

CACOR Symposium 1996

The Annual CACOR Symposium was held at the time of the Annual General Meeting on June 3, 1996. Here is the Chairman's Introduction to that Symposium, followed by the two papers presented by the Panelists as a basis for the day's discussion.

Introduction to the Panel Discussion

by A.H. (Drew) Wilson (CACOR Chairman)

Last year at this time we had a Panel Discussion that was titled *The World Problematique: First Steps Towards Solutions*. Significantly, these were first steps – plural, and solutions – again plural.

The various elements of last year's Panel Discussion were later reported in the *Proceedings*. By way of summing them up, I will simply quote in part from the report of it prepared by Jane Dougan:

- ...one felt unsure as to whether the problematique essentially concerned the survival of a diversity of life on earth, human survival in particular, or the survival of human civilization as each panelist defined it...
- Change requires not only a shift in perception, but a link to what is known or experiential. Each panelist made reference to both the macro and micro level; from expanding boundaries or global problems to the basic functioning of the human body.
- ...there was a corresponding theme of time as constant change, and of our 'progress' as a long march in which the boundaries and obstacles keep shifting. There was also an underlying sense of fear: fear of God, fear of retribution, fear of those in power, and fear of there simply being no future.
- Ultimately, there was agreement that what is really needed is a new vision; one that will allow us to live appropriately within our time and place. Our panelists identified some of the traits that are needed – boldness, bravery, courage, integrity, resilience, the ability to imagine new horizons, and the humility to recognize the very real boundaries that do exist, including those of our own creation.

This year the title is *Solutions for the World Problematique: The Element of Hope*. Its origins lie in three directions. One is that last year's discussions were in fact first steps, and there are more to be taken. The

second is that messages without hope are likely to be disregarded by the very people they are intended to affect. And the third is that, within our membership this past year, there has developed the view that CACOR should be more visibly active and more 'on the record' with its views than has been the case in the recent past at least.

This last direction came clearly to the fore in March of this year, when the Ottawa luncheon devoted its available discussion time to these three questions: 'Are we (CACOR) going in the right direction?'; 'Are we satisfied with progress to date?'; and, 'What should we do next?' As I heard them, the discussions in March answered the three questions very simply as follows: 'Yes, we are going in the right direction, although this direction may not be completely clear'; 'No, we are not satisfied with progress to date, but we have no plan for the future'; and, 'Yes, we have a number of suggestions about what we should do next'.

These suggestions, centred as they were on the membership of the various tables around the room in which the luncheon was held, also brought out a number of important points, of which the following are examples:

- CACOR can only do relatively few things by way of indicating solutions to the World Problematique. But these should point towards the achievement of a viable transition from the present to the future; they should be addressed not only to political leaders; and they should be designed to make more people aware of what may lie ahead.
- These solutions should attempt to change only those elements in the current situation that can be changed, and they should take into account the nature and timing of the threats that are to be faced.
- It should be recognized that the 'triggering' event that could lead to chaos throughout the world might not be one of the principal elements of the 'problematique' but, instead, a problem that is not presently recognized as being both large and serious. There should therefore be constant watchfulness for what might be called 'big trouble.'
- The impediments to change are many, and they include the great difficulty of changing human values and

institutional behaviour, of educating a very large number of people who will then influence those who have to make the decisions, and of achieving consensus among the leaders as well as among the led. Also, CACOR and The Club of Rome are still considered by many to be elitist and, therefore, out of touch with the 'real' world.

- But we should remember that public opinions can be changed, that political, economic, social and technological 'situations' are constantly changing – but at different rates – throughout the world, and that information – to be valuable – should have some application.
- The projects that CACOR has under way are good projects, but more are needed. The Association itself needs new blood, and should make itself better known to a broader public in this country. Also, CACOR might to its advantage collaborate with like-minded organizations that take a broad view of the future. And there should be some way of measuring, at least roughly, the impact of the actions taken by the Association.

What we may well be doing today is charting CACOR's future, but it is not the first time that this has been attempted. During my several rambles through the Association's archives at the Arboretum of the University of Guelph, I came across a number of interesting items. One of these was a report by a consultant (Boston Gilbert Henry Associates Ltd.) entitled *Long Range Planning Review* that had been written for CACOR's Board of Directors back in 1980. It was based on a fairly extensive set of interviews with some members of CACOR and with outsiders, as well as on minutes, files and other Association documents. It examined the need for the expansion of the Association to include more top quality and influential people, who would be prepared to accept the responsibilities of membership, as well as on the need for CACOR to seek more input from younger Canadians. The key, however, was the need to recruit an enthusiastic, energetic and most likely salaried Executive Director, who would be prepared to commit a lot of time to CACOR's work. The Association would, of course, need to raise the funds to support not only this person but also the new projects that could not be done satisfactorily on a volunteer basis by the members themselves.

As you know, CACOR did not follow up on this report. I have mentioned it because one of the continuing 'outside' criticisms of CACOR – in addition to its supposed elitism – is its lack of the resources for the hiring of people and the letting of contracts without which the achievement of the objectives of the Association, with its volunteer membership and modest annual fees, becomes more elusive. We should remember this when recommending today, or in the months ahead, what CACOR ought to be doing in the future. Hypothetical imperatives usually cost money!

One last comment – about the element of hope in today's Symposium subject. One of our panelists warned me in advance that he would not have much that is hopeful to discuss. I told him to go ahead anyway, that there are among us a number of perennial optimists, and the point of the exercise is to initiate an energetic discussion!

Food and Population: The Approaching World Crisis

Andy Clarke

An address to the Annual Symposium of the Canadian Association for the Club of Rome, June 3, 1996.

We are today living in an exceptional period in human history. Twentieth century science and technology, the energising forces of our age, have made available to the more fortunate members of the world community a standard of living beyond the dreams of our 18th century forbears, not to mention our earlier ancestors. We marvel at our new machines, and our ability to explore both inner and outer space. Although world population has doubled since mid century, the global economy has increased five-fold, a fact which encourages "optimists" among us to believe a millennium of progress lies before us, limited only by the power of human imagination.

The pre-eminent political change of recent years is the collapse of the Soviet empire. Its demise has terminated a costly 70 year experiment in total state control, brought an end to the cold war and, for the short term at least, greatly reduced the nuclear threat. Capitalism, in its various forms, has not only won the day but is rapidly becoming global in its economic reach. Today capitalism stands unchallenged, politically and militarily, and as Robert Heilbroner said in his recent book¹, "it will likely

¹ *Visions of the Future: The Distant Past, Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow.*

be the principal form of socio-economic organization during the 21st century, at least for the advanced nations, because no blueprint exists for a viable successor."

Yet despite our enormous advances in material progress, and the new economic climate which spans the globe, a strange unease grips our thoughts. The hopeful optimism of never ending human progress of the 19th century and very early 20th has given way to a deep anxiety about the future of this planet and its human inhabitants. To again quote Heilbroner, "apprehension is the dominant mood of today." Deep concern about the human condition is no longer the purview of the Club of Rome and its friends; words approaching alarm about the health of planet earth and its various life forms are now voiced almost daily by individuals from a wide range of disciplines. Two recent examples: In April 1996 Elizabeth Dowdeswell, a Canadian who heads the U.N. Environment Program, said:

"It is estimated that between 150 to 200 species of life become extinct every 24 hours - a mass annihilation caused by humankind's unsustainable methods of production and consumption. With so much being lost it's an open question whether the human species can survive."

William Rees, a University of British Columbia ecologist, spoke the following words to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in February of this year:

"With the global population expected to nearly double to 11 billion by the year 2040, we would then need about five additional planets to keep all earthlings at a Western-level standard of living. North Americans, Japanese and Europeans require such vast land, water and air resources to supply their economic, waste and nutritional needs that the earth's supply would run out long before Third World people reached similar levels of prosperity."

This last quote refers to a subject I would like to explore with you in some detail.

There is muted but increasing evidence that a new global crisis is approaching, centred on the widening gap between human numbers and the food supply. Particularly troubling, the dimensions of this new threat have not yet begun to penetrate either the public or political consciousness. Lester Brown of the Worldwatch Institute recently referred to the impending food/population crisis with these words:

"The world is moving into a new era, one in which the problems we face will be vastly different from those which most governments and news organizations are now preoccupied."

In broad outline, most people are generally aware of the population side of the food/population equation. Planet earth reached its first one billion humans in about 1825, close to the time of the birth of my great grandparents. It took 105 years to achieve the second billion in 1930, just after my birth. During my lifetime we have added almost another four billion which means our species has the dubious distinction of having tripled its entire world population during the lifetime of one of its members. As far as I am aware, no other life form has equalled our level of single generation fertility on a planetary scale.

On a more hopeful note we can take some slight encouragement that population stability has now been achieved in some 30 countries, all are in Europe except for Japan. While the fertility rate is also slowing in much of the rest of the world, because of the enormous demographic momentum in most third world countries, we continue to add about 90 million (three Canadas!) to the world's population each year. United Nations projections indicate that another four billion people will be added before world population stabilises in perhaps the mid 21st century, i.e. when my grandchildren are approaching the age I am today. Ninety-five percent of this additional four billion increase is projected to occur in the less developed world. If UN projections are approximately correct, today's third world countries will comprise about 90% of the world's population in 2050.

Few people will dispute the information I have just provided on population growth; food production, however, is another matter entirely. Not only is there a wide difference of opinion concerning future food production potential but the various agriculture experts and organizations are often unable to agree in their interpretation of present data.

Between 1950 and 1984 the production of food easily exceeded population growth. During this 34 year period population increased an average of 1.9% each year while world grain output grew at 3%, substantially reducing the percentage of people who were chronically hungry, even though in absolute numbers malnutrition changed little. This impressive growth in the production of food can be attributed to the new technologies of food production: improved seeds, extensive irrigation, fertilisers and pesticides. The Green Revolution, however, has a cost

which the agriculture community has been slow to acknowledge. Its technology increases soil erosion, pollutes water resources and contributes to public health and environmental problems. In short, the new agricultural methods are unsustainable. Dependence upon unsustainable agriculture carries with it a heavy price: one generation's food problems are eased at the expense of reducing food production for future generations.

Our addiction to unsustainable agriculture is a long term threat and as a species we are seldom moved to take appropriate action to avert a danger which may visit our grandchildren but not ourselves. Unfortunately (some may say fortunately), recent data indicate that a threat more immediate than long term unsustainability may be only a decade or less away. It seems that some of the assumptions upon which the new agricultural technologies were based are proving less than accurate and, in part because of population growth, resource and biological limits are being reached or exceeded sooner than expected. Since about the mid 1980s there has been mounting evidence that the Green Revolution is stalling out.

The new evidence reveals that we may now be crossing a series of thresholds in world food production. I will mention four.

Grainland Area

Grain, principally wheat, rice, corn and soya beans, provides over 50% of the world's food consumed either directly, or indirectly through animal products. During the past 15 years the world's grainland area has been shrinking steadily and is now a full 8.5% below its 1981 peak of 735 million hectares. This decrease is occurring in all areas of the world. When population growth is factored in, harvested grain area per person has in fact declined steadily since the 1950s. On a per capita basis it has fallen a full 25% during the last decade alone.

While the reasons for the decrease in grainland area are many it is only very recently that we have become sufficiently aware that if countries become densely populated **before** they industrialise, their loss of grain area is particularly severe. An early example is densely populated Japan which has lost 52% of its grainland area since the post war industrial boom began in the 1950s. A similar loss has occurred in both South Korea and Taiwan. China, where double digit industrial growth has

recently increased the size of its economy by a previously unheard of 56% in only four years, is now beginning to experience a similar loss of grainland.

Agriculture in China made enormous strides soon after free markets were allowed in 1978; during the early 1990s it was even able to export modest quantities of grain. Partly because of a loss of agricultural land through industrialisation, but also because of the annual population increase of some 13 million, China's per capita grainland area shrunk by 10.5% between 1990 and 1994. This per capita loss forced China to import 16 million tons of grain in 1995 and placed it second only to Japan among grain importing countries. Future trends are ominous and there is growing concern that grain exporting countries may be unable to supply China's grain needs. The world's estimated carryover stocks of grain, measured in days of global consumption, fell to 49 days for 1996 – the lowest ever.

Plant Yields

The impact of the loss of agricultural land has been hidden in part through the enormous increase in yields that were achieved during the early stages of the Green Revolution. During the 1950s and 1960s grain yields increased 4% annually. This exceptional rate of growth decreased to 2% in the 1970s, 1% in the 1980s, and only 0.5% during the first half of the 1990s. Grain yields are clearly approaching their biological limits. In fact grain varieties appear unable to use additional fertiliser and global fertiliser use has fallen by at least 17% since 1989. The time when the loss of grainland area could be compensated for by increasing grain yields has clearly ended.

Irrigation

Another food production threshold now being crossed is the availability and use of irrigation. During the 28 year period between 1950 and 1978, the irrigation of agricultural land increased by 119%. This large increase in irrigated land was linked closely to the Green Revolution with the introduction of high yield seeds as well as the increased use of fertiliser. Since 1978 growth in irrigation has been much less rapid and is now falling behind the growth in population. The seriousness of this decline is underscored by the fact that about 40% of the world's food is grown on the 16% of land that is irrigated. Because of competition from non farm sources, the silting of irrigation reservoirs, and falling water tables, there is

almost no possibility of reversing irrigated land area per capita in the foreseeable future.

Fisheries

The fourth and last food production threshold I will mention is the end to the growth of the world's fish harvest. Not unlike the spectacular growth in land based food production which occurred after 1950, the world's fish catch expanded more than four fold between 1950 and 1989. During the last seven years world seafood catch has stabilised at about 100 million tons, but because of the increase in world population the harvest per person has declined by eight percent. The United Nations reports that all of the world's 17 major oceanic fisheries are now being fished at or beyond their capacity.

Although noticed by few persons, the crossing of the above thresholds signals a turning point in human history. Humanity now faces a steady decline in per capita production of food and as we exit the 20th century food scarcity is about to move to the top of the world's security agenda. Little time remains to develop policies which may be an adequate response to what is about to unfold.

Near the beginning of my address I mentioned "optimists" among us who hold a very different view of population growth and food production. They include the representatives of influential organizations such as the World Bank and the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization, as well as privately funded research organizations such as The Fraser Institute in Canada. Their reports are published widely and unquestionably play an influential role in shaping the policies of governments.

There are essentially three reasons for their optimistic view on population and food: a mindset which refuses to believe there are finite resource limits; a conviction that all economic problems can be solved through the market forces of unrestricted capitalism, and insistence on basing all food production projections on an extrapolation of the very favourable 1950-1984 experience. Perhaps not surprisingly, the above organizations and others who hold their optimistic outlook are staffed disproportionately by economists.

During the past year I have had two exchanges of correspondence with Michael Walker, Executive Director of The Fraser Institute. In a letter I

received from Dr. Walker in February of this year he refers to "the unlimited resource base which imagination makes available to mankind and which differentiates mankind from all the other species to which you would like to compare us." Dr. Walker, along with many others, seems to believe that the marvels of science and technology, together with the magic hand of capitalism, renders us immune to the fate of all other civilisations, and indeed all other creatures, which lived beyond their resource base. Immortality is ours through the new tools which our imagination has created. Their world view is human centred – but earth destroying. I am convinced that all who hold this view are profoundly mistaken.

When conditions are favourable, there is no question that free market economies can indeed increase food production. But free markets will only succeed if necessary pre-conditions are in place including appropriate agricultural infrastructure, an educated farm community and a necessary framework of social values. In situations where a resource is limited, unregulated free markets will lead not to a greater supply of food but to the collapse of the resource base itself. As Canada is painfully aware, it is precisely this situation which now confronts the world fishing industry.

Contrary to the views of The Fraser Institute and others, doctrinaire capitalism, without regard to wider resource and environmental considerations, will exacerbate rather than solve the world's food problem.

We should also be mindful that in a finite world stability in population and resource consumption will, sooner or later, become unavoidable. Either we act, in a deliberate way, to achieve stability or the uncaring forces of nature will do it for us. World stability implies a ceiling on economic growth, particularly resource related growth, the driving force of free enterprise economies. Placing limits on growth, to the extent that limits are incompatible with capitalism, may provide the incentive for the gradual emergence over time of a greatly modified economic system.

Conclusion

I am persuaded by the available evidence that the carrying capacity of planet earth is not more than three billion, about half of today's population. The transition process to a more stable world society, living within its resource base, is most uncertain. We cannot exclude the possibility that achieving a sustainable human population level may well involve a traumatic experience for the

human family, not unlike the estimated 75% population crash experienced by Easter Islanders some three centuries ago in their small island world.

There is of course a better way. It requires recognition that our too numerous species has already inflicted upon this planet's fauna and flora one of the greatest convulsions in biological history. It requires agreement that a world in which close to one billion of its citizens lead desperate lives and are chronically hungry is totally unacceptable. And a better way requires the adoption and implementation of national and global policies to achieve a sustainable world community, at a reasonable standard of living, without further destruction of the ecosystem.

Our options are clear. We can continue to focus our energies on satisfying the near unquenchable appetite of a single species – or we can assume stewardship of planet earth with intelligence and responsibility. If we do not choose wisely, and our response is not equal to the challenge before us, both we and the political leaders of this generation will not escape the verdict of history.

Environmental Issues and the Media

John M. Milne

An address to the Annual Symposium of the Canadian Association for the Club of Rome, June 3, 1996.

We all know there is a veil of ignorance surrounding the minds of many people on the full portent of environmental issues. They are in every level and walk of life and not just "the average man on the street". The full environmental story, with all its implications, is just not getting across to the public nor to those in positions of influence. The problem we as environmentalists have to solve is why.

Newspapers had their birth shortly after the invention of movable type and the production of relatively cheap paper. The authors of those early politically dedicated newspapers (broadsheets and pamphlets, they were called) contracted with outside printers for their production and distribution. To a very considerable extent, the independence of the

editorial staff and their relative unconcern over the business aspects of newspapers, continued until only a few short years ago. When that relationship changed and editorial departments were required to recognize fully that publishing was, first and foremost, a profit making business, the ethos of newspapers underwent a considerable change.

The change occurred naturally and not as a Machiavellian conspiracy by accounting departments. The first blow was the loss of the great bulk of national advertising that was the result of legislation that gave retailers, rather than manufacturers, the sole right to determine retail prices. This gave retailers control of the distribution, marketing and advertising of goods. Because of this change, the pool of advertising dollars was reduced drastically bringing about severe changes in the operating structures of newspapers and their competitive position relative to rapidly expanding television networks.

Editors have always been required to work within the general policy guidelines outlined by publishers but otherwise have had wide discretionary authority of what goes into the news and features columns as well as the stress that is placed on any particular news item or topic. As budgetary strictures increased, all departments had to adjust their methods of operation and devise new ways to function while still maintaining the readability and appeal of the paper. Where newspapers once ran three or four daily editions, they now (essentially) print one. Where they once raced one another to be first on the street, they now share delivery trucks to depots. The old tension and the competitive aspects of the 'press deadline' is gone forever. Editorial costs, foreign bureaus, specialist writers, etc., were reduced, closed down or modified to suit the conditions of a new era in newspaper publishing.

What has all this got to do with the environment.

Editors now must temper any missionary zeal they might have because, regardless of their personal viewpoints, they can budget neither the time nor the money to research, write, or to rewrite, news items or features on specialized subjects. The environment, and all the surrounding issues that have a direct bearing on the environment, certainly fall within this category.

Environmentalists complain that the press does not have the right perspective on environmental issues and, too often, takes a disparaging attitude about "tree huggers", etc..

It is a rare editor (or politician) who has grasped the full scope and significance of global environmental destruction and the chain reactions it sets in motion: reactions that have far reaching implications for all of us. Therein lies the root of the communication and educational problems that plague environmentalists. The press have a limited understanding of the environmental message. But whose fault is it? As Pogo said in the comic strip, "We have found the enemy and it is us". We must recognize the condition and the requirements of the press.....and the electronic media.....if we are to communicate effectively.

The Problematique takes literally hundreds of forms on the land, sea and in the atmosphere. They are, however, all interrelated to the extent that they form a single malignancy capable of changing civilization as we know it. This is as familiar as the "Sermon on the Mount" but if we meekly do nothing about it, there will be precious little of this earth for future generations to inherit. We must do all we can to bring about change.

Here are a few examples of where, and how, we have failed.

- We are all environmentalists and are well aware of the high volume and variety of material on environmental and ecological subjects that emanates daily from thousands of sources around the world. Regardless of its importance, the greater part of this flood of information is not used because news releases, reports, etc. have not been submitted in a usable form nor with an understanding of the interests and requirements of editors.
- Too much thought is given to the points the author wants to get across and too little to the form in which it must be presented to inspire broad newspaper readership. It is imperative that any material sent to a newspaper be submitted in usable style and contain information that is important, readable and interesting from the standpoint of the public, be the target audience national, regional or local. Unless it is precise, relevant, complete and meaningful, it will never see the light of day.
- All too often, environmentalists find themselves reacting to situations that have passed the

recovery stage when they could have been anticipated.

Although it is a blinding flash of the obvious, it is important to recognize that the media are the sole means of communicating the environmental message. Nothing is accomplished until the message gets across and is clearly understood.

Where there are clashing interests on any issue, editors and reporters are the target of expressed opinions, news releases, press conferences and solicitations. They must sort out distortion from reality, what is true and what is false, what is rational and what is sophistry. Some appreciation of the difficulty of determining the truth can be gained by examining the policies and tactics of anti-environmentalists use to gain public and political sympathy for their position.

Who are anti-environmentalists and how do they function?

- Anti-environmentalists are corporations or individuals who have a remarkable contempt for anything that prejudices the implementation of their plans, their profit or their convenience, regardless of the environmental consequences.
- Anti-environmentalists, as a whole, are not formally organized in any group or association as such. Many are intellectual sophists who evolve simplistic formulas and generalizations that are attractive to the susceptible. They, individually or as an industry or industrial association, will oppose any environmental program that, directly or indirectly, prejudices their interests.
- Their opposition is almost always framed in terms the public understands, or think they understand.
- They react quickly and persistently to an immediate or threatening challenge.
- They accurately tie their rebuttals to local interests, conditions and politics for maximum effect.
- When they have a weak position, they will take whatever action is necessary to confuse the issue thus dulling or deflecting public attention.
- They will resort to, or threaten, legal action as a tactical measure to create public doubt over environmentalist claims.
- They have money, staff.
- They can call on the support of their unions and have ready access to politicians.

- They have flexibility. The nature of an environmental problem, from the environmentalist point of view, is usually easily expressed, is unchanging and uncomplicated. It remains unchanged through the period of any action. Those in opposition, however, command press space and broadcast time through the use of a very wide variety of public relations tactics, ploys, distortions and manoeuvres.
- Many people develop established views of particular environmental issues that effect them negatively in a particular way – location of dumps, hunting limitations, use of wetlands, development, etc., etc. They are inclined to develop an over-all anti-environmental bias and categorize all environmental subjects negatively in the light of their own particular interest. Anti-environmentalists, fighting for a particular position, seldom fail to broaden their base by mentioning unrelated side issues.

The foregoing points may be summarized as follows:

The most strident anti-environmentalists usually represent vested interests and are capable of marshaling organized opposition quickly and effectively by bringing to bear a wide variety of emotional, political, labour, industry and public relations methods and devices. They can gain the support of secondary supplier industries, or related organizations for additional political, labour and popular support to broaden the base of opposition. They are in a position to distort facts and claims with a wide degree of impunity and thus gain unwarranted sympathy for their position and downgrade environmental problems as a whole.

Anti-environmentalists do not have a broad general viewpoint on the global impact of their actions and attitudes. They have very specific fields of concern that are closely related to their own well-being and financial interests. When challenged by environmental resistance, they never fail to dress up their rebuttal with dire predictions of lost jobs, increased prices, loss of tax revenue, plant shut-downs or anything that will impress editors from the news standpoint – and intimidate politicians.

We all know that getting the environmental story across is a difficult one because it is broad, complicated and controversial. But we simply cannot wring our hands and do nothing. We are all fully aware of the world "Problematique". It is time we took active measures to do something about it.

The question I leave is, "What can CACOR do to enable the Canadian environmental movement to communicate effectively with the general public and to be a positive force in bringing about change?"

The Solution?

Almost all mass communication is disseminated by the press and the broadcast media. For the reasons outlined, news editors and feature writers have a veneer of knowledge of the inordinate risks of environmental degradation and destruction. They do not fully understand the complexity and the interdependencies that exist in the natural world. They cannot, and will not, allocate space or broadcast time unless they are made fully aware of the fact that we are fighting to save the essential values of life. It is our responsibility and any failure can be laid on our doorstep.

The first objective must therefore be the establishment of a system whereby environmentalists can justifiably gain the support of the media in publicizing the very many problems we know so well: that will make truly effective use of the masses of information on facts and conditions that are being produced by thousands of organizations around the world; and that will create an awareness that the degree of environmental destruction and depletion of resources is reaching what might be termed 'a critical mass'.

CACOR can play a very important role in the creation of such an organization without taking an active part in its operation. A meek, passive attitude or approach to the problem of communication is totally unacceptable for the very simple reason that the media stand between the problem and the cure. The press and the broadcast media are our only channels of mass communication. They represent the only weapon we have in the fight for survival.