# "Speak now or forever hold your peace ..." by Michelle Linklater

A fictional dialogue prepared for the subject STS300, "The environmental context," University of Wollongong, 2008

This essay is one of several outstanding STS300 essays available at http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/classes/STS300\_08topessays/

The STS300 subject outline, including requirements for this essay, is available at

http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/classes/STS300\_08outline.pdf

#### 3105088

# **Michelle Linklater**

## STS300 ESSAY

## Autumn Session 2008

# "Speak Now or Forever Hold Your Peace..."

*Miss Robertson*: Now class, today I'm going to tell you the story of how our oceans came to be the way they are today. Can you believe that they were once filled with *life*? We were once able to swim in its beautifully clean waters amongst weird and wonderful creatures such as these...

[*Miss Robertson displays images of whales, sharks and corals to her grade 6 class. The class responds – wide-eyed in disbelief*]

*Charlie*: No miss that's silly! If you swim in the ocean you'll get burnt. It's filled with acid, nothing could live in there!

*Miss Robertson*: I know may be hard to understand, but it's true. It all happened many years ago from the actions of a newly appointed president of the United States, a man named Frederick Morris. He was elected at a time of environmental revolution, where all nations had agreed to reduce emissions and signed what is known as the Kyoto Protocol - which bound them to their decision<sup>1</sup>. All countries had signed this agreement except one: America<sup>2</sup>.

Charlie: Did President Morris sign the agreement?

<sup>-</sup>America has not yet signed the Kyoto Protocol and has not expressed any intention to (Reynolds, P. 2001, *Kyoto: Why did the US pull out?*, accessed 10/05/08,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Kyoto Protocol was established in Japan, 11 December 1997 at the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and is an international agreement which sets binding targets on participating countries to reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions by a selected date (currently 2012). Under the protocol, participating countries would need to reduce emissions by 5% of 1990 levels by 2012. So far, 180 countries have ratified the protocol (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC) 2008, *Kyoto Protocol*, accessed 10/05/08, http://unfccc.int/kyoto\_protocol/items/2830.php).
<sup>2</sup>America has not yet signed the Kyoto Protocol and has not expressed any intention to (Reynolds, P.

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1248757.stm)

*Miss Robertson*: No Charlie, he in fact did the opposite. With production in all other countries bound by limitations, President Morris saw it as an opportunity to outcompete industries in these other countries, so he increased production to an obscene level.... though with great cost.....

\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### 80 years prior...

*Pres. Morris*: I will not tolerate your disrespect of my rulings any longer! You made the decision to publicly state your opinions, and by doing so you have allowed yourself to be subject to punishment. I made it quite clear – speak, act or even THINK against my principles and you will suffer the consequences! <sup>3</sup>

# [The cold bars of the prison cell door slams against the face of its horrified prisoner]

*David Suzuki*: How can I be punished for protecting our country? What was criminal about my behaviour? I merely spoke to a group of peers about the potential damage of this current system<sup>4</sup> – I have the right to speak my opinion! <sup>5</sup>

# [A small smile creeps into the concrete face of President Morris]

*Pres. Morris:* You have no rights. Since I gained my presidential position, there have been some slight.... *adjustments* to law and constitution.... Though do not worry, these new laws are quite easy to understand. You must simply follow my decisions

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Totalitarianism punishes people who act against the will of the Leader and his government through terroristic police force (Vetterli, R. and Fort, Jr. W.E. 1997, *The Essence of Totalitarianism*, University Press of America, Inc., New York) Its punishment extends not only those who do rebel, but also those who *might* rebel (Friedrich, C.J. 1964, *Totalitarianism*, The Universal Library, New York).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Suzuki was captured while lecturing to a group of people in protest of the current state of the government. Suzuki is a Canadian citizen, though he is speaking on behalf of American citizens as well as citizens from other countries.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> This is stated in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution (1971) which outlines "Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances" Wang, X. ND, "Freedom of Speech" in the United States Constitution, accessed 19/05/08, http://www.ovcf.org/perspectives/11\_043001/freedom.htm.

without question - any rebellion will result in punishment at my discretion<sup>6</sup>. You spoke against my policies to a large group of civilians, and for such an action I have punished you accordingly.

*David Suzuki*: By throwing me in JAIL?! A lifetime sentence is absolutely absurd! I had every reason to speak against your so-called policies. It is these policies that are going to drive this planet into catastrophe!

*Pres. Morris*: So, please, explain to me why I would listen to a radical such as yourself? Your socialist views do little for our economy. Do you sincerely believe that rather than seize an invaluable opportunity to progress as a nation, I should devote my time to preventing something that *may* or *may not* occur in the distant future<sup>7</sup>? Now, sir, <u>that</u> is absurd.

*David Suzuki*: You don't understand - there are dangers that you cannot foresee. It widely known that continued emissions *will* irreversibly harm the environment, the only unknown factor is the extent. The carbon dioxide that your factories are releasing can cause the oceans to acidify. Can you imagine the consequences of this? There would be mass species loss - the entire ecosystem would break down<sup>8</sup>.

Pres. Morris: Acidified oceans? I doubt that is possible from my contributions....

*David Suzuki*: Even only minor changes in acidity can disrupt the chemical equilibrium, preventing shell formation of many marine creatures. This may seem

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Morris has introduced a Martial Law System. Under a modern totalitarian system, a single party possesses complete control over all aspects of society. This is aided by technological advances, with surveillance and military force which are employed to control rebellion toward government (Vetterli, R. and Fort, Jr. W.E. 1997, *The Essence of Totalitarianism*, University Press of America, Inc., New York).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Morris is referring to the uncertainty of scientific thought regarding emissions and climate change (Fisher, E. Jones, J. and Schomberg, R. 2006, *Implementing the Precautionary Principle*, Edward Elgar Publishing, United Kingdom).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Acidified oceans occur from an increase of atmospheric carbon dioxide which is absorbed by the upper layers of the ocean water. Projections give a predicted decrease in pH of 0.14-0.35 within this century (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2007, *Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report; Summary for Policy-Makers*, accessed 11/05/08, http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4\_syr\_spm.pdf).

trivial, but this means plankton, an essential base of the food chain, would not be produced and there would be a ripple effect to all the ocean's inhabitants<sup>9</sup>.

*Pres. Morris:* You are basing your ideas on theories - models constructed to project future levels. There is debate amongst the scientific community and there are many doubts associated with the findings of the studies from which you are drawing from <sup>10</sup>. We have no way of proving if any of the predicted effects will eventuate, it is merely speculation.

*David Suzuki*: The studies may have an element of uncertainty, but they are supported by a wealth of data of which no one debates is valid. They know that up until now, the oceans have absorbed half of all the carbon dioxide we have emitted into the atmosphere and it's built up over centuries since the industrial revolution. Though, there is no way of knowing how long it will keep absorbing the gas<sup>11</sup>.

*Pres. Morris*: As you have said yourself, we have been polluting for centuries, so what difference can a few extra years make? Now would be considered an ideal time to continue with production as the rest of the world has dramatically decreased their levels, so our increased production merely balances out with decreases everywhere else<sup>12</sup>.

*David Suzuki*: You don't understand, we ALL need to reduce our levels before this damage occurs. It is predicted that within 100 years the effects could spread

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Ocean acidification reduces the saturation level of calcium carbonate and shifts the equilibrium to reduce its production of calcium carbonate shells. Carbonate shelled organisms, such as coral and plankton, are considered to be key species within the oceanic ecosystem (Orr, J.C., Fabry, V.J., Aumont, O., Bopp, L., Doney, S.C., Feely, R.A., Gnanadesikan, A., Gruber, N., Ishida, A., Joos, F., Key, R.M., Lindsay, K., Maier-Reimer, E., Matear, R., Monfray, P., Mouchet, A., Najjar, R.G., Plattner, G.K., Rodgers, K.B., Sabine, C.L., Sarmiento, J.L., Schlitzer, R., Slater, R.D., Totterdell, I.J., Weirig, M.F., Yamanaka, Y. and Yool, A. 2005, 'Anthropogenic ocean acidification over the twenty-first century and its impact on calcifying organisms', *Nature*, vol.437, no.29, pp.681-686).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Morris is referring to the scientific uncertainty that exists, and has been described by Fisher, E. Jones, J. and Schomberg, R. 2006, *Implementing the Precautionary Principle*, Edward Elgar Publishing, United Kingdom.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Due to the complexity and the interconnectedness of the Earth's systems, there are difficulties in predicting effects (Fisher, E. Jones, J. and Schomberg, R. 2006, *Implementing the Precautionary Principle*, Edward Elgar Publishing, United Kingdom).
 <sup>12</sup> Totalitarian systems takes complete control and direction of the nation's economy (Vetterli, R. and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Totalitarian systems takes complete control and direction of the nation's economy (Vetterli, R. and Fort, Jr. W.E. 1997, *The Essence of Totalitarianism*, University Press of America, Inc., New York)

throughout the entire Southern Ocean and sub-arctic Pacific Ocean<sup>13</sup>. Although the oceans are absorbing the pollution now, we do not know - is there a threshold we are reaching? What will happen if we breach it? These are things you must consider, you must think about the future. What sort of world will you be creating?

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

*Charlie*: Wait Miss, I don't understand..... How can the president do anything if he isn't sure its going to happen?

*Miss Robertson*: That's a good point Charlie. You've hit a key point in why people have trouble in deciding what to do about things that could happen in the future. To help you understand why it's important, I'll put it this way: How many of you know how to cross the road?

[A sea of hands rise up excitedly]

Charlie: I do! We look "left, right, then left again"

*Miss Robertson*: Good. Now what if there were no cars there, does that mean you didn't need to look?

Charlie: No, because there could have been a car there.

*Miss Robertson*: Exactly. There's a known risk of cars when you cross the road, just as there was known risk of damage to the oceans from pollution. Even if there was a chance it may not have happened, the president should have acknowledged the risk. Essentially, President Morris crossed the road without even looking.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Suzuki is referring to the projected spread of effects of calcium carbonate undersaturation as a result of acidification found in the study by Orr, J.C., Fabry, V.J., Aumont, O., Bopp, L., Doney, S.C., Feely, R.A., Gnanadesikan, A., Gruber, N., Ishida, A., Joos, F., Key, R.M., Lindsay, K., Maier-Reimer, E., Matear, R., Monfray, P., Mouchet, A., Najjar, R.G., Plattner, G.K., Rodgers, K.B., Sabine, C.L., Sarmiento, J.L., Schlitzer, R., Slater, R.D., Totterdell, I.J., Weirig, M.F., Yamanaka, Y. and Yool, A. 2005, 'Anthropogenic ocean acidification over the twenty-first century and its impact on calcifying organisms', *Nature*, vol.437, no.29, pp.681-686.

*David Suzuki*: Our oceans are in danger, and as an authority you must act with caution to prevent damage before it occurs. You have a responsibility as the leader of your country<sup>14</sup>.

*Pres. Morris*: I do not believe that we should spend money preventing something when scientific uncertainty persists<sup>15</sup>. As a leader I am acting in the best interests of this country. I am looking out for the economy.

*David Suzuki*: How can you lead a country if you are not concerned with its welfare? Society needs a voice, and they need to hold some power over their own lives and future. You are taking total control of the primary means of production, taking any control away from the people<sup>16</sup>. They have no choice - it's a complete violation of human rights to use military power against your own people!<sup>17</sup>

*Pres. Morris*: It was through the very democratic system already in place that I was able to do this. You see, a bill introduced by President Bush actually enabled me to use the military within America for one year <sup>18</sup>. I'm quite surprised myself, that I was *legally* able to use the defence force against my own people.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>The' responsibility' that Suzuki states is in reference to the Precautionary Principle, which was developed to prevent state bodies from using a lack of scientific evidence as a reason for not acting on matters which require attention. Its is outlined by Principle 15, Article 3.3 in the UN Conference on Environment and Climate Change (1992), in the Convention on Biological Diversity (1992) and Convention on Climate Change (1992), the Cartagena Protocol for Biosafety (2000), and outlined in various other documents (Fisher, E. Jones, J. and Schomberg, R. 2006, *Implementing the Precautionary Principle*, Edward Elgar Publishing, United Kingdom).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> The US government has publicly stated its disbelief in the Precautionary Principle, with government official John D. Graham, Bush Administration being quoted by the New York Times as calling it a "mythical concept, perhaps like a unicorn" (Sindico, F. ND, *Unravelling the Trade and Environment Debate through Sustainable Development Law Principles*, accessed 15/05/08, http://www.esil-sedi.eu/english/pdf/Sindico.PDF).

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Central to socialist beliefs is the abolition of private ownership of the main means of production, which in this case is the supply products and services through the burning of fossil fuels which generate power (Levine, A. 1984, *Arguing for Socialism*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston).
 <sup>17</sup> This violation of the rights of humans is outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> This violation of the rights of humans is outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) (Beder, S. 2006, *Environmental Principles and Policies, An Interdisciplinary Approach*, UNSW Press Ltd, Sydney).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> In 2006, under Bush administration, a \$500/50 billion, 591 page bill was developed which changed the "Insurrection Act" of 1807 into the "Enforcement of the Laws to Restore Public Order Act" as part of Section 1076 of the "Defense Authorisation Act". Under the previous act, the president was able to gain control of the military to use for internal purposes for 365 days in situations of violence and/or conspiracy. Alterations within the act involved the inclusion of "natural disaster, epidemic, or other serious public health emergency, terrorist attack or incident or other condition" (where 'other condition' was not specified) under the specifications required for military control (Bovard, J. 2008, *The Martial Law Act of 2006*, accessed 11/05/08, http://www.fff.org/freedom/fd0801c.asp).

# [Exasperated, Suzuki shakes his head with despair]

*David Suzuki*: I can't believe it. I can't believe what this has become. That goes against the very foundations of democracy<sup>19</sup>. It just isn't fair, people should be able to have a *say*! They should be included into processes that affect them- their lives shouldn't be at the whim of the government<sup>20</sup>.

*Pres. Morris*: Don't you see? The public agree with me, they love me. I have them eating out of my hands - I think it must be my charismatic charm....<sup>21</sup>

*David Suzuki*: They do not support you - they have been manipulated and controlled by yourself and your people! You have generated false reality, and those whose see through this and disagree with you are silenced! You have distorted public opinion so badly that people don't even know what's true anymore. They have been led to believe you are leading them to victory by domination over all other nations.<sup>22</sup>

Pres. Morris: That is exactly what I'm doing - I am leading them into victory.<sup>23</sup>

*David Suzuki*: No! You will not be 'dominating' you will be *destroying* all other societies! Your actions can affect everything, from entire nations to entire species. Worse still, not only will the consequences spread globally, but they will spread unevenly - Third World countries will be more exposed to damage, and delicate

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> The employment of military for law enforcement goes against the values of democracy (Bovard, J. 2008, *The Martial Law Act of 2006*, accessed 11/05/08, http://www.fff.org/freedom/fd0801c.asp)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> This is a core belief of socialism, which involves the even spread of goods, equal distribution of power without domination by specific bodies, and democracy in decision making processes (Levine, A. 1984, *Arguing for Socialism*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston). This right to participate is fundamental to almost every international environmental treaty and has been established since the World Charter for Nature in 1982 (Beder, S. 2006, *Environmental Principles and Policies, An Interdisciplinary Approach*, UNSW Press Ltd, Sydney).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Morris is capitalising on the image purposely projected by members of his party. The creation of a 'charismatic' persona is a technique often used by totalitarian governments to influence the public, as outlined by Schapiro, L. 1972, *Totalitarianism: Key Concepts in Political Science*, Pall Mall Press, London.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup>Propaganda is used by Totalitarian governments to elevate public support of the Leader and his ideals. Opponents to the Leader are terrorized and silenced through violent force (Schapiro, L. 1972, *Totalitarianism: Key Concepts in Political Science* Pall Mall Press London)

*Totalitarianism: Key Concepts in Political Science*, Pall Mall Press, London). <sup>23</sup>Under a totalitarian system, an official ideology is used to cement the ideas into the people's minds, and the ideology used must appeal to the basic instincts of the people (Schapiro, L. 1972,

*Totalitarianism: Key Concepts in Political Science*, Pall Mall Press, London). In this case, the ideology is that of progression and domination of society through increased production, and the instinct they have exploited is that of greed and power.

creatures such as corals will be more susceptible to changes - it is tragically unfair!<sup>24</sup>

*Pres. Morris*: There is no proof to such claims. Who are the victims? Give me their names! Ha! Your generalisations counteract your argument. You claim 'damage' but can not address any specifics<sup>25</sup>.

*David Suzuki*: I cannot be any more specific with the data. I cannot possibly tell you *who* will get affected, nor can I tell you exactly *how* or *when*, but I can tell you that it <u>will</u> happen. Even if we completely cease production, many of these effects would still occur <sup>26</sup>.

*Pres. Morris*: Well, until it is absolutely certain I will continue with production as planned<sup>27</sup>.

*David Suzuki*: Well you cannot continue for much longer. You may have been able to change American laws, but you still need to answer to international laws. The oceans are owned by everybody, as they rightfully should be, and you have no right to damage public property - you are bound by the Law of the Sea!<sup>28</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> The effects of ocean acidification will extend globally, with and uneven spread of impacts. The sensitivity of coral reefs mean they cannot survive if sea temperatures increase faster than 1.5°C, with no greater an increase than 0.05°C per decade. Third world countries are similarly vulnerable as they are not as equipped to mitigate problems (Fisher, E. Jones, J. and Schomberg, R. 2006, *Implementing the Precautionary Principle*, Edward Elgar Publishing, United Kingdom). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) outlines that we must "protect the vulnerable …..[from] being made to suffer under the self-interested politics of the powerful" (Beder, S. 2006, *Environmental Principles and Policies, An Interdisciplinary Approach*, UNSW Press Ltd, Sydney, pg.93).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> President Morris is utilising the 'unknown' factor involved in ocean acidification damages to avoid responsibility. Governments notoriously act faster when victims are able to be identified and when the relationship between cause and effect is clear, as outlined by Raffensperger, C. and Myers, N. 2001, *Democracy and the Precautionary Principle*, accessed 14/05/08,

http://www.mindfully.org/Precaution/Democracy-And-PP-SEHN.htm.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> It is believed that even if conditions were to be fixed today, temperatures would still increase due to the thermal inertia of oceans which cause a time delay in temperature changes (Fisher, E. Jones, J. and Schomberg, R. 2006, *Implementing the Precautionary Principle*, Edward Elgar Publishing, United Kingdom).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Authoritative bodies often use a lack of scientific uncertainty as a reason for inaction (Fisher, E. Jones, J. and Schomberg, R. 2006, *Implementing the Precautionary Principle*, Edward Elgar Publishing, United Kingdom).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> Suzuki is referring to 'The Law of the Sea' outlined in the UN Conference on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS I 1958, UNCLOS II 1960 and UNCLOS III 1973) which stated coastline countries only had jurisdiction on water 12 nautical miles off the land, and 200 nautical miles of Exclusive Economic Zone (United Nations, 2007, United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea - Agreement relating to the Implementation of Part XI,

 $http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention\_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm).$ 

*Pres. Morris*: Sir, you are mistaken. I am bound by no such guidelines since America hasn't signed this treaty. It's merely, a *moral* obligation, which clearly I've decided not to follow<sup>29</sup>.

# [Morris' chest inflates proudly, smug in his ability to surpass the law]

*David Suzuki*: But how can you continue to act against the environment when the risk is so great?

*Pres. Morris*: Because the risk of not acting is even greater. Our economy has been built on fossil fuels - without them we risk total collapse. The only way we could reduce greenhouse gases without harming the economy or workers would be to use natural gas instead, but there simply isn't enough of it available and there are no facilities to import it. Attempting to reduce emissions now would raise energy costs, burdening the community<sup>30</sup>.

**David Suzuki:** But there are alternatives, cleaner technology is available<sup>31</sup>.

*Pres. Morris*: The costs of future clean-energy are tremendous, at this point in time it just isn't feasible<sup>32</sup>. When the technology becomes more economically viable I would gladly accept it, but for now it just wouldn't be beneficial. People within the community understand this - they can see we are currently too reliant on natural resource use for energy production, and to suddenly cease operations would have too drastic of an effect on the economy<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> America has not yet committed to any of the UNCLOS treaties (United Nations, 2007, United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea - Agreement relating to the Implementation of Part XI http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention\_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> Morris is referencing claims made by Reynolds, P. 2001, *Kyoto: Why did the US pull out?*, accessed 10/05/08, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1248757.stm.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup>Technology such as wind power, solar power, hydropower (Reynolds, P. 2001, *Kyoto: Why did the US pull out?*, accessed 10/05/08, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1248757.stm).
 <sup>32</sup> Future energy infrastructure investments are estimated to be greater than \$US20 trillion between

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> Future energy infrastructure investments are estimated to be greater than \$US20 trillion between 2005-2030 by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2007, *Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report; Summary for Policy-Makers*, accessed 11/05/08, http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4\_syr\_spm.pdf.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> Information extracted from conversations with Jim Lando, Asset Manager, 08/05/08.

*David Suzuki*: What about the "carbon markets" that other countries are using for emissions trading? It's cost effective and it directs money to 'green' companies and helps countries reach their targets<sup>34</sup>.

*Pres. Morris*: The system hasn't been operating long enough to tell whether or not it's truly cost-effective. Besides, why should we reduce our emissions when developing countries aren't required to? Brazil is one of the biggest emitters and no one's asking them to do anything about it! At least our emissions are from areas that are helping the economy and providing jobs<sup>35</sup>.

**David Suzuki:** The proportion of Brazil's emissions to the US pales in comparison<sup>36</sup>. The United States is a developed country, by asking undeveloped countries to reduce their emissions would have a far worse effect - they need to *survive*, we only want to prosper.

*Pres. Morris*: Listen, your ideas are just too idealistic; this utopian<sup>37</sup> idea of society could never work in real life.

*David Suzuki*: It *can* work, and it would be so simple. People I have spoken to are eager to have their voice heard, they want to be a part of the decisions that affect them, and they have a right to be! <sup>38</sup>. There are options that would work, one person suggested a voting system where issues like adopting cleaner technologies should be voted on<sup>39</sup>.

*Pres. Morris*: Do you honestly believe that the vote of a professor should outweigh that of a lay person? Many people are uneducated and know nothing about politics,

<sup>35</sup> Brazil has been ranked in the top ten emitters of greenhouse gases, releasing 550million tonnes of greenhouse gases per year, primarily through the burning of Amazon forests (BBC News 2004, *Amazon fires raise CO2 threat*, accessed 15/05/08, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/3900919.stm).
 <sup>36</sup> Brazil is responsible for 1.4% of global emissions whereas the US accounts for 25% (Kirby, A. 2001,

Principles and Policies, An Interdisciplinary Approach, UNSW Press Ltd, Sydney.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> Targets outlined by United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC) 2008, *Kyoto Protocol*, accessed 10/05/08, http://unfccc.int/kyoto\_protocol/items/2830.php.

*US Blows Kyoto Hopes*, accessed 16/05/08, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/1247518.stm). <sup>37</sup> 'Utopian' and 'idealistic' are often negative terms used against socialism, and Morris is referring to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> This is known as the right to participate, and was described by Beder, S. 2006, *Environmental* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> This idea was drawn from conversations with Sandra Jennings, Nurse, 17/05/08.

and even those who may understand global warming, many are not aware that ocean acidification is a consequence of it. Clearly, democratic systems cannot provide the justice you seek<sup>40</sup>.

*David Suzuki*: But people ultimately want to help the environment<sup>41</sup>, they feel that since we've damaged it, we're responsible for fixing it. And if we provide them with information, they will be able to make educated decisions and their decisions would be more balanced and better reflect the values of *everybody*, and not a select few<sup>42</sup>. Things such as workshops and conferences could allow people a real chance to participate<sup>43</sup>. They're already in place overseas, and even in your own country - Massachusetts is using workshops to involve the public - and it's *working*. We just need more support from the government<sup>44</sup>.

*Pres. Morris*: It does not provide an answer. Socialism in action is my best argument against it: German National Socialism is <u>proof</u> that it can never function in reality - democracy would simply transform into a dictatorship<sup>45</sup>.

*David Suzuki*: How can you liken the socialism I speak of to history's Soviet socialism? Clearly your actions are a far more accurate reflection of that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> Democracy is believed to be ineffective in protecting the environment due to the influence of organisations (such as those vested into fossil fuel use e.g. oil companies, collieries), economic pressures, and voter majority and/or apathy (Raffensperger, C. and Myers, N. 2001, *Democracy and the Precautionary Principle*, accessed 14/05/08, http://www.mindfully.org/Precaution/Democracy-And-PP-SEHN.htm).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> Socialism is believed to address the 'true wants' of society, (Levine, A. 1984, *Arguing for Socialism*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> This is the expressed feeling of Sandra Jennings, interviewed 17/05/08. The opinions of a lay person may be more insightful as they are better able to view problems in a broad and balanced perspective, more adequately reflect human values, identify alternative and potential errors (Raffensperger, C. and Myers, N. 2001, *Democracy and the Precautionary Principle*, accessed 14/05/08, http://www.mindfully.org/Precaution/Democracy-And-PP-SEHN.htm).

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> Socialism in America is seen as the expansion and strengthening of democratic processes (Shalom, S.R. 1983, *Socialist Visions*, South End Press, Boston).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup> Europe and states within America are successfully using workshops to discuss matters and hear opinions from the community. Massachusetts has even developed the Massachusetts Precautionary Principle Project to address issues with the public (Raffensperger, C. and Myers, N. 2001, *Democracy and the Precautionary Principle*, accessed 14/05/08, http://www.mindfully.org/Precaution/Democracy-And-PP-SEHN.htm).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia have been used as a powerful arguments against the inadequacies of socialist performance in governments (Levine, A. 1984, *Arguing for Socialism*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston, & Friedrich, C.J. 1964, *Totalitarianism*, The Universal Library, New York).

system<sup>46</sup>. The current crisis of the environment can be used as evidence of the failure of the current system, and with only few examples of socialism rulings how can you even compare it to other systems? Socialism has not been given a decent chance, but it won't happen naturally, it needs government support to drive it into place<sup>47</sup>.

*Pres. Morris*: You have proved my point. People are incapable of organising themselves - they need to be led, and I shall lead them<sup>48</sup>.

*David Suzuki*: You yourself are not capable of leading. Your method of "leadership" involves disregarding human opinion, well researched facts, and basic instinct to protect oneself from future danger. Your responsibility lies with the people and the environment as a priority<sup>49</sup>.

*Pres. Morris*: On the contrary, I am avoiding the future danger of economic downfall at the sacrifice of the *possibility* of long term problems.

*David Suzuki*: Your policies completely disregard human rights, environmental rights and the rights of future generations. You are thinking only of the current economy! You should be jailed yourself for ignoring science! <sup>50</sup>

*Pres. Morris*: Hmm...Well, you have changed my mind and convinced me of one thing. Guards! Take this prisoner to the Western Quarters - he has now been sentenced to death!

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> The term 'totalitarianism' is often used in references to the Soviet Union, Fascist Italy and the Nationalist Socialist Germany (Schapiro, L. 1972, *Totalitarianism: Key Concepts in Political Science*, Pall Mall Press, London).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> The socialist ideology is believed to require intentional introduction as it is not thought to be a system that can naturally evolve (Schapiro, L. 1972, *Totalitarianism: Key Concepts in Political Science*, Pall Mall Press, London).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> Leadership is fundamental to the totalitarian regime. The leader is supported by the ideology and together they act as a force used to overcome resistance Schapiro, L. 1972, *Totalitarianism: Key Concepts in Political Science*, Pall Mall Press, London).

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> Where scientific uncertainty exists in a matter that threatens adverse effects, priorities of risk management are to be given on human health and the environment (Fisher, E. Jones, J. and Schomberg, R. 2006, *Implementing the Precautionary Principle*, Edward Elgar Publishing, United Kingdom).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> Suzuki has actually been quoted saying words to this effect: "What I would challenge you to do is to put a lot of effort into trying to see whether there's a legal way of throwing our so-called leaders into jail because what they're doing is a criminal act". In these comments, Suzuki is not advocating the true jailing of politicians, rather he is trying to make a statement of the severity and apparent criminality of their actions (Offman, C. 2008, Jail Politicians who Ignore Science: Suzuki, accessed 20/05/08, http://www.nationalpost.com/news/story.html?id=290513).