SWITCHBOARD

v.2 #14 April 9-15

GREETING CARDS

published weekly by COMMUNITY SWITCHBOARD 24 Ryerson #309, 868-0113

one block north of Queen, one block east of Bathurst

Community Switchboard offers a forum and research facilities to those concerned with analyzing the need for basic social change and establishing an alternative social system, economically and ecologically sound, whose principles of small-scale technology, self and co-operative employment and human-scaled social units will contrast with those of the corporate state. Anyone who shares these goals is invited to contact the Switchboard to discuss means of working together towards achieving them.

OFFICE HOURS: The Switchboard is usually open Twesday thru Saturday after-noons. Spontaneous visits are always welcome, but visitors wishing to verify the office being open are invited to phone in advance.









DOUG MARLETTE/CHARLOTTE OBSERVER

April 9-demonstrate against Canada-US Central American policy 5 pm outside Parliamentary Subcommittee hearings, 157 Queen E. Sponsored by most Central America Solidarity Groups.

April 12-Solidarity Film Festival; films on Third World political problems 2-10 pm Faculty of Education Auditorium 371 Bloor W, \$5 admission, childcare. Sponsored by Newman Centre Development and Peace Group.

April 19-Mutual Aid Network Organizing Conference, 519 Church St. 10 am-5:30 p.m. No charge, childcare. Information 868-0113.

April 5-12: Book sale, GSU Gym 16 Bancroft Ave.

KTRKPATRICK SALE ON BIOREGIONALISM

In an excerpt from his new book Dwellers in the Land (quoted Utne Reader #14) Sale discusses the relationship between city and country in a bioregional world. The city would be a magnet for trade, culture and "those theoretical urban virtues--anonymity, complexity, tolerance, self-expression, stimulation--that are deficient or nonexistent in many rural and small-town settings." The countryside would supply raw materials, carry on the traditions of the bioregion and "be a source of its own kinds of creativity and innovation, its own crafts and artforms, its own styles of deliberation and intercourse, a different and earthier voice." Since a healthy ecosystem cannot support many cities, a majority of the population would live in the country.

"The receptive hinterland might take on some of the compatible practices of the city: small towns, for instance, could learn the virtues of density rather than sprawl in designing new buildings, especially for the elderly; a small city might appreciate the wisdom of setting aside a block or so of clubs and pubs for its young people as a place for necessary misbehaviour; new towns created in the countryside could follow the example of urban clustering and become cohesive villages instead of imitating those towns with isolated farmhouses strung out for miles along a stretch of highway; and rural areas wanting to simulate the city's culture could establish networks of musicians for a symphony orchestra or networks of musicians for a symphony orchestra or networks of libraries (town and personal) for an extended and enriched book service. And so on and on, the ways of imitation being as infinite as those of the urban life itself, the models being always there for the attentive village and town to learn from and borrow.

"Similarly, for the attentive bioregional city, living on and with the earth would be a necessitarian matter of course, and the spirit of the countryside would need to become absorbed into the veins of the city. Not merely in the sense of parks and woodlands and greenswards and canals and waterways, as fundamental as they would be for any city to establish; not merely vest-pocket gardens and window boxes and treelined streets and fountained plazas, as desirable as they should be. But more: the city would have to be rooted in the earth, as close to the natural processes, as the farm and the village. That would re-

quire growing much of its own food in backyard, rooftop and community gardens or in a surrounding farmbelt; generating most of its own energy with wind machines and solar collectors; recycling its wastes, both organic and solid; making maximum use of trees and shrubs to absorb dirt, heat and noise; designing transportation primarily for cyclists and pedestrians; constructing buildings of local materials, with energy efficiency, durability and human use uppermost -- in short, integrating into every urban process a total understanding of ecological principles that is at present so astonishingly lacking. being continually in touch with the natural world, every citizen, even the tiniest child, would realize that water does not come from a pipe in the basement, and tomatoes do not grow on supermarket shelves, and you can't throw anything away because there is no "away."

Another current periodical, Social Anarchism #10, contains Sale's essay "Anarchy and Ecology" in which he asks anarchists and decentralists to give more attention to the liberatory aspects of ecology--there is no dominant species of either flora or fauna in a healthy and stable ecosystem, no fixed forms or ideas of power; instead, balance and adjustment, a broad pattern of cooperation between and among the communities of the ecosystem. He advocates cross-pollination between the ideas of ecologists who need greater human and political dimensions and anarchocommunists who could gain from the new insights provided by ecological analyses, and the energy of the growing number of people attracted to the ecology movement. Certain segments of the various Green movements--the German "Fundis" and some American bioregionalists and Bookchinites -- are moving in this direction.

Sale contrasts biocentrism, the belief in the absolute centrality of the total mixture of life-forms (including the living earth) in the biosphere, to anthropocentrism, the belief in the essential superiority of the human over other species. The latter attitude is found among reformist environmentalists who fail to challenge the human species right to manipulate the natural world in its own interest, the former among "deep ecologists" who challenge the right of humans to reduce the richness or diversity of life-forms or to interfere with the non-human world save to meet vital needs. (The philosophy of deep ecology was originally expounded by the Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess in 1973.)

continued on page four

A Deep Ecology caucus at the first North American Bioregional Congress adopted all of Naess' principles, and deep ecologists accept bioregions as the appropriate natural divisions of the earth surface, yet the two movements remain separate, with bioregionalists not as committed as are deep ecologists to population level reductions and a total rejection of modern industrial civilization. deep ecologists talk of returning to pre-industrial, hunter-gatherer, perhaps even pre-agricultural social units while a Telecommunications Caucus at the Bioregional Congress pushes for a continent-wide computer network. This gives rise to the question of how much of the modern industrial civilization we must give up in order to live in harmony with nature: can we select relatively benigh high technologies or must we try to recapture the wisdom of pre-industrial peoples, learning our identity and continuity with nature by experiencing true wilderness throughout our lives, abandoning not merely this piece of technology or that but the whole culture of scientific technology? These questions do not have to be answered immediately, but we do have to start asking them now.

A linkage between the ecological and anarchist movements could establish the means to create a broad and passioned and wise force for the rescue of the human species: "it would behoove those on both sides to appreciate that the mixture may not be just more than the sum of its parts but possibly something quite as explosive as other kinds of fusion. After all, what better understanding of the liberatory possibilities of humankind could the ecologist get than from the anarchist; what better understanding of the liberatory character of the natural world could the anarchist get than from the ecologist? Surely Nature is trying to tell us something.

It is interesting to compare media coverage of the deaths of four Americans in the TWA explosion (extensive interviews with survivors, emotional denouncing of terrorists etc.) with the lack of coverage of the deaths which resulted from Reagan's unprovoked attack on four Libyan ships (we haven't even been told how many Libyans were murdered.) Without actually saying that Libya was behind the TWA bombing, the media have managed to plant this impression in peoples' minds. Once again we have been conditioned to accept terrorist violence so long as it is committed by the U.S. government.