound to elicit concern from them and interest from their opponents. The eyes of the world have been focused on South Australia.

The 1977 Ranger Uranium Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) had always claimed that once dolphins had been kept in captivity, they were unable to return to the wild. This is why they were not overlooked in the US in 1987 and the strong feeling amongst those against captivity was that South Australia would be the perfect place to set up a permanent rehabilitation centre.

Two dolphins who had spent seven years in captivity were fully re-habituated back into the wild after a few months intensive ‘un-training’ by a team lead by former trainer of Flipper, Ric O’Barry in 1987. He has been brought to Australia by the organisation Wildwatch to front a proposal to the Marineland dolphins, sea lions and seals to Granite Island in Victor Harbour.

Wildwatch, made up of individuals from the leading organisations in the protection of cetacea - Greenpeace, Project Jonah, ANZFAS (Australia and New Zealand Federation of Animal Societies) and the Dolphin Project - has submitted a management plan to the government for the transport and care of the Marineland mammals. The proposed facility will house the dolphins in a netted off ocean area in which the animals can be constantly monitored and fed. The advantage of this facility will be that the dolphins are in their natural environment and enjoying the myriad of stimuli that it affords. After two years cycling a concrete tank, the effect these sounds and textures will have on the mental health of the animals will be enormous. Live fish will also be introduced to them, giving them an opportunity to hunt and chase again.

The facility itself would become a centre for research and marine education, as well as a source of revenue and volunteers to assist stranded whales and dolphins.

While Wildwatch’s long term aim is to return these animals who are now tied to the ocean permanently, under no circumstances would any animal be released who was unlikely to be able to survive. Wildwatch is prepared to care for the animals for the rest of their lives if need be. The choice is whether they end their days in a concrete tank or in the sea where they belong.

There have been a number of proposals in this vein in South Australia. The one that has gained most support is the recent proposal to Coffin Bay, the Museum, Adelaide and Flinders Universities, and the Australian Conservation Foundation are in support.

The government must now decide whether they will accept a 60% risk for the dolphins and send them to Sea World and therefore refuse them the opportunity to once again be surrounded by the ocean environment or whether they will choose one of the innovative alternatives in South Australia which see the dolphins in their right place.

Open-to-ocean facilities have their place in responding to the decline of the captivity industry. They are in no way interpreted as a new form of captive display. It is another method for looking after, and perhaps returning to the wild, those dolphins that have been the victims of this industry.

The South Australian government has indicated approval for Wildwatch and Coffin Bay proposals in principle, but appears prepared to send the Marineland dolphins to Seaworld. The Unions have placed a ban on the movement of the Dolphins in the immediate future. Write to the Premier, Mr John Bannon, or the SA Minister for the Environment, Ms Sue Lenehan, if you wish to lobby for the transfer of the Dolphins to either of the open sea alternatives. We have a responsibility to those individuals and must provide them with the future they deserve.

Sue Close is an activist and campaigner working with Wildwatch.

One of the most difficult environmental issues for the federal ALP is that of uranium mining. An attempt in 1988 to change the policy resulted in the establishment of a Uranium Policy Review Committee. Pat Jessen appeared on behalf of Friends of the Earth Fitzroy and part of her submission raised some of the incidents which have made Australian uranium mining dangerous.

The Australian newspaper Newspoll 15 June, 1988, revealed that a clear majority 61 per cent oppose increasing the number of uranium mines, 57 per cent are opposed to increased uranium exports, 59 per cent are against uranium enrichment in Australia and an overwhelming 78 per cent are against the storage of nuclear waste in Australia.

A survey was conducted on the telephone by trained interviewers on the weekend of June 10, one week after the 1988 ALP National Conference and was based on 1150 interviews of people aged 18 years and over, in all states and in both the house and car.

There are many reasons for the public to feel so strongly about the nuclear issue and the evidence mounts daily.

Three years after the Chernobyl disaster fish have been found in Swedish lakes so contaminated with radioactivity that a person eating the fish would receive the equivalent of a maximum yearly dose of radiation. Over recent years evidence has emerged on the contamination from Sellafield (Windscale) in the UK, where the links between radiation and leukemia have been recognised by the medical profession. Sellafield is so ‘hot’ that people can no longer lie on the nearby beaches.

According to Dr. John Goffman,Emeritus Professor of Medical Physics at the University of California: “When someone sets a so called ‘permissible dose’ of radiation they are in essence saying they think it is alright to produce cancers which will occur if people get this ‘permissible dose’. The ‘permissible dose’ is a permit to commit random murder on people, and to propose that people are supposed to be happy to suffer this ‘random cancer’... in exchange for the benefit that nuclear technology is supposed to confer. While this may be acceptable to the promoters of nuclear technology it may not be acceptable to the people who will suffer the results.”

Last year’s documents from West Germany proved Australia’s uranium was enriched to weapons grade material. This is despite the utterance from the Australian government that this could never happen and is scandalous. For this reason alone Australia should immediately stop its export of uranium. The fear of nuclear war is also at the forefront of many people’s thinking and is making them more aware on ‘all nuclear matters.

The 1977 Ranger Uranium Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is making them more aware of ‘all nuclear matters. The report recommended that the mine should only go ahead with the strictest safeguards. However, since then, problems associated with mining have been ongoing. In March this year Senator Richardson questioned the adequacy of current environmental protection at Ranger, because of the release of 10,000 cubic metres of contaminated water into Kakadu during January–the latest in a long line of accidents (see box, next page).

Richardson called for a number of options to be examined that might enable the Commonwealth property to fulfill its obligations in regard to protecting Kakadu National Park. These options included the possibility of using legal powers under the Atomic Energy Act, the World Heritage Properties Conservation Act or the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act.

The ALP Review Committee must recommend that there be no further release of contaminated water into the river system of the world heritage Kakadu National Park. Action must be taken against the Company for ignoring the calls of the Office of Supervising Scientist and the Federal Minister for Environment and releasing water in such a manner that dilution levels could not be monitored.

Roxby Downs

Another reason is that if this dubious situation occurs at the supposedly ‘highly regulated’ mine at Ranger, then what is happening at Roxby Downs in South Australia? The Roxby mine is accountable to nobody but itself. The joint venturers are only required to report such accidents in annual reports to the South Australian Department of Mines and Energy. Under the Agreement negotiated with the South Australian Government there is no independent monitoring body overseeing operations at Roxby Downs.
It is absolutely outrageous that one of the largest uranium mine in the world operates with no independent monitoring given the dangerous and accident prone nature of the industry. Where there is vested interest it is obvious "significant incidents" and sloppiness will be kept from the public for as long as the companies can get away with it. Independent monitoring must be established immediately.

Under the same Indenture Legislation an Environmental Plan of Management was required for the mine. This has now been completed but has not been made public. The South Australian State Government have indicated that they would be prepared to release the Environmental Plan of Management for public comment. However the Joint Venturers will not comply. It is of the utmost urgency that the Commonwealth, who is not bound by the legislation, make the Plan of Management available immediately.

Contracts

The Review would have made well aware of the problems associated with gaining contracts for uranium sales. Ranger is prepared to expand production, even though it cannot cope with its current operation, but there are no buyers. Roxby is operating well below projected assumptions and is also unable to find buyers willing to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and also adhere to the Australian uranium floor price.

In the light of recent newspaper articles regarding suppressed workers health and safety reports at Roxby, one can only assume the Joint Venturers have much to hide. An Inquiry into worker’s health and safety is urgently required.

To quote Robert J Crew, Resident Manager, Olympic Dam Operations at the Official Opening November, 1988: "Miners have had their share of excitement and disappointment over the years and no-one here, I'm sure needs reminding that the viability of the industry depends to a large degree on outside influences - world market prices, exchange rates movement etc. Everyone in mining understands how fragile a project can be - a profitable producer one day, a marginal operation the next."

The Review has no grounds to recommend unrestricted mining in Australia and it would be reckless and unnecessarily provocative to open up such a dangerous and unpopular industry in Australia.
The Australian Government claims that it is committed to providing the public with information about the role of US bases in Australia. In 1988 with no public debate the Hawke Government renewed the lease for the base at Nurrungar in South Australia. Margaret Colmer discusses the functions of this facility and argues that the base links Australia to US nuclear war strategies.

The agreement to establish Nurrungar was first signed in 1969, providing a ten year lease, and the Joint Defence Communications station began operating in 1971 to receive and process information on Soviet missile launches and nuclear tests. This information is gathered by United States satellites and relayed by radio or submarine cable to the US Strategic Air Command (SAC) in Omaha, Nebraska, which controls US land-based ballistic missiles and strategic bombers.

When the initial lease expired Nurrungar had a periodic tenancy until November 1988, when the Federal Government signed a new ten year lease. In his parliamentary statement of 22 November 1988, Hawke stated, "These changes also reflect the commitment of this government to informing the public as fully as possible about the facilities." However, apart from the Government's acknowledgement that Nurrungar is a DSP ground station, no information has been forthcoming.

The new agreement was signed, not only without public debate, but without parliamentary, caucus or cabinet discussion. It was drawn up in secret. Prime Minister Hawke and Defence Minister Beazley have something to hide, not from the Russians or the Chinese, but from the Australian public.

The purpose of US bases in Australia has always been shrouded in secrecy on the grounds that their security is at stake even though much so-called secret information is publicly available in the United States. Successful Australian governments have limited debate by discussing the bases as a single entity. Although all the bases are essential components of US nuclear war strategy, their roles are very different.

Nurrungar is located about 500km northwest of Adelaide, just south of Woomera, near a salt lake known as Island Lagoon. The area is part of the land claimed by the traditional owners of the region, the Kokatha people. The base consists of a number of technical buildings and three radomes in a valley surrounded by a restricted area of several hundred square kilometres. In 1986, 472 people were employed at the base – 251 Americans and 221 Australians, Most live in Woomera.

The base is operated by US Air Force personnel and the current commander is Colonel Chester Banachowski. The US military also has a navy task force studying Soviet anti-missile ships, and the National Security Agency, which is responsible for communications security. Australians make up almost 50 per cent of the staff, with about 40 per cent of them civilian personnel working for private contractors.

The Australian military, mostly members of the Air Force, are represented by a Deputy Commander, Wing Commander Alan. Figures obtained under the Freedom of Information Act indicate that the Australian Government spent nearly $23 million in the 1987/88 financial year on maintenance and staffing at Nurrungar. Added to this are the costs of providing housing in Woomera, roads and services for Woomera and Nurrungar and the wages of the Australian Protective Services officers who police the prohibited area.

Nurrungar's role

Nurrungar is a command, control, communications and intelligence station crucial to US nuclear war fighting strategies and the development of the Star Wars system. It is the overseas ground station for the Defence Support Program (DSP). DSP is a vital element of the world-wide US military command and control system, providing "operational direction and technical administrative support involved in the function of command and control of US military forces." Nurrungar controls and monitors the eastern DSP satellite (DSP-E), located 20,000 miles above the Indian Ocean. DSP-E watches for Soviet and Chinese Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) launches and is capable of giving 25 minutes warning of an impending attack.

DSP satellites carry two types of sensors: infrared and Nadet. Infrared sensors provide early warning of missile attack by detecting the hot exhaust plumes of ballistic missiles after launching. Nadet sensors detect nuclear explosions in the atmosphere and are capable of detecting 100 nuclear blasts per second.

Nurrungar monitors approximately 500 missile launches a year. Since 1971 it has collected information on 6,000 Soviet missile and satellite launches, providing the SDI (Star Wars) program with a data-base from which to determine the most appropriate design for a boost phase missile defence system.

Verification: Obsolete

Recent developments in US satellite programs have changed Nurrungar's role. While in the past Nurrungar may have had a role in verifying the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty and the non-Proliferation Treaty, for verification purposes it is now technologically obsolete. The new Global Positioning Satellites (GPS), also known as Navstar, have been fitted with nuclear detonation sensors and will take over any verification role of Nurrungar. Unlike the DSP system, the GPS system has no gaps in its coverage. The satellites can communicate directly with each other via UHF data cross links and do not need vulnerable ground stations like Nurrungar to read data.

In 1990 a new kind of satellite, DSP program 14, is to be launched. These satellites will be powerful enough to track missiles after booster burnout and will increase Nurrungar's fighting capabilities, allowing the US during nuclear war to re-target its missiles away from empty silos and to assess the impact of US strikes. They would also assist with the targeting and destruction of Soviet missiles by Star Wars weapons. Already $1.26 million has been spent on Nurrungar to provide the necessary technology to integrate the base into SDI.

Both the US and Australian governments have acknowledged that Nurrungar is a nuclear target. Ground stations are "soft targets" and a military strategy is to destroy command, control and communication systems.

Although Nurrungar is technologically obsolete (for verification) it is still important to the United States. It represents a large capital investment, but more importantly its continued presence ties Australia formally into the United States' nuclear war strategies.

Join the protest

At the national conference of the Australian Anti-Bases Campaign, which followed the renewal of the lease in 1988, plans were drawn up for a protest at Nurrungar from Wednesday to Sunday, Actions will be held in accordance with non-violent principles and anyone attending the action will be required to undertake non-violent direct action training.

For further information on the campaign, conference, or actions at Nurrungar and to send those always needed donations, contact the Anti-Bases Campaign, P.O. Box 1025, Adelaide 5001. Ph. (08) 232 3197 or the Anti-Bases Campaign in your state.

Margaret Colmer is an activist with the Anti-Bases Campaign in South Australia.

* Material in this article is based on Base for Australia.
Recycled Paper: Still a Whitewash

The recent release of recycled papers on to the Australian market has been accompanied by much fanfare by media, manufacturers and marketers. But David Vincent argues that the raw material for these products has not yet been used by consumers, and ‘recycled’ may be a misnomer.

Scratch a paper industry executive and they’ll come up virgin white every time. Conditioned to the high white sheet as the pinnacle of papers, the paper companies have been reluctant to market recycled papers. While some of the resistance has been overcome with the release of locally made environmentally-friendly papers there is still a long way to go before we have a sustainable and ecologically sound paper industry.

Australian Paper Manufacturers (APM) and Associated Pulp and Paper Mills (APPM), two of the three major paper manufacturers in Australia, have recently released 100 per cent recycled papers on to the market. Previously the only 100 per cent recycled paper came from the Sydney based Ecopaper, which has been importing recycled paper from West Germany since 1986.

Ecopaper is made from post consumer waste paper. Post consumer waste paper is generated at the end use, such as when people throw away wastepaper. Depending on its use, the specks in the paper contain a lot of ink which remains in the paper, giving the German paper its grey color.

The brown recycled paper from Germany contains post consumer cardboard and unbleached envelopes as well as high quality wastepaper and printer offsets. Because of their obsession with bright white papers the paper companies see recycled paper as inferior. At a recent public meeting the APM representative referred to grey recycled papers as ‘dirty’.

The paper companies are attempting to make recycled paper as similar to virgin white papers as possible. For example, high quality wastepaper is used to produce both Recycle 100 and Recycle 80 rather than post consumer waste paper.

Both manufacturers have used high quality industrial offcuts from sources such as envelope manufacturers, paper converters and printers. These have been used by APM for some time as a substitute for imported pulp in its high quality papers. This paper contains very little ink so the resulting product is almost white and is not easily recognisable as recycled paper that has not been de-inked or bleached.

The manufacturers are missing the point. According to Con Goik of Ecopaper we don’t need such a high quality paper for most uses. It’s time that paper companies and paper users stopped judging paper by its appearance and looked instead to its performance. If this is adequate there are no real grounds for rejecting it.

Neither company has made substantial efforts to increase collections of office wastepaper. APM seems merely to be planning to divert into Recycle 100 the high quality industrial offcuts it is already collecting. APM is making a stronger effort, establishing some source separation schemes in offices with the aim of increasing its collections of post consumer waste and has prepared educational material to assist. However these programs are very limited.

Waste Paper Wasted

One of the minimum requirements of Friends of the Earth in the campaign for the local production of recycled paper has been that the recycled paper should contain post consumer wastepaper. Use of post consumer wastepaper to make recycled paper creates demand for this material, which has not been collected at anything near its potential. Only one eighth of office paper is collected in New South Wales.

For office wastepaper collections to increase dramatically it will be necessary for APPM to use post consumer wastepaper, as it is the only company with the capacity to make large volumes of recycled paper. APPM however has other ideas. It plans to release another recycled paper Recycle 80 which will contain 80 per cent recycled paper and will be both bleached and de-inked. Office wastepaper cannot be used in this paper because photocopy paper and laser printed paper, which make up an increasing proportion of office wastepaper, cannot be de-inked.

Recycle 80 is not an environmentally friendly paper. De-inking and bleaching of recycled paper cannot be justified when an acceptable alternative exists. If the de-inking process is avoided as with Recycle 100, then photocopy and laser printed paper can be used. If Recycle 80 becomes a large seller it will do nothing to increase office paper collections even if post consumer waste is used.

APPM is aware that there is pressure on governments to use environmentally friendly papers and has produced Recycle 80 as the compromise that it truly is. This is the paper APPM hopes to sell in large volumes and it appears that they have already agreed to supply it to the Federal government.

The paper companies are keen to obtain government contracts for recycled paper and the government seems keen to prove its environmental record.

Pressure needs to be applied to the government to purchase the most environmentally friendly paper.

Paper procurement policies

A mechanism used in the United States to create demand for recycled papers has been the introduction of paper procurement programs, many with the specific aim of increasing office wastepaper collections. These programs have been introduced at the Federal level and in 17 states. They require that the public sector buy recycled paper, often with a specified minimum level of post consumer waste. Such programs should be used in Australia to push the paper industry in a direction that is in the public and environment’s interest.

The paper companies, particularly APPM, correctly declare that marketing environmentally friendly papers implies that other papers are environmentally unfriendly. Putting environmentally friendly papers on the market opens a can of worms for the paper manufacturers because it throws attention on parts of their operations they want to keep from public scrutiny such as pollutants in pulp and paper mill effluent and their management of forests.

Once scrutiny of these aspects of the paper industry occurs, a range of sensible policy options will come into play, such as the full application of the polluter pays principle. These will increase the attractiveness of wastepaper over virgin material and help it overcome the subsidy the environment is paying for the production of paper from virgin sources and the wasteful landfilling of wastepaper.

Getting locally produced recycled paper is an important step in progress towards an ecologically sustainable paper industry. Now it is up to us to keep the pressure on the paper companies and prove that there is demand for environmentally friendly papers from what one day might be an environmentally-friendly paper industry.

David Vincent is the Recycling Campaign Co-ordinator for Friends of the Earth Sydney.
Sacred Sites Under Threat

Early on Friday morning May 26 1989, the Northern Territory Government pushed the Northern Territory Aboriginal Sacred Sites Protection Act 1989 through the Legislative Assembly. It replaced the Aboriginal Sacred Sites Act 1980, abolishing the Aboriginal controlled Sacred Sites Authority.

The NT Government made no serious attempt to consult Aboriginal people about the changes. The primary aim of the new law is not the protection of Aboriginal sacred sites but the accommodation of mining and pastoral interests. It gives the NT Minister for Lands and Housing the power to override and revoke the decisions of the Authority.

The responsibility of the Federal Government

The lands councils believe that responsibility for sacred site protection legislation should be returned to the National Government. The fears of Royal Commissioner Woodward and reservations of Justice Toohey about the Northern Territory Government's motivation have been realised with the passage of the NT Aboriginal Sacred Sites Act 1989.

Woodward

In the Woodward Royal Commission reported to the Commonwealth on how Aboriginal Land Rights could be recognised in Australian law. Woodward recommended that sacred sites be protected by land rights legislation.

"because of the Aboriginal's personal identification with his land, such places are even more important to him than are places of worship to members of other religions."

Woodward also said the legislation should be Commonwealth. He was warned that the NT Legislative Assembly had little respect for Aboriginal rights and would rather satisfy local pressure groups.

The basic legislation should be introduced into the Australian Parliament. It is important that it should be protected in such a way that it cannot be eroded by the effect of any Northern Territory Ordinances."

Both the Whitlam and the Fraser Government's land rights Bills provided for the protection of sacred sites. But pressure from the NT Country Liberal Party led to Fraser agreeing that the NT Legislative Assembly should have the power to legislate to protect sacred sites.

Section 73 of the Aboriginal Land Rights (NT) Act 1976 gives the Legislative Assembly this power.

Toohey

A 1983 review of land rights, including sacred site protection laws by Justice Toohey did not accept the Land Council's position that sacred site protection be returned to the Land Rights Act "... unless the Territory legislation is demonstrably inadequate or is not working effectively."

Toohey's recommendations for improving the Sacred Sites Act were ignored by the NT Government. The new NT Act is demonstrably inadequate.

NT Government abuses its power

Since winning the power to legislate for sacred site protection the NT Government has abused this power and acted in favour of vested interest groups like pastoralists and miners rather than seriously accepting the need for proper protection laws.

The NT Government introduced the Aboriginal Lands and Sacred Sites Act in March 1977. It proposed that the NT Government introduced the Aboriginal Sacred Sites Act. It recommended that the NT Minister for Lands should have the power to override and revoke the decisions of Aboriginal custodians.

In October 1988, without consulting Aboriginal people, the NT Government introduced the Aboriginal Areas Protection Bill (the name of the Bill was later amended to the Northern Territory Aboriginal Sacred Sites Bill). The Federal Government has the power under the NT Self Government Act to disallow the legislation. It also has the responsibility bestowed on it by the Australian people in the 1967 referendum.

Aboriginal people are appealing to the Prime Minister to act. A delegation of senior Aboriginal leaders, led by the Central and Northern Council chairman, flew to Canberra in June to see the Prime Minister in a bid for Federal Government intervention.

"We made our position clear. The Federal Government should use its power to disallow the new law. The law is not about protecting sacred sites but providing mining companies with legal ways of desecrating sacred sites."

"The Prime Minister urged us to attempt, once again, to convey our concerns to the NT Government in order to give them a last opportunity to revise the Act," the Land Council Chairman said.

The NT Chief Minister has dismissed the subsequent letter from the Central and Northern Land Councils which detailed the principles of site protection which are not negotiable — including Aboriginal, rather than Ministerial, control of sacred site protection.

This article was based on material from the Central and Northern Land Council.

Women's petition

The women of Minjilang presented Darryl MANjie with a petition setting out their concerns. This is what they said:

- Warramungingil is a woman. It was Warramungingil first came that all our places as well as the law that we live by were given by us.
- Both men and women live by this law today. And our new generation will have to live by it too. Everything we do in our daily lives we do by paying attention to our law.
- Our law cannot be changed or taken away from us and neither can our sacred places.
- Our children come from these places. And, when we die we go back to them. We make sure these places are looked after properly and we make sure that they are protected because this is where our children's children will come from and this is where we will go when we are finished.
- People alive now will fight to keep these places. They will fight to have a place to go when they die and so that there will be new people to come after them. All of our children are taught this and they know.
- Our law is not like the artificial law of the balanda. We are proud to be part of our law. No other people can translate our law to a full understanding. But, you do need to understand this. When we talk about Sacred Sites we are talking at the same time about our language, our skin groups, our land, our law and our whole life. None of these things can be separated from the whole thing. This is why when we talk about Sacred Sites we talk as one people with one voice.
- And what we are saying to you with one voice is this: we do not want our Aboriginal Areas Protection Bill.
Frame-Up

if at first you don't succeed ...

Why Tim Anderson?
The answer is: to pursue a vendetta from the original frame-up to shut Tim up; and to avoid a public enquiry.

Tim has remained in Sydney since his release from jail and has been involved in a wide range of activities, including some which have been severely embarrassing to police involved in the original frame-up. Serious questions arise over the role of a senior police officer exposed by Tim Anderson as a perjurer and basher at an International Legal Conference in Sydney in mid-March 1989.

There must be a question on the role of this man in second frame-up.

Frame-up?
In 12 years only one unreliable witness attempted to connect Tim to the Hilton bombing. Now the police have three more, two of whom were discredited witnesses at the 1982 Hilton Bombing Inquest. Will they be like the notorious Scary?

At a public meeting in Sydney on June 9, 1989, a lecturer in law, Mr. David Brown, put Tim’s re-arrest in the context of the NSW government’s law and order offensive in a society where the demands of the market take priority at the expense of human needs and freedoms. Tim is seen by these people as a threat who must be silenced.

Who did the bombing?
At the 1982 Hilton Bombing Inquest, Senior Constable Terry Griffiths, instructed by the NSW government’s law and order offensive in a society where the demands of the market take priority at the expense of human needs and freedoms. Tim is seen by these people as a threat who must be silenced.

On Tuesday 30 May Tim Anderson was arrested and charged with three counts of murder for the Hilton bombing. Georgina Abrahams looks at some issues behind the re-arrest and the progress of the campaign to expose it as a frame-up.

Four years ago Tim, Ross Dunn and Paul Alister were released and unconditionally pardoned after serving seven years in jail on the charge of conspiring to murder National Front leader Robert Griffiths.

"The Anderson Marga case was to scapegoat Ross, Paul and Tim for the Hilton Bombing. Since no charge was laid over the Hilton bombing, it was still possible for Tim, or anyone else, to be charged.

Those newly acquainted with the Tim Anderson case and its long history may ask: 'Why Tim?' Is this a frame-up? And 'Who did bomb the Hilton in 1978?'

"In 1978, three men were arrested for the Hilton bombing. They were released and unconditionally pardoned a few years later. Ever since, Tim Anderson has been fighting to clear his name, just as a new 1983 frame-up has started.

"But who is the new phoney? And what is Tim accused of?"

Chaos: Making a New Science
Reviewed by Chris Sanderson

The cover of Gleick’s book on chaos is tantalisingly subtitled Making a New Science. And what better time could there be for the emergence of a new science than what promises to be the warmer end of the twentieth century? Just in time to solve some of the most difficult environmental problems which are the legacy of the old science, perhaps.

When I came across this book I knew little about chaos except that it was something to do with unpredictability and the weather. I wondered, optimistically, if this new set of ideas might provide some different perceptions to offer us as we all worry about the unpredictability of the weather. Unfortunately my environmental preoccupations aren’t shared by the author, so that particular set of questions has gone unanswered.

Nonetheless, it’s a good book. Even when I knew it wasn’t going to address the issues I was interested in, I kept reading. The reason is that this really does seem to be a whole new direction for science. It is the beginnings of a science of all the things that don’t have nice, tidy linear equations to describe them.

"In the past, the physical sciences have tended to make their work manageable by ‘assuming away’ many of the messier aspects of the real world - so the lab, the test-tube, the computer model are all perfect abstractions from which we deduct the workings of nature. Yet the real world creeps in, can’t possibly be kept out. Until recently, the messy bits of the results have been discarded as ‘background noise’. But scientists who are interested in chaos have started to look at the ‘noise’ - that is, the part of the simplest phenomena - things that science has seemingly known inside out for centuries, like the motion of a pendulum - and see the strange, chaotic, unpredictable patterns.

"So what is it that’s so fascinating about this approach? Like quantum theory earlier this century, this new view of the universe tends to drive people to ideas and perspectives on the Hilton allegations, or any comment by Tim or people supporting him. At the same time, extensive uncritical coverage is being given to police allegations. If sub judice really means that nothing can be said about a matter before the courts, then police allegations should be censored, along with protests of innocence, rights of reply, expressions of public concern and historical perspectives.

"Tim should not have to spend another eight years of his life fighting for justice. In his words:

"How is it possible that, after the failure of such a scandalous frame-up, in which three innocent people spent seven years in jail, police are allowed to return to square one and begin all over again; putting me and my family and friends through the stress and agony of potentially years of court cases and the worst sort of lies?"

The Campaign Exposing the Frame-up of Tim Anderson (CEFTA) is calling for the false charges against Tim Anderson to be dropped and for an investigation to be held to show how and why this second frame-up occurred. If you’d like more information contact: CEFTA, PO Box A737, Sydney South, 2000. Telephone: (02) 281-5100.

From the winter 1989 edition of Chain Reaction
Turning up the Heat: Our Perilous Future in the Global Greenhouse
by Fred Pearce, Bodley Head. $17.95

The Greenhouse Effect: Living in a Warmer Australia
by Ann Henderson-Sellers and Russell Blong, University of NSW. $12.95

The Greenhouse Effect: A Practical Guide to the World's Changing Climate
by Stewart Boyle and John Ardill, Hodder and Stoughton. $10.95

Reviewed by Stuart White.

Has anyone ever stopped to ask the obvious question about the greenhouse effect? We've known since the warning of Arrhenius in the 1890's that the delicate balance of gases in our atmosphere controls the temperature of our oases and home and that the steadily increasing input of industrial pollutants could raise the temperature. James Lovelock in the early 1970's initiated debate on the 'Gaia Hypothesis': that the Earth is a living organism, in which the atmosphere is a dynamic part. And yet suddenly it's big news. Books are being written. Carers are being made. Conferences are being held. Why did it take us so long to put the pieces together and who was and is responsible for kicking the issue along now? Reading these three books provides an insight into this question, but before doing so it's important to make a few points about the issue in general. Firstly, the implications of seriously attempting to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are profound. One thing the greenhouse effect tells anyone who is prepared to consider it is that the era of the 'technical fix' is over. Fundamental change in the nature of industrial society will be necessary in order to make inroads into this symptom. Secondly, the greenhouse effect is just that: a symptom, just as the depletion of the ozone in our stratospheric umbrella and the increasing burden of organochlorine compounds in all living things are other, potentially more severe, symptoms of our flawed system.

Thirdly, the questions and the uncertainties upon which all the scientific models must eventually depend, those relating to rates of greenhouse gas emissions, are social and political. It is individual and collective human behaviour which has got us into this mess and it will be individual and collective behaviour which will help us out of it.

Fred Pearce, the news editor of New Scientist, has written a book 'Turning up the Heat' which is useful for understanding the processes and interactions that give rise to the greenhouse effect and, as a bonus, ozone depletion. Its quality is in the easy-to-follow explanations, accessible to anyone with high school chemistry. In fact this book would make an ideal reference for chemistry and physics teachers wanting to introduce students to topics of environmental concern. It is also the first time I've seen a good explanation of the atmospheric 'double whammy' that carbon monoxide from motor vehicles represents, as a gas that is reducing the cleaning ability of the atmosphere.

The frustration I have with this book, and even more so with the quickie by Ann Henderson-Sellers and Russell Blong from Macquarie University which has produced, is that they cop out of the possibilities for reducing the source of the heat. These are not manuals for those wanting to find individual or community solutions to our planet's discomfort. The latter work, 'The Greenhouse Effect: Living in a Warmer Australia', devotes less than two of the 200 pages to an inadequate re-examination of greenhouse solutions. I can only presume that Rovyn Williams was writing about another book in the same title with the Australian work, because the Boyle and Ardill book is the first major publication to provide a thorough analysis of the crucial energy issues, including a welcome critique of the hoary old nuclear chestnut.

The best work so far is that by energy researcher and campaigner Stewart Boyle and Guardian environment writer John Ardill. This book, 'The Greenhouse Effect: A Practical Guide to the World's Changing Climate' is to be released in Australia to coincide with the visit by international greenhouse researcher Bill Keim. It would be unfortunate if the reading public were to be confused by the coincidence of the main title with the Australian work, because the Boyle and Ardill book is the first new book to include the Australian work, because the Boyle and Ardill book is the first major publication to provide a thorough analysis of the crucial energy issues, including a welcome critique of the hoary old nuclear chestnut.

Of course the information on energy is not new. The environment movement has been pointing out for over a decade that there is a need to reshape patterns of energy use and industrial production, regardless of the greenhouse effect. Boyle and Ardill restate this case, but make the links to other related issues such as deforestation and equity and the third world. As they point out: 'Global warming is the threat which bundles up all our woes into a single problem and a single solution. They might have added, not a single solution in the technical sense. Referring to the United Nations priorities for the rest of this century the UN Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar and the Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland wrote: 'To achieve these goals a new global ethic is needed based on equity, accountability and human solidarity - solidarity with present and future generations - rather than on the tyranny of the immediate.'

The Boyle and Ardill book provides all the usual information about climatic change and projections for the future, but it is complemented by a program for action which goes a long way past construction of sea walls. Each chapter has a well researched 'Action Check List'. This is a refreshing addition to a discussion of the agenda for which has been set by the narrow focus of the scientific community or the derivative and un-critical mass media. This book is recommended, despite the use of the grubby masculine nouns and pronouns which mar all three works. On this score we still have a long way to go.

Stuart White is an activist with Friends of the Earth Sydney and has just completed a doctorate in Physics.
what meteorological effects such as droughts and cyclones. And still less can we accurately predict the sea level rises which might ensue.

Regardless of what we do, the already increased levels of greenhouse gases will have an effect on our climate. We can ameliorate climatic changes by altering our global consumption of fossil fuels, and by stopping the destruction of forests, but changes will ensue, nevertheless. Local government politicians cash in on the hysteria by offering free trees for people to plant — the presumption being that trees work against the greenhouse effect by absorbing CO₂. While this effect does in­deed operate, it might be more than offset by the 10km drive to collect the free tree!

The authors somewhat flippantly compare the strategy of saving rain­forest with the need to continually plant trees for people to plant — the serious issue of whether or not the general public take it as seriously as does the sample used in this book, is debatable. Recently, newspapers (The Sunday Mail, 25 June, 1989) reported a survey which showed that 77 per cent of Australians are either ‘very concerned’ or ‘concerned’ about the greenhouse effect. This cer­tainly seems impressive until we note that the greenhouse issue ranked 35 out of 40 in terms of publicly perceived ‘crucial’ problems, ranking equally with “High cost of service from new car dealers’ and ‘High cost of petrol’n.

This short, very readable book should be a great help in educating people about the real dangers, and not the hysteria of the greenhouse effect. It clearly outlines ways in which we can plan now to cope with it, as well as ways we can minimise its impact.

While it is certainly easy to question the seriousness with which Australians treat the greenhouse effect, there is little doubt but that we should take it seriously. After all, the changes which might accelerate the greenhouse effect — tree planting, maintenance of tropical rain­forests, and more energy efficiency — are all worth doing even if there was no greenhouse effect. We have nothing to lose if we ignore the predictions, and are wrong! Only fools ignore such odds and do nothing!

Dr. Bill Metcalf is a Chain Reaction researcher and Senior Teaching Fellow in Australian Environmental Studies at Griffith University.

**RESOURCES**

**The Sanitary Protection Scandal**
Alfon Costello, Bernadette Valley and Josa Young Women’s Environment Network (UK), 1989.

This book investigates the implications for the environment and human health of sanitary towels, tampons and other disposable nappies. The ‘sanitary protection’ industry has been shown in secrecy for too long. This book uncovers all those facts they definitely don’t want you to hear! Although a British book it provides useful information that applies to the Australian situation.

Available from: Friends of the Earth Bookshop, 222 Brunswick St Fitzroy or Women’s Environmental Network, 287 City Rd Illogan London EC1V 1LA United Kingdom.

**Inside Ciba-Geigy**
Olle Hansson International Organisation of Consumer, 250 pages, 1989, $7.95

Dr Olle Hansson’s book exposes some of the unconscionable operations of the pharmaceutical giant Ciba-Geigy. The book is in three parts. The first, is the story of a drug dispensed as a diet pill and then marketed as an abortifacient. The story is told by the author who, early on, became deeply involved in exposing the tragedy and did more than anyone else to bring it to a conclusion. The second part covers more recent examples of drug marketing by Ciba-Geigy and other transnational companies, and the third is an examination of the effects of the present system.

Available from: PO Box 201 Byron Bay, 2451, New South Wales.

**The Ozone Layer and The Greenhouse Gases**
United Nations Environment Programme Booklet, 1989, $18 per set includes postage

The United Nations has produced two information booklets about the greenhouse effect and ozone depletion.

Available from: Australian Conservation Foundation, 6728 Glebe Road, Hawthorn 3122 Australia.

**Pegasus Networks**
Computer Network Membership $30, basic subscription $12 per month

Pegasus Networks is an independent member of the worldwide Association for Progressive Communications. APC member networks share common goals to provide a low cost service for world peace, and to devote ten per cent of their operating revenues to promote further global spread of the network.

By connecting any brand of computer to your telephone with a modem, and utilising the facilities provided by the Pegasus Networks project, you will be able to:

- communicate at low cost with a global group of users concerned with the welfare of planet Earth and its inhabitants;
- participate in worldwide computer conferences.

The project will be launched in September 1989 and will provide links with a gathering group of Australian users, along with participants in PeaceNet and EcoNet (USA), GreenNet (Europe), the Web (Canada) and many other networks on other continents.

Available from: PO Box 201 Byron Bay, 2451, New South Wales.

**Toxic: Chemical, Radiation and Environmental Safety**
Editor Paul Rogers Six issues yearly, annual subscription $60.

A regular round up of Australian and overseas news and research in chemical, radiation and environmental safety. Most of the information is compiled from the latest scientific studies and journals. Specialist information.

Available from: Ecol Data, PO Box 246 Everton Park, Queensland 4053.
So, you really believe one of these flowers is responsible?

I can't believe this...

There's so much more you should hear.

We're people... that's why I'm becoming a flower...

Am I missing something here?

But biologically, you're using people talk.

I'm bridging the cultural gap.

I live by my own laws, even my own laws of nature.

That's crap!

Am I not missing something?

I'm not missing something.

It's impossible until you can be a flower.

All you have to do is believe.

Why don't you get up and stop me. I might just... NO! DON'T!

Hello Flower

IT SPOKE!

WHAT DID YOU EXPECT?

...OR...

...STOP IT...

...STOP WHAT?

...YOU? I MIGHT...

...JUST...

...NO!

...DON'T!

Why do you really believe one of these flowers is responsible?

I can't believe this...

There's so much more you should hear.

We're people... that's why I'm becoming a flower...

Am I missing something here?

But biologically, you're using people talk.

I'm bridging the cultural gap.

I live by my own laws, even my own laws of nature.

That's crap!

Am I not missing something?

I'm not missing something.

It's impossible until you can be a flower.

All you have to do is believe.

Why don't you get up and stop me. I might just...

NO! DON'T!
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If we act as if it matters, and it doesn't matter, then it doesn't matter. But if we act as if it doesn't matter, and it matters, then it matters!

Our future! Unless you join Friends of the Earth.