

# The Sustainable Psychologist

Newsletter of the APS Environmental Interest Group

Volume 3 Number 1

May, 2011

## CONTENTS

The editor's rave	→
<b>Response to previous issue</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Debate</b>	<b>3</b>
Anthropogenic Global Warming, Julie Le-Fevre	3
A voice from the past, Pip Lipkin	4
<b>Thinking</b>	<b>5</b>
Yes, Climate Skeptics Can Change, Brian Merchant	5
Leading to a change of mind, An- drew Gaines	6
Two world moves toward sustaina- bility, Mark England	7
The Great Disruption: How the climate crisis will transform the global economy, Paul Gilding, Re- viewed by Bob Douglas	7
A simple question, Lance Olsen	8
A source of depression, David Kidner	9
Radioactive tuna	9
<b>What we can do</b>	<b>9</b>
Cooking according to the weather, Bob Rich	9
Hope for Tomorrow's World, Bob Douglas, reviewed by Bob Rich	10
Enabling action for sustainability, Jody-Anne Smith	10
Opposing the desalination plant, Ailsa Drent	11
Ecocide — a new crime? Chris Cass	13
The dirtiest bank	14
Psychology for a safe climate	14
<b>Resources</b>	<b>14</b>
Visions of the future, from Trans- form Australia	14
Journals from Mary Ann Liebert	15
Gorillas and humans, Marcel The- unissen	15
A game for kids	15
See sea level rise	15
<b>Submission guidelines</b>	<b>15</b>

## The Editor's Rave

Welcome to the newest issue of *The Sustainable Psychologist*. This is the third year I have the pleasure of being the editor, and I've got it out on the due date, despite the fact that the world is punishing me for being good at what I do: so many referrals I've had to put on another day a week of work.

The APS has an exciting new service to members: free access to the EBSCO database for psychology and behavioural sciences. (I found the page by entering EBSCO in the search slot at the APS home page. The link is on the right side of the page, and you need to log in as a member first.)

I was wondering if that is of any use for environmental psychology, so entered search terms for one of my hobbyhorses. Two searches, using the terms "climate change" and "global warming" generated over 3500 hits, though there may be some overlap. Go to the APS web site, and access the database. Try it out for your particular interests.

This newsletter is designed to be read on-screen. Please do not print it. Annoyed electrons are less damaging than devastated trees.

And have a good life,  
Bob Rich



"The use of solar energy has not been opened up because the oil industry does not own the sun."  
— **Ralph Nader**

---

## Response to previous issue

Thanks Bob – loved the cartoon.

I understood the position taken by Tristan Snell in *Counselling Psychology and Climate Change: Ethics and Responsibilities*. The key sentence quoted by Tristan was "The welfare of clients and the public, and the standing of the profession, take precedence over a psychologist's selfinterest."

Tristan went on to say that "One might argue that a psychologist who broaches climate change, as an area of personal interest, may not be giving priority to the *immediate* welfare of the client." This seems to imply that the only welfare a client might be interested in is immediate...

Going a bit deeper, I wonder how many people who show up in psychologist's offices have underlying anxiety associated with the experience of living in a declining environment with the apparent absence of responsible political leadership.

Cheers,

Andrew Gaines

Hi Andrew,

Thank you very much for responding to my article, I was hoping that people more experienced than I could help elucidate the role of counselling psychology and climate change. I was somewhat conflicted reading the APS code of ethics and arguing for the immediate welfare of the client, because I think one could in fact make a case that the code of ethics does support encouraging clients to engage in more environmental behaviours for their own welfare and the welfare of the public. The IPCC and CSIRO both stress the importance of energy efficiency among citizens as an important environmental policy, and so where clients are encouraged to make changes to their environmental behaviour, a psychologist might be considered as acting for the welfare of the client and the public. My own position would be however that the more immediate problems of the client, relative to the long-term difficulty of climate change, should take precedence before environmental behaviour is seriously addressed. In this sense the term 'immediate' reflects the problems the client is having right now and in the short-term future rather than the inevitable issues associated with climate change.

It is the case however, so I have been told, that client's do come to therapy concerned about climate change. In these instances I think the issue needs to be taken seriously by the psychologist and I don't believe there are ethical issues involved then by offering strategies for environmental sustainability and political activism. Joanna Macy (1995) also showed up to a psychotherapist with concern about the environment: "Once, I told a psychotherapist of my outrage over the destruction of old-growth forests, she informed me that the bulldozers represented my libido and that my distress sprang from fear of my own sexuality." So I would think that if a client arrives at therapy with concern for the environment, that concern needs to be treated with the utmost respect and to be taken literally, and where clients arrive for other reasons the presenting issue should be addressed before environmental behaviour is considered.

Kind Regards,

Tristan.

Macy, J. (1995). Working through environmental despair. In T. Roszak, M. Gnomes, & A. Kanner (Eds.), *Ecopsychology: Restoring the Earth, healing the mind* (pp. 240-259). San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Hi Tristan,

Your position makes sense to me, and I myself would not be suggesting to clients that they do more recycling. That's not what they pay me for, and it certainly would not be close to a client's immediate needs. Nor would it make much difference in the great scheme of things.

However, there are deeper questions that may relate to the client's emotional and spiritual wellbeing. These are questions having to do with the client's values and what they stand for the world in an age in which we are destroying the future. Some people are healthier and more emotionally stable when they align with a cause greater than themselves. Would probing into these kinds of issues be appropriate for all clients? Certainly not. Would it be appropriate for some? Possibly.

I have no criteria that I would propose, but I suggest that the possibility can come into our collegial discussions. If it is true that we live in the last bright blooming of a dying culture, and a new order of citizen responsibility is necessary if things are to have a hope of coming approximately right for future generations, then the question of how should a person position themselves in this circumstance may be relevant to some clients sometimes.

My personal position, and commitment, is that we need a whole system change to an ecologically sustainable society that operates on goodwilled partnership/respect values. But this needs a lot of unpacking. There are ways to think through what healthy whole system change means, and in particular how partnership/respect

values play out in our lives and in society. Unless a psychologist has thought this through for himself or herself they would have little basis for broaching or guiding a client into this area. Therefore best to leave it alone.

Cheers,  
Andrew

---

"Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a finite world is either a madman or an economist."

— **Kenneth Boulding**

---

## Debate

### Anthropogenic Global Warming

by Julie Le-Fevre

I am concerned at the direction in which we appear to be heading in attempting to make a contribution to the global warming (AGW) debate. I find it particularly alarming when terms such as “denier” and “denial” are bandied about. These have quite specific and usually negative connotations when used by psychologists and I consider it unprofessional to apply them to a significant subset of the general population: to substitute “grief” is simply an insult to intelligence. When this PEIG was first formed, I voiced my concern about lapsing into the tree-hugger, touchy-feely realm rather than adopting a disciplined, scientific approach. Does it not concern psychologists particularly, that with AGW:

the analysis/predictions are based on computer modelling

the modelling involves multi-disciplinary data from the sciences and that some variables from some disciplines have been omitted

that mathematical data e.g. temperature recordings has been interpreted as simultaneously indicating a warming, cooling or plateauing trend

that predictions based on the modelling have swung wildly in terms of for instance, degrees of warming, rises in sea levels, or have simply been proven not to hold e.g. in 2000 “winter snow would become a very rare event” — tell that to the residents of the Northern hemisphere, or again in 2000, that rainfall in Australia would diminish markedly and drought conditions continue — did I imagine the la Nina cycle and that the bulk of Queensland, large areas of Victoria and part of WA were completely under water a few weeks ago?

climate change is not new — from catastrophic change affecting the entire planet to predictable cyclic effects, without the remotest possibility of human causation

“scientific consensus” per se does not confer truth or fact — it was not so very long ago that scientific consensus held that the Milky Way constituted the entire universe

there is a misuse of power/authority and peer group pressure in pinning negative labels on dissenters

in a similar fashion, the imposition of a moral dimension changes the tone and adds weight to the pressure (if morality was a major criterion in dealing with the environment, then the Murray-Darling basin system would not now be on the brink of collapse)

communication is vital, however the persistent use of “pollutant” to describe a vital element for life on Earth is neither accurate nor helpful.

I agree that it is prudent to give the planet the benefit of the doubt, and I believe we should be using our knowledge and expertise in finding solutions. Could we not make a more useful contribution in terms of the research methodology and our knowledge of human behaviour?

#### Research methodology

Of all the disciplines, psychology arguably has the most thorough grounding in research methodology. From a number of accounts, some of the AGW research may not be as rigorous as required (remember the basics: that is must be valid [measures what it says it measures], and reliable [when replicated will produce the same results]. If fully detailed studies are not in the public domain for scrutiny, then that research would have to be highly suspect. Peer review is all very well, but is only as good as the expertise of the reviewers.

#### Human behaviour

Psychology has a vast body of knowledge on human behaviour and hence, ability to predict behaviour. Somebody needs to state the obvious — that wishful thinking will not make it so! For instance, the claim that the world’s biggest CO2 emitters (China — totalitarian), India (a democracy but still developing) and the US (democracy but in dire financial straits) are serious about reducing green house gas emissions is simply not true. What do we know about motivation, power and authority, self-preservation, short-term gains/satisfaction, perceptual set, gambling on future outcomes etc., etc..? Given that surveys indicate that a majority of people are not convinced about AGW, do not rank it as a number one problem, or are concerned but not willing to pay, then there is little incentive for the people governing these countries to willingly risk their positions by making life

even more difficult for their citizens by raising the cost of living or sacrificing jobs (witness China's repressive reaction to the Middle East uprisings) The idea that the rest of the world will be influenced by what Australia does on this issue is delusional.

Another instance is in mandating levels of power generation from renewables — now here is an excellent example of denial — the technology is simply not there yet for renewables to provide the level of 24/7 baseload power required for a modern lifestyle. It is one thing to promote and fund research into this area: it is another altogether to ignore the facts (and the cost penalties involved).

What about motivation?

Money/cost can be a powerful motivator or sanction to modify behaviour — if a carbon tax is meant to reduce emissions, which implies less consumption and/or more efficient consumption, where is the motivation if users are to be compensated for cost increases involved? What do we know about behaviour modification when we are dealing with inelastic commodities and demand, of which electricity and petrol are prime examples? And, what kind of cognitive deficit are we dealing with, when an action taken to solve a problem (the carbon tax/greenhouse gases emissions/AGW), not only will do serious damage to our economy and standard of living, but will not make the slightest difference to mitigating the world's AGW problem?

While we are at it, how about the psychology evidence dealing with logic and reasoning in problem solving, and fads, fashions and mania and fanaticism (remember the definition of a fanatic? “a fanatic is somebody who, having forgotten their aim, redoubles their efforts” - many a true word spoken in jest ...).

PEIG members would do well to read the “Enquirer” section of *The Weekend Australian* of 9-10 April 2011 (no, *The Australian* is not biased/in denial about AGW), for facts and figures on costs and consequences, of millions of Euros rorted under the European ETS scheme with no appreciable decrease in emissions and the accompanying political spin (which used to be known as either prevarication or propaganda!)

It is disappointing but entirely predictable that Psychologists would jump on the AGW bandwagon. However, now that the government is determined to fit carbon tax wheels thus turning the wagon into a juggernaut which will do untold damage to our economy and standard of living for no impact whatsoever on the world scale (and some of us could have a field day as to the motivation for this!), we need cold, hard logic and rational analysis more than ever.

---

### A voice from the past

Dr Pip Lipkin

The following talk was part of a debate in 1970. The topic was “Economic growth is the way to social justice.”

Growth is good, right? Well, friends, cancer is a growth. The question is growth toward what, for what purpose. A thirteen-year-old's growth in leg length is good. A fifty-year-old's growth in circumference is bad.

Edward Goldsmith has put it beautifully. You can't cut an ever-growing number of slices from a cake, each slice of increasing size. The planet Earth is a finite cake. You can eat your piece only once. And this is not a matter of capitalism versus communism. Those two ideologies only disagree on who wields the cake knife.

Yeah, I can hear you thinking: Malthus is dead, technology can solve it all. The Green Revolution can feed the masses. By the time oil is short, we'll get it from the sea bed.

I've got news for you. This is a dangerous illusion. When we stop here today, you owe it to yourself to go to the Library and read the *Second Report of the Club of Rome: Mankind at the Turning Point*. The Club of Rome is some of the planet's top scientists, who have spent thousands of hours of pro bono work to examine where current trends are taking us. And if Latin is Greek to you, “Pro bono” means “for the public good.”

Briefly, their rigorous computer modelling shows that you can fix any problem with technology, but only by making one or more other problems worse.

The Green Revolution is a perfect example.

If you're interested, I can give you the references to the evidence. The Green Revolution is a means of increasing the necessity for pesticides and artificial fertilisers. Such chemicals are very profitable, but not for the starving masses. And pesticides in food is, well, distasteful to me.

Who can afford the chemicals and the special seed? People with money. Who needs the help? Subsistence farmers who are being displaced by agribusiness. Sure, the plantations grow more food, but where do the evicted peasants go? To swell the slum settlements around cities, with all the resulting problems. So, the Green Revolution is a means of passing wealth from the poor to the rich. Solving one problem worsens another.

OK, offshore drilling for oil. Guess what, it costs more than putting a pipe in the ground in Texas. Recently, I filled up the tank of my car for \$2. My estimate, and I'm happy to share the calculations, is that by 2000 it'll be more like \$40.

Right, who cares about the year 2000? My friends, if you don't, you're idiots.



We'll only be middle-aged then, loving parents, and some of us doting grandparents. Every time we stuff up today, we're stealing from those kids, that future.

We live on a lovely planet, with only one thing wrong with it: an infestation of a noxious species. Us. Money is the measure of the harm we do. Every time you spend a dollar, you steal from your kids. And every kid you have above two per two adults means that the cake will be cut into more pieces.

You've seen car stickers: "Live simply, so others can simply live." That's the answer to today's topic. But it's inaccurate. It should be: "Live simply, so YOU can simply live." Be selfish. Fight for your future, and the future of your kids.

Jim has pointed to the clock, so I'll wrap up by telling you where the problems come from. In 1962, John Calhoun did an experiment on the effects of population density on rats. No crowding: normal rats. Up the density one click, and some rats developed stress-related physical problems: eczema, asthma, cancer, digestive ulcers, strokes, heart attacks and stuff. Two clicks up, and many females were unable to properly socialise their young into the rat way of doing things. With the highest population density, many male rats became so territorial they attacked their own females and young, and males formed gangs that fought to the death.

Look around at our world and think.

---

### Responses invited

Please send your reactions to this pair of essays. You may notice that Pip did not refer to climate change once, and yet he was saying exactly the same things as the people (like me) whom Julie objects to. Is there a lesson in that?

I hope the next issue will be FULL of contributions to this debate.

---

"A man generally has two reasons for doing a thing: one that sounds good, and a real one."

— J.P. Morgan

---

## Thinking

### Yes, Climate Skeptics Can Change

by Brian Merchant

<http://www.treehugger.com/files/2011/04/climate-skeptics-can-change.php>

Attempting to convince a climate change skeptic that human activity is causing the planet to warm is often viewed as a Sisyphean task -- since that skepticism is most often more rooted in political ideology than a view of the science itself, it can quickly devolve into a thankless war of words. Try as you might to construct the most rational, scientifically sound, evidence-backed argument, it's all apt to come to a screeching halt over ad hominem attacks on Al Gore or the scientists themselves, contention over a scientific point that's inadequately understood by both parties, or so forth.

Which is why there's very little actual exchange between the two camps -- and so one group continues to get its news from outlets tailored to a world where climate change isn't real, a la Fox News, and the other gets drawn to the other pole, and gets lumped into the progressive sphere. And rarely do the two intersect. But it is possible: even ideologically committed conservatives and climate change-denying Republicans can change their ways. Here's proof.

It's in the form of a fascinating op-ed at the conservative blog FrumForum, called [Confessions of a Climate Change Convert](#), where D.R. Tucker, a Republican and one-time climate skeptic writes the following:

I was defeated by facts.

It wasn't all that long ago when I joined others on the right in dismissing concerns about climate change. It was my firm belief that the science was unsettled, that any movement associated with Al Gore and Van Jones couldn't possibly be trusted, that environmentalists were simply left-wing, anti-capitalist kooks. It wasn't until after I read Stanford University professor Morris Fiorina's book *Disconnect* (2009) that I started to reconsider things.

The biggest selling point was evidently the fact that environmentalism once used to be the province of conservatives -- it was, of course, once a deeply held belief that wildlife and ecosystems should be preserved for future generations. This is worth noting, as the current ideological polarization has created an apparent divide between left and right over the environment -- Republican politicians, are so staunchly anti-regulation, anti-environmental protection and pro-corporate that we couldn't imagine anyone who cares about that environment supporting them. But millions do. And if the facts were better separated from the political dogma (if anyone has any new ideas on that front, I'm all ears), perhaps we'd have more success stories like this:

Tucker's friends suggested he read the 2007 IPCC Assessment Report, and he did.

I began reading the report with a skeptical eye, but by the time I concluded I could not find anything to justify my skepticism ... I came away from the report convinced that climate alteration poses a critical

threat to our health and way of life, and that "policies that provide a real or implicit price of carbon" are in fact necessary, from an economic and a moral standpoint, to mitigate that threat. Such policies--most notably the much-maligned concept of cap-and-trade--should not be considered job-killers but life-savers.

In the months following my acceptance of the conclusions in the IPCC report, I've had a change in my emotional climate. I go back and forth between disappointment and hope--sadness over seeing Republicans who once believed in the threat of climate change (such as Massachusetts Senator Scott Brown and former Minnesota Governor Tim Pawlenty) suddenly turn into skeptics; optimism about efforts by such groups as Republicans for Environmental Protection and Citizens Climate Lobby to sound the alarm about the need to combat climate pollution. I struggle with the urge to give in to cynicism and bitterness, to write off the American right for its refusal to recognize scientific facts. Thankfully, there's a stronger urge--an urge to keep working until the American right recognizes that a healthy planet is required to have the life and liberty that allows us to pursue happiness.

For a climate blogger who's spent years butting heads with skeptics, this is pretty inspiring stuff. Now, we can't expect to win over most deniers by handing them a copy of an IPCC report -- but I do think it's important to note that what we see happening here is likely to start happening with greater frequency down the line: facts winning the day. It's going to get harder to ignore climate change, disprove the fact that global temperature keeps rising, droughts keep worsening, etc.

But we still need to find a better way to get those facts into the spotlight, and fast.

[Brian Merchant](#) is a freelance writer and editor living in Brooklyn, NY. He covers politics for TreeHugger, with a focus on climate and energy issues. He has written for *Paste*, *Salon*, *GOOD*, and the Huffington Post, among many others. He pens a column about [getting Samy out of Burma](#). He's also the editor of the online magazine [the Utopianist](#).

---

### Leading to a change of mind

by Andrew Gaines

People change themselves, if they change at all. Asking pertinent questions can stimulate people to do the thinking that may lead to a new assessment of the situation.

Transform Australia member Ian Cleland frequently talks to doubters and sceptics. He starts by finding out precisely what they are sceptical about.

What part of the climate change model, if any, do you accept?

Which specific parts do you doubt or deny?

Are there important planetary changes other than climate change going on?

At some point they will reach a question that they cannot answer.

This occurred in a conversation I had with the CEO of a major charity. He expressed some doubt about climate change, based on information he had heard recently in the news. Instead of giving 'counter information,' I asked him how he could solve the dilemma for himself. He said that he did not know.

At this point his mind was open. I commented that I thought climate change was very real, and the reason was because I had read books by Australian scientists such as Barrie Pittock that go into the science in detail. I indicated what some of these books are.

At the end, he was appreciative. I did not try to lay a trip on him. I respected his autonomy, and shared my point of view.

However, this person was not a sceptic, in the sense of having a fixed position. He was simply in a state of doubt.

Ian does something else that is very important. When he sees that someone doesn't like the implications of an idea such as climate change being human induced, he probes into their precise reasons for not liking the implications. This may make the semi-conscious more conscious, and brings them closer to having a choice about how they respond.

Some years ago my own views about species extinction were challenged by a good friend, and I went into a deep process of internal reassessment. My friend gave me several articles and a book. In response I let myself go into confusion for about a week — not a comfortable place to be in. If my friend was right, then much of my current worldview was mistaken. This would have been good news; it meant that I could relax and get on with enjoying life without worrying about the big picture. But was he right?

I went to the library and got out Richard Leakey's *The Fifth Extinction* and other relevant books. On review, the scientific case for extinction seemed solid, thus (regretfully) confirming my original views.

We live in one physical reality, although we may have many different interpretations as to how it works. The question for all of us, whether we are sceptics or passionate climate change activists, is: do we base our views on a thoughtful consideration of the real-world facts, as best we can ascertain them, or do we create opinions based on our emotional responses, and hold them as the truth?

---

## Two world moves toward sustainability

from Mark England

Two initiatives currently unfolding around the globe involve efforts to encourage greater sustainability, with implications for social progress. The first is the Boao Forum for Asia and the second is the trialing of international sustainable accounting standards.

The **Boao Forum for Asia** (BFA) was held in Boao, Hainan Province in China from April 13 to 16, 2011. At the Forum, guests from around the world were invited to express views on ‘Inclusive Development’ to reach common understanding. The calibre of participants denotes a genuine attempt to reach and build on common understanding. Chair of the BFA is the former Prime Minister of Japan, Yasuo Fukuda. Hu Jintao, President of the People’s Republic of China and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev will be present as will dignitaries from around the globe. Henry Poulson, 74<sup>th</sup> Secretary of the Treasury, United States, is a special guest.

BFA topics focus on economics and the environment, including:

- Women — the Under-represented Leadership: Explores how women’s leadership manifests itself in local, national and trans-national cultures
- Young Leaders Roundtable: Charting Growth — Include the Excluded
- Chronic Diseases and International Cooperation
- Inclusive Development: Common Agenda and New Challenges
- Inclusive Development: Sound and Orderly Growth
- China Embraces the World: A Decade of Shared Growth
- Environmental Protection
- Risk Management: The Unknown Unknowns

On a second front is the development and trialing of international sustainable accounting standards under a voluntary reporting code. This code is known as **Integrated Reporting** and builds environmental, social and governance metrics into company performance reporting. The aim is to meet the needs of a more sustainable global economy. This is spelt out by the IIRC Chair and Deputy Chair on the IIRC website. Sir Michael Peat, Chairman of the Integrated International Reporting Committee states, ‘integrated reporting is a vital building block to enable the global economy to meet the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.’ Deputy Chairman Professor Marvyn King states ‘to make our economy sustainable, we have to re-learn everything we have learnt from the past. That means making more from less and ensuring that governance, strategy and sustainability are inseparable.’ Key members of the IIRC include companies promoting sustainable technology, multi-nationals, major international accounting and standards bodies and companies with primary concern for the environment. The pilot scheme involves 50 global companies across 12 industries over a two year reporting cycle, beginning from September 2011.

---

## The Great Disruption: How the climate crisis will transform the global economy, Paul Gilding

Reviewed by Bob Douglas

*“Can we afford to save civilization or would we rather keep the energy costs down while we hurtle off the cliff into collapse?”*

“The great disruption” is a stimulating, indeed uplifting book by a writer who presents his arguments with passion and careful attention to detail. Paul Gilding was the CEO of Greenpeace International before working as a sustainability consultant to the CEOs of some of the largest and most successful businesses in the world.

Gilding argues that economic growth has no future in a world already overstretched beyond its capacity. He believes we approach a period of massive instability, precipitated by climate change, resulting from the combination of human population and economic growth. We now face limits imposed by physics, chemistry and biology, because the Earth is now full. Despite brilliance at technological innovation, our current naïve faith in economic growth as a solution to our difficulties will inevitably fail us and we will hit the wall probably quite soon.

The problem is not only climate change but also the massive destruction of the ecosystems on which our lives and livelihoods depend. Gilding has no doubt that we can get through the serious crises and disruption that now lie in wait for humanity. Indeed he finds the challenge positively exhilarating. He argues that the great disruption will bring out the very best of human innovation, compassion and community spirit, although we cannot now avoid chaos and misery for millions and perhaps billions during the transition period.

He says that a successful outcome requires that we will reinvent the human economy. When the world finally accepts the seriousness and inevitability of our predicament, we will respond by unleashing massive ingenuity and capacity to adapt. “Our species is slow but not stupid,” he says. We will be forced to change from shopping and overwork to sharing and enjoying our leisure time, our communities and our relationships. Because we must, we will share the world’s resources with those who are in poverty. And we will all enjoy life more. Continuation of the current consumerist culture now does little for human wellbeing in developed countries like Australia and has huge crippling costs.

Gilding uses the rapid transformation that occurred as the Allied Powers responded to Hitler's invasion of Poland and the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour, as evidence of the capacity of human societies to transform and lift themselves to new heights of capacity, communal understanding and support at stunningly short notice. In that situation, as with the one that now faces us, human societies were very slow to act, but once committed, the results were extraordinary.

The climate crisis is only one of a series of interconnected challenges, which now face humanity as we contemplate a population of 9 billion people by 2050. Food insecurity, water availability, heating of the planet and the destruction of ecosystems are all associated with our pathological addiction to economic growth. Furthermore, he says, it is economic growth that has contributed to growing inequity in the distribution of resources even though it has also lifted millions out of poverty.

Gilding has great respect for the market and also for the role which economic growth has played in the past. But economic growth is over and the market will only serve society if it is regulated to do so. The problem is, we have now passed the planet's limits to growth. We must rethink the human strategy. Inevitably, he says, the dam of denial that it is holding up global action on anthropogenic global warming will collapse and we will act rapidly and with great ingenuity and effect. The sooner the tipping point arrives that will unite the world around the seriousness and mitigation of the gathering storm, the better.

But while we wait for that to happen, millions of people and groups around the world are preparing the building blocks for a new stable state economy that will replace our growth addiction. For a while, the growth addicts will continue to use the growth model to tackle climate change and fight what the author describes as "the 1° war". This is the requirement that we reduce the world's carbon emissions budget to one that is compatible with no more than a 1° rise in planetary temperature above preindustrial levels. Currently, we are heading for at least 2° and possibly much more, which would be catastrophic.

This is an optimistic book written by a clear thinker. Gilding shares with the reader his personal journey to these conclusions and the anxieties and uncertainties he has experienced along the way. He also anticipates and deals with many counterarguments to his optimism. He says that the challenge is not only for big business and government, but especially for ordinary people everywhere. Together we must take charge of the restructuring of society and the economy in ways that serve both humanity and our precious environment.

I found little to disagree with in this important work. Perhaps that is because I have been wrestling for some years with many of the same ideas as have tantalized Gilding for much of his life. This is a book that deserves to be read by people of all ages from many walks of life and especially those in business and government. Young people concerned about tomorrow's world will find here, meaning and hope.

Bob Douglas is a retired epidemiologist who currently Chairs SEE-Change ACT and has spent the past ten years as Chair of Australia21

---

### **A simple question**

from Lance Olsen

What have we learned since the question below was asked? Does anyone know of a referenced review of the related literature then to now? An anthology?

"Energy consumption in 1960 was about half what it is now. Surely we had a civilized country then, with roads, electricity, entertainment, and so on. Have we, by doubling our energy consumption, doubled our happiness?"

**Reference:** Kimon Valaskakis, Peter S. Sindell, J. Graham Smith, and Iris Fitzpatrick-Martin. *The Conserver Society*. 1970. Harper & Row.

---

### **A source of depression**

by David Kidner

David W. Kidner *Depression and the natural world: towards a critical ecology of psychological distress* *Critical Psychology* 2007, vol. 19 Spring

Researchers have struggled to explain the dramatic increase in diagnoses of 'depression' in the industrialised world. This paper argues that psychological distress is likely to arise within an ecological context that is becoming increasingly degraded, and in which the character of selfhood is being redefined to fit an industrialised context. In turn, these redefinitions of selfhood reduce our capacity to address ecological concerns. I argue that it is only possible to recognise the connections between human well-being and ecological health if we identify and challenge the dissociations and repressions on which the 'business as usual' of industrial society depends, and that a more embodied conception of the person is fundamental to this recovery of our wholeness. More specifically, I argue that our current reliance on cognition and our corresponding marginalisation of sensing and feeling, in addition to undermining human well-being, may be ecologically catastrophic.



---

## Radioactive tuna

Food & Water Watch Executive Director Wenonah Hauter appeared on ABC's Good Morning America to discuss concerns about radiation in seafood. The Japanese government has announced it had found high levels of radioactive materials in fish in the Pacific Ocean after millions of gallons of radioactive water was dumped in the sea from the damaged nuclear site.

"I think the concern is that the FDA doesn't have the resources to properly screen...they only test less than 2 percent of seafood that comes from imports," said Hauter.

Food & Water Watch is concerned that they are only testing for products from locations near where the accident occurred. The radioactive isotopes that have been dumped into the Pacific Ocean are dispersing, and have been detected in small fish that are consumed by larger fish, like tuna, which are consumed by humans.

As our food system deals with this latest threat, we have even more reason to act to ensure that our food and water safety protections are adequately funded. Take action now to tell Congress to protect funding for essential food and water programs that ensure our health and safety in the federal budget.

Want another way to take action? Let Washington know that you want our food and water monitored for radioactive contamination.

<http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/blogs/food-water-watch-on-gma/>

---

"Capitalism is the astounding belief that the most wickedest of men will do the most wickedest of things for the greatest good of everyone."

— **John Maynard Keynes**

---

## What we can do

### Cooking according to the weather

by Bob Rich

In the 1970s, my wife and I specifically chose a lifestyle in which we could minimise our impact on the future. Over the years we have developed a toolkit, some of which may be of use elsewhere. Because we chose to [live on a very low income](#), assembling it took a long time, and quite a bit is from the opp shop: other people's throwouts.

We've been on solar electricity with no grid connection since 1980 — bought one panel at a time, and at first with ex-Telecom batteries. When Kevin Rudd offered lots of money for installing solar electric systems we put in a large new system, which is utter luxury compared to what we had before. Since then, our opp shop treasures have been the previously shunned electric appliances.

So, often the carbon in our cooking is limited to what's in the food. Here is how we do it:

On sunny summer days, we often use a solar oven. This is an insulated box with a black-painted sheet metal inner lining, and a liftable double-glazed lid. It won't bake scones for you, but does a nice loaf of bread, and is great for slow cooking of stews and the like. In the autumn, with the lid partly propped open it's handy for drying fruit.

Sunshine any time of the year allows us to use those opp shop treasures: a toaster, electric frypan, electric jug, a small fan-boosted electric oven... all the things city people take for granted. Only, for us it's all from the sun, nothing from nasty coal or even from the drowned valleys of hydro. I REALLY enjoy a meal and a cuppa, prepared entirely with no damage to the ecology.

At the same time, the same sunshine also heats our water. Solar-heated showers are wonderful.

When the sun don't shine, we have a slowcombustion kitchen stove. This cooks food, heats both water and air. Firewood would be a problem in some areas because of smoke pollution. However, we are on top of a mountain, with low population density, and so it's OK. Most of the wood comes from black wattles, a very fast-growing and fast-dying native tree that can actually be a nuisance. Dead trees can be found, or ones growing too close to people-things. The only environmental damage is fuel and oil in the chainsaw, and perhaps a few hundred metres of car and trailer use.

OK, not everyone can live like we do. But, wherever you are, whatever your circumstances, something is possible. In the 70s we visited a sister-in-law in Holland who had an indoor vegie garden, in a highrise block of flats. She covered the concrete floor with plastic, put soil on it, and used those lights others apply to the cultivation of marijuana. Her family was self-sufficient in vegies.

Solar water heating, interactive solar, a homemade solar oven are possible in most places. And you can apply creativity to invent your way to save the future by being different.

---

## Hope for Tomorrow's World

### A manual developed by Professor Bob Douglas

reviewed by Bob Rich

Emeritus Professor Bob Douglas AO is a retired epidemiologist who was from 1989 to 2001 the first Director of the National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health at the Australian National University. From 2001 to 2011 he was the Founding Chair of Australia 21 [www.australia21.org.au](http://www.australia21.org.au) and since 2006 has been Chair of SEE-Change ACT [www.seechange.org.au](http://www.seechange.org.au). He can be contacted by email [bobdouglas@netspeed.com.au](mailto:bobdouglas@netspeed.com.au).

Bob and I became friends at the first workshop of [Transform Australia](#).

He is the author of a very impressive 77 page manual for a pilot study in 20 Canberra schools: “**2020 Vision: How will we change?**” The aim of the project is to examine how Canberra can be transformed into a sustainable city.

I found the manual to be accurate, easy to understand and powerful. The first parts are scary, because they set out the problem: climate change, ecological destruction, resource depletion, population growth. However, once we get past the problem and the evidence for it, we arrive at the justification of the title. There is hope.

Don't wait for the pilot study to be completed, and evaluated, and argued over. [Grab the manual](#), and do your best to act on its contents NOW.

---

### Enabling action for sustainability

Jody-Anne Smith

Five different educational approaches are used by sustainability educators to induce behaviour change: 1) information and awareness raising; 2) market, technology and regulatory; 3) green marketing; 4) critical systems (problem solving) and 5) social learning approaches.

I have been exploring a 6<sup>th</sup> category, of psychologically-based approaches for obtaining behaviour change for sustainability. The APS (2008)[1] explain the psychological underpinnings of people's reaction to environmental threats:

“It is common for people to experience a range of emotions and psychological symptoms when faced with information about environmental threats and predictions of an uncertain future. People may feel anxious, scared, sad, depressed, numb, helpless and hopeless, frustrated or angry. Sometimes, if the information is too unsettling, and the solutions seem too difficult, people can cope by minimising or denying that there is a problem, or avoiding thinking about the problems. Being sceptical about the problems is another way that people may react. ...Another common reaction is to become desensitized to information about environmental problems. Stories and images relating to climate change flood our daily news. People can become desensitized to the stories, and mentally switch off when the next one comes. The fact that these problems are not easily fixed, and seem to go on and on without resolution, increases the chances that we will tune out, thus minimizing our stress, and continuing with business as usual. Once people believe that they cannot do anything to change a situation, they tend to react in all sorts of unhelpful ways. They may become dependent on others (i.e., by believing that the government or corporations will fix things, or that technology has all the answers), resigned (‘if it happens, it happens’), cynical (‘there's no way you can stop people from driving their cars everywhere — convenience is more important to most people than looking after the environment’), or fed up with the topic ‘yeah — whatever’.”

Therefore, sustainability educators need to help people overcome a sense of despair and helplessness. The psychology literature also explores the reasons why people behave in unsustainable ways and this suggests additional educational approaches needed to obtain behaviour change for sustainability.

Consumerism and unsustainable lifestyles are seen as largely due to psychological woundedness, resulting from their childhoods and life experiences. This woundedness occurs due to traumatic incidents such as child abuse (physical, mental, emotional or sexual abuse[2]); parental divorce; and alcoholic, drug addicted or workaholic parents.

These experiences result in low self esteem and self worth, so they develop defense mechanisms to protect themselves and help them cope. Many individuals define their sense of self based on external sources: material goods, power, wealth, success. This had led to consumerism, competition and isolation as people focus on achieving and accumulating more. Many are very lonely, unable to connect intimately with others, afraid to show their ‘real’ self for fear of judgment or rejection. Many people lead superficial lives using addictions (alcohol, drugs, cigarettes, gambling, sex, shopping, etc.) or anti-depressants[3] to numb their pain. Those who don't cope express their anger by lashing out and harming others (graffiti, crime, destruction of nature, maltreatment of animals, repeating the cycle of child abuse with their own children) or commit suicide[4].

The psychological literature suggests that to achieve large changes to people's lifestyles we need to help people:

- heal past hurts that lead to defense mechanisms and addictions
- develop healthy self esteem so that they don't define themselves by possessions and status

- express their emotions and remove defense mechanisms that inhibit caring for the environment and others
- develop intrinsic valuing of the environment, self and others
- develop strong connections with nature
- improve their personal, social and environmental sustainability
- support improved parenting practices so that children grow up with minimal wounding[5]

Unless we address the above, we are unlikely to get significant changes in lifestyles. People may be willing to make small changes to their behaviour, such as the use of energy efficient lightbulbs and whitegoods or the installation of solar panels. They may do this for extrinsic reasons — to save money or for reputation benefits. However, it can lead to a rebound effect. They may spend the money they save on more electronic gadgets or an overseas holiday — more unsustainable practices[6]. Or they may stop their environmentally supportive behaviours if they are no longer trendy.

Larger changes to lifestyle are more likely if people intrinsically care about the environment. Then they change their behaviour because they care about the environment for the environment's sake — respecting the rights of plants, animals and ecosystems as well as acknowledging the many benefits nature provides us in its pristine state. When people intrinsically care about nature they see behaviour change as responsible, moral, not as a sacrifice or punishment. So the psychological literature emphasises the need to help people reconnect with nature and its healing properties[7].

So what does this suggest to sustainability educators?[8] A lot of what we already do — supporting individuals and communities to take action on sustainability. Support is the key word. Supporting them to form partnerships to discuss what they want to do individually and as a community, helping them find ways to do what they want — removing barriers, building skills, getting resources, etc.

Such partnerships are being formed in many communities with the proliferation of Local Climate Action Groups[9]. Recent research conducted for the Vic Department of Planning and Community Development recommended that these groups be supported through grants, climate change community engagement officers in local government and community organisations, as well as provided with practical and ongoing material support.

I am involved in two projects at RMIT University that focus on the support of community partnerships for sustainability: 1) research investigating examples of schools and their communities working together in learning partnerships for sustainability; 2) investigating the use of scenario thinking workshops with communities to develop stories of what their region may look like in the future. The scenarios are analysed to identify the implications and develop strategies to 1) minimise undesirable outcomes, 2) maximise opportunities and 3) prepare for those aspects that will occur regardless of what actions the community takes. The stories and their analysis enable the community to decide what they want to do. This can give people a sense of empowerment and hope, rather than feeling overwhelmed and in despair about climate change and the future[10]. Scenario workshops have been held in the Hamilton Region and the Otway Ranges Region of Victoria.

Partnerships strengthen the sense of community and can also help individuals to heal some of their wounds. They can feel a sense of belonging and acceptance, feel that they are doing something worthwhile and that they are okay — building their self confidence and self esteem. Further support is needed to assist with deeper healing. This can be done individually with a counsellor/psychotherapist and in groups with workshops focussed on healing from the impacts of abuse; building self esteem; increasing awareness of and ability to dissolve defense mechanisms; building social skills, emotional literacy, and conscious parenting.

Ideally educators should be role models of healthy personal and environmental sustainability functioning, supporting individuals to achieve personal healing (embrace emotions, reduce addictions and support healthy functioning) as well as sustainability goals.

#### Notes

1 APS (2008). Climate change: what you can do.

Child sexual abuse is extremely common in Australia. 1 in 4 girls and 1 in 6 boys are sexually abused before the age of 18yrs. ([http://www.darkness2light.org/KnowAbout/statistics\\_2.asp](http://www.darkness2light.org/KnowAbout/statistics_2.asp)).

2 Since 1990, the number of prescriptions for anti-depressants has risen from five million a year to 12 million in a population of just 20 million, and many of these drugs, which are meant to be used only for major depression, are being handed out for less severe cases and are also being prescribed to children. (<http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2005/s1401280.htm>).

3 Every 4 days a farmer is committing suicide in Australia. It is expected this may worsen with climate change (<http://www.abc.net.au/news/newsitems/200610/s1771783.htm>).

4 Grille R, 2005, Parenting for a peaceful world, Longueville Media, Australia. Grille R, 2008, Heart to heart parenting, ABC Books, Australia

5 Weathercocks and signposts: the environment movement at a crossroads, WWF-UK (2008).

6 Macy JR & Brown MY, 1998, Coming back to life: practices to reconnect our lives, our world, New Society Publishers, Canada

7 Sattmann-Frese, Werner J & Hill, Stuart B: Psychology of Ecological Crises and Eco-Self Transformation: A Guide to the Psychology of Sustainable Living, Morrisville: Lulu.com, 2007

8 Local Climate Action Groups are developing across Australia and starting to work together advocating for changes to government and societal practices. <http://www.foe.org.au/climate-justice/media/news-items/2009/australias-climate-action-summit/>.

9 Fritze J, Williamson L and Wiseman J (2008). Draft Report - Community engagement and climate change: benefits, challenges and strategies. Melbourne, Department of Planning and Community Development, Victorian Government.

10 The Hamilton scenarios: <http://prodmams.rmit.edu.au/cyb31c4gyjn2.pdf>.

Dr. Jodi-Anne M Smith, is a sustainability educator, counsellor and researcher. She facilitates healing and personal development workshops for members of the community, as well as leadership development workshops with business personnel. Her research at RMIT University focuses on school-community learning partnerships for sustainability and the use of scenario thinking to assist communities to adapt to climate change. She can be contacted by email at [jodi-anne.smith@rmit.edu.au](mailto:jodi-anne.smith@rmit.edu.au) or phone 03 9925 9891.

---

### **Opposing the desalination plant**

by Ailsa Drent

Ailsa sent me an excellent document, which is too long for this newsletter. It is her submission to the Environmental Effects inquiry into the Wonthaggi desalination plant in Victoria. Hers was the only submission to consider the psychological effects on people. Here is an extract:

“I must go down to the sea again.” John Masefield

My association with this enchanting part of South Gippsland is over a period of thirty years. I lived for most of my life in Melbourne and recognise the nation's situation in relation to drought and future water supply.

The Environmental Effects Statement (August 2008) supports the siting of a large de-salination facility on the very coast that has sustained me and my family, and thousands, if not millions of others.

Most Australians live near the coast on this dry and fragile island continent. It is as if the words above beckon us all. More recently social researchers have attested to the important health benefits for us all.

Ever since we were children, going down to the sea has been part of the Australian psyche. The sheer joy and freedom in mid-summer to swim, splash, explore, relax, exercise, create and play implanted 'the coast' into our psyches. At school and through our reading of dramatic and beautiful poetry, such as Southey's 'The Inchcape Rock', and adventurous stories, this development was further enhanced.

Increasingly urbanised, and relatively recently so in evolutionary terms, we as humans still need connections with 'the land' and 'the coast' for our well-being. Growing understanding through the human sciences is providing strong evidence for the importance of this connectivity for our futures, and it is this evidence which supports the almost 'unconscious knowing' we experience when close to the natural world and its special places.

Three points from psychology are relevant:

1. The APS Position Paper on Psychology and the Natural Environment states: "The natural environment is a defining and formative part of the Australian character and lifestyle: it is integral to the construction, representation, and experience of place and to perceived environmental quality and quality of life. Notwithstanding the urban and suburban character and context of most Australian residential communities, these environments encompass and/or are adjacent to a large spectrum of natural environments which are an important part of people's everyday lives and connection with the natural world... The effective management and conservation of natural environments and ecosystems in Australia requires an appropriate knowledge base and applied expertise for conserving natural environments, for fostering environmentally sustainable lifestyles and behaviours, and for managing and mitigating adverse human impacts on and of the natural environment." Further, it states, P 4. "It is clear that the wellbeing and integrity of natural ecosystems and the biophysical environment are integral to human health and well-being. The implications for humans are not limited to physical health and well-being... but include psychological need and benefit considerations ...such as identity formation, restoration, recreation, connection and inspiration. Equally, the perception and/or direct experience of environmental degradation and loss can lead to concern, anxiety, guilt, anger, helplessness, dread and pessimism."

2. Research findings summarised in Maller C. et al in the *Health Promotion International Journal* 2006. include the following:

- known physiological effects when humans encounter, observe, or otherwise positively interact with animals, plants, landscapes, or wilderness;
- natural environments foster recovery from mental fatigue and are restorative;



- some nature based treatments that have success in healing patients who previously had not responded to treatment;
- when given a choice people prefer natural environments (particularly those with water features, large old trees, intact vegetation or minimal human influence) to urban ones regardless of nationality or culture;
- The majority of places that people consider favourite or restorative are natural places, and being in those places is recuperative;
- People have a more positive outlook on life and higher life satisfaction when in proximity to nature;
- Exposure to natural environments enhances the ability to cope with and recover from stress, cope with subsequent stress, and recover from illness and injury;
- Observing nature can restore concentration and improve productivity;
- Having nature in close proximity, or just knowing it exists, is important to people regardless of whether they are regular 'users' of it.

3. New concepts in psychology describe the psychological costs to humans with climate change are being developed. Maginness and Stephens Page 16, state: "Psychoterratic' illnesses have recently been introduced into the literature in an attempt to describe what people experience with environment change. These constructs focus more on the experience of distress as opposed to the diagnosis of mental illness. For example, 'solastalgia' is a new concept that has been developed to promote understanding of environmentally induced stress. It refers to the pain and distress caused by the loss of , or inability to derive, solace from a home environment which has been subject to physical desolation. "(Albrecht et al 2007)

As a practising psychologist and local resident I have experienced all of the above and also observed the same effects in others whether they are local community members or the people that seek my help professionally. Almost all state that the natural environment of this coast is restorative for their stress, depression and anxiety, their grief and loss, their challenging times, their social times. We do not need to add solastalgia to their experience.

The EES includes little investigation into the real experiences, perspectives, feelings of the humans in this area. It is not only the people living, working and holidaying here, but also the parliamentarians, the project workers, the Melburnians, the local water delivery systems providers. All will, I believe, be adversely affected by their witting or unwitting participation in the loss of classified coast to industrialisation. For instance, the parliamentarians are having to 'battle' local people in what is perceived to be undemocratic and costly processes. The area selected for the desalination plant is the very area used by so many for passive recreation. Further, the project workers undoubtedly will be keen to work and secure income, but the experience will no doubt be affecting their senses as they work in the beauty of the area and engage in its change. The silence of the past custodians of the land, the Bunurong people, should not go unnoticed as the coast is a large midden with a large number of sites, four of which are of moderate significance, and not all as yet are known.

Recent statistical publications by the Bass Coast Shire indicate that over two million tourists visit the area each year. The area immediately around the mouth of the Powlett River is classified by the National Trust of Australia (Victoria) Page 84 of this classification states that "this landscape has high scenic values, and is a valuable small scale natural ecosystem." Similarly the Victorian Coastal Spaces (Victorian Government ) document describes this coast as being "of regional significance."

And finally on Page 43 of the summary document I was most concerned to read the following: "Most components of the Desalination Project — water transmission pipelines, electricity power lines, booster and substations, manufacturing/treatment plant are familiar in the Victorian landscape and have relatively predictable environmental impacts. These impacts are concentrated in the construction phase and lessen during operations, save for ongoing visual or noise impacts in some cases." What does this mean? Are classified scenic landscapes generally filled with such intrusions?

---

### **Ecocide — a new crime?**

from Chris Cass

Chris had sent this letter to the Editor of *The Age*:

"There is a pressing need to criminalise ecocide — that is, extensive ecological devastation caused through human agency. Currently, corporations breaching pollution permits are issued with fines only, which can be easily accommodated as financial losses. Corporations are abstract entities and, as such, cannot be imprisoned for crimes. CEOs, however, are real persons who can be tried and convicted of crimes against the environment. Mere "hand-slap" fines are insufficient deterrents for reducing environmental destruction. A potential prison sentence for corporate heads may well prompt better decision-making and practice oversight than the current system. These crimes should be tried in the International Criminal Court."

Afterward, Susie Burke found an article in New Internationalist on this very topic, and Chris draws our attention to much more information about at [www.thisiseccocide.com](http://www.thisiseccocide.com).

---

## The dirtiest bank

Tell ANZ to clean up its act!

Burning coal is endangering our health, polluting the air and water, and making global warming worse. And who is providing the dirty money to finance dirty coal power in Australia? It's the retail bank that claims it 'lives in your world' — ANZ.

**ANZ is officially the dirtiest bank in Australia.**

Despite announcing its plan to be carbon neutral by the end of 2009, ANZ is the largest financier of dirty coal power in Australia. Over the past five years, ANZ has poured nearly 1.6 billion dollars into coal power stations, coal mines and coal ports. At a time when we need to be cutting pollution and investing in renewable energy, ANZ is using our money to expand Australia's coal industry.

Let ANZ know that you want it to stop financing polluting coal power. Enter your details below. You can edit the letter and the subject line, if you prefer, before sending it. Your name will automatically be added to the end of the letter.

The letter can be found at [http://greenpeace.org.au/climate/db\\_action.php](http://greenpeace.org.au/climate/db_action.php)

---

## Psychology for a Safe Climate

Psychology for a Safe Climate is an enthusiastic and active group that meets regularly in Melbourne, typically on a Monday evening. They have various promising projects going, including designing psychodrama intended to use fun to bring people's attention to climate change.

If you are interested, email Carol Ride [carol.ride@gmail.com](mailto:carol.ride@gmail.com)

---

"'Growth' and 'progress' are among the key words in our national vocabulary. But modern man now carries Strontium 90 in his bones, DDT in his fat, asbestos in his lungs. A little more of this 'progress' and 'growth,' and this man will be dead."

— **Morris K. "Mo" Udall**

---

## Resources

### Visions of the future

from Transform Australia

Children, and most adults, can readily outline what a healthy future would look like. Of course we want clean air and water, healthy food, schools and workplaces that bring out the best in people, peace, democratic governance that supports community wellbeing, and so forth.

Yet we live in a world that is controlled by militarism, unseen financial interests and governments that appear to be in thrall to corporate elites. This power nexus delays or opposes the obvious changes that are needed to avoid the ecological unravelling of civilisation.

At the same time there is a growing groundswell of initiatives for healthy change. Transform Australia is part of this groundswell. Here are links to individuals and organisations that are championing practical visions of a positive future. The list is indicative at best. There are an extraordinary number of positive initiatives going on. We know how to evolve a viable future. Transform Australia's role is to catalyse the national commitment to put them to work.

### References

Graeme Taylor's *Evolution's Edge: The Coming Collapse and Transformation of Our World* clearly outlines the world we are moving to if we intend to make the human experiment succeed.

[Tellus Institute](#) has developed a set of scenarios that clearly outline both positive visions of the future. They have a number of excellent publications including [Great Transition: The Promise and Lure of the Times Ahead](#)

The [Transition Decade Alliance](#) is a growing network of organisations that commit to achieving the structural transformations necessary to deal with climate change by 2020.

Amory Lovens, Rocky Mountain Institute CEO, offers his vision of a bright future in his [Imagine a World](#) speech. More practically, he outlines the business case for moving away from coal and oil. We can shift to renewables and make money. Another remarkable lecture is Amory Lovens [short talk](#).

Amory Lovens [Integrative design and systems thinking](#).

In this poignant lecture on [Envisioning a Sustainable World](#) systems thinker Donella Meadows considers why many people are afraid to express their heartfelt desire for a healthy future.

[The Zero Carbon Australia Stationary Energy Plan](#) can be downloaded from the Beyond Zero Emissions website. The plan shows how, with proven technology that we already have, we can completely shift out of coal fire stationary energy by 2014.

Frederick Leboyer's [Birth Without Violence](#) describes a method of birth that minimises trauma in the newborn when they are first greeted into this world.

David Korten's *Agenda for a New Economy* outlines practical economic reforms that support the wellbeing of local communities.

In [Priority One, Chapter 5](#) Alan Yeomans offers a calculation to show that by instituting advanced techniques of building soil carbon around the world we could sequester enough CO<sub>2</sub> to bring us back from the edge of uncontrollable global warming.

---

### **Journals from Mary Ann Liebert**

[Sustainability: The Journal of Record](#), documents the implementation of sustainability programs in higher education and business, and provides the central forum for academic institutions, the business community, foundations, government agencies, and leaders of green-collar endeavors to learn about one another's progress and programs and foster collaborations for attaining mutually supportive objectives. To view the complete tables of content for *Sustainability: The Journal of Record*, [click here](#).

[Environmental Justice](#), edited by Sylvia Hood Washington, PhD, ND, MSE, MPH, explores the adverse and disparate environmental burden impacting marginalized populations and communities all over the world. To view the complete tables of content for *Environmental Justice*, [click here](#).

Articles in [Ecopsychology](#), edited by Thomas Joseph Doherty, PsyD, explore the relationship between environmental issues and mental health and well-being, and examine the psychological, spiritual, and therapeutic aspects of human-nature relationships, concern about environmental issues, and responsibility for protecting natural places and other species. To view the complete tables of content for *Ecopsychology*, [click here](#).

[Mary Ann Liebert, Inc.](#) is a privately held, fully integrated media company known for establishing authoritative peer-reviewed journals in many promising areas of science, medicine, biomedical research, and law, including *Industrial Biotechnology*, *Environmental Engineering Science*, and *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism*. Its biotechnology trade magazine, *Genetic Engineering & Biotechnology News* (GEN), was the first in its field and is today the industry's most widely read publication worldwide. A complete list of the firm's 60 journals, books, and newsmagazines is available at their [website](#).

---

### **Gorillas and humans**

Marcel Theunissen

Just compare this ([http://www.youtube.com/watch\\_popup?v=FZ-bJFVJ2P0](http://www.youtube.com/watch_popup?v=FZ-bJFVJ2P0)) with the average news we hear in the eight o'clock news about human behaviour on this planet. Makes you think what it actually means to 'behave like an animal'.

---

### **A game for kids**

*Fate of the World* is fun: an interactive computer game that educates kids about the environment:

"The year is 2020. Climate change has been ignored. Cities are underwater. People are starving. Nations brace for war. Species are dying. And you've got to solve the crisis. The fate of the world is in your hands."

Based on the research of Prof. Myles Allen at Oxford University, *Fate of the World* simulates the real social and environmental impact of global climate change over the next 200 years. The science, the politics, the destruction — it's all real, and it's scary.

Your mission: Solve the crisis. But, like life, it won't be easy. You'll have to work through natural disasters, foreign diplomacy, clandestine operations, technological breakthroughs, and somehow satisfy the food and energy needs of a growing world population. Will you help the planet or become an agent of destruction?

<http://fateoftheworld.net/>

---

### **See sea level rise**

<http://www.care2.com/causes/global-warming/blog/rising-sea-levels-threaten-island-nations/> photos from Kiribati, a small island nation that is being swallowed by sea level rise NOW.

---

### **SUBMISSION GUIDELINES**

Contributions need to be brief. Ideal is something to fit one page. I have reduced font size, so if it's all text, that's about 800 words. Pictures, tables etc. will reduce the word count. And shorter filler items are invaluable. I may shorten an article, or make minor line edits. Particularly valued are responses to this issue, and to recent issues before it. Content should be relevant in some way to psychology and the environment, using clear language. Anything inflammatory, discriminatory or libellous will be consigned to the deep.

The next issue is due out in November 2011. Deadline is 15th October, 2011.

Send contributions to bob at bobswriting.com.

Bob