

## **WE MUST MOVE TO THE SIMPLER WAY: An outline of the global situation and the way out.**

Ted Trainer, Faculty of Arts, University of N.S.W.

Despite the rapid recent increase in awareness regarding energy and greenhouse issues, the magnitude of the global problems facing us and of their implications is not generally understood. The following argument is that the situation is so far beyond sustainability that only huge and radical system changes can solve the problems.

This extreme view of the global situation has been argued for about forty years now yet it has been almost completely ignored. The dominant assumption is that the problems can be solved without any need to question the commitment to affluent lifestyles, the market system or economic growth. The following argument is that this is seriously mistaken and that a sustainable and just society cannot be achieved without transition to what is well-described as The Simpler Way.

### **1. THE GLOBAL SITUATION**

There are two fundamental faults built into our society. The first is to do with over-consumption and unsustainability, the second is to do with the injustice within the economy.

#### **Fault 1: THE LIMITS TO GROWTH**

The most serious fault in our society is the commitment to an affluent-industrial-consumer lifestyle and to an economy that must have constant and limitless growth in output. Our levels of production and consumption are far too high to be kept up for very long and could never be extended to all people. We are rapidly depleting resources and damaging the environment. Our way of life is grossly unsustainable. Following are some of the main points that supports these limits to growth conclusions. (For the detailed limits case see Note 1.)

- Rich countries, with about one-fifth of the world's people, are consuming about three quarters of the world's resource production. Our per capita consumption is about 15-20 times that of the poorest half of the world's people. World population will probably stabilise above 9 billion, somewhere after 2060. If all those people were to have the present Australian per capita resource consumption, then world production of all resources would have to be about 6 times as great as it is now. If we tried to raise present world production to that level by 2060 we would by then have completely exhausted all probably recoverable resources of one third of the basic mineral items we use. All probably recoverable resources of coal, oil, gas, tar sand and shale oil, and uranium (via burner reactors) would have been exhausted by 2045.
- Petroleum appears to be especially limited. A number of geologists have concluded that world oil supply will probably peak by 2010 and be down to half that level by 2025-30.
- If all 9 billion people were to use timber at the rich world per capita rate we would need 3.5 times the world's present forest area. If all 9 billion were to have a rich world diet, which takes about 1 ha of land to produce, we would need 9 billion ha of food producing land. But there are only 1.4 billion ha of cropland in use today and this is not likely to increase.
- Recent "Footprint" analysis estimates that it probably takes 7 ha of productive land to provide water, energy settlement area and food for one person living in a rich country. So if 9

billion people were to live as we do in Sydney we would need about 65 billion ha of productive land. But that is about 9 times all the available productive land on the planet.

- The most disturbing argument is to do with the greenhouse situation. The Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change has concluded that in order to stop the carbon content of the atmosphere from reaching 550 ppm, double the pre-industrial level, we must reduce the global use of fossil fuels by at least 60-80% in coming decades, and further in subsequent years. That target is much too high; 400 to 450 ppm should be the goal, although this would probably involve a 2 degree temperature rise and serious damage to ecosystems

If we did cut CO2 emissions by 60% and shared the remaining energy among 9 billion people, each of us would get only about 1/15 of the amount we now use in Australia per capita. The more responsible 450 ppm target would mean cutting Australian per capita use of fossil fuels to about 2% of the present amount.

These are some of the main limits to growth arguments which lead to the conclusion that there is no possibility of all people rising to the living standards we take for granted today in rich countries like Australia. Note the magnitude of the overshoot. Most people have no idea of how far beyond sustainable levels of consumption we are, and how big the reductions will have to be. We seem to be at least 10 times over some crucial limits, e.g., re footprint and greenhouse. It is difficult to see how anyone could disagree with the conclusion that we should be trying move to far simpler and less resource-expensive lifestyles and systems.

### **The absurdly impossible implications of economic growth.**

But the foregoing argument has only been that the present levels of production and consumption are quite unsustainable. Yet we are determined to increase present living standards and levels of output and consumption, as much as possible and without any end in sight. In other words, our supreme national goal is economic growth. Few people seem to recognise the absurdly impossible consequences of pursuing economic growth.

If we have a 3% p.a. increase in output, by 2070 we will be producing 8 times as much every year. (For 4% growth the multiple is 16.) If by then all 9 billion people expected had risen to the living standards we would have then, the total world economic output would be more than 60 times as great as it is today! Yet the present level is unsustainable. (For a 4% p.a. growth rate the multiple is 120.)

### **"But can't technical advance solve the problems?"**

Most people assume that the development of better technology will enable us to go on enjoying affluent lifestyles and pursuing limitless economic growth, e.g., by reducing the energy and resource inputs needed to produce things. However the magnitude of our over-consumption makes this impossible.

Perhaps the best known "technical fix" optimist, Amory Lovins, claims that we could at least double global output while halving the resource and environmental impacts, i.e., a "Factor Four" reduction. But this is nowhere near enough to solve the problems.

Let us assume that present global resource and ecological impacts must be halved. If we in rich countries average 3% growth, and 9 billion rose to the living standards we would then have by 2070, total world output would be 60 times as great as it is today. Now do you think technical advance will make it possible to multiply total world economic output by 60 while halving impacts, i.e., a Factor 120 reduction? (For a detailed criticism of Lovins see Note 2.)

Most people assume that we can change to use of renewable energy sources and thus avoid use of fossil fuels. There is a strong case that this unquestioned faith is invalid. (See my Renewable Energy: Cannot Save Consumer Society, Springer, 2007.) Just consider the liquid fuel problem. We will probably be able to produce 7 GJ of ethanol per tonne of biomass, and to grow biomass at no more than 7 t/ha (if the scale is very large.) To provide the 128 GJ p.a. of oil plus gas that Australians now average we would need 2.56 ha of biomass plantation. To provide this energy to 9+ billion we would need some 25 billion ha of plantations...on a planet with only 13 billion ha of land! (...and at the present rate Australian energy demand will be about 2.5 - 3 times as great by 2050.)

Clearly there is no possibility that all people could have anything like the quantity of liquid fuel that we now take for granted in Australia. The situation re electricity is more complex, but quite problematic.

## Fault 2: THE MASSIVE INJUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

Markets do some things well and in a satisfactory and sustainable society there could be a considerable role for them, but only if carefully controlled. It is easily shown that the market system is responsible for most of the deprivation and suffering in the world. The basic mechanisms are most clearly seen when we consider what is happening in the Third World. (For a detailed discussion of Third World see web addresses in Note 3.)

The global economy is a market system and in a market scarce things always go mostly to the rich, e.g. to those who can pay most for them. That's why we in rich countries get most of the oil produced. It is also why more than 500 million tonnes of grain are fed to animals in rich countries every year, over one-third of total world grain production, while 850 million people are hungry.

Even more important is the fact that the market system inevitably brings about inappropriate development in the Third World, i.e., development of the wrong industries. It will lead to the development of the most profitable industries, as distinct from those that are most necessary or appropriate. As a result there has been much development of plantations and factories in the Third World that will produce things for local rich people or for export to rich countries. But there is little or no development of the industries that are most needed by the poorest 80% of their people. The third World's productive capacity, its land and labour, have been drawn into producing for the benefit of others, especially rich world corporations and consumers. This is most disturbing where most of the best land is devoted to export crops.

Consider the situation of the people in Bangladesh who produce shirts for export, being paid 15c an hour. Obviously it would be far better for them if they could be putting all their work time into little local farms and firms that used local land, labour and skill to produce for themselves the basic things they need. But in capitalist development this is deliberately prevented. Third World ruling classes and rich world governments will only support development that is

led by whatever will maximise the profits for some investor. The conditions of the Structural Adjustment Packages imposed by the World Bank on indebted countries prohibit any other kind of development, indeed they force poor countries to open their economies more to market forces and corporate investment. The poorest 1 to 2 billion people live in countries where corporations can't make any profit, so there is almost no "development" in them, when those countries could be solving their basic problems via appropriate development, quickly and without much capital or dependence on the global economy. (On appropriate development see Note 4.)

These are inevitable consequences of an economic system in which what it does is whatever is most profitable to the few who own capital, as distinct from what is most needed by people or their ecosystems. (See Note 5 for detailed critical discussion of the economy.) The Third World problem will never be solved as long as we allow these economic principles to determine development and to deliver most of the world's wealth to the rich. For these reasons, conventional Third World development can be seen as a form of legitimised plunder.

The point of geopolitics and international relations is to get control of the resources and markets of others. Again reflect on the fact that the abundant resources and productive capacity of the Third World are not used to benefit Third World people; they enrich corporations and rich world consumers. This situation cannot be guaranteed without ruthless, brutal thuggery. The US leads in this campaign, but all rich countries are complicit, and must be if their "living standards" are to be maintained.

In other words our affluence and comfort in rich countries like Australia are built on massive global injustice. Few people in rich countries seem to understand that they could not have their high "living standards" if the global economy was not enabling them to take far more than their fair share of world resources and to deprive Third world people.

We must recognise that the rich countries have and control an empire. The rich countries support many dictatorial and brutal regimes willing to rule in our interests, they enable and actually engage in terrorism, they invade and attack and kill thousands of innocent people, in order to ensure that regimes and regions keep to the economic and development policies that suit the rich countries. (For extensive documentation on the existence and maintenance of the empire see Note 6.)

There is no possibility of satisfactory Third World development until the rich countries stop taking far more than their fair share of the world's resources, until development and distribution begin to be determined by need and not by market forces and profit, and therefore until we develop a very different global economic system. Again this must mean huge and radical structural change, to simpler living standards and to an economy that focuses on meeting need rather than maximising profit.

Since the 1970s we have entered a period in which all these problems are rapidly accelerating, because of the globalisation of the economy. The big corporations and banks are now pushing through a massive restructuring of the global economy, sweeping away the controls which previously hindered their access to increased business opportunities, markets, resources and cheap labour. The supreme, sacred principle now is to "free market forces. This is enabling the transnational corporations to come in and take more of the businesses, resources and markets local people once had, and to gear "development" to whatever suits them rather than to what is needed by most people.

Globalisation is eliminating the arrangements which used to ensure that many little people could sell and work and trade, and that local resources such as land would produce things they need. Now the corporations are able to take over all those opportunities to increase their sales. The resulting skyrocketing wealth of the global super-rich should be no surprise. Globalisation is basically a gigantic takeover of economic wealth by the big corporations and banks, a sudden and stunningly arrogant grab that has delivered greatly increased wealth to the corporations and banks and the few high skilled professionals and technocrats the corporations want. But it has had catastrophic impact on the lives of most of

the world's poor people. (See Note 7 for extensive documentation.)

It is not possible to have a good society unless we make sure that considerations of morality, justice, the public good and the environment are the primary determinants of what happens. This means what is done must not be determined by what will maximise profit within the market for those with capital, and that there must be much social control and regulation of the economy. It is made clear below that this must be via highly participatory local political systems, not centralised states and bureaucracies, and that there could still be a place for private firms and markets.

### **The loss of cohesion and quality of life.**

In addition to the foregoing global resource and environmental problems, in the richest countries we are experiencing accelerating social breakdown and a falling quality of life. This is the result of the triumph of neo-liberalism. Because many people are not given a satisfactory share of the wealth, jobs and resources, and because people are having to work harder, in more insecure circumstances, and many are being dumped into “exclusion”, there is much drug abuse, crime, stress and depression. Public institutions are deprived of sufficient funds (hospitals, universities, public transport.) Social attitudes are becoming more selfish and mean. Increasing numbers of people believe the future will be worse than the present. Neo-liberal doctrine advocates that all compete against each other for as much wealth as possible, when the sensible way for humans to relate to each other is via cooperative and collective ways.

### **Conclusions on the global situation.**

The way of life we have in rich countries is grossly unsustainable and unjust. There is no possibility of all people rising to our “living standards”, or of us maintaining them for any length of time. The basic cause of the alarming global situation is simply over-consumption. Some of the core lines or argument indicate that we should be trying to reduce per capita resource consumption by 90% or more. Nothing like this can be done without huge and radical change in systems; i.e., reform of a society that remains obsessed with affluent living standards and economic growth cannot solve the problems.

## **2: THE ALTERNATIVE:**

### **THE SIMPLER WAY**

If the foregoing arguments are basically valid some of the key principles for a sustainable society are clear and indisputable. (For a detailed discussion see Note 8.)

- Material living standards must be much less affluent. In a sustainable society per capita rates of use of resources must be a small fraction of those in Australia today.
- There must be mostly small scale highly self-sufficient local economies.
- There must be mostly cooperative and participatory local systems whereby small communities control their own affairs, independent of the international and global economies.

- A very different economic system must be developed, one that is under social control, geared to meeting needs as distinct from maximising profits, not driven by market forces, and without any growth.
- None of this is possible without radical change in values, away from competition, self-interest and greed.

It would be easy to move to The Simpler Way --- if we wanted to. It would eliminate the major global problems. It would provide all with a high quality of life.

### **Simpler lifestyles**

Living more simply does not mean deprivation or hardship. It means focusing on what is sufficient for comfort, hygiene, efficiency, etc. Most of our basic needs can be met by quite simple and resource-cheap devices and ways, compared with those taken for granted and idolised in consumer society.

Living in ways that minimise resource use should not be seen as an irksome sacrifice that must be made in order to save the planet. These ways can and must become important sources of life satisfaction. We have to come to see as enjoyable many activities such as living frugally, recycling, growing food, "husbanding" resources, making rather than buying, composting, repairing, bottling fruit, giving old things to others, making things last, and running a relatively self-sufficient household economy.

### **Local self-sufficiency**

We must develop as much self-sufficiency as we reasonably can at the national level, meaning less international trade, at the household level, and especially at the neighbourhood, suburban, town and local regional level. We need to convert our presently barren suburbs into thriving regional economies which produce most of what they need from local resources. They would contain many small enterprises, such as the local bakery, enabling most of us to get to work by bicycle or on foot. Much of our honey, eggs, crockery, vegetables, furniture, fruit, fish and poultry production could come from households and backyard businesses engaged in craft and hobby production. It is much more satisfying to produce most things in craft ways rather than in industrial factories. There would be many little firms throughout and close to settlements, some cooperatives but many could be private firms. They would mostly produce for local use, not export from the region.

Many market gardens could be located throughout the suburbs and cities, e.g. on derelict factory sites and beside railway lines. Having food produced close to where people live would enable nutrients to be recycled back to the soil through compost heaps and garbage gas units.

We should convert one house on each block to become a neighbourhood workshop, including a recycling store, meeting place, surplus exchange and library. Because there will be far less need for transport, we could dig up many roads, greatly increasing city land area available for community

gardens, workshops, ponds, forests etc. Most of your neighbourhood could become a Permaculture jungle, an "edible landscape" crammed with long-lived, largely self-maintaining productive plants such as fruit and nut trees. Especially important will be achieving a high level of local energy self-sufficiency, through use of alternative technologies and renewable energy sources such as the sun and the wind.

There would also be many varieties of animals living in our neighbourhoods, including an entire fishing industry based on tanks and ponds. In addition many materials can come from the communal woodlots, fruit trees, bamboo clumps, ponds, meadows, etc. These would provide many free goods. Thus we will develop the "commons", the community land and resources from which all can take food and materials. Many areas could easily supply themselves with the clay to produce all the crockery needed. Similarly, just about all the cabinet making wood needed could come from those forests, via one small saw-bench located in what used to be a car port.

It would be a leisure-rich environment. Suburbs at present are leisure deserts; there is not much to do. The alternative neighbourhood would be full of familiar people, small businesses, common projects, animals, gardens, forests and alternative technologies and therefore full of interesting things to do. Consequently, people would be less inclined to go away at weekends and holidays, which would reduce the national per capita footprint and energy consumption greatly.

### **More communal and cooperative ways.**

We must share more things. We could have a few stepladders, electric drills, etc., in the neighbourhood workshop, as distinct from one in every house. We would be on various voluntary rosters, committees and working bees to carry out most of the child minding, nursing, basic educating and care of aged and disabled people in our area. We would also perform most of the functions councils now carry out for us, such as maintaining our own parks and streets. We would therefore need far fewer bureaucrats and professionals, reducing the amount of income we would need to earn to pay for services and pay taxes. Especially important would be the regular voluntary community working bees to build and maintain commons, edible landscapes, energy and water systems.

### **The new economy**

There is no chance of making these changes while we retain the present economic system. The fundamental concern in a satisfactory economy would simply be to apply the available productive capacity to producing what all people need for a good life, with as little bother, resource use and waste and work as possible.

Most obviously there would have to be far less production and consumption going on, and there would have to be no growth.

Market forces and the profit motive might have a place in an acceptable alternative economy, but they cannot be allowed to continue as major determinants of economic affairs. The basic economic priorities must be decided according to what is socially desirable (democratically decided, mostly at the local level via participatory local assemblies, not dictated by huge and distant state bureaucracies -- what we do not want is centralised, bureaucratic, authoritarian, big-state "socialism"). However, much of the economy could remain as a (carefully monitored) form of

private enterprise carried on by small firms, households and cooperatives, so long as their goals were not profit maximisation and growth. The goals of enterprises would be to provide their owners and workers with satisfying livelihoods, and to provide things the town needs. Market forces might operate within regulated sectors. For example local market days could be important, enabling individuals and families to sell small amounts of garden and craft produce. (This is not capitalism because these small private firms are only the “tools” that yield stable and adequate “wages” to those who own and work in them.)

The new economy must be mostly made up of many small scale, local economies, so that most of the basic items we need are produced close to where we live, from local soils, forests and resources, by local skill and labour. Things like fridges and stoves would come from regional factories a little further away. Very few items, including steel, would be moved long distances, and very little (perhaps items such as high-tech medical equipment) would be transported from overseas.

Much of the new economy would not involve money. Many goods and services would come “free” from the commons and cooperatives run by our voluntary committees and working bees, including orchards, ponds, forests, dams, recycling systems, workshops, cooperative firms, stores, aged care...

When we eliminate all that unnecessary production, and shift much of the remainder to backyards and local small business and cooperatives and into the non-cash sector of the economy, most of us will need to go to work for money in an office or a mass production factory only 1 or 2 days a week. In other words it will become possible to live well on a very low cash income. We could spend the other 5 or 6 days working/playing around the neighbourhood doing many varied and interesting and useful things everyday.

Unemployment and poverty could easily be eliminated. (There are none in the Israeli Kibbutz settlements). We would have neighbourhood work coordination committees who would make sure that all who wanted work had a share of the work that needed doing. Far less work would need to be done than at present. (In consumer society we probably work three times too hard!) This is the kind of social control over our economic fate that we will exercise via our town assemblies. We would not tolerate anyone being left without a livelihood; a worthwhile contribution.

### **Government and politics.**

The political situation would be very different compared with today. There would (have to) be genuine participatory democracy. This would be made possible by the smallness of scale, and it would be vitally necessary. Big centralised governments could not run our small localities. That could only be done by the people who live in them because they are the only ones who would understand the local conditions, know what will grow best there, how often frosts occur, how people there think and what they want, what the traditions are, what strategies will and won't work there, etc.

Most of our local policies and programs could be worked out by elected unpaid committees and we could all vote on the important decisions concerning our small area at regular town meetings. There would still be some functions for state and national governments, but relatively few, and there will be a role for some international agencies and arrangements.

Thus our intense dependence on our local ecosystems and social systems will also radically transform politics. The focal concern will be what policies will work best for the town and region. Politics will not be primarily about individuals and groups in zero-sum competition to get what they want from a central state. There will be powerful incentives towards a much more collectivist



outlook, to find solutions all are content with, because we will be highly dependent on good will, concern for the public interest and eagerness to contribute. Above all the goal will have to be to find the policies that are best for the town, the region, because we as individuals will only live well if our region thrives. Without these people will not turn up to committees, working bees, celebrations and town meetings, conscientiously and eagerly. We will therefore be keen to find and do whatever will contribute to town solidarity and cohesion.

The core governing institutions will be voluntary committees, town meetings, direct votes on issues, and especially informal public discussion in everyday situations. In a sound self-governing community the fundamental political processes take place through discussions in cafes, kitchens and town squares, because this is where the issues can be slowly thrashed out until the best solutions come to be generally recognised.

Note that these crucial changes must be made in economic, geographical and political structures and systems. They can't be made just by individuals changing their lifestyles.

### **The new values and worldview.**

The most difficult changes will have to be in values. The present fierce demand for affluent-consumer living standards and endless increases in wealth must be replaced by a strong desire to live simply, cooperatively and self-sufficiently.. Only if these alternative values and sources of satisfaction, which contradict those of consumer society, become the main factors motivating people can The Simpler Way be achieved.

### **A higher quality of life.**

People working for The Simpler Way have no doubt that the quality of life for most of us would be much higher than it is now. We would have fewer material things and would have much lower monetary incomes but there would be many powerful sources of life satisfaction. These would include a much more relaxed pace, having to spend relatively little time working for money, having varied, enjoyable and worthwhile work to do, experiencing a supportive community, experiencing giving and receiving, growing some of one's own food, keeping old clothes and devices in use, running a resource-cheap and efficient household, practising arts and crafts, participating in community activities, having a rich cultural experience involving local festivals, performances, arts and celebrations, being involved in governing one's area, living in a nice environment, and especially knowing that you are not contributing to global problems through over-consumption.

### **Abandon modern technology?**

It should be stressed that the Simpler Way would enable retention of all the high tech and modern ways that made sense, e.g., in medicine, windmill design, public transport and household appliances. We would still have national systems for some things, such as railways and telecommunications, but on nothing like the present scale. We would have far more resources for science and research, and for education and the arts than we do now because we would have ceased wasting so many resources on the production of unnecessary items, including arms.

### **There is no alternative.**

If the foregoing discussion is basically correct, then we have no choice but to work for the sort of alternative society outlined here. In rich and poor countries a sustainable society can only be conceived in terms of simpler lifestyles mostly in highly self-sufficient and cooperative settlements, zero-growth or steady-state economic systems, mostly small local economies, and in terms of some very different values.

### **HOW CAN WE CONTRIBUTE TO THE TRANSITION?**

The foregoing arguments constitute such a fundamental challenge to the dominant ideology of consumer society that it is not surprising that they have been almost completely ignored. These kinds of changes will not be led by governments. Their top priority is always to maximise business turnover, and they must respond to public demand for rising "living standards". Changes of this magnitude can only come via a slow process of grass-roots public education aimed at getting people in general to see the sense of moving to the systems of The Simpler Way in the places where they live. Whether or not the transition will be achieved will depend on whether small groups of ordinary people can come together in existing neighbourhoods to start taking the first steps.

In the last 20 years a "Global Alternative Society Movement" has developed, in which many people all around the world have begun to build, live in and experiment with new settlements of the kind sketched above. (For listings of more than 1000 settlements see Note 9.)

The first -contribution we can all make to the transition to The Simpler Way is to talk constantly about these issues, to get them onto the public agenda. However by far the most valuable contribution that can be made is to help to establish alternative settlements and systems right where we live, so that more people in the mainstream will be able to see that there is a Simpler Way which is viable and attractive.

We must set ourselves for many years of plodding away slowly establishing the systems that people in the mainstream will become more interested in as the conventional economy increasingly fails to provide for people. Little will change until the problems become so acute as to impact on their supermarkets. The coming peaking of petroleum supply will jolt them into taking notice of us! So what is the most important thing for activists concerned about global problems to do? It is, help us get local Community Development Cooperatives going here and now.

#### Notes.

1. See <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/06a-Limits-Short.html>
2. <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D50NatCapCannotOvercome.html>
3. <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/08b-Third-World-Lng.html>
4. <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D99.Dev.Rad.View.161005.html>
5. <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/09c-Our-Economic-System.html> For the detailed account see <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/10-Our-Empire.html> For a large collection of documents on the topic see <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/DocsOUREMPIRE.html>
6. <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D41GlobalisationASum.html>
7. <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/12b-The-Alt-Sust-Soc-Lng.html>

Hagmaier, S., J., Kommerall, M. Stengil, M. Wurfel, (2000), Eurotopia: Directory of Intentional Communities and Eco-villages in Europe, 2000/2001, Poppau, Okodorf Seiben Linden. For discussions of the movement see . Douthwaite, 1996, ), Short Circuit, Dublin, Lilliput and W. Schwarz and D. Schwarz, W., (1998), Living Lightly, London, Jon Carpenter.

8. <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D75.ThoughtsonTrans.html>
9. 10. <http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/RenewableEnergy>

---

**For critical summaries and detailed documentation on global issues, for use by critical educators, please see The Simpler Way website.**

**<http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/>**