

## GLOBAL GREEN POLITICS

Gert Bastian and I are very happy to be here at the Ecopolitics Conference of the University of Adelaide and we thank especially John Young, the conference convenor. We thank also the Centre for Environmental Studies for their generous hospitality. We are all the more happy to be here because our very close Australian friends, Bob Brown, Dr. Helen Caldicott, Jack Munday, and many others are with us. All of them are very close friends of the Greens in Europe and they are a great source of inspiration for all of us in the ecological movements across the world.

I must use this opportunity to correct a few unfortunate misunderstandings, especially with the newspaper *The Australian*. For several days I have been reported as saying that I labeled Prime Minister Bob Hawke a "fraud" or as "faking concern" for the environment. The reporter for *The Australian* never spoke personally with me. Those who attended the press conference of Gert Bastian and me will know that I do not use such words as "fraud" or "faking." That would not be any way in which to attempt to encourage anyone into a dialogue and it is not my way of speaking. I do not lessen my criticism of the policies of the Australian Labor Party (ALP) and of the various decisions made by it up to now, but I did not present my criticism in the way *The Australian* reported it!

---

*Ecopolitics Conference, University of Adelaide, Australia, September 21-24, 1989.*

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

These newspaper reports led to further breakdown in communication. Yesterday Environment Minister Graham Richardson stated that I labeled Mr. Hawke's record as "posturing" (a term I did not use) and noted that on the contrary the Green Party "was full of praise for Bob Hawke's efforts, particularly in relation to a Wilderness Park in the Antarctic when Bob Hawke visited Germany earlier this year." Here again let me set the record straight. It was not the German Green Party, but precisely Gert Bastian and I who gave Bob Hawke a personal Open Letter in Bonn on June 27, 1989, raising a number of environmental concerns but at the same time welcoming and supporting his move to establish a Wilderness World Park in the Antarctic. We expressed our personal hope in the letter that Bob Hawke would receive support from our Kohl government and other European governments. This was also the nature of our statement during our press conference here in Adelaide. I hope that Minister Richardson will take note of our Open Letter of June 27, 1989, to Bob Hawke, which was reported at that time in Australian newspapers!

It is quite sad that the media cannot differentiate and often substitutes dramatic headlines for in-depth reporting. In his speech Mr. Richardson criticized terms I had used to describe Mr. Hawke, but I did not use those terms.

This morning I read in a newspaper that Mr. Richardson found my remarks on Australia's commitment to uranium mining "ill-founded." I do not believe that they were ill-founded because yesterday evening I heard directly the positions of the Labor and Liberal Parties on uranium mining and uranium export. I was, just like Dr. Helen Caldicott, shocked and saddened. The Environment Minister stated that the Australian uranium mining industry was unlikely to expand after 1991. Gert Bastian and I not only questioned and criticized the possible future expansion of uranium mining, but we also criticized that there is not a total phase-out of uranium mining and exports right now! I believe the Labor Party reviewed its uranium policy up

to May 1989 and that the public response was overwhelmingly negative, with 90 percent of the submissions opposing uranium mining in Australia. The right wing of the ALP has reopened this debate and I hear that there is a desire to increase the number of mines. We are just as worried that German mining companies will continue to demand Australian uranium--all this while radiation deaths increase around Chernobyl, while children around Sellafield die of cancer and leukemia at alarming rates, and while France continues to test atomic bombs in the Pacific!

How anyone in the Labor and Liberal Parties can speak about "effective" Australian safeguards is beyond my understanding, because of the history of loopholes since the German Nukem/Alkem scandals--this is embarrassing enough. The argument that nuclear power can help solve the greenhouse effect is also invalid. Effective energy conservation is one of the best answers! Everywhere countries are beginning to cancel orders for new nuclear power plants because corruption and bad economics are causing the nuclear industry to begin a retreat. The Federal Republic of Germany has just cancelled its most prestigious nuclear project, the Nuclear Reprocessing Plant in Wackersdorf, for economic reasons.

Australia could lead the movement out of the "nuclear power phobia" by deciding to keep its uranium in the ground! Mr. Richardson stated that mining on Kakadu National Park's Coronation Hill should not be approved until the impact of further proposals affecting the park are considered. But why not declare clearly and simply that no mining at all will take place in Kakadu National Park?

Please let me not bore you with further corrections, but let me add one last urgent one regarding our statements concerning the proposed weapons range that stretches from Woomera Rocket Base in the East to Maralinga in the West. We stated our fears that foreign air forces as well as the Australian air force and arms companies will fire rockets, missiles, and other war materials on this range. A spokesman for Prime Minister Hawke

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

dismissed our claims as "non-sense." Yet in the very same newspaper (*Advertiser*, September 20, 1989) the Premier Mr. John Bannon stated that "it is expected that this open-air laboratory will cater for both civil and defence aerospace requirements well into the 21st century." Yet Mr. Bannon's spokesperson also stated in the same paper: "It has never been suggested by this or the Federal Government that there will be any testing of hostile weaponry on this range. . . . The Woomera Range Redevelopment Programme will be used primarily for civil purposes, including radar." I ask you, is there a difference between hostile and non-hostile weaponry? Are not all weapons and all weapon materials hostile to life? Hostile to the present age of new thinking--for example the disarmament thinking that is going on in Poland, Hungary, and the Soviet Union?

We ask, why will there be a commercialisation of the former Woomera Range? Why are international media reports not corrected or challenged when they speak of Defense Minister Kim Beazley and the South Australian government wanting to expand the Woomera range into a military "mega-range?" *The Bulletin* of July 25, 1989, reported that the Australian Defense Department faxed on May 9th a document to the Aboriginal people of Maralinga, seeking consent to fire rockets, missiles, and other war materials into their lands.

The Aborigines are the same people who were driven off the very same land to make way for the British nuclear tests more than thirty years ago--Aborigines who have just managed to get their land back after a long legal battle. This saddens me very much, for only recently it was reported that some of the Australian victims (ex-servicemen) of British nuclear bomb tests will receive compensation. However the compensation does not extend to Aborigines who suffered the effects of radiation after explosions in the South Australian outback. History seems to be repeating itself. Whereas Sir Robert Menzies once let Whitehall test its nuclear bombs, with grave consequences only now admitted, Bob Hawke now plans to commercialize a vast range

to allow the White House and other countries to try out their latest airborne weapon systems.

I am stunned by this. On the one hand Bob Hawke plans to protect the Antarctic; on the other, the go-ahead is given for a military scheme without much public debate! I am told that the new Woomera Instrument Range will be unique for its size alone, 130,000 square kilometers, roughly the area of England. This will allow weapons testing on a scale unimaginable in the northern hemisphere! It will be a weapons range where the Australian air force and other countries with the necessary cash can test weapons, warplanes, and electronic equipment under "life" conditions.

It is rather ironic that even before the deadly Maralinga plutonium that spread beyond the range is cleaned up, the Aborigines are asked to agree to a new military programme there. We in Europe must do everything possible to find out which European companies have registered interest in this new weapons range (there have been many) and we must see this as a central issue for all ecologists. It concerns us all because together we must prevent Australia from becoming a training ground to test weapons and rehearse battle scenarios. Is this Australia's bid to expand its military role overseas? Is this another expansion of the military industry, since already arms export controls have been eased in the hope of doubling Australian arms sales? Will it become increasingly likely that Australia will supply oppressors with arms? This also includes my concerns about United States military bases in Australia, because the Labor Government is not being candid about all the functions of the bases. I support wholeheartedly the closing of all U.S. bases here as well as the present campaign to close Nurrungar, which has a renewed lease for another ten years. Close down Roxby Downs, close Woomera and Nurrungar! The thirty million dollars a year contributed to the running of the Nurrungar base by Australia should be used for action-oriented peace research toward a nonaligned, nonnuclear Australia.

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

Last but not least, news has reached us that the German company Blohm and Voss are a big part of the twelve FFG class frigates deal for the Australian and New Zealand navies. If we are to change the direction of this trend, then, as Jack Munday stated yesterday, we must revive the Green Ban movement, labour union actions similar to those of the 1970s which stopped work on forty-two building sites. I hope that workers and progressive parts of the trade union movement will join us for such ecological action, but we must intensify the dialogue with unions from our side as well. Spelling out employment opportunities that are in harmony with nature and in harmony with a peaceful society must be an action priority for us. I hope that the "Green Bans" will return right here in Australia so that we may follow! When I speak about green global politics and about the green movements in both Western and Eastern Europe, I recall the magnificent slogan of the French students in the May-June uprising of 1968: "Be practical! Do the impossible!" To this demand, we, the generation that faces the next century, can add the solemn injunction: "If we don't do the impossible we shall be faced with the unthinkable."

We want global green politics and a green world, but there are still many hurdles and obstacles before we can reach that goal. Exactly ten years ago, at the founding of the German Green Party, I coined the term "anti-party-party" for the Greens, trying to express the new type of power (counterpower) that we are all speaking about. This is the power of nonviolent change and nonviolent transformation, a power that is common to all, to be used by all and for all. "Power over" is to be replaced by "shared power," by "the power to do things," by the discovery of our own strength as opposed to a passive receiving of power exercised by others, often in our name. It is not power to dominate--not power to terrorize or to oppress--but the power of nonviolent change. The Hungarian writer Gyorgy Konrad expressed it even better with his term "anti-politics," a moral force:

*Global Green Politics*

Anti-politics strives to put politics in its place and makes sure it stays there, never overstepping its proper office of defending and refining the morals of the game in a civil society. Anti-politics is the ethos of civil society, and civil society is the anti-thesis of military society.

These are very dramatic times. Some of the major green movements in Western Europe or in other parts of the world are beginning to celebrate their anniversaries and there are miracles happening in many countries, including France where the French Green Party, Les Verts, has had a most dramatic success in the recent European elections. British Greens with fourteen percent of the votes are now the strongest Green Party in Europe! We now have over thirty Green members in the European Parliament--three from Belgium, eight from the Federal Republic of Germany, eight from France, seven from Italy, two from the Netherlands, one from Portugal, and one from Spain. There are Green Parties growing in India, which Gert and I have visited twice in the past year. And there are Greens struggling in Japan against the nuclear fuel cycle complex that is now being built in Rokkasho village at the northern tip of the main island of Honshu. Green activists are giving us a lot of hope, like those in India who recently formed a human chain across a river to stop the building of a dam. Just a few days ago, the Green Party in Quebec, Canada, held an international symposium on energy and sustainable development. In the United States of America many local Green political organizations have sprung up around the country, contesting local elections and occasionally even winning. Green-affiliated candidates have been elected to municipal offices in Connecticut, Wisconsin, Michigan, and North Carolina. In 1987, there were seventy-five unaffiliated local Green parties in the U.S.A.

When we look to the roots of the Green Parties, we must look to the "New Politics" programme which was founded in the

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

late 1960s in New Zealand under the name of the New Value Party.

In Scandinavia Green Parties are growing in Finland, Sweden, and Denmark. They are also growing in Ireland, Austria, Switzerland, and Italy. One of the most hopeful developments has been that of the Green Party in Great Britain and their incredible success in the recent European elections. Although they gained fourteen percent of the votes in Britain, they did not get a single seat because of the unfair British majority electoral system, where smaller parties have hardly any chance of winning seats in the national Parliament or in the European Parliament, despite receiving such a high vote. Here in Australia, of course, there is the great success of the Greens in Tasmania, made possible by our friends like Bob Brown and others. We congratulate them and wish them much strength and courage for their future political negotiations. Gert and I are also looking forward to meeting with Jo Vallentine in Perth because of the formation of the Green Alliance there. There are also the efforts of Helen Caldicott to turn the Australian Labor Party green from within and the efforts of Jack Munday to create a new ecological left party. All in all, there is much Green growth!

As I stated before, these are very dramatic times and we are all looking at the most exciting developments of this decade as well as the coming decade in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. There we see the emergence of independent citizens' peace and ecology movements, coupled with a widening discussion about disarmament, militarism, ecology, and civil, political, social, and economic rights. Although the many human rights and other social movements of the Eastern European countries are very different in nature, they all have a common desire to reclaim from the state what is called "civil society" or what might be called "public life" or "community activism" in the West. The notion of "civil society" implies a space where independent discussion and criticism can grow, where an

alternative to the state's monopoly on information and education can thrive, where an effort can be made to restrain the state's arbitrary or arrogant use of power against its own citizens or other countries, and, finally, where the rigidity and isolation of the bloc mentality can be challenged. Activists in Eastern Europe have described this process as the restoration of citizens as subjects in history, rather than as objects controlled by the state.

Just recently we have witnessed the governmental declaration of Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki in the Polish Parliament [Sejm]. We have also witnessed discussion in Poland about humanizing the police and armed forces. We have witnessed a nonviolent transformation of Polish society through the nonviolent leadership of Solidarnosc [Solidarity], a true grass-roots movement. In Hungary we are witnessing how the "European House" can be built in a nonviolent way. We are witnessing how over twenty thousand East German refugees leave freely through the Hungarian border into Austria and on to other European countries. The Hungarians have put human rights first, above any bilateral agreements with the German Democratic Republic! The Hungarians have stated very clearly that Hungary will not change present policies even if its neighbours are irritated or angry. The Hungarian Foreign Minister Gyula Horn stated that Hungary has come to the point of respecting the life of every single individual and of respecting the rights of those individuals to determine their own life and where they would like to travel. He has stated clearly that in the Europe of today Hungarians will not depart from this position--the position of human rights having priority over all others. And there are, of course, most exciting developments in the Soviet Union, although at the same time we are still so very fearful that the road Mr. Gorbachev is travelling on could suddenly be cut off! The leadership--the old stubborn heads of concrete in the governments of East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Romania--have so far refused to go the path of "glasnost" and "perestroika." And there is a very bitter struggle ahead between the

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

independent peace, ecological, and human rights movements in those countries and the repressive machinery of those three governments. Very recently there has been a new group initiated in East Germany called Neues Forum [New Forum], one further ray of hope in trying to bring "perestroika" and "glasnost" into East Germany. In those three countries all independent ecology, peace, and human rights activities have been met with harsh retaliation from the security forces which regard any unofficial citizen initiatives as a challenge to their authority and power.

All of us in Europe look to Solidarity, the free trade union and democracy movement in Poland, as a symbol of hope. At its height it has reached ten million strong! Solidarity has continued nonviolently to transform Polish life. In an unprecedented development, this grass-roots mass movement has been able to force an agreement with the Communist government to initiate a true democratic process. All of this after the imposition of martial law in December 1981.

We should not forget that the nuclear disaster in Chernobyl in May 1986 provoked a tide of fear and indignation among the peoples of Eastern Europe who were in the path of radioactive clouds. Calls to abolish nuclear power began to be heard and many green or ecological movements gained impetus. The independent peace and environmental initiatives in Eastern Europe have been all the more courageous. Repression and oppression have long inhibited their work. They have had to face many more obstacles than any of us here or in Western Europe. Green politics, on a global scale, means that we must act responsibly for each other and practice more solidarity across boundaries and ideologies. I was glad to hear, for example, of the protest of the Tasmanian Greens against a dam in the Siberian wilderness. On the other hand, it would be excellent if East European activists could travel to Australia to help close down uranium mining or to participate in nonviolent actions against wood-chipping right here.

*Global Green Politics*

Global green politics has never had such an opportunity and such a chance as today! But, at the same time, Green parties that have been successful for a long time, like the German Greens, are also facing many existential choices and changes. I will try to deal with them later on.

But what are the important preconditions for global green thinking? Let me mention just a few. First, an ecological society must be a truly free society, based on ecological principles that can mediate humanity's relationship with nature. This means searching for a soft, decentralised energy system and for soft technologies and for ways of true co-determination and self-determination, rejecting and moving away from monolithic modes of production, monolithic technology, and institutions like the military-industrial complex. At the present time, the five hundred largest industrial corporations control nearly one trillion dollars in corporate assets in the United States. And the six hundred largest multinational corporations will control over 40 percent of planetary production by the end of this decade. The result of all these monolithic modes and trends has been wastefulness, overdependence, and their unnaturalness.

A truly free society must also mean the guarantee of economic, social, and individual human rights. Regardless of country or ideology, regardless of where human rights are violated--whether in China, Tibet, Chile, Romania, South Africa, Kurdistan, El Salvador, or Afghanistan--we must stand up and never ever be silent when it comes to helping those who are oppressed. The past few months in Western Europe have been most depressing, especially in regard to the solidarity movement for the Chinese students, intellectuals, and Chinese workers who staged such a brilliant nonviolent struggle for over seven weeks on the Square of Heavenly Peace in Beijing. I have been very disappointed in parts of the German Green Party and in large parts of the European peace movement because of weak solidarity. The same criticism also applies to the German Green and European peace movements when it comes to standing up

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

for the nonviolent people on the high plateau of Tibet, the last ancient nonviolent culture, which is literally being killed off. Over one million Tibetans have been killed since the military invasion of the Chinese and over thirty thousand Chinese people have been put to death through capital punishment in the past three years in the People's Republic of China.

Pol Pot of the Khmer Rouge still holds a seat at the UN General Assembly. Why was the protest so moderate when we all knew about the genocide of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia and that this might occur again due to the failed Paris Conference? Thousands and thousands of committed peace activists marched in the streets of West Germany and Western Europe when it came to supporting Ho Chi Minh and to opposing the Vietnam War, but where were they when it came to standing up against Pol Pot and the atrocities which he committed against his own people? Now, after the failure of the Paris Conference, we are most fearful of new massacres in Cambodia. But where is the international pressure and morality? Where is the international conscience that will stand up for human rights? If we, the global green movement, do not do it--who will?

A truly free society must not include a "peace" which oppresses us. We must learn on our own terms what peace and freedom mean together. All too long peace and freedom have been part of Right-wing vocabulary and at times sadly neglected by the Left. There can be no peace if there is social injustice and suppression of human rights, because external and internal peace are inseparable. Peace has a wider meaning for us. It is not just the absence of mass destruction, but a positive internal and external condition in which people are free so that they can grow to their full potential. Within that framework of peace we also believe in nonalignment and active neutrality. We believe in taking unilateral steps not only to dissolve military power blocs, but also to dissolve armies and to get rid of "deterrence" thinking. And within that framework of peace we also believe in

civilian-based defence--social defence. Our idea of social defence presents an alternative to the dead-end self-destruction of the arms race. Social defence or defence by nonmilitary means against any military attack from outside or within is based on the idea that a society cannot be controlled if it is not prepared to cooperate with the oppressor.

In this process of bringing more justice, peace, and harmony to the planet earth, we must also learn to become more peaceful, just, and tolerant with ourselves and with one another, within our own ranks. The small-hearted spirit and the attitude of "not trusting" and "always controlling each other"--something so common in the German Green Party--has been a strong disappointment to many of us and has done much to minimize our appeal, our chances, and our concrete results. Participatory democracy must not become a new formula for demagoguery, for misuse of grass-roots power, for tactics. It cannot mean hurting each other just because there is disagreement. There must always be room in Green politics for tolerance, for accepting each other's positions and points of view, just as there must always be room to act according to our own conscience in certain questions like the question of abortion. Living our values is what Green politics is all about. It was Carl Rogers who stated:

Many many years from now, when the telling of history is told, people will hear about the 1980s. A fragile era where a hydra of tensions and conflicts threatened the survival of the planet--where terrorists menaced the innocent, racial and religious wars overtook great countries and children became armed militia. . . . The time was also marked by an uprising of the human spirit--founded on people's faith that within was a vast reservoir of good.

This "vast reservoir of good" is what Albert Einstein also meant when he wrote, "The problem is not the atom bomb, but the heart of the people."

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

We must ask the question of whether or not we will be moving toward an intensification of the many present crises -- from the global greenhouse effect and the plundering of tropical rain forests to acid rain and daily militarization. Or will we be able to build up a global community without frontiers that will be founded on ecology, nonviolence, and social justice with a spiritual base? If there is a future, it will be green! This could be the motto of this conference!

These are both very good and very bad, but certainly dramatic times. When I speak about the disappointing developments within the Federal Republic of Germany, I am speaking about the great concentration within my own party on internal power struggles to get into power in the next national elections, when there could be a numerical coalition between the Social Democrats and the German Greens. As a former Social Democrat, for many years I have been warning about the danger of joining all too easily Social Democratic governments as we have done in Hessen and as we have done now in Berlin. Of course, there will be a time when the Greens might end up in the government and certainly that time could come in Germany next year. But, becoming a coalition partner and becoming a junior partner in government cannot mean losing our Green identity. It cannot mean giving up our key principles of radical and ecological solutions, of nonviolent means and ends, of democratic grass-roots decisions, and of working for a demilitarised and denuclearized society. More and more the German Green Party is moving toward giving up those positions for the sake of becoming acceptable to the Social Democrats, for the sake of having three or four ministers in a red-green cabinet. But how high will the price be? Will the SPD embrace the Green so much as to destroy the Green movement?

We cannot afford to make compromises when trying to protect human lives, when trying to protect the health of peoples and of all living things on the planet! Talking suddenly about "limit values" of, for example, dioxin or lead, or accepting here

and there a little bit of deterrence or radioactivity cannot be green politics! We must provide healing, life affirming answers, not just repairing a little bit here and there. We must empower people at the grass-roots level to start initiating political action themselves; we must help them share more power. We cannot stop our ecological consciousness-raising work in the streets even while we are in Parliament. We cannot forget our commitment to the social movements outside! Effective work inside Parliaments cannot become a replacement for effective nonviolent transformation work outside in the streets! Both go hand in hand and both are interdependent in ecological politics. Our future, our potential, and our credibility lies in inter-connecting the issues of peace, human rights, employment, ecology, and social justice. Mahatma Gandhi stated:

Democracy can only be saved through non-violence, because democracy, so long as it is sustained by violence, cannot provide for or protect the weak. My notion of democracy is that under it, the weakest should have the same opportunities as the strongest. This can never happen except through non-violence.

Exactly this question of nonviolence is the biggest challenge to all Green parties, especially when we are on the road to sharing power in governments. How should one deal as a green minister with the violence inherent in the state? How should one deal as a green minister with the structural violence often inherent in governmental policies? I do not believe that we have yet found the answer, but we all know that we must try to transform those institutions of violence into nonviolent institutions.

Where do we begin with nonviolent transformation? Consider just one example. We are correct in stating that a lifestyle and methods of production which rely on an endless supply of raw materials and which use those raw materials lavishly also furnish the motive for the violent appropriation of raw materials from other countries. In contrast, a responsible use of raw materials, as part of an ecologically-oriented lifestyle and

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

economy, reduces the risk that policies of violence will be pursued in our name. Thus we must learn that we can begin by reducing our consumption of goods to where we do not provide a market for big business. We can reduce our consumption of goods to where we will use only our share of the world's resources, not taking what belongs to someone else.

Up to this point, no official economic policy, whether in the West or East or North or South, has taken into consideration the global damage resulting from human activity. But the damage is being done, and considerable parts of our natural base have already been destroyed while other parts are seriously threatened--and all this solely on the grounds of economic gain. In the end, I believe, these old economic systems will pull the rug out from underneath their own feet. What we are beginning to see in Poland and in Hungary is the emergence of a third way in economics-- neither capitalist nor socialist, but a new self-determined grass-roots ecological economy! But we also see Western capital and Western companies now attempting to put their blueprints on Eastern Europe. Our friends must be watchful!

We welcome the many reforms announced by Mr. Gorbachev and the good will behind them. But at the same time we also criticize the German and European banks and businesses who are about to export all those things we have finally gotten rid of; e.g., German nuclear reactors going to the Soviet Union and Mr. Gorbachev passing on nuclear reactors to India--a vicious cycle that we must stop! There has been so much imperialism, whether it is "garbage imperialism" through the sending of highly toxic wastes to Third World countries, or testing unwanted technology in other areas of the world because there has been so much opposition to it at home. We must be very clear in favouring the dismantling of all those branches of industry which are hazardous to life--above all the nuclear, defence, and chemical industries.

*Global Green Politics*

We favor the development of production techniques which are more in conformity with the environment. They should be sparing in their use of natural resources and energy; they should produce little waste; and they should function as small decentralized production units. We must turn to the production of more socially useful and durable products and learn to revive the Green Ban movement and Green Ban thinking which took place in the early 1970s in Australia. We must never be prepared to allow social justice and employment questions to be played off against the ecological/environmental concerns or vice versa. The fight against unemployment is simultaneously a fight for meaningful employment, for ecological and socially useful investments, and for alternative production and conversion schemes.

Let us note one other hopeful movement, which is the movement in Switzerland for a "Switzerland Without an Army." Within that movement, which is having its referendum very soon in November on the question of Switzerland abandoning its army, there are also many models for alternative production and conversion of the military. There is even hope that over one fourth of the Swiss voters will vote to abandon the Swiss army! [The actual vote was 36 percent, eds.]

Environmental statistics usually bring boredom, but I would like to mention just a few which will describe the present situation. Every year, the European Community produces 2 billion tons of waste, of which 160 million tons are industrial waste, including 25 million tons that are highly poisonous. Existing facilities for treating toxic waste can only handle 10 million tons a year. The resultant illegal dumping and incineration makes a mockery of EEC directives on toxic waste disposal. We must drastically reduce our rubbish mountains by outlawing wasteful packaging and using recyclable containers. We must press for local waste management plans to encourage recycling and the use of unrecyclable waste for creating energy. And we must work for an EEC ban on the shipment of hazardous

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

wastes from one country to another, in particular to Third World countries, and seek an early halt to the dumping of waste at sea.

At present there is no coherent transport strategy for Europe. We are having great difficulties fighting for transport policies which are based on energy efficiency and environmental protection, while providing local transport facilities that people most need.

Consider the tragedy of acid rain over Europe. The sky over Europe is poisoned; acid rain from power stations, cars, and factories is corroding buildings and poisoning lakes, soils, and forests. It is also killing people. Without radical action to stop acid rain, the chemical cocktail above our heads can only become more deadly. Our forests and fish, cathedrals and crops, and our lungs are all under attack. As wind spreads pollutants from factories in the Midwest to Canada or from Western Europe to Norway and Sweden, the problem has become truly a global one.

Take the example of the North Sea. The North Sea is perhaps the most conspicuous example of the hazards of using coastal waters as a dumping ground for industrial wastes. Three rivers, the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Elbe, discharge each year more than 38 million tonnes of zinc, nearly 13,500 tonnes of lead, 5,600 tonnes of copper plus arsenic, cadmium, mercury, and even radioactive wastes into the North Sea. Ships annually dump another 145 million tonnes of ordinary garbage. Furthermore the North Sea is dotted with four thousand wells and 150 drilling platforms, all connected to the shore by five thousand miles of pipes. The pipes leak some thirty thousand tonnes of hydrocarbons into the surrounding seas every year. The impact of all that waste is not hard to see. Salmon, sturgeon, oysters, and haddock have simply vanished. The fish that survive often suffer from skin infections, deformed skeletons, and tumors. Last year we heard about seals dying along the North Sea by the hundreds. Scientists in Neumunster have performed autopsies on some of the dead seals. All told, they

found traces of more than one thousand toxins in the tissue samples.

According to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), 35 percent of the earth's land surface, on which about one-fifth of the world's population depends for its livelihood, is threatened by desertification, a principal threat to the economic well-being of many countries. In such countries as Ethiopia and India, which are severely affected by desertification, it is human survival itself that is at stake. Because environmental degradation and pollution respect no human-drawn borders, they jeopardize not only the security of the country in which they occur, but also that of others, near and far. The tragic explosion of a nuclear reactor in Chernobyl in 1986 hurled radioactive waste and debris far into the atmosphere. All too often we forget that in Europe there are 119 nuclear power plants located within a hundred kilometers of national borders. The Danish Parliament decided to ask Sweden to close a plant thirty kilometers from Kopenhagen. The French government rejected a similar plea by local West German authorities in the Saarland to cancel construction of four atomic reactors at Cattenom. All environmental problems and disasters have an all-encompassing global effect from which no one country can insulate itself.

As stated in a report by the Worldwatch Institute, the security of nations is similarly compromised by the specter of the "greenhouse effect," global climate change brought on by the accumulation of carbon dioxide and other gases in the atmosphere that trap heat. Global average temperature records from 1880 to the present reveal a gradual warming trend compatible with greenhouse scenarios predicted by computer simulations. In a passionate speech before the United Nations General Assembly in October 1987, the President of the Maldives declared that a sea-level rise of only one meter will jeopardize the survival of his island nation. He observed, "We did not contribute to the impending catastrophe to our nation and alone we cannot save ourselves." His comments highlight the

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

particular predicament faced by Third World nations. Except for China (which burns a lot of coal) and Brazil (where the decimation of the Amazon rain forest causes large-scale carbon release), global warming is caused primarily by industrial countries. Industrial countries account for 70 percent of carbon dioxide emissions and 84 percent of chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) production.

Reflecting on the true dimensions of what "security" really means, Wendell Berry, a noted American writer and farmer, has asked:

To what point...do we defend from foreign enemies a country that we are destroying ourselves? In spite of all our propagandists can do, the foreign threat inevitably seems diminished when our air is unsafe to breathe, when our drinking water is unsafe to drink, ...when our forests are dying from air pollution and acid rain, and when we ourselves are sick from poisons in the air.

Of course it is clear that modern welfare and so-called security and defence policies, based on deterrence and mass destructive weapons, entail large-scale environmental destruction. Nuclear war, with its potential for massive devastation, destruction of all life, and the triggering of a nuclear winter, is the ultimate threat to the global environment. But even peacetime military operations, the production and testing of conventional, nuclear, and chemical weapons, the conduct of maneuvers, and the generation of military wastes involve activities that imperil both the environment and the health of workers. As the Worldwatch Institute observes:

Again there is the irony that the pursuit of military might is such a costly endeavor that it drains away the resources urgently needed to protect against the environmental perils that are most likely to jeopardize our security.

The Brundtland Commission put the dilemma in the following way. "The Earth is one but the world is not. We all depend on one biosphere for sustaining our lives. Yet each community, each country, strives for survival and prosperity with little regard for its impact on others." Consider another example, the exploitation of Southeast Asian rain forests which is currently in full swing. In Malaysia, two-thirds of the forests have been logged or converted to oil palms. Virgin rain forest clearing is being funded by the World Bank. All of Malaysia's rain forests will be gone by the next generation.

The largest stands of tropical rain forests are in South America. Amazonia contains fifty percent of the world's tropical rain forest. Twenty percent of this forest has been cleared for cattle ranging for McDonald's, mining, pulping, and farming. Yet, we all know that tropical rain forests are the earth's richest gene pool, on which we depend for our food and medicine. Seventy percent of the three thousand species of plants with anticancer properties come from the rain forest. Rain forests are a memory bank evolved over billions of years, a library of knowledge we have only just begun to read. Australia also dramatically has lost 75 percent of its rain forest through logging, agriculture, and settlement. Pacific islands such as Fiji and the Solomons have stands of rain forest--much of which have been allocated to local and multinational timber companies. Since 1900, 50 percent of the world's tropical rain forest has disappeared, never to return. If the destruction continues, there will be five hundred million hectares left by midway in the next century, and by the year 2100 there will be nothing! The consequences of this are catastrophic, not only for humankind but for the millions and millions of living inhabitants of this planet. I can only express my deepest wish here that Australia will save its remaining tracts of tropical rain forest in North Queensland and Tasmania.

Siegfried Lenz, a German author, recently stated that we live in peace but are still at the mercy of force, a privileged kind

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

of force that is condoned by public authorities and is making our world more and more uninhabitable. Against our will, he stated, they are taking away our lakes and oceans, allowing our rivers to die, and turning our forests to skeletons. Anyone who resists, a German court has declared, is acting on legitimate moral grounds but is still legally in the wrong! That is how far we have come. Anyone who still maintains a certain amount of loyalty towards creation may be legally in the wrong. Here we cannot but question the nature of laws which allow this force to take action against all those who are not earning money from the destruction of the environment. Unfortunately, observes Lenz, the domain of business is considerably greater than the domain of politics. The end of life on this planet earth has become conceivable. Creation is dying. As Siegfried Lenz so eloquently mourns: "A grave-stone for our dying age could well bear the inscription: 'Everyone wanted the best--for themselves.' "

Global green politics means to acknowledge the vital importance of our whole environment. That environment, its health, its safety, and its wholeness, affects our lives, our politics, and our future. Whenever we damage the environment, we must realize that we are damaging ourselves.

Green politics is different from all other forms of politics because it acknowledges the complexity of that web of life. We need to rediscover our roots and our histories and to learn from those cultures which are more in harmony with their environment that we have ever been. Over many years we have set ourselves up to control, dominate, and exploit the planet. We must learn from the Aborigines here in Australia, learn from the Indian tribes in the United States and Latin America, and learn from the Tibetans on the roof of the world struggling to survive.

I remember the terrible accident of the *Exxon Valdez* in Prince William Sound. The pictures of the Alaskan oil spill sickened all who saw it. But had this oil safely reached its destination and had it been burnt in power plants and car engines, then the eleven million gallons of crude oil lost in the

wreck of the Exxon Valdez would have released into the atmosphere about sixteen million pounds of carbon in the form of carbon dioxide. As the *Herald Tribune* wrote, "The whole planet is an Exxon Valdez." But President Bush continues to say that oil drilling in the wildlife refuge must proceed because the oil is needed. It is not clear to him that the refuge for the wildlife is also needed. Regardless of how many rocks Exxon had polished by the time it pulled out, the chaotic response in the first few days after the spill has cast a very dark shadow over the oil industry's repeated assurances that it can safely operate in fragile environments.

In conclusion, let us not forget the terrible environmental destruction in Eastern Europe, which looks more and more like an industrial waste land. In Molbis, East Germany, the air pollution is so thick that drivers even turn on vehicle headlights in the middle of the day. Women with newborn babies in Czechoslovakia have priority access to bottled water because the tap water there is considered a hazard to infant health. The Polish government has recently declared five villages in the industrial region of Silesia unfit to live in because of high levels of heavy metals in the soil. In Eastern Europe, water contamination is so severe that many portions of those supplies that do exist are unfit for industrial use let alone for drinking. Eastern Europe's burning of brown coal, combined with a lack of scrubbers and other pollution control equipment, has made the air quality in some regions among the worst in the world. In Silesia, rates of respiration ailments and cancer are 30 to 50 percent above the Polish average. A writer in Krakow stated recently:

All around are signs of the city slowly rotting from pollution. Pieces of masonry regularly fall off church steeples, balconies crumble and graceful saints lack faces. What centuries of war and pestilence have spared, chemical pollutants have destroyed.

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

But public revolt and environmentalism is emerging as a major force in Eastern Europe. With the rise of Glasnost in the Soviet Union an entire environmental movement has emerged across the whole of Eastern Europe. This process is irreversible, opening many new doors to public participation in Eastern Europe. What is happening is the Greening of Glasnost. Although the Soviet government still remains one of the world's most ardent supporters of nuclear energy for so-called "peaceful" uses, at least five planned nuclear power plants have been cancelled since the Chernobyl atomic power station exploded. There are Green parties rising up everywhere in Eastern Europe, for example, in Estonia, in other Baltic republics, and around Leningrad. There are Green parties in Poland and Green movements in Hungary, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia.

Increased Green cooperation and solidarity across the West-East borders must be given a high priority on our political agenda. As Martin Luther King, Jr. stated, "We are caught in a network of mutuality. We are tied in a single garment of destiny. What affects one directly, affects us all indirectly!" And as Theodore Roszak, echoing Gandhi, has written, "The world has enough for everyone's need but not for everyone's greed." This message is also being passed on to us from all the indigenous peoples of the world. And this message must be absorbed by us in humility if we are to learn from the native women and men.

We must build ecological alliances and get rid of and ban all military alliances. Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, the Wilderness Society, and the many conservation societies and ecological groups all over the world are linking East and West and North and South at the grass-roots level. We are at the beginning of creating a global culture of ecological responsibility and we must start to establish binding principles governing ecological relations among all countries.

Most important of all, we must begin to give higher priority to social and environmental issues than to military ones. Instead of building a Trident-II submarine and F-16 jet fighters, we can

*Global Green Politics*

use that same amount of money to clean up the three thousand most hazardous waste dumps in the United States. We should get rid of the Stealth Bomber Program and use that money for an action plan to save the world's tropical forests. Cancelling one nuclear weapon test could provide the money for the installation of eighty thousand hand pumps that would give many Third World villages access to safe water. The money for one Trident submarine could provide a five-year immunization programme for children against six deadly diseases, preventing one million deaths a year. Ten days of EC military spending could provide the annual costs of cleaning up hazardous waste sites in ten European Community countries by the year 2000.

Finally, global Green politics must give people hope that a future without the use of force is possible. This is not a utopian dream. As the abolition of slavery changed from once seeming unrealistic to becoming a normal state, so too can radical disarmament come to be the norm of international affairs. A disarmed world is not defenceless for there can be nonviolent, civilian-based defence, a revolutionary concept that is the only sane answer to the atomic age.

A new beginning in security thinking could be an independent, nonaligned, neutral, and nonnuclear Australia, pursuing true environmental and ecological policies, and working for nonviolent civilian defence together with the South Pacific Islands. Australia must stop being "a suitable piece of real estate" in which to locate various vital elements of U.S. nuclear war strategy. We truly hope that Australia can and will follow the courageous example of New Zealand and start to declare its ports and air space truly nuclear free! And we are hoping that Green alliances all over Australia, following the example of the Tasmanian Greens, will provide motivation and examples for us to follow.

Green parties all over the world will grow. They will start to replace Socialists and Social Democrats and will, in the course of their political growth, also make many mistakes. That is

*Nonviolence Speaks to Power*

natural and also something from which we can learn. But I truly hope that the Green parties will never make the mistake of giving up their Green identity for the sake of being in power!

Barbara Ward and Rene Dubos wrote in 1972:

Alone in space, alone in its life-supporting systems, powered by inconceivable energies, mediating them to us through the most delicate adjustments, wayward, unlikely, unpredictable but nourishing, enlivening and enriching to the largest degree--is this not a precious home for all us earthlings? Is this not worth our love? Does it not deserve all the inventiveness and courage and generosity of which we are capable to preserve it from degradation and destruction and, by doing so, to secure our own survival?

We have only one Earth and this Earth has no emergency exit. But the question remains open--can we save the Earth?