Australia has, this month, recorded a population of 20 million human beings. It remains a country with an exceedingly low population density. Australia is one of the driest continents in the world. Three levels of government – federal, State and Territory, and local, look after its political interests. While local government has considerable responsibility for society and the environment (eg policing, development approvals, licensing of business activities such as pollution permits, etc.), the federal government sets the national agenda.

In November 2003 a new Leader was chosen for the federal Opposition Labor party - the Honourable Mark Latham. The Liberal Coalition has been in government since 1996, headed by the Honourable John Howard. The next federal election is expected in 2004. The Australian Democrats represents a third force in federal politics. Others include the ‘One Nation’ party and a small group of independent members of Parliament.

Opinions expressed below reflect some of the recent, diverse views about the environment and society that are likely to be played out over the next few years in Australia at the federal level.

First, a comment on the current federal Liberal Coalition policies is expressed by Susan Brown, a former conservation council co-ordinator and environment adviser to Australian Democrats leaders Cheryl Kernot and Meg Lees – both of who have since left the party.

Second, is an edited extract from an insightful speech by Clive Hamilton to the National Left ALP/Trade Unions Conference at the Humanities research Centre, ANU, Canberra, 11 May 2002.

Third, comes a solid reply to Hamilton’s challenge by the, now, new leader of the Labor opposition, Mark Latham.

This is followed by a plea for control of media concentration made last month in Parliament by Kelvin Thompson - as reported in the daily Hansard. He feels that the media are too powerful and ignore environmental issues to follow their own agenda.
Finally, an alternative perspective on media concentration and the environment is provided by the Canadian Institutes for Journalism and Natural Resources.

How a blue-blood Liberal government has quietly adapted to greenie ways,
By Susan Brown, Australian Democrats.

No one expected a green-tinged Liberal Party under John Howard. Not the public, which assured most pollsters before the 1996 election that it trusted the Australian Democrats and Australian Labor Party more on the environment. Certainly not conservation groups, which play footsy with conservatives only when they want to teach the ALP [Australian Labor Party] a lesson. And not the Liberals, with a membership then uninterested in the environment and a policy platform tending to the minimalist.

But this month the Howard government agreed to start pulling environmental flow back to the Murray-Darling rivers. It is the latest in unexpected big-ticket environmental moves by the Liberals. Cabinet has also moved towards protecting one-third of the Great Barrier Reef.

A muted press release merely announced structural adjustment for the fishing industry, despite Environment Minister David Kemp getting one hell of a cabinet win. Liberal environment ministers aren’t allowed to gloat because it salts the wounds of an already outraged National Party and annoys some industry groups. Yet the record shows a Liberal government that has done more for the environment than any government.

These Liberals are accidental greenies. They knew whatever they did, they would never be accepted by some of the main conservation groups which, despite their rhetoric, cannot deal ideologically with conservative governments. But they headed up a country rapidly outspending its environmental bank account. In a green-tinged Senate, big political packages came with an environmental price tag.

Governance for the environment is difficult in Australia. The legacy of the floundering fathers’ Constitution of federated states means states have control of water and much of the land. There are many environmental examples of state-federal bunfights paralysed by competitiveness, politics and finger-pointing.

The ALP-established environment policy under Gough Whitlam and Malcolm Fraser followed the trend. But by the Hawke-Keating years, well-organised industry and some union groups were able to threaten greenish cabinet ministers intent on wider reform. They effectively turned federal ALP environment policy into bone-throwing events - a new park here, an inquiry there.

On ascension in 1996, the Liberals expected to go no further than the $1billion Natural Heritage Trust, a clever political ploy designed to buy votes for the part sale of Telstra [a national telecommunications company]. But a GST and diesel deal for the Democrats included a fat $1.2 billion environment package in new and changed spending directed to clean air and greenhouse initiatives.

The government was mildly surprised to note it was the biggest single amount given over to the environment. Perhaps it could deal with this bothersome portfolio after all. In the next deal with the Democrats, the Liberals achieved a complete overhaul of
federal environmental legislation, giving sweeping new powers to the environment minister, and giving the community and conservation groups the right to be informed, to question and to go to court over decisions. States, industry and farming groups were furious. But the environment announcements kept coming.

Nearly $2 billion more for the National Heritage Trust, $1.4 billion for the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality, $500 million for the Living Murray plan and hundreds of millions of dollars more for oceans, sustainable cities, water quality, land and marine reserve areas, and so on. There is even $150 million for Queensland land clearing should the Nationals stop helping farmers spoil the process with the same enthusiasm they are spoiling much of the land.

The Liberals got over their green shudder by placing environment under the trendy moniker, an aspirational issue. Not everyone wants a week in the wilderness but they like to know it's there. They want clean water in the rivers, fish in the sea and control over the bulldozers. The government knows investors and insurers are telling business that unless sustainability is up at board level, companies are taking considerable risks in the medium-to-long term.

Despite low-profile announcements, the message is getting through. Although for much of the past decade the Liberals have lagged behind Labor in polling on the environment, recent polls show the main parties level-pegging, sometimes with the Liberals in front.

Mind you, the Liberals haven't given up their day job: keeping the big end of town happy. The Howard government still refuses to sign the Kyoto Protocol, facilitates uranium mines and brings in wider fossil-fuel subsidies. Some of the government's environment spending has been slow or off-target and it slashed environment group funding. And environmental problems continue to worsen. The State of the Environment report shows we are not moving fast enough to overtake the rapid decline in natural ecosystems.

Still, it's hard to argue there hasn't been increased environmental spending, increased federal protection for more of Australia and more environment laws passed under this government. And it will keep coming. There is no guarantee the rest of Telstra will be sold but you can bet full privatisation would come with a hefty environmental price.

The forests issue is re-emerging. The campaigners are not just ferals but also the fed-up middle class - and they are gaining increasing media coverage. Clearly, the ALP will have to work much harder than it imagined. Tories as greenies?


Since the early 1980s, many of us have been searching for a coherent alternative to neoliberalism, for a way of reinventing social democracy in an era of global consumer capitalism. We have failed miserably. The left has been wandering in the wilderness,
mouthing the old slogans to a world that is no longer interested, distraught at its irrelevance, but not knowing where to turn.

The vacuum has been filled by the pallid apologetics of the so-called Third Way - Thatcherism with a human face. The Third Way is the way that no-one can define, a program in search of a rationale, a social analysis in which conflict is conveniently replaced by complexity, and in which any talk of power is taboo.

Around the world, we have seen the parties of the left transformed into their opposite, with the spin doctor elbowing out the policy advisor. They have increasingly become parties for politicians who are not sure what they stand for but which employ advertising agencies to convince us that they stand for something. The Third Way is essential to the new dispensation of political convergence in which the historic battle of ideologies has been superseded by product differentiation. The left itself is responsible for this state of affairs. It remains wedded to a view of the social order defined by class, exploitation and inequality. Difficult as it may be to admit, social democrats and democratic socialists have a psychological predisposition to believe that the mass of people are suffering from material deprivation. We thrive on the imagined wretchedness of others. When the economy goes bad we feel secretly vindicated, for our reason to condemn the system is renewed.

But we must face up to the facts – the left’s "deprivation model" is today the opposite of the truth. The dominant characteristic of contemporary Australia is not deprivation but abundance.

By any standard Australia is an enormously wealthy country. The great majority of its citizens want for nothing. In 1950, average real incomes were around $9,000; today they are more than $30,000. Average households today are filled with big-screen TVs and DVDs. When we overfly the suburban expanses of Sydney, we see backyards dotted with swimming pools. It is nothing for an average parent to spend $1,000 on a present for a child or to buy them a personal mobile phone. Ordinary families happily shell out $40,000 for a four-wheel drive play-thing and gamble away a few thousand dollars each year merely for entertainment. They avail themselves of sophisticated healthcare when it’s needed. Almost everyone has access to good quality primary and secondary education.

In real terms, Australians today are at least three times better off than their parents were after the war, and the fact is that the distribution of income is about the same. Of course, there is a residual at the bottom who are struggling. We still have poverty (and, let’s face it, we probably always will). As a society we have an obligation to attempt ceaselessly to eradicate it. But why does the left continue to base its entire social philosophy and political strategy on the circumstances of the bottom 10 or 20 per cent? Concern for the underprivileged should not provide the driving force for a politics of social change in a society where the daily experience of the great majority is occupied not with how to pay the bills but with how to enjoy their unprecedented wealth.

The model of society where the dominant social evil is want has been rendered irrelevant by five decades of sustained economic growth. It might be argued that the left is concerned not with material wealth but with exploitation. But it is impossible today to argue that the mass of people in industrialised countries is exploited, at least not in the way the left has
traditionally understood the term. Both the structure and nature of classes are fundamentally different. Liberation itself has not been denied but co-opted by consumer capitalism.

Modern consumer capitalism is wracked by a great contradiction – that between the promise of consumer capitalism and the modern social condition. Despite the fantastic promises of material progress, and the extraordinary success of capitalism in delivering undreamt of wealth for ordinary people, the people are still not happy.

In the USA, where consistent surveys have been conducted since 1946, real incomes have increased by 400 per cent, yet there has been no increase in reported levels of well-being. Indeed, the proportion of Americans reporting themselves to be ‘very happy’ has declined from 35 per cent in 1957 to 30 per cent in 1988, while the percentage who said they agreed with the statement that they are ‘pretty well satisfied with your financial situation’ fell from 42 to 30 per cent.

The story is the same in Australia. The growth project has failed; but it is too threatening for people to admit it. In the USA, there is virtually no difference in reported levels of life satisfaction between people with incomes of $20,000 and $80,000. Overall, over half of the population of the richest country in the world say they cannot afford everything that they really need. And it’s not just the poorer half.

The pursuit of wealth is not making us any happier. It is not simply that other trends in society, occurring in parallel with rising incomes, have offset the benefits of wealth; the process of economic growth itself has produced a seriously sick society. In a mass of evidence from the USA, mirrored by studies in Australia and other rich countries, the richest people in the world are saying that they are miserable, that it’s not worth it, and, most disturbingly of all, that the process of getting rich is the cause of the problems.

So the issues for the left today are not those of exploitation, poverty and discrimination. At the dawn of the 21st century, the sicknesses we face are overwhelmingly the sicknesses of affluence. We see epidemics of the diseases of boredom and alienation, especially gambling, television catatonia and recreational shopping.

We see an epidemic of drug use, both legal and illegal. Our response to unruly children is to drug them into submission with Ritalin.

For all of the hype, the information superhighway is principally a conduit for pornography, and there is an insatiable demand for soft-core titillation on television and video.

Moreover, at a time of unprecedented levels of personal wealth, citizens of rich countries are afflicted with an epidemic of psychological disorders. According to one study, depression has increased ten-fold among Americans born since World War II.

Young people, the principal beneficiaries of super-affluence, are most prone to clinical depression, manifested in record rates of teenage suicide and other social pathologies such as self-destructive drug taking.

Today, our greatest afflictions are associated not with deprivation but with over-consumption. We are gorging ourselves and growing fat. The volume of waste we generate is enormous. We discard and destroy vast quantities of useful goods. Driven to consume more and more, we are willing to pour our wastes into the atmosphere, oceans and landfills, causing
severe damage to the natural world that sustains us.

In the age of global consumer capitalism then, the defining predicament is not a lack of money, but a lack of meaning. From a mass of psychological studies, confirmed by folk wisdom, there is one factor that stands out as differentiating more happy from less happy people— a sense of meaning and purpose in life.

Yet a lack of purpose is the hollow centre of life in modern consumer capitalism. It is the hole we try to fill with consumption. As long as we cleave to the deprivation model we validate the belief in the general populace that the foremost means to social and personal betterment is continuously to raise incomes. The left reinforces the belief by those in government, of whatever party, that everything must be sacrificed on the altar of economic growth. In the interests of more growth we must have privatisation, free trade, small government, lower taxes, corporate welfare, competition policy and reduced welfare payments. We cannot adopt policies of sustainability because they might affect growth.

The left is as much the slave of growth fetishism as the right. The deprivation model draws the power from progressive people, not only because it means they share the fundamental goal of neo-liberalism but, crucially, because it prevents the left from joining with the most serious political and intellectual challenge to consumer capitalism: environmentalism. It explains the uneasy dissonance between the left’s preoccupation with deprivation and environmentalists’ emphasis on the perils of abundance. Put crudely, one wants more growth and one wants less.

The political implications of all of this are profound. The left must discard its old understanding of the world. We must accept that capitalism has moved to a phase of abundance broadly spread. We must focus on the things that really do affect the well-being of ordinary people and the processes that condition society. For despite its extraordinary successes, and at a time of complete political hegemony, capitalism is more fragile than it has ever been. Why? With more wealth at their disposal than ever before, most people could simply choose not to participate, to no longer notice the advertisements, to step off the materialist treadmill, to discard the DVD player, the second house, the luxury car, the holidays abroad, the meaningless acquisitions. To do so would not mean taking to the barricades, or putting themselves on the breadline.

All it takes is a recognition that personal contentment is more important than money, and that it is possible to find a purpose in life that is fulfilling and self-expressive. If ordinary people today are exploited, then it is by common consent. They choose the gilded cage. We need a politics that will point out that the door of the gilded cage is open, so that ordinary people can achieve liberation and authentic lives in which community and relationships are valued above wealth and status. We need a politics for a society in which the citizens are committed to a rich life rather than a life of riches.

A post-growth politics would deprive capital of much of its political power, because people would everywhere reject the assumption that everything— including our communities, the natural world and our dignity— should be sacrificed on the altar of growth.
Clive Hamilton is Executive Director of The Australia Institute. The Australia Institute is an independent public policy research centre funded by grants from philanthropic trusts, memberships and commissioned research.

Many thanks to the editor of Online Opinion and to the author for permission to reproduce.

Let them eat lentils,
by Mark Latham, Leader of the Opposition, Parliament of Australia

Question: which Australian think tank recently declared that, "the issues of the Left today are not those of exploitation, poverty and discrimination?"

If you are thinking of the neo-liberal IPA or HR Nicholls Society, think again. These are the words of Clive Hamilton from the Australia Institute in a speech to Left-wing union officials in Canberra.

I cannot imagine Left-of-Centre politics in this country without a passionate commitment to the elimination of poverty and discrimination. Indeed, this should be a unifying theme on our side of politics. Unless we win the war against poverty our hopes for social justice will be just a pipedream.

The Hamilton thesis, in fact, reveals the poverty of Green Left thinking. His argument is riddled with confusion and contradictions.

Hamilton claims to be an opponent of Third Way politics, yet his paper mimics the chief concern of the Third Way – the disconnection between GDP growth and human happiness. This is the central paradox of modern capitalism. We live in a society with record levels of financial capital but declining levels of social capital.

Hamilton has identified an important issue but advocated the wrong solution. The deterioration in social capital should not be used as an excuse for giving up on the problems of social disadvantage. Far from it, these two goals are highly compatible. Only by creating stronger communities, where people trust in each other and work together cooperatively, can we hope to address the problems of poverty and discrimination.

Instead of repairing social capital at its core through community-building initiatives, Hamilton advocates an extreme, anti-materialist agenda. In his world, working families should be able to "step off the materialist treadmill, to discard the DVD player, the second house, the luxury car, the holidays abroad, the meaningless acquisitions."

If only this were true. In the real world, economic insecurity and poverty remain. The purpose of Left-wing politics must be to ensure that all Australians can access material goods – economic assets, decent incomes and the comforts of the consumer age.

This highlights the burning contradiction in Hamilton’s agenda. He wants working class people to hold middle class, environmental values without the benefits of middle class incomes and assets.

This is the ultimate betrayal of the Green Left: post-materialist basket weaving for gentrified inner-city types like Hamilton, while those of us in the suburbs should simply forget about the public housing
estates nearby, with their 40 percent unemployment rates and 80 percent welfare dependency. "Let them eat lentils" is the Hamilton mantra.

In practice, the first challenge for Left-of-Centre politics is to re-engage the public in a dialogue about a good society. During a time of constant change and uncertainty, most people now glaze over at the thought of "big picture" politics. Their primary interests are at a neighbourhood level – the small nuggets of public policy that can improve local schools, clean up the streets and rebuild a sense of community and place.

In the era of globalisation, the politics of community matters more, not less. It is in this local realm that people first learn the habits of trust and cooperation. If this inner core of social capital is weak then people are unlikely to meet the broader challenges of social justice.

Globalisation is calling on society to trust in strangers, to understand the needs of people we are never likely to know or to meet first-hand. At the moment, Australians are struggling to trust in asylum seekers, the Third World poor and even our own indigenous communities. This represents a major breakdown in the strategies and engagement of the Left.

For whatever reason, Left-wing politics in Australia has lacked a strong tradition of mutualism and community-building. It has relied heavily on state-led strategies and neglected the importance of neighbourhood politics. As the Left now seeks to redefine itself and cope with a new politics, it must overcome this deficiency.

A solution lies in communitarianism – governments facilitating the rules of community engagement, acting as brokers in the relationships and connections between

people. This is a vital strategy for combating individualism and restoring social capital.

Ultimately, the choice between government bureaucracies and market forces is flawed. It neglects the space in the middle where people come together in voluntary action. It ignores the mutual interests and associations that make up civil society.

The new role for government is to create the space and opportunities within which neighbourhood politics can thrive. Communities should not be campaigning for better services. They should be running them.

Answers are available for Left-of-Centre politics. If we are to create a good society, it must come from the inside out. With a solid, inner core of trust and cooperation, we can then rid our society of the curse of poverty and discrimination.

Hamilton can keep his wickerwork and rabbit food. I’ll stick with economic and social justice as frontline issues for the Labor Party.

Many thanks to the editor of Online Opinion and to the author for permission to reproduce.

Media’s Role in Promoting Environmental Issues is Lacking!
comments made by Kelvin Thompson, Labor Member.

The following extract is taken from Hansard, the House of Representatives, Parliament of Australia, 1 December 2003, p.23052 ff. during a discussion of media power and how the current federal
government is helping to increase the powers of media organizations. Environmental issues, it seems, are just not newsworthy….when money and power are at stake.

Mr KELVIN THOMSON (Member of Parliament for Wills – Australian Labor Party) (6.26 p.m.) — I was not going to speak on the Broadcasting Services Amendment (Media Ownership) Bill 2002 [No. 2] but the dramatic political events of the last few days [Ed. The standing down of the previous Labor leader, Simon Crean, and election of a new leader, Mark Latham, in the federal Parliament] have caused me to decide that I ought to speak up and tell a few home truths to that small, hardy political band out there who listen to the broadcasts of parliament. Generally, most of us remain silent about the issue of media concentration in this country. I think those of us in politics do so sometimes out of fear or out of the hope of political advancement but, from my point of view, it is time that I stated some of the things that I have learnt in my 15 years in state and federal parliaments about this issue of media ownership and concentration….

My personal experience, having put out what must amount to hundreds of press releases during the past couple of years in my environment portfolio, has been that the commercial media take no interest in these press releases at all, yet I field any number of calls and requests for interview on the question of leadership of the federal parliamentary Labor Party. The media has used that question as a means of undermining and attacking the federal Labor Party.

We have taken a position of principle on this bill. Occasionally people say that the Labor Party fail to take positions of principle. That is not correct; we have taken a position of principle on this bill—and, indeed, we are paying a price for it. I will talk a little further about the sort of price you pay in these circumstances. In my own portfolio area, we release policies but none of the commercial media take the slightest interest in them. Given that polling frequently shows that the environment rates in third place in issues of public concern behind only health and education—that is, it is the third-largest issue of public concern—you would think that perhaps the views of the federal parliamentary Labor Party were worth mentioning. We have been putting those views forward. Whether it is on land clearing, climate change, water for the Murray River or protecting the Great Barrier Reef, we have been putting policies forward. But the commercial TV stations and newspapers never touch federal Labor’s positions.

We have an environment reporter for the Australian [Ed. A national daily newspaper], Amanda Hodge, who would sooner die than publish anything concerning federal Labor’s position on these issues. The Age [Ed. A daily newspaper in the State of Victoria] is about the same: Point Nepean is an issue that the Age has pursued with some vigour but there was not a word about things like the visit by Simon Crean to Point Nepean and his declaration that federal Labor would hand over that land to Victoria to be incorporated in the national park. [Ed. Point Nepean is an area of land in the hands of the federal Department of Defence, which was made available for a 50 year lease, which community groups worried would be a form of private ownership, reducing public access and opening the site to development as State planning laws would not apply. The Victorian government (a Labor government) wishes to have the area made into a national park, (see The Age]
http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2003/08/25/1061663734217.html?from=storyrhs, accessed on 8 December 2003]. There was not a word about the private member’s bill which I introduced into the House to transfer Point Nepean to the Victorian government to be used as a national park. Any commercial reporting of them, the issues they raise or what they say about Labor policy. We have a commercial media whose intention is to keep marginalising Labor until we capitulate on this bill. They want this bill through because it means more power to them and more money in the bank.

I do not know how to solve the problem of the way the commercial media uses its political power to seek commercial objectives but I do know that we cannot capitulate. We cannot support this bill. It would be a betrayal of political principle for political expediency, and we cannot expect our supporters to support us on that basis. Furthermore, if we say yes now, the media barons will just get even more powerful and it will become even harder to say no to them the next time around.

I just hope that maybe there are a few ordinary Australians out there who are interested in and thinking about this issue and who will demand that the Howard government withdraws this bill and backs off—some people out there who will demand that we keep some media concentration laws in place and that we make an effort to protect media diversity. Ultimately the health of our democracy depends on it.

A CANADIAN SOLUTION TO MEDIA POWER AND THE ENVIRONMENT?

One way to overcome this lack of media interest in environmental press statements has been suggested in Canada, by the Institutes for Journalism and Natural Resources (IJNR) (Matching the Scenery: Journalism's Duty to the American West, August 2003, IJNR). Since 1995, IJNR has been helping to increase the competence of individual journalists all across North America - the reporters, assignment editors, bureau chiefs, story editors and newsroom managers who determine, shape and produce coverage of natural resources, economic development, population growth and environment. Criteria for reporting that were shaped by the Board of Governors of IJNR's Wallace Stegner Initiative include:

- **Accuracy and Clarity**
  Reporting clearly, factually and without serious omissions about events, trends and issues of growth, development and the environment.

- **Significance and Relevance**
  Choosing to emphasize those events, trends and issues that clearly stand out as significant and relevant to the community and the region.

- **Frequency and Persistence**
  Examining regularly and often the significant and relevant events, trends and issues of growth, development and the environment. Making a sustained effort to pursue this coverage as important stories continue to evolve.

- **Prominence and Proportionality**
  Demonstrating consistently sound judgment by reporting and displaying stories about growth, development and the environment in proportion to their significance and relevance. Refraining from sensational or trivial treatments of trends and issues.
Credibility and Context
Providing a consistent and credible range of viewpoints in coverage of growth, development and the environment. Incorporating sufficient context in coverage, thus helping audiences to increase their awareness and to reach responsible conclusions.

According to the Canadian Institute for Business and the Environment (Vol. 8, No. 9, December 1, 2003) [Colin Issacs, Editor], a recent report on journalism’s duty to the North American West states that the current performance of most daily newspapers with respect to reporting on growth, development and the environment “needs to improve a lot”. That is the assessment of a well qualified Montana-based journalism education foundation, Institutes for Journalism and Natural Resources, about newspapers in an area where at least some newspapers actually try to cover environment in an informative way.

Some fifteen or so years ago one of Canada’s national newspapers decided that it was wrong to have a specialist environment reporter on staff. As I understand it, the argument was that a specialist reporter may develop a bias which may detract from his or her ability to write a balanced story. A generalist reporter, on the other hand, was supposed to be less inclined to bias, reporting only on the information provided by the various parties to the news story. Today most papers seem to have followed this lead: there are virtually no specialist environment reporters in any of Canada’s print or electronic media.

The theory behind abolition of the specialist environment reporter position superficially appears to have merit but in fact ignores the complexity of environmental reporting. When industry, government or an environmental group puts out a press release on a topic, let’s say PCBs, they do not provide an entire description of what PCBs are, where they come from, and in what way they are harmful to humans and the environment. A press release is normally no longer than a page or two, far short of the whole book needed to educate the general reporter on the background of PCBs and their particular form of adverse environmental impact. The deadline pressure on journalists to write stories for publication makes it impossible for the general reporter to research a topic like PCBs in any depth, so the story becomes one about the confrontation rather than a much more informative and useful one about the effects of the PCBs and what industry, government and environmental groups are doing to eliminate their release. Increasingly the public sees environmental issues as being about battles between industry or government and environmentalists rather than about the transition to a more environmentally responsible society.

The IJNR report addresses these concerns in a well-researched manner. It recommends that there should be specialist environment and development reporters, it recommends increasing training for environmental reporters, and it urges newspapers to take more risks by exploring and testing other formats and approaches to gathering and telling complicated stories about growth, development and the environment. These conclusions are extremely relevant not just in the west but across North America. IJNR urge all those interested in the media, and particularly those who are newspaper publishers, to give this report the very serious consideration that it deserves.

Content analysts take note!