

# econews

ECOLOGY PARTY NEWSLETTER

No 2 May-June 1979



Left to right: Geoff Garbutt, David Abrahams, John Ingham, three Eco candidates in the South West. Each polled over 1000 votes.

## Election success story

The 53 candidates standing for the Ecology Party in the General Election achieved a total of just over 40,000 votes. In the constituencies where we stood, our share of the poll averaged out at 1.6% of the votes cast. This result, together with the consistency with which we beat the National Front (in 17 out of 24 constituencies) puts us well ahead of the other parties, consolidating our position as the only significant challenge to the three major parties.

### One Million leaflets

Between them, our 53 candidates distributed well over a million leaflets! The number of "name-only" candidates was whittled down as the campaign progressed, and leaflets were produced of the highest standard - indisputably superior to those of the major parties in most cases.

The television and radio broadcasts were well received, and stirred up a lot of interest - about 4000 enquiries to date. Our press conferences also got wide coverage, as did the London candidates demonstration against the use of lead in petrol. All around the country, there were countless appearances on local television and radio. Our overall viewing audience is impossible to compute, but it must be well up above 20 million.

It will be a while before we can determine how much our membership has increased, but it will certainly have doubled. Apart from the thousands of enquiries received nationally, every campaign generated scores of local

enquiries - two branches have reported a ten fold increase in membership.

We have also achieved our objective of establishing "national credibility". The reaction to the Ecology Party in the press, both national and local, was serious and wholeheartedly sympathetic. An extensive network of press and media contacts has been established, and they are genuinely keen to hear more of us. Much work still has to be done analysing the results, and all the candidates and agents are gathering in Birmingham on the 19th May to start work on this. With successes in both rural and urban areas, and remarkably little regional variation, the 53 results present a very similar pattern. It will not be easy to isolate any "natural electorate", but what information there is will be gathered together for future reference - this election has provided the Party with a vast store of invaluable experience.

### Fourth Party

We have therefore succeeded in dramatically increasing our membership, projecting ecology into the national consciousness, and establishing ourselves as Britain's fourth political party. It is widely agreed that the most important job for the Party over the next few years is to make real headway at the local level. The General Election campaign has provided a solid foundation on which to build for the future.

Jonathon Porritt.  
Peter Frings.

## Torness - 4000 occupy site

The Torness Gathering on May 4 - 7th was a timely reminder of the growing strength of the anti nuclear movement. 10,000 people attended the festival on the Saturday, and over 4,000 stayed on to occupy the site of Britain's next AGR on the following Sunday and Monday.

The Gathering was more than just a protest rally - it was a celebration of the values of the ecological movement. In glorious sunshine, people renewed old friendships, visited exhibitions and bookstalls from a bewildering range of alternative groups, joined the kids on the inflatables, or just relaxed listening to music from local folk bands wafting along the shore.

A considerable number of people visited the Eco marquee, organized by the Edinburgh branch, and containing a bookstall, leaflets, and an exhibition explaining party policy. A workshop on the future of the Ecology Party attracted 200 people.

## Clamshell Alliance

In other marquees, representatives from both the Clamshell Alliance in America, and a German Burgerinitiativen group spoke of their experiences and led workshops discussing further opposition to nuclear power. Elsewhere on the site could be found an adventure playground, face painting, kite making, windmills and solar panels, and also Bath Civil Aid, feeding the ten thousand with a majestic array of wood stoves.

The following day, successive waves of occupiers marched to the site, walking over the perimeter fence on a staircase of straw bales donated by local farmers. Later, a section of the Torness Alliance strolled into the inner compound and caused some minor damage to machinery - a few deflated tyres and severed fuel pipes - but desisted after appeals from a solitary policeman and other occupiers. 300 stalwarts braved torrential rain and stayed overnight. The site was re-occupied in strength the following day, and remained so until Tuesday morning.

The Gathering achieved most of its objectives. The simple act of coming together en masse hardened the resolve of the movement,

Continued on Page 3

eco



# econews

EDITOR: Peter Frings, 15 Lower North Street, Exeter, EX4 3ET, Devon.  
EDITORIAL BOARD: David Fleming, 104 South Hill Park, London, NW3.  
Keith Rushworth, 8 The Mount, Alwoodley, Leeds.  
Alan Clarke, 65 Oakfield Road, Clifton, Bristol.  
COPY DATE FOR NEXT ISSUE: June 25th.

## STRIKING THE BALANCE

1979 will go down in the record books as the year Britain woke up to ecopolitics, and the year the Ecology Party forced its way firmly onto the political map. The general election campaign has been an unprecedented success and can be counted as a formidable achievement for a political machine as ostensibly fragile as ours might have seemed only a few short months ago.

In our euphoria however, it should not be forgotten that our involvement in this election was on pragmatic rather than altruistic grounds, and that we haven't got anywhere yet - we've simply passed the first milestone. The real work lies in establishing our network of local branches, committed to active social and political participation at community level, and in tidying up our administration and public image into a realistic and serious working model of the society at the end of our rainbow. We could certainly do worse than agree with Johnson that "example is always more efficacious than precept" - both in a practical and an ideological sense.

Our collective heart is in the right place, as everyone will no doubt agree. Nevertheless, the mechanics of our system still leave something to

## Alan Clarke on decentralization

be desired. The new membership record system, at present waiting in the wings for its grand unveiling, is a bureaucrats dream, if the draft instructions to branches are anything to go by. There has been an unaccountably hostile reaction to the proposals for varying degrees of regional autonomy that have now been put to two successive regional conferences. Some of our "selection procedures" - for want of a better phrase - are arbitrary to say the least. A good example of this last point is our list of candidates for the European elections; another is the makeup of the editorial board of Econews, devised by the NEC in London earlier this year.

It is understandable that the delicate balance of the Party's administrative equipment should be strained a little by a General Election - in such circumstances, the benefits of a central decision taking body far outweigh the costs. Now that its all over, the more elementary principle of ecology should return to the forefront to guide us into the future. The temptation to play the centralists at their own game is a strong one, but it should be resisted - once on the roundabout, it's almost impossible to get off.

Alan Clarke.

## ELECTION FEVER

Since May 3rd, the Ecology Party has been quietly celebrating. And rightly so. To come from nowhere, and end up acknowledged as Britain's fourth political party is a magnificent achievement. And to do it on shoestring resources, with the barest modicum of previous experience, has impressed even the hardest bitten of political commentators. "A breath of fresh air", "a wider perspective", "a note of reality" - ECO can feel justifiably proud of providing these, standing out in all we did as the only alternative to today's consensus politics.

Nevertheless, many of us must have looked on with some apprehension as the ballot papers were unfolded and counted before us. Those one or two fragile crosses out of every hundred were so anxiously sought out, whilst all the rest provided a forceful and painfully visible reminder of just how far we still have to go.

We have five years in which to do it, five years to ensure that all the interest and sympathy we inspire is converted into hard voting power. With our newly won credibility and a massively increased membership, we should not be too dismayed at the challenge of facing up to several years of unmitigated Thatcherism - we certainly won't go short of targets to aim at!

## Porritt's prognosis

Most immediately, the European election on June 7th is an important event for us. For all the electorates stolid indifference, it gives us a chance to maintain the momentum, a useful bridge along the road to our conference in September where we must set the pattern for the next couple of years.

These will be the show pieces. Less dramatically and less visibly, the most important job will be to build up the party on the foundations laid during the general election. We must get ourselves properly organized, ensuring above all that our decentralist principles amount to more than paper-thin rhetoric. We must forge closer links with the whole environmental movement, avoiding the holier-than-thou purism which alienates so many potential colleagues. And we must put flesh on our ecological bones, backing principle with policy, balancing distant visions with short term realities.

So we're going to be busy. And it's an enormously exciting prospect, for this campaign has demonstrated just how important a role we have to play in British politics, and just how big a gap there is to fill.

For our part, we have proved that it's a task of which we are clearly capable. ECO has at last arrived.

Jonathon Porritt.



# NEWS

## Three Eco candidates in European Elections

The Ecology Party will be fielding three candidates for the European elections on June 7th.

Michael Benfield will be standing for Midlands Central, Jonathon Porritt for London Central, and Teddy Goldsmith for Cornwall and Plymouth.

This represents the best regional spread we could get, and the most sensible use of very limited resources. Despite our success in the general election, even so limited a commitment as this will stretch to the limit the dedication of the membership and our financial reserves - involvement in this particular democratic process does not come cheap. The deposit alone is £600, and with constituencies of over half a million, even a low-key campaign is a high-cost campaign.

This should not obscure the fact that even so small a presence as this is important for the Party. Having staked out so solid a claim at the General Election, the European election provides an excellent opportunity to keep up the momentum. It means proving

ourselves all over again, and just as our message in the General election was received as a fresh, realistic alternative, so this time must we impress a jaded electorate that we have something different to offer.

It is of course galling to hear our colleagues in other European countries confidently predicting the election of a significant number of ecology candidates, while we yet again have to compete with an electoral system stacked so comprehensively against us. But even without the prospect of ending up with any Eco Euro MP's, we have a lot to go for. Just to save those deposits would be to achieve our best fundraising success to date! With a low turn out, and party loyalties somewhat in abeyance, we have a good opportunity to press our message home.

All of which means that before we've even had a chance to draw breath, it's back to that good old election treadmill.

Jonathon Porritt.



Teddy Goldsmith

Michael Benfield

Jonathon Porritt

## Torness

and gave a tremendous psychological fillip to participants. Media coverage was excellent and particularly sympathetic in Scotland, while relations with the police and local community remain very friendly.

Unfortunately, little immediate progress was made towards halting the construction of the Torness reactor. For this reason,

the call for violent destruction of the site and a permanent occupation will be considerably stronger next time round - and many activists previously committed to non-violence will reluctantly support it. The arsenal of repressive techniques at the State's disposal means that violence is unlikely to succeed, but if reasoned argument and peaceful protest continue to be ignored, what other option is open to us?

Peter Frings.

## Debt of gratitude

Now that it's all over, all the candidates would like to acknowledge their debt of gratitude to the membership as a whole, for their generous contributions to the General Election Fund and all the different branch campaigns. Without this generosity, we would now be in much the same position as we were 6 months ago.

## Eco-martyr

The campaign has of course imposed a real strain on Eco-members. Several candidates and Party activists are now in some financial difficulty, and many more are conscious of having let things slip at work, or having neglected family obligations. We even have our first "eco-martyr", Jacky Dempsey, who has been dismissed from her job on the flimsiest of pretexts.

If a history of the party is ever written, the overall level of commitment and the many individual sacrifices will take some telling.

Jonathon Porritt.

## Official manifesto back on sale

John Luck now has stocks of the Party's 1976 manifesto ("Little Green Book") as amended at the Birmingham 1978 conference. Any member who wants to find out about the Party's officially adopted policies should have a copy. The manifesto costs £1 per copy including postage and packing - all profit goes to boost party funds. There is a 10% discount on orders of 5-9 copies, and 20% discount on orders of 10 or more copies. Send your order, with cash, to John Luck, 20 Military Road, Rye, Sussex.

(New members should not confuse our election manifesto "The Real Alternative" with the official manifesto mentioned above. "The Real Alternative" is a condensed version of the older manifesto.)



# NEWS

## GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS

### SOUTH WEST

<b>BATH (2.2%)</b>	
Patten (C).....	23025
Mayhew (L).....	13915
Baber (Lab).....	11407
DON GRIMES (Eco).....	1082
Mundy (NF).....	206
<b>BODMIN (0.9%)</b>	
Hicks (C).....	27922
Tyler (L).....	17893
Knowles (Lab).....	5508
Holmes (MK).....	865
CHRIS RETALLACK (Eco).....	465
Carter (NF).....	235
<b>BOURNEMOUTH EAST (1.5%)</b>	
Atkinson (C).....	25808
Goodwin (Lab).....	7553
Matthew (L).....	6738
Pratt (NB).....	681
JACKY DEMPSEY (Eco).....	523
<b>BRISTOL NORTH EAST (1.25%)</b>	
Palmer (Lab Co-op).....	19337
Mulvaney (C).....	13685
Trinain (L).....	3693
GUNDULA DOREY (Eco).....	469
Brown (NF).....	320
<b>BRISTOL WEST (2.7%)</b>	
Waldegrave (C).....	22257
Bath (Lab).....	9690
Silver (L).....	8880
JOHN INGHAM (Eco).....	1154
Jones (NF).....	246
Redmore (UDP).....	93
<b>CHIPPENHAM (0.87%)</b>	
Needham (C).....	29308
Banks (L).....	24611
Inchley (Lab).....	5146
BERT PETTIT (Eco).....	521
<b>CORNWALL NORTH (0.9%)</b>	
Neale (C).....	24489
Pardoe (L).....	20742
Tremlett (Lab).....	1514
JEREMY FAULL (Eco).....	442
Bridgwater (NF).....	224
<b>DEVIZES (1.1%)</b>	
Morrison (C).....	32439
Finlayson (Lab).....	16351
Ainslie (L).....	14059
RAY BURCHAM (Eco).....	713
Mockler (WR).....	142
<b>DEVON NORTH (1.1%)</b>	
Speller (C).....	51811
Thorpe (L).....	23538
Saltern (Lab).....	7108
TONY WHITTAKER (Eco).....	729
Price (NF).....	237
Hansford-Miller (ENP).....	142
Waugh (DLP).....	79
Rous (WR).....	50
Boaks (DMPSWR).....	20

<b>EXETER (1.9%)</b>	
Hannam (C).....	27173
Hobbs (Lab).....	19146
Marsh (L).....	8756
PETER FRINGS (Eco).....	1053
<b>GLOUCESTERSHIRE S. (1.0%)</b>	
Cope (C).....	35627
Mullins (Lab).....	20465
Conrad (L).....	12850
DAVID KERRIDGE (Eco).....	695
<b>HONITON (2.0%)</b>	
Emery (C).....	37832
Ruffle (L).....	12601
Luesby (Lab).....	8756
HILARY BACON (Eco).....	1423
<b>LYMINGTON &amp; CHRISTCHURCH (2.2%)</b>	
Adley (C).....	29817
Harrison (L).....	7654
Hatts (Lab).....	6722
JIM KEELING (Eco).....	975
<b>ST IVES (1.0%)</b>	
Nott (C).....	22352
Evans (Lab).....	8636
Cotton (L).....	8299
Murley (MK).....	1662
HOWARD HOPTROUGH (Eco).....	427
<b>SOMERSET NORTH (1.6%)</b>	
Dean (C).....	45173
Smith (Lab).....	22122
Sanders (L).....	12898
RICHARD CARDER (Eco).....	1254
<b>TAUNTON (2.6%)</b>	
Du Cann (C).....	28483
Horne (Lab).....	15759
Lee (L).....	7928
GEOFFREY GARBETT (Eco).....	1403
<b>TORBAY (1.75%)</b>	
Bennett (C).....	36099
Mitchell (L).....	15231
Fear (Lab).....	12919
DAVID ABRAHAMS (Eco).....	1161
Spry (NF).....	647
<b>WESTBURY (0.9%)</b>	
Walters (C).....	29929
Jackson (L).....	15950
Atkins (Lab).....	12532
Alexander (Ind).....	2547
Thatcher (WR).....	1905
SALLY RODWELL (Eco).....	554

### LEEDS AREA

<b>BARKSTON ASH (2.5%)</b>	
Alison (C).....	40581
Muir (Lab).....	21670
Pughe-Morgan (L).....	7909
DAVID CORRY (Eco).....	1829

<b>BATLEY &amp; MORLEY (1.0%)</b>	
Woolmer (Lab).....	22984
Crone (C).....	17634
Caywood (L).....	4943
Parkins (Ind).....	848
CLIVE LORD (Eco).....	460
<b>KEIGHLEY (0.48%)</b>	
Cryer (Lab).....	19698
Dawson (C).....	19620
Holmstedt (L).....	4062
Fairey (NF).....	234
JOYCE WADE (Eco).....	208
<b>LEEDS EAST (0.4%)</b>	
Healey (Lab).....	26346
Carter (C).....	15810
Ellis (L).....	4622
Rigby (NF).....	445
ANNE HILL (Eco).....	206
Slaughter (WRP).....	103
<b>LEEDS NORTH EAST (2.0%)</b>	
Joseph (C).....	20297
Sedler (Lab).....	14913
Hollingworth (L).....	5329
SARA PARKIN (Eco).....	813
Tibbitts (AC).....	103
<b>LEEDS NORTH WEST (1.7%)</b>	
Kaberry (C).....	23837
O'Grady (Lab).....	17623
Keates (L).....	7899
KEITH RUSHWORTH (Eco).....	847
<b>PUDSEY (0.6%)</b>	
Shaw (C).....	24591
Cooksey (L).....	15832
McBride (Lab).....	13727
PETER LEWENZ (Eco).....	340
<b>RIPON (1.85%)</b>	
Hampson (C).....	26292
Tennant (L).....	9089
Davies (Lab).....	6749
ALASTAIR LAURENCE (Eco).....	781
<b>SHIPLEY (1.0%)</b>	
Fox (C).....	22641
Ward (Lab).....	14281
Roberts (L).....	5673
DAVID PEDLEY (Eco).....	486

### THE NORTH

<b>ALTRINCHAM &amp; SALE (1.4%)</b>	
Montgomery (C).....	29873
Pratt (Lab Co-op).....	14643
Campbell (L).....	12603
CICELY MARSH (Eco).....	796
<b>CROSBY (2.4%)</b>	
Page (C).....	34768
Mulhearn (Lab).....	15496
Hill (L).....	9302
PETER HUSSEY (Eco).....	1489

FIGURES IN BRACKETS REPRESENT PERCENTAGE ECOLOGY VOTE IN THAT CONSTITUENCY



# NEWS

## GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS

### LONDON

<b>BECKENHAM (1.75%)</b>	
Goodhart (C) .....	24607
Mordecai (Lab) .....	10856
Forrest (L) .....	6450
BIFF VERNON (Eco) .....	762
Dickson (NF) .....	606
<b>BRENTFORD &amp; ISLEWORTH (0.8%)</b>	
Hayhoe (C) .....	27527
Walker (Lab) .....	22533
Parry (L) .....	4208
Attridge (NF) .....	738
IRENE COATES (Eco) .....	454
Simmerson (CACM) .....	257
<b>CHINGFORD (1.5%)</b>	
Tebbit (C) .....	24640
Gerrard (Lab) .....	12257
Nicholson (L) .....	5225
South (NF) .....	1157
STEVE LAMBERT (Eco) .....	649
<b>DULWICH (1.1%)</b>	
Silkin (Lab) .....	18557
Morley (C) .....	18435
Pearson (L) .....	4759
Thompson (NF) .....	920
DAVID SMART (Eco) .....	468
<b>HENDON SOUTH (1.5%)</b>	
Thomas (C) .....	19981
Mantle (Lab) .....	11231
Palmer (L) .....	5799
GEOFFREY SYER (Eco) .....	563
Elder (NF) .....	290
<b>ISLINGTON CENTRAL (1.2%)</b>	
Grant (Lab) .....	13415
Goodson-Wickes (C) .....	9276
Dunn (L) .....	2242
Chaney (NF) .....	797
ADRIAN WILLIAMS (Eco) .....	310
<b>KENSINGTON (2.06%)</b>	
Rhys-Williams (C) .....	17361
Holmes (Lab) .....	11898
Vincent-Emery (L) .....	3537
NICHOLAS ALBERRY (Eco) .....	698
Hopewell (NF) .....	356
<b>ST MARYLEBONE (2.8%)</b>	
Baker (C) .....	14899
Hegarty (Lab) .....	6586
Mann (L) .....	2459
JONATHAN PORRITT (Eco) .....	691
Elrick (NF) .....	239
<b>HITCHIN (1.45%)</b>	
Stewart (C) .....	35169
O'Flynn (Lab) .....	19940
Dix (L) .....	8224
BRIAN GOODALE (Eco) .....	911
Logan (NF) .....	881
<b>READING SOUTH (1.2%)</b>	
Vaughan (C) .....	30067
Gale (Lab) .....	14422
Watts (L) .....	10642
PETER DUNN (Eco) .....	700

### MIDLANDS

<b>BIRMINGHAM EDGBASTON (1.8%)</b>	
Knight (C) .....	25192
Hudson (Lab) .....	15605
Duguid (L) .....	4377
JONATHAN TYLER (Eco) .....	852
Howlett (JHC) .....	297
Dore (SSE) .....	129
Marshall (Ind) .....	112
<b>LOUGHBOROUGH (0.98%)</b>	
Dorrell (C) .....	29788
Cronin (Lab) .....	24589
Palmer (L) .....	6650
DAVID WHITEBREAD (Eco) .....	595
Peacock (NF) .....	484
<b>WARWICK &amp; LEAMINGTON (1.36%)</b>	
Smith (C) .....	35925
Gray (Lab) .....	19367
Woodcock (L) .....	9905
PETER SIZER (Eco) .....	905
<b>WORCESTER (1.2%)</b>	
Walker (C) .....	30194
Sparks (Lab) .....	18605
Elliot (L) .....	8886
JOHN DAVENPORT (Eco) .....	707
Stevens (NF) .....	450
<b>WORCESTERSHIRE SOUTH (2.8%)</b>	
Spicer (C) .....	34926
Phillips (L) .....	14272
Daniel (Lab) .....	10206
GUY WOODFORD (Eco) .....	1722

### SOUTH EAST

<b>BRIGHTON PAVILION (1.5%)</b>	
Amery (C) .....	22218
Hill (Lab) .....	12099
Venables (L) .....	5965
JOHN BEALE (Eco) .....	638
Jones (NF) .....	436
<b>CHICHESTER (1.2%)</b>	
Nelson (C) .....	34696
Rix (L) .....	10920
Cooke (Lab) .....	8569
Iremonger (UCP) .....	863
NICK BAGNALL (Eco) .....	656
<b>GILLINGHAM (1.0%)</b>	
Burden (C) .....	26791
Love (Lab) .....	16292
Sidebottom (L) .....	6219
Campbell (NF) .....	528
COLIN FRY (Eco) .....	501
Beckwith (WRP) .....	92
<b>RYE (2.2%)</b>	
Irvine (C) .....	35516
Moore (L) .....	12438
Smyth (Lab) .....	6852
ANNE RIX (Eco) .....	1267
Duesbury (NF) .....	552

### EAST ANGLIA

<b>LOWESTOFT (0.65%)</b>	
Prior (C) .....	33376
Lark (Lab) .....	25555
Skelcher (L) .....	6783
TIM PYE (Eco) .....	435
<b>NORWICH NORTH (0.94%)</b>	
Ennals (Lab) .....	17927
Rippon (C) .....	12336
Moore (L) .....	4253
GEORGE HANNAH (Eco) .....	334
Goold (NF) .....	250
Panes (Comm) .....	106
Colling (WRP) .....	92

### WALES

<b>BEDWELTY (1.4%)</b>	
Kinnock (Lab) .....	28794
Walter (C) .....	8358
Richards (PC) .....	2648
PETER ROUT (Eco) .....	556
<b>PEMBROKE (1.1%)</b>	
Edwards (C) .....	30483
Evans (Lab) .....	23015
Livesey (L) .....	6249
Dawe (PC) .....	1573
BRIAN KINGZETT (Eco) .....	694

### SCOTLAND

<b>EDINBURGH SOUTH (1.3%)</b>	
Ancram (C) .....	17986
Brown (Lab) .....	15526
Lovell (L) .....	7400
Shirley (SNP) .....	3800
STEWART BIGGAR (Eco) .....	552

### SUMMARY

53 CANDIDATES  
39918 VOTES

SOUTH WEST...1.5%  
LEEDS...1.3%  
LONDON...1.5%  
MIDLANDS...1.6%  
SOUTH EAST...1.5%  
ELSEWHERE...1.3%

OVERALL PERCENTAGE  
VOTE...1.5%



# BRANCH NEWS

## 22 new branches!

### South West

As usual, the South West is making the running. A new branch has sprung up in Truro and is already producing its own newsletter. The branch had hoped to be able to contest David Penhaligon's Truro constituency, but in the end were thwarted through lack of a suitable candidate. Since then attention has had to be concentrated on the local elections in Truro, and assistance for Howard Hoptrough in nearby St Ives.

Bristol and Somerset also have local newsletters, and Somerset have started a branch library - an excellent recycling scheme. Henry Pomeroy is anxious to start something in the Cirencester area: Jonathon Porritt and David Taylor spoke at a meeting there in March, and another is scheduled for April 20th.

It looks likely that a North Devon branch will soon be starting up after the impetus from the general election campaign there, and there is a possibility that a new branch will also be started in Honiton.

### North West

Encouraging news from Richard Slaughter of a small group of activists at Lancaster University. It is hoped that this will eventually lead to the formation of branches in Lancaster and Garstang. Members wanting more information are asked to contact Jonathon Lambert, Furness College, Univ. of Lancaster, LA1 4YF.

John Wareing has sent an up-to-date list of branch secretaries or contacts in the region. Apart from Jonathon Lambert mentioned above, Mrs Jean Johnson of 16 Oak Street, Shaw, Oldham, (Shaw 848257), is the contact for members in the Oldham area, while Blackburn members should get in touch with Win Bentley, 62 Prospect Avenue, Darwen, Lancs. (0254 76328). A Blackburn branch should have formed on the 10th May. The Merseyside branch (Secretary Peter Hussey, 167 Gardner Rd., Formby, Merseyside, 07048 72645) is shortly splitting into three: Wirral, Liverpool and Crosby. John Wareing, the Regional Organizer, would like to hear from people in the following areas, where he is on the verge of setting up groups: Chester, Warrington,

Chorley, Preston and Manchester. He is also trying to arrange a regional conference, to be held in July, probably in Preston.

### North East

Gleanings from the Leeds regional newsletter: A new branch in York, formed after a meeting in David King's Wholefood's Restaurant at 98 Micklegate, York. Further meetings in Sheffield (see last newsletter) and news of potential branch organizers in Huddersfield, Batley and Whitby. The election results in the Leeds area ought to help.

### South East

Following my report last time, I have had confirmation that a branch has been set up in Brighton. John Beale is Chairman, and Roger Bennett Secretary. Again, a good result in the general election (1.5%) should help things along.

A new branch too in Aylesbury, which I had to look up in my Atlas. I imagine it falls within the South East (North of Thames) Region, but I stand open to correction. The branch was formed in March, following a public meeting earlier that month to which Jonathan Tyler had been invited to speak. A Chairman (Roger Oliver) and Secretary/Treasurer (Tim Stevens) have been elected and a bank account opened.

### London

News has just arrived of a new branch in Enfield. Members living in Enfield should write to 15 Highworth Road, London, N11, or phone the Secretary, David Merryweather on 366 5936.

### East Midlands

Finally an open meeting in Leicester (held in a Real Ale Pub) gave some impetus to our new Leicester branch, which already has 20 full members. Dave and Linda Whitebread seem to have assumed organizational responsibility, and Dave has pointed out to me that his telephone number is Ashby 2369 and not 2367 as printed in the last issue of Eiconews. Sorry!

Please send all branch news direct to Alan Clarke, who compiled the above report.

## Regional Committee ruled out

For the second time in as many months, the question of regional independence has been brought up at a Regional Annual Conference - this time by the Kent branch at the first Conference and AGM of the South - East (South of Thames) Region at Guildford on March 10th.

The proposal put to the conference by Fred Clarke, was that a Regional Committee be formed to administer the region generally, prepare alternative structure plans, advise local branches, develop party philosophy and co-ordinate press issues. After discussion, this was defeated by 23 - 11, the general feeling being that a Committee was unnecessary at the present stage, and that its establishment might hinder rather than develop devolution within the party.

The greatest measure of agreement on the day was for the proposal to drop the cumbersome title South East (South of Thames) Region, and to adopt simply South East Region in its place. Exactly where that leaves the present South East (North of Thames) Region is not known for certain - the NEC have discussed the question and are hoping for a decision at the national AGM.

The day's formalities saw Peter Draper elected as NEC representative for the Region, and Basil Mager returned as Regional Co-ordinator.

Alan Clarke.

## District Elections

We are unable to publish a breakdown of our results in the district elections, because candidates, almost without exception, have failed to send details of their election figures to Jonathon Porritt.

From the few results known to the Editor, we appear to have done extremely well. John Campbell, standing in Exeter polled 17%, beating two Labour and one Liberal candidate. Don Grimes and Richard Carder, standing in Bath, both achieved over 20%. Alan Clarke, standing in a three seat ward in Bristol, polled over 1000 votes. Results such as these indicate the true level of our support, unobscured by the tactical voting that occurs in a general election.



# GREEN POLITICS

## Italian Radicals turn green

The Italian Radical Party today shares much of the philosophy of the Green parties of Germany, France, Great Britain and Belgium, and its policies, as one would expect, are also similar. It differs from them in that it is a well established party, with four members in the Italian Parliament, and secondly in that it has only moved slowly towards becoming an ecological party - one step at a time, so much so that it is possible that many of its members may not yet have realised that it has actually done so.

The Party is a small one. It has only 2000 members, but its influence is considerable, partly at least because it has refused to take part in the increasingly sterile and irrelevant arguments that separate the right from the left, from both of which, as Emma Bonino, one of its leading figures tells us, it is increasingly isolated.

Instead it is concerned with more serious issues such as political decentralization, federalism, the preservation of cultural diversity - all of which are closely related. It has been active in defending the rights of such groups as the Sardinians and the inhabitants of the Val di Fassa in the Trentino to preserve their customs and also to teach their respective languages in local schools.

It has also been concerned with civil liberties including women's rights, and significantly, it fought hard to obtain

the legalization of divorce and also of abortion. Another of its concerns is "la caccia", the large scale massacre of song-birds that takes place every year in Italy.

More recently it has taken up the nuclear issue. Emma Bonino was a member of the Parliamentary Commission appointed to study this subject. She was so unimpressed by the arguments made use of by the nuclear experts testifying at this commission that she became determined that the Radical Party would take up the anti-nuclear cause.

### Ingredients

Decentralization, federalism, cultural diversity, civil liberties, birth control, protection of wildlife and a passionate opposition to the development of nuclear power - these are some of the main ingredients of an ecological policy, and it was inevitable that a party with such concerns would sooner or later come into contact with the Green Movement in the rest of Europe. Its first contact was in July 1977 when Marco Panella, the Party's leader met Brice Lalonde, one of the leading figures in French eco-politics in Paris. The following year Panella attended a meeting of Ecoropa in Geneva. Since then both Emma Bonino and Marco Panella have joined Ecoropa and regularly attended its meetings, while they have set up a branch

of Friends of the Earth (Amici de la Terra) in Italy.

Particularly interesting is the Radical Party's concern with direct government. The Italian constitution makes possible three different means whereby ordinary citizens can directly influence legislation. The first is the 'popular initiative', whereby Parliament must debate a specific issue if 50,000 citizens sign a petition asking it to do so. The second is the regional referendum, the procedure for which varies from region to region. In general, about 30,000 signatures, obtained within a three month period, are sufficient to force the Regional Parliament to organize a referendum on a specific issue. The third is the national referendum which must be organized at the request of 500,000 citizens, whose signatures must also be obtained within a three month period.

### Referenda

The Radical Party makes use of these three very valuable tools for achieving its ends. This year, due to its great energy and initiative, no fewer than eight referenda are in the offing, including one on "la caccia" and another on nuclear power. Emma Bonino is quite sure that the Italian people will vote 'ecologically' on both these issues.

Teddy Goldsmith.

## CONFERENCE 79

The 1979 Ecology Party Conference and Annual General Meeting will be held at Keele University on the 7th, 8th and 9th of September. The organizers are expecting at least 300 members to attend.

Much of the conference will be taken up with policy formation. Jeremy Faulk and Gundula Dorey (addresses on back page) are co-ordinating the presentation of policy papers this year, and will be sending drafts of all conference policy documents to branches sometime in August. Individuals, branches or regions

who wish to present resolutions to the conference should send them to David Taylor before July, so that they can be circulated to branches beforehand.

There is a choice of accommodation: rooms will be available at the University, or members may choose to stay at a camping site 5 miles to the south of the University on the A4. The phone number of Trentham Gardens Camping Site is 0782 657225 - members who wish to use the site will have to make their own arrangements.

The cost of accommodation at the University, together with meals should work out at approximately £18-£20.

Full details of the programme/agenda, costs, delegate voting system, etc will be provided in the next issue of Econews. Queries concerning the University or facilities should be sent to Ron Andrews (021 445 2576); suggestions for speakers, entertainment, and any other matter connected with the conference should be addressed to David Taylor, the Conference Organizer, at 13 St James Square, Bath. (0225 319434).

David Taylor.



# LETTERS

## The Stable Society: debate continues

73 Molesworth Street,  
Wadebridge,  
Cornwall.

Dear Sir,

It has been suggested that I answer Richard Slaughter's criticisms on "The Stable Society", published in the March/April newsletter.

In his review he describes it as "one of the bleakest books he has ever encountered". The style he regards as "self indulgent". It is considered to lack "discipline, humour, and coherence." I am said to have the "excruciating habit of writing down" to my readers. My criticisms of modern science he tells us are "quite meaningless when they are not simply banal".

Elsewhere the style is described as "pretentious" and he refers to "the disdain with which it (the book) treats the identity and experience of its readers".

I am also accused of "sterile posturings" and of having "cobbled together a tawdry little system that borrows from all of these (history, science, the human personality etc) but gives little back".

Finally, I am told that my book is, from the point of view of the ecological movement, "a continuing disaster".

Unfortunately these are not precise criticisms deserving precise answers. They are simply different, if somewhat abusive ways of saying that he, Richard Slaughter, does not like this book and still less its author.

However, he does make a few points which I should perhaps try to answer.

The first is that the book preaches a return to pre-industrial or pre-Christian society. This is not true. We are all concerned in trying to work out what sort of society we would like to create out of the ruins of industrialism. It has always been my theme that one could not simply postulate a hypothetical society of which there was no historical precedent. One has first of all to look at the past and see the sort of societies which proved to be viable. To do otherwise is to postulate that 95% or so of the human experience on this planet i.e. that which preceded the industrial era is totally irrelevant - and I do not think anyone in the Ecological Movement believes this. In "The Stable Society" I tried to determine what were the forces

which enabled pre-industrial societies to achieve stability. I did not say we should return to the past - it would be impossible to do so. Our experience is irreversible. We can only move towards the future, though the future may have many things in common with the past. In this way when the Roman Empire collapsed, there was not a return to the Hellenic city, nor to the original tribes which created it. New social forms came into being, such as the feudal system, and the medieval city state.

Slaughter accuses me of authoritarian leanings. That is why, he intimates, I am so concerned with social control. This betrays his lack of understanding of the notion of control. A natural system whether it is a biological organism, a society, or an ecosystem, is said to be under control when its behaviour displays order as opposed to randomness. One of the main features of a natural system when functioning normally is that it is self regulating which means that it can control itself. This is true of primitive societies. It is because they could control themselves that there was no need for any institutional government of any kind, and less need for dictators, who in tribal societies are conspicuous by their absence. Government in such societies is by public opinion - "demouphenos" as it was known among the ancient Greeks. Indeed autocracy only becomes possible once the social and cultural forms that make self-government possible are allowed to disintegrate. This is not only my thesis. It was that of Aristotle who pointed out in his "Politics" that it was only with social disintegration and the development of a mass society that dictators such as Pisistratus of Athens and Dionysius of Syracuse began to emerge. This is also the theme of Kornhauser in his valuable book "The Politics of Mass Society", and of Durkheim who showed that the terrible instability of modern society was due to the absence of what he referred to as "intermediary associations" which are so important in a traditional society, and whose disintegration renders the isolated individual totally helpless and puts him at the mercy of the bureaucratic institutions that emerge to fill the vacuum.

Another answerable criticism is that stability is not the basic feature of an ecological society. He suggests "liberty, equality

and fraternity". This seems strange for one who affects so little interest in the past. Perhaps Slaughter has not been told that the Bastille has already been stormed.

Slaughter seems to have misunderstood the meaning of the term 'stability' which is normally equated with 'continuity'. A stable society is above all one that can survive over a long period without undergoing drastic and crippling changes. A stable society must therefore be capable of living off the interest rather than the capital of its resources, otherwise it would soon face a resource crisis. It must also refrain from polluting its environment so as to avoid being poisoned. It must also preserve its culture and its social structure to avoid the emergence of authoritarian governments, and hence to massacres, wars, and other social discontinuities. Hence the Ecological Movement's concern with the concept of 'stability' or the 'steady state', which is the same thing.

My feeling is that Slaughter has not only failed to understand what this book is about, but also what are the basic principles of the movement to which he claims to adhere. I can only suggest that until he has increased his understanding of these matters he might consider writing with greater modesty and less vindictiveness.

Yours faithfully,  
Edward Goldsmith.

## Neo-tribalism

Burrington House,  
Burrington,  
Ludlow,  
Shropshire.

Dear Sir,

We were delighted to read Richard Slaughter's unequivocal attack on Goldsmith's philosophy in the March-April Ecology Party Newsletter. (We hope incidentally that the name 'econews' - especially without a capital - will be quietly abandoned.) It is vital that the Party's ideology should be clearly distinguished from Goldsmith's "neo-tribalism". At present, the apparent association, particularly with Goldsmith's prominent candidature, causes considerable confusion: in our case at least, it certainly mutes our enthusiasm for the Party.

Yours sincerely,  
Nicholas and Antonia Parsons.



# LETTERS

## Stab in the back

15 Ellsworthy Terrace,  
London, NW5.

Dear Sir,

It would be pleasant to offer you unreserved congratulations on the first issue of Econews. Plainly its a great improvement in presentation over its predecessor (though I have to reach for my strongest spectacles to read the small type). But I can't believe I was the only eco-party member to feel distinctly put off by two features in it.

The first was the leading article "A Government of Ecologists" which claimed that "voting is not political action, it is political abdication", and that "the first act of a truly ecological parliament would be to dissolve itself". Whether or not the anarchist case against representative government has ever been satisfactorily answered, neither the party's 1976 manifesto, nor its 1979 election manifesto lends any warrant for putting it forward as party policy. A commitment to devolve powers to regional and district assemblies in no way implies that voting is political abdication, since it is clearly indicated that these assemblies will themselves be elected; nor will a Parliament which retains many vital functions such as foreign policy, resource management and pollution control be in any hurry to dissolve itself. While we might all enjoy discussing such ideas on a suitable occasion (such as the next Conference), to trot them out on the eve of a General Election must have seemed little short of a stab in the back to 50 odd candidates preparing to explain the party's national policies to the electorate for the first time.

Even more disturbing, to me at least, was the space (almost 1/2 of the entire issue) devoted to Richard Slaughter's slashing attack on Teddy Goldsmith. It is difficult to comment on the ideas underlying this since they are so scantily indicated: we are given little beyond the author's self description as "a long active member of the environmental movement" who happens to believe in "the sheer living promise of a truly egalitarian, decentralised society". What I find totally unacceptable is the general tone of character assassination, which leads up to the predestined conclusion that "as part of the intellectual baggage of the Ecology Party it (Goldsmith's 'tawdry little system') is a continuing disaster".

There are many routes which can lead to a conviction of the necessity for an Ecology Party and there must be hundreds of new members who, like me, have come to it for

reasons which are neither Goldsmiths or Slaughter's. What matters is that we cannot as a party claim to have an ideal which transcends the old differences between Left and Right if, at the same time, we have not room both for those whom approach ecology by the route that leads from "Blueprint for Survival" to "The Stable Society", and those who come to it through a belief in "the infinitely varied and subtle realities of... the twentieth century".

If you want to keep us in the party, then Econews will have to devote its space, not to advertising our differences, but to helping us all better to understand and appreciate the deeper perceptions which bind us together.

Yours sincerely,

Roger Toulmin.

## Systems and stability

Bosnieves,  
Withiel,  
Bodmin,  
Cornwall.

Dear Sir,

I shall leave it to Teddy to defend himself against Richard Slaughter's criticism if he wishes. But I cannot let it pass without commenting that Richard seems to have missed the fundamental point of Teddy's book. The proposition that society is a system, and therefore like all other systems susceptible to the laws of General System Theory is valid and useful. By describing the principles which promote the stability of a system and relating them to the features of so called primitive societies, he has given us a valuable tool for analysing the features of our own society. It enables us to isolate the factors which are causing our society to disintegrate and understand why. This does not mean that to attain stability we have necessarily to return to pre-industrial ways of life, but it does help to show us what ways should be avoided.

The trouble is caused by the slight importance which Richard seems to give to stability as a goal of society. I find this extraordinary considering that the intention to achieve a stable society is the central plank of Eco-policy. Stability is not just one goal amongst many other possibility. It is the goal which makes the other possibilities possible. While it is true that not all stabilising factors may be desirable, e.g. infanticide, it is certain that all destabilising factors are to be avoided.

I also think it unfair of Richard

to criticize Teddy for having chosen a theme which cannot appropriately be expressed in the sort of language Richard prefers, i.e. that of Mumford or Roszak. That is what his epithets bleak and soulless really imply. Richard is of course entitled to dislike Teddy's style, but what comes over to him as arrogance comes over to me as a passionate belief in the rightness of what he is saying, and I would not deny any author that belief.

Yours,

Jeremy Faulk.

## Left or Right?

11 Milton Road,  
Oxford.

Dear Sir,

I am disappointed to see that Party literature continues to say that we are neither left or right wing. I cannot accept this.

True socialists could not argue with most Eco policies because these policies are left wing. But the Ecology Party is not just left wing - it also has an important ecological perspective that most, if not all, socialist parties have neglected.

The manifesto also mentions "crisis in economy" and "crisis in society". Nowhere in Party literature is it said that it is Capitalist society and economy in crisis. It is the Capitalist society based on profit that Eco policies are demanding an end to, and yet the word itself is taboo.

I find these facts disturbing because it seems to imply that the Ecology Party is unaware of the implications of its own policies.

Yours fraternally,

Stephen Twine.

## RECRUIT A NEW MEMBER

Use the form enclosed with this issue to:

- recruit a new member
- send a donation to party funds
- renew your subscription



# POLICY FORUM

## Dual economy: back to the drawing board

In the last issue of Econews, we published an article by David Fleming advocating the development of a 'Dual Economy' during the transition to a stable society. Below, Jeremy Faull puts another point of view.

David Fleming's defence of the Dual Economy is premature. Until the precise nature of the Dual Economy is known, it is pointless to attack, defend, or support it. The proposal that the economy should be separated into a "conventional industries" part and a "stable society" part raises a multitude of questions on which the article is silent. How can the tremendously complex and varied UK economy be separated into two parts? Will the profit motive still determine economic activity in both parts? How are transactions between one and the other to take place? Will the goods and services required by the "stable society" part (because it will not be completely self sufficient) be supplied by the other at special, i.e. below market prices? Will workers in the stable society be paid lower wages? Will the unemployed have the choice of the dole or working in the "stable society" part? Will there be a different system of taxes, laws and social security in each part? Will the two parts be geographically separated? What will be the criteria for deciding in which part a business is to go? For example, successful, small-scale exporting businesses, of which there are many?, or a conventional, unprofitable, but important export earner like British Leyland? To these and other similar questions, answers

must be given before the Dual Economy can be assessed.

Of course, I agree with David's forecast of massive unemployment and the need to move towards the stable society, but I think it is misleading to describe the microchip as introducing the crisis. The microchip will undoubtedly play an important part in the process of economic collapse, but serious unemployment and recession are already here without its help. David also makes two statements, one in relation to imports and the other in relation to exports, which I consider inaccurate. "It is the Value Retained (i.e. profits, taxes, reinvested capital and wages), which makes it possible for Britain to buy the food and materials she needs from abroad", and "taxes would have to be raised so far that British goods would be priced out of the world market" For Britain to buy abroad, the essential requirement is that Britain should sell abroad, and for Britain to sell abroad there is no necessity for exports to be tied to domestic prices. There are many examples of countries exporting at below domestic prices, either by means of export subsidies or direct government policy, as in the case of the Communist bloc.

I hope I am not being unfair to David in wondering whether he has misunderstood the essential nature of the problem of the transition to the stable society. The continual use of the phrase "setting up" rather than "moving towards" is worrying. He seems to see the stable society more in terms of its projected physical differences from our present

society, than in terms of its fundamentally different aim, which is to maintain as comfortable and satisfying a way of life for all its members as is consistent with neither depleting nor damaging its environment. In other words, living on its income not its capital. It is likely and desirable that such a society will be community based, have small scale industry, more people on the land etc., but these features are not the essentials. Hence the first step on the road of transition is a mental one - i.e. the conscious change of aim. The second step must be an exhaustive review of Britain's resources, with the object of assessing the highest level of goods and services which can be indefinitely maintained, and determining what will have to be exported to pay for essential imports which cannot be provided from domestic resources. The third step will have to be the imposition of controls to ensure that there is no waste of precious resources.

The question of controls is understandably distasteful to the party, but it is inescapable that controls will be required during the transition period to avoid the waste that any haphazard process would engender. It seems to me that the whole area cries out for debate within the party. Will indirect controls through fiscal measures be sufficient? Or will there have to be direct controls, such as controls on exports and imports, rationing, designation of essential industries and allocation of resources and labour to them? How gradual should be the transition towards the stable society, in other words, how much of our resource capital should be used to cushion the process? So far there has been no mention of these unavoidable topics in any of our literature.

Jeremy Faull.



Reprinted from the Daily Mail



# REVIEWS

## What price progress?

**AUTONOMOUS TECHNOLOGY** by Langdon Winner, MIT Press (1977), \$4.90.

Now that the election is over, the Ecology Party can devote its energies to building up grass roots support and to thinking out its policies more carefully. Both are important, but if the latter are to be more than just a loosely related set of "good ideas", then there is a lot of work to be done before the next election. One issue in particular stands out: that of technology. It is quite fundamental, since our stance on this has implications for virtually all the other policy areas. Yet it is an issue about which there exists a wide variety of opinion within the party, and no little confusion too. It seems to me that we must get a much firmer grip on the subject before we can evolve sound proposals that are practical and, remembering our status as a political party, that people will accept and vote for. We cannot as some suggest, simply propose to do away with technologies wholesale and attempt to return to "the simple life" unless we are confident that we understand how they have penetrated our society and modified our lives. This is the subject of "Autonomous Technology".

Winner begins by suggesting that commonsense views of technology no longer hold. That is, he questions both that men fully understand or control what they have made, or that technologies are neutral, simply means for achieving clearly articulated human ends. He suggests that they impose on society deeply embedded systems of usage, value and structure that "provide a positive content to the area of life in which they are applied, enhancing some ends, denying or even destroying others". "Each individual" he writes, "lives with procedures, rules, processes, institutions and material devices that are not of his making, but powerfully shape what he does". The author shows that many modern technologies have proliferated less as a result of conscious human direction than in response to their own internal imperatives, and gives examples which suggest that once they are firmly established they seek out new tasks that are often unrelated, or even inimicable to human interests. (For example, NASA, ABM's and the SST.)

Now many will have come across the "technological domination" thesis before. In my case I discovered it in Ellul's "The Technological Society", which I found singularly depressing, because it offers no way out of the trap. But one of the strengths of Winner's book is that he reinterprets such writers, admits the force of the thesis, but also points to a way forward. To be sure, Winner is quite clear that notions of "control" and "use" become inadequate when applied to technological systems. They are "tools without handles". He adds "by the time the issue of "use" comes up for consideration at all, many of the interesting questions involved in how technologies are constituted and how they affect what we do, are settled and submerged". He then concludes that "for this reason it becomes of paramount importance to examine the structure of technologies, as well as the goals of their employment".

### Examination

His critical examination of advanced technologies shows that they are neither responsive, flexible or neutral as is assumed by conventional political theory. "Rather than respond to social or political commands, they produce demands that society must fulfil...". This is not something that has happened overnight, but on the contrary, is the result of long active processes. The problem is partly that countervailing traditions have been swamped by the "technological juggernaut", and partly that most of us have become so used to obeying (or at least reaching a modus vivendi with) its requirements that we just fail to perceive them. We want the products of high technology, but overlook the details on the price tag. However, once we understand what is happening (and the author devotes considerable attention to this), we are in a much better position to make fully conscious choices. Once we perceive the chain of requirements and conditions stretching back from the so-familiar plethora of goods and consumer items, we see that the price is high indeed, and the need for change is urgent.

Winner does not suggest that a reversal of existing trends will be easy, but he does believe it

is possible. He notes how easily disrupted most forms of modern technology are, and suggests that such breakdowns that do occur might be used positively as "methods of enquiry" to reveal some of the patterns of dependency that underlie our lives. In this view, the chaos of last winter represents a useful object lesson to us all. Beyond this he outlines an entirely different approach to technics. For example, he suggests that technologies should not merely be of an appropriate scale and structure, but also that they be understandable by non-experts, highly flexible, and judged for desirability against the dependencies they foster.

There are a few omissions in this book. Scientific innovation itself, from which technologies arise, is treated only sketchily. Little attention is given to examining how particular technologies affect us, and no distinction is made between the drawbacks of "industrial" technologies, and more recent developments that promise to be more flexible and less costly, (for example fibre optics, which make copper wiring obsolete for many purposes.) Nevertheless, this is an important and useful book which illuminates many current issues. It helps to explain why the problems of British Leyland are not resolvable so long as they are thought of only in terms of "labour problems", but have much more to do with the delicate balance of technical arrangements that the company must attempt to maintain simply to function "normally". From this perspective we can also view the demand for more engineers in Britain and the passive acceptance of the inevitability of microelectronics as related to technological imperatives that no-one can be said to "control".

### Penetrating critique

In short, Winner offers a penetrating critique of existing technological usage and a promising framework for discussion and action. Not only does he clear away much of the confusion surrounding technological issues, but by helping us to understand the extent of our present dependence on, and accommodation to existing technologies, he gives a clear indication of the magnitude of the task ahead and provides the outlines of a strategy for research, action and the development of policy that is of central and direct interest to the Ecology Party.

Richard A. Slaughter.



# NOTICEBOARD

## Regional Organizers

SCOTLAND: Leslie Spoor, 55 Clermiston Road, Edinburgh. 0313541510.  
 WALES: Peter Rout, 82 Grays Gardens, Craig-y-Rhacca, Machen, Newport, Gwent. 0222 861552.  
 YORKS & HUMBERSIDE: Mike Sellers, 3 Sponcommon Lane, Tadcaster, Yorks. Boston Spa 842652.  
 NORTH WEST: John Wareing, 329 The Green, Ecclestone, Chorley, Lancs.  
 WEST MIDLANDS: Joe Bennett, 59 Selly Park Road, Birmingham 29. 021 472 2406.  
 EAST MIDLANDS: Dave Whitebread, Penshurst, Upper Packington Rd., Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicestershire. 05304 2369.  
 EAST ANGLIA: Andrea Hodgkinson, Flat 1, 217 Unthank Road, Norwich, Norfolk. 0603 501530.  
 SOUTH EAST NORTH: Dean Wayland, 4 Yarmouth Road, Stevenage, Herts. 0458 68177.  
 GREATER LONDON: Steve Lambert, 5 Howard Road, London E17. 01 520 0676.  
 SOUTH EAST SOUTH: Basil Mager, 1 Whitelodge, Collington Lane West, Bexhill-on-Sea, East Sussex. 04245 2908.  
 SOUTH WEST: Richard Carder, 76 Lower Oldfield Park, Bath, Avon. 0225 24531.

Regional Organizers still needed for Northern Ireland, and the North. Contact Sally Willington, the National Secretary if you would like to volunteer.



*"It looks as though the ecology party is the only one that hasn't been recycled."*

Reprinted from The Guardian

## National Executive Committee

RON ANDREWS: 18 Cofton Lake Rd., Birmingham 45. 021 445 2576.  
 JOHN DAVENPORT: 2 The Old Vicarage, 26 Main Road, Kempsey, Worcester. 0905 820489.  
 GUNDULA DOREY: 14 Goldney Road, Clifton, Bristol. 0272 26812 (Eve)  
 JEREMY FAULL: Bosnieves, Withiel, Nr Bodmin, Cornwall. 020 883 236. (Policy Co-ordinator)  
 DAVID FLEMING: 104 South Hill Park, London NW3. 01 794 5644. (Press and Publicity).  
 EDWARD GOLDSMITH: Whitehay, Withiel, Nr Bodmin, Cornwall. 020 883 237.  
 ANDREA HODGKINSON: Flat 1, 217 Unthank Road, Norwich, Norfolk. 0603 501530. Deputy National Secretary.  
 STEVE LAMBERT: 5 Howard Road, London E17. 01 520 0676. London Region Representative.  
 JONATHAN PORRITT: 57 Hamilton Terrace, London NW8. 01 286 6695, Vice Chairman.  
 PETER SIZER: 9 Sherbourne Terrace, Clarendon Street, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire. 0926 29875. Treasurer.  
 DAVID TAYLOR: 15 St James Square, Bath. 0225 319434. South West Region Representative.  
 JONATHAN TYLER: 121 Selly Park Road, Birmingham 29. 021 472 1088. Chairman.  
 LESLIE SPOOR: 55 Clermiston Road, Edinburgh. 031334 1510.  
 BIFF VERNON: 29 Churchfields Rd., Beckenham, Kent. 01 658 4086. Membership Secretary.  
 SALLY WILLINGTON: Riverside Herb Garden, Hossenford, Torpoint, Cornwall. 050 35352. Moving to 278 Battersea Park Road, London SW11 end of May. National Secretary.  
 PETER DRAPER: 49 Granville Road, Limpsfield, Oxted, Surrey. 08833 4161. South East Region Representative.  
 KEITH RUSHWORTH: 8 The Mount, Alwoodley, Leeds 17. 0532 672198. Yorks & Humberside Region Representative.

## Campaign material

"Join Together" Poster. 50p for 5, from Andrea Hodgkinson.  
 "Introduction to the Party" leaflets. 60p for 50, from Andrea Hodgkinson.  
 Writing paper. A4: 90p per 100 sheets. A5: 70p per 100 sheets. A6: 50p per 100 sheets. (Branches only)  
 ECO badges. 5p each, from Andrea Hodgkinson, or Steve Lambert, 3 Howard Road, London, E 17.  
 "The Real Alternative" (Election manifesto). 5p each from Andrea Hodgkinson.  
 "The Reckoning" (Policy pamphlet). 25p each, or 15p each for orders of 50 or more, from Andrea Hodgkinson.  
 Manifesto for a Sustainable Society. £1.00 each, discounts for bulk orders, from Andrea Hodgkinson, or John Luck, 20 Military Road, Rye, Sussex.  
 "Work for a Stable Future - Join the Ecology Party" (car sticker). 5p each, or 2p for orders over 10, from Wiltshire Branch, 8 Mount Pleasant, Chippenham, Wilts.

## Events

JUNE 2nd: CND national demo at Faslane.  
 JUNE 16/17th: Malvern Hills International Organic Assembly. Details from Dennis Nightingale-Smith, Greenways, Malvern Wells, Worcs.  
 JULY 8/9th: Save the Whale demo in London. Details from Dave Parkins, 4a South Road, Bournemouth, Dorset.  
 JULY 14/15/16th: Stop URENCO action weekend at Capenhurst. Details from Stop URENCO, c/o 95 Oxford Road, Manchester.  
 AUGUST 10/11/12th: Polgooth Country Fayre. Eco stall manned by Howard Hoptrough and Dave Fowkes.  
 SEPTEMBER 7/8/9th: Ecology Party Conference and AGM, at Keele University. See article in this issue.

## The Ecologist

### SPECIAL OFFER TO ECOLOGY PARTY MEMBERS

A complete set of Ecologists for only £10, plus £5 p&p, if you take out a subscription to the magazine. This is a £35 reduction on normal price.

BRANCHES: Why not sell back issues of The Ecologist?

Write to: The Ecologist, 73 Molesworth St, Wadebridge, Cornwall.