



Centre for Culture Land and Sea Inc

Report to the Murray Darling Basin Commission

Amending the Water Allocation Plan for the River Murray
Prescribed Watercourse 2015

Ruth Trigg
Director

6 AUG 2018



Submission

My submission is a critique of the adequacy of the framework of reference for this draft, *Amending the Water Allocation Plan for the River Murray Prescribed Watercourse* covering three areas.

These areas are equivalent in status, and are

- the economic model the draft is based on
- the model used in the draft for developing priorities
- what is absent from the draft

The economic model the draft is based on

There is a basic assumption within the economic modelling and values presented throughout this draft that economies of production that depend on River Murray water should keep expanding. These values are aligned with economic values dominant in world economies: that of unfettered expansion of production of food, fibre and other goods. These values are aligned with a view that populations will also keep expanding, and therefore an increase of food and goods is a rational economic view. This dominant world view is self-perpetuating and is closed to scrutiny on the assumption that it is a self-evident 'truth'.

This 'taken-for-granted' dominant economic model does not allow any engagement with other realities. One reality is the over-consumption of food, goods and energy by developed economies. A parallel reality is the effect on the climate by human activity to the extent that a tipping point, beyond which acceptable climate conditions cannot be maintained, is both a scientifically supported position and a potential reality which poses a catastrophic threat to current and future local and world communities.

The basic economic and cultural assumption described in the first paragraph above of unfettered economic expansion based on production dependent on (finite) water resources is at odds with the significance of the realities described in the second paragraph above.

The absence of acknowledgement and discussion about these tensions of competing economic and production models, realities and sets of values, with local and international outcomes, is an unacceptable feature of this draft. Until this systemic tension is opened up and explored, the whole draft is rendered totally inadequate and therefore redundant.

To explore other current models of economic development which acknowledge and show ways of investigating these real tensions, I suggest the following resource edited by Phil Lawn, Flinders University, with international authors, exploring economic and social modelling of 'steady state economics':

Lawn, P (ed) 2013 *Globalisation, economic transition and the environment: forging a path for sustainable development* Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK

The model used in the draft for developing priorities

The dominant model for developing 'fairness' in the allocation of water from the River Murray (and by default, the MBD), is the concept of 'balance' presented in the draft:

...to ensure an equitable balance between economic, social and environmental needs (p1-2).

Within the 'balance' model several principles of 'hierarchy' are presented (p3, under Proposed policy), using new terms such as 'Consumptive Pool A' and so on. The fusion of 'balance' and 'allocation hierarchy' creates a very powerful model of fairness and equity of access to a reduced resource.

I propose that this model of 'balance' is not only not capable of doing the work required to maintain a sustainable river system, it is a model which will hasten the demise of a sustainable river system. The 'balance' model, and the hierarchies proposed within this 'balance' model, is culpably inadequate for the following reasons.

The model of 'balance' proposed in the draft is aligned to the first critique presented in this submission, that an expansionary economic system in the current local and world conditions, cannot deliver a sustainable living river system. The economic outcomes are considered more significant, when the water resource is at its lowest, than the needs of the environment – the sustainable health of the river.



A sustainable river system for sustainable economies and for sustainable communities (social needs) along the whole river requires a model which places at first, and non-negotiable priority, the health of the whole river system. River systems are complex and need to be considered as a living whole, and as a system requiring the application of knowledge across almost all major disciplines: physics, hydrology, chemistry, climate, ecosystems, biology, histories, cultures, anthropologies. But in the midst of this complexity one simple core remains; it is a whole system that begins to degrade when sections of it are cut off from other parts, so that the interconnectivity of the whole system is compromised.

This draft focuses and gives privilege to the sections and the parts, not to the overriding complexity of the whole as the main thing to be protected and enhanced. This makes this draft a seriously inadequate document.

One thing that has been learned, at great cost, over the past decade, from 2005 until 2015, is that a healthy river needs to flow to the sea, most (9/10) of the time. That knowledge does not appear in this draft. A river needs to flow to the sea to carry increased salt and nutrient overload out of the system. If the river does not flow to the sea, the health of the river, back to its source, is severely compromised. Extracting water from a compromised river, with increased salts and nutrients, keeps degrading the land, reducing production, and impacting on economic outcome, for present and future communities and economies. Nowhere is this reality discussed in this draft.

Understanding this reality, means that a 'balance' model, linking economic, social and environmental needs, has to be discarded for other modelling. For a model which states, as a non-negotiable, that the first task of whole system management (environment, economic and social) is to maintain the health of the river by creating conditions which ensure a constant (9/10 of the time) proportion of water flowing to the sea, in sufficient volume to keep the river mouth open. The build-up of sand does not stop the river flowing to the sea: the lack of water volume allows the sand to accumulate and block a weak volume flow to the sea. Causes need to be presented as causes, not as symptoms, of the hydrology of the river.

The *Proposed policy* (p3) is redundant, as nowhere does it establish the conditions to keep the river mouth open, and thus maintain the quality of the water available for extraction and use, at a high level of quality, with low salt and low run-off nutrient overload. All of the community knowledge and work repudiating the completely flawed model of a dam at Pomanda Island, south of Wellington, and a 'regulator' at Hindmarsh Island-Clayton, needs to be incorporated into this draft as core knowledge. Nowhere is it present, and this makes it a redundant draft.

A model needs to be developed that creates these healthy flow conditions through the Murray Mouth as non-negotiable conditions, before allocations are determined, for environmental, economic and social needs. The outcome of this remodeling is that there will be less water available for economic use during drought. This model is then aligned, not to an outdated and destructive economic expansionary practice, but to one which aligns with 'steady state' economics. The 'balance' model is seductive as it creates illusions of fairness. What it does not acknowledge is that within this model, too much water is allocated for extraction in times of reduced flow, and this leads to breaking the living system of the whole river.

In summary, the 'balance' model is not only grossly inadequate, its dominant presence further exacerbates the problems it is supposed to be solving.

This draft refers to the use of water from the desalination Plant at Port Stanvac at times of reduced flow. The unexamined use of water from the desalination plant is inexcusable in a document of this status.

There is no acknowledgement of the arrangement between the state government and the owners of the desalination plant to cede control of the accountability of the salinity outfall to the Gulf St Vincent to the owners. During dudge or neap tides, which occur eight days out of thirty each month, there is no independent mechanism or organization to require the plant to cease production. The plant is thus highly unlikely to stop its production if the salinity levels are above mandated levels.

There is no acknowledgement of the damage of slight increases in hypersalinity have on marine eggs and young Stock across many species. There is no acknowledgement of the effect on pooled areas of high salinity during dudge tides on mature species. There is no acknowledgement of the range of hypersalinity from the outfall of the desalination plant as described by Assoc Prof Jochen Kaempf, 2011 (see attachment).



There is no acknowledgement in the draft of the on-costs of pumping desalinated water. Firstly, the cost of electricity, secondly, the cost of replacing old pipes with titanium-infused steel pipes, necessary to carry desalinated water with a component of boron. It is very difficult to obtain estimates of these costs, except a recognition that the cost is several times higher than delivering river water for industrial and human use. These costs relate to the dominant, but now redundant economic model, of unfettered expansion, and the lack of exploration of other economic models which model the wide range of environment, climate, social and economic realities in the present and future. As suggested, one such model is 'steady state' economics. As also shown, this draft is deficient in not recognising the need to create models which incorporate these realities.

A model which damages a marine environment, a marine environment which has world-level marine biodiversity of species, is not a moral or ethical model, especially when it is based on an expansionary economic model. How can the future be secure for good environments, community life and economics if the current environment is being damaged to the point of no recovery?

What is absent from the draft

The language of the draft creates a belief that the reduction in water in the River Murray is caused by drought.

This belief is presented and repeated as the only cause of reduction in water and is presented as a self-evident truth. The dominance of this description disallows reflection on other causes for lack of volume and flow in the river system. The dominance of this belief creates a view that the drought in the last decade was the worst drought ever, almost the only drought ever. This lack of historical perspective, and lack of understanding about the rhythmic pulse of the wet and dry nature of the river system, over roughly a ten year period, ignores the fact of the many other droughts, of equal severity, in the recorded history of South Australia and Australia. From the time of the 1956 flood, my family farm at Cummins had one crop in the following seven years. That was a bad drought, but only one of the many before and after.

The Murray Mouth has had to be dredged almost continuously since 1981. This state of affairs has not been caused by a continuous drought over that time. There is a silent factor which needs to be named and described, alongside drought. This is the factor which is absolutely and resolutely absent from this draft. It is the factor of over-extraction from all sections of the river, along the whole river system, where state boundaries are irrelevant. The whole living system of the river is unaware of these human-imposed boundaries, but the whole living river system is degraded by the systemic lack of acknowledgement of the over-extraction of water from the whole system.

Who gains by the absence of this factor, of over-extraction, from this draft? Those who have the most to gain from the access to the water resource. Is this factored into 'balance'? How can it be, if this factor of over-extraction is not even mentioned in this draft?

Water access and use from the river needs to be regulated. Is this discussed in this draft? How many water use officers are employed to regulate, and if necessary, prosecute, if water is extracted unlawfully? How many pumps, flow rates, volumes are checked regularly?

Historical knowledge about the average of the ten year cycle of the flow of water through the River Murray Mouth before the 1981 regime of dredging, is around four times what is allocated now. This loss of volume through the mouth has not been reduced by drought, but by increased allocation and extraction. Over-extraction is subsumed and made silent within the term 'drought' in this draft.

Until the absence of language and meaning about over-extraction is acknowledged, and the language of the draft incorporates that knowledge and language, then there can be no responsible accountability for water allocation to keep a whole river system healthy, and not, by degrees, dying from being dismembered into too many parts and from too much extraction. In this harsh desert land, that means less area under production, even in the modern era of high technology of directing water for maximum effect. Despite these advances, the whole of production has to be reduced to respect the living requirements of the living river system.



Summary of analysis

Analysing the three categories: the economic model the draft is based on; the model used in the draft for developing priorities; and what is absent from the draft, shows that they are not discrete categories but are interactive in the way they illuminate cultural practices embedded in the draft.

The cultural practices name and give privileged status to some aspects of meaning and suppress others. What is privileged in this draft is the description of how water in the system is reduced by drought. Drought is presented as an irregularity that has to be managed, when in fact it is a key rhythmical feature of the whole living system. The living system has evolved to manage drought.

What is suppressed in these cultural practices, where the suppression is evident through analysis in the draft, is the benefit some users of the water gain by not naming some practices, such as extraction, and especially, over-extraction, of water, from the system. The benefit of silence over this practice, allows some cultural practices to flourish without scrutiny, within a framework of them being 'normal', and thus, not needing scrutiny. When drought is presented as an aberration of the system, over-extraction is not named, because it serves a powerful purpose: economic expansion through increased production.

There are many social gains from keeping this practice of over-extraction silent, and there are devastating consequences for the living system by keeping it silent. These environmental outcomes are subsumed within a model of 'balance' between the economy, the social benefit, and the environment. This analysis shows that the 'balance' model proposed within this draft cannot deliver a healthy environment, a state of affairs which the other two factors, social and economic, rely on. The model is trying to build forward benefit on a system of increasing collapse. This is not logical, ethical or moral.

The analysis of the deficit of an expansionary economic model, validating unfettered production, and the deficit of the 'balance' model, revealing the threat to the sustainable function of a healthy (but stressed) living system of discharging salts and nutrients into the sea through an open mouth, has brought into clear view the presence of 'over-extraction' as a category, out of the silence and out of its subversion within 'drought'.

This analysis, incorporating the presence of 'over-extraction', then allows the examination of other issues that are absent in the draft.

The catastrophic degradation of the Coorong, now regarded as 'lost', (and the catastrophic degradation of Lake Albert) since 1981, has not been caused by 'drought'. If drought was the cause, these significant features (of RAMSAR significance) would have reached this state before 1981 – but they did not. They maintained equilibrium throughout the pulses of wet and dry over the rhythms of the ten year cycle. Water, plants, birds, fish, crustaceans, all maintained their intricate and exquisite biodiversity.

By bringing forward 'over-extraction', alongside 'drought', in fact, superseding drought on the evidence, is a modelling of the severe deficits of an expansionary economic model for the rest of the Murray Darling Basin in the coming decades. The tipping point for a living system being able to restore itself has not only been reached but exceeded. These catastrophic degradations cannot be ignored or made silent. They are the signals of the failure and absence of proper, responsible, mature, comprehensive, moral and ethical modelling.

This failure and absence is tolerated and ignored because of the power of expansionary economics. 'Balance' is a propaganda and an illusion. It is time to stop.

New legal models are emerging in world cultures, such as legal standing and 'speaking rights' within courts for living ecological systems, such as achieved for the Whakatane River in New Zealand. The Australian Earth Laws Alliance (AELA) states

Earth Jurisprudence is a new legal theory and growing social movement. It proposes that we rethink our legal, political, economic and governance systems so that they support, rather than undermine, the integrity and health of the Earth.

Once these movements increase in speed and application for whole living systems – land, river and marine – documents such as this draft (and this process of obfuscation) will be dismissed as documents of shame, for what they promote, uncritically, and for what they hide and do not allow to be seen.



References and Attachments

Australian Earth Laws Alliance
www.earthlaws.org.au

Kaempf, J 2011 *On the variation of environmental performance conditions: behind the scenes of the Adelaide Desalination project* submitted to Marine Pollution Bulletin, June

Trigg, R 2011 Submission to SA Legislative Council Inquiry into Lonsdale Based – Adelaide Desalination Plant

Trigg, R 2010 Submission to House Standing Committee on Regional Australia Windsor Inquiry into the impact of the MDB Plan in Regional Australia

Trigg, R Vanderhoek, C 2009 *Ten Reasons for saving our precious gulfs*



6 AUG 2018

CCLS
CENTRE FOR
CULTURE
LAND & SEA
INC.

Brett Walker QC
Commissioner
Murray Darling Basin Royal Commission
GPO Box 1445
ADELAIDE 5001

2 August 2018

Dear Commissioner Walker

I attended the morning session, Tuesday 31 July, of the Royal Commission, to hear the evidence of Ms Maryanne Slattery.

Post-retirement as a founding lecturer at UniSA, I have worked for fifteen years with community organisations on environmental issues. This began with the River Murray issues in SA with the small communities around the Murray Mouth, as a member of the River Lakes and Coorong Action Group, and as chair from 2011-12.

I was also working with the Save Our Gulf Coalition, another community group, to stop the desalination plant being built. The silliness of that project, never mind its effects on the marine ecology of Gulf St Vincent, is at last seeping into public consciousness—with knowledge emerging of the power costs to run it. This was discussed on local ABC radio this morning.

I am now secretary of the Industrial Hemp Association of South Australia Inc—to present a rational solution to the problem of sequestration of water along the MDB by cotton, by growing low-THC hemp instead. Its advantages over cotton by providing food, fibre, composites, by improving soil rather than degrading it, and by not requiring the chemical additives for fertilisers and pests, is well-known, and favoured, by many citizens in the MDB states.

I am aware it is too late to present submissions to the Royal Commission. I am sending these analyses not formally as submissions, but to let you know how affirmed I was by the immense clarity of your structural and textual analyses of the Water Act and the MDBA Plan, when working through the submission by Ms Maryanne Slattery.

My work has also attempted to analyse the arguments at the deep level of metaphor and grammar, using systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis, following MAK Halliday. I have included these documents for your perusal—if permitted under the RC terms.

The half-day session on Tuesday was one of the best half-days of my life, due to your analytical competence and clarity. The quality of Ms Slattery's submission and evidence was also superb, as was Mr Beasley's skill in managing the business of the investigation.

Regards.

Ruth Trigg
Director CCLS

FIRST THE **EARTH.**
ECOLOGY
FOR A HEALTHY **PLANET**
BEFORE
ECONOMY
FOR UNHEALTHY
LIFESTYLE

Memorandum

To House Standing Committee on Regional Australia
From Ruth Trigg
Re Windsor Inquiry into the impact of the MDB Plan in Regional Australia
Date 20 December 2010-12-20

Ruth Trigg

Member: River Lakes and Coorong Action Group Inc (RLCAG)

Address:

Tel

Email

Summary

- Have I commented on some or all of the terms of reference?

My submission discusses issues that I believe have not been incorporated sufficiently into the terms of reference. I am analysing deep structural issues and interpretation of the problems facing the management of the MDB Plan and its implementation

- Have I provided a summary of the submission at the front (for lengthy submissions)?

I am presenting five problems and suggestions for their solution

- Have I provided my return address and contact details with the submission?

Yes

- If the submission contains confidential information, have I made this clear at the front?

The submission is not confidential

- Have I provided an electronic version of the submission (if possible)?

The submission was by email.

Submission in two parts

Part 1

Proposal: a new model for consultation and community engagement.

A citizens forum – a forum of 15–20 of the best water knowledge people in Australia with big picture capacity, long term vision, on-the-ground deep knowledge, community consultation insight and expertise.

This committee will meet in Canberra, and invite the state and federal water ministers, state DENR HOD equivalents to come and sit in the outer tier with listening rights only.

This Citizens forum will set a procedural agenda where the hierarchy of problems, issues and tasks are identified, their interconnectivity identified, the workable solutions around them worked through, the resources to support the solutions identified, the implementation of the solutions described.

Part 2

Analysis

What are the problems?

How can they be addressed – what are solutions?

Resources to address problems

Problem 1

It is illogical to present to the communities of the MDB the task of restructuring downwards to deal with the expansion and over-allocation (not drought) of irrigation over the past 15 years, while at the same time celebrating the rapid expansion of mining and other ventures, such as energy extraction (coal seam gas) in other places of Australia.

There is a logical inconsistency here. The whole world is facing the task of dealing with catastrophic futures with climate change, and yet Australian minerals are being extracted in a frenzy of excitement that is obscene when considering the effects of increased manufacturing on climate issues. Also, the obscenely destructive processes on the Australian environment and water tables of coal seam gas extraction for expanded energy use here and overseas need to be examined in terms of responsible action for the future of Australia and all Australians, with environmental considerations the prior and most important criteria, not short-term economic gain.

All of this ‘development’ is predicated on the rights of the shareholder to increase ‘paper’ wealth.

The ‘lifestyle’ changes in western economies post WW2 are treated as a ‘right’, and indulgent living practices, beyond any level of necessity in energy and product use, are occurring in a way that directly threatens the future viability of the planet.

The language and practice of 'economics', the dominant rights of the 'shareholder' are so deeply infused into the cultural fabric of meaning that the conditions on which future living for all species is based, a healthy environment, is relegated as a secondary, and disconnected, consideration. This illogic of priority, and the illogic of disconnection, is embedded in the principles of this enquiry, and thus make the work of the enquiry redundant (can only lead to systemic failure) until these priorities are reversed and until the connections are restored. Anything else is a waste of time.

Problem 2

The problem of disconnecting the parts from the whole.

'will inquire into and report on the socio-economic impact'.

The socio-economic has been disconnected from the main problem, an extensive water system (The MDB) which is at the point of collapse. The health of the whole, connected rivers system must be maintained as the prior consideration **before, not equivalent with**, the socio-economic impact.

This is a problem analysis and solving process which needs to employ logic.

This problem-solving process acknowledges the cultural analysis of science and its interaction within communities, both expert and lay communities, where linguistic and thinking structures validate a dominant logic model of the parts being disconnected from the whole. This model of thinking and analysis (of separating the parts from the whole) is dominant in western economies, but that does not validate its capacity for effective problem analysis and problem solving.

The 'socio-economic' is implicated deeply in the practice of deeply flawed, but extensive and persuasive logical analysis, because communities throughout the MDB know the section of the system they live in work in, and draw water from, but they lack knowledge of the workings and needs of the whole system. They lack knowledge of the connection of the whole system, and the ways the health of one part of the system directly affects the health of all other parts.

A particular lack of knowledge throughout the communities along the whole system is the significance of the workings of the end stage of the system. Here, at the great Southern Lakes, water must carry two million tonnes salt a year out of the system to the sea for the rest of the system to stay healthy.

Proposed solution to Problem 2

An educational program about the nature and workings of the whole system must be developed. This program must be resourced so that all communities involved in future decision-making about the MDB engage with this program to the extent that current, regional, parochial knowledge about the river system is changed to a 'whole of river system' understanding.

This program requires professional curriculum developers with deep experience in transformational educational practice to deliver this outcome.

Problem 3

Before communities in regions are asked to consider future developments and transformations in their communities, a working 'map' of the whole MDB for the past 15 years must be developed and made available to all communities.

The first purpose of creating this working map is to show

- how much the areas under irrigation have increased during the past 15 years
- what crops: fibres, grains, foods and so on have been planted over the areas during the past 15 years
- what water has been extracted
- what water has been licensed
- what water has been held, stored, sequestered
- what the rainfall patterns have been
- what is grown for Australian use, export, what is wasted
- what the relationship with what is grown in the MDB is to overseas patterns
- what alternative fibres, grains, foods are possible and viable

This map will be a significant resource for dealing with Problem 2.

Proposed solution to problem 3

Provide the resources, which must be transparent and independent, to develop this map, disseminate it, and educate participants at all levels, in communities, governments and corporations, in its application for analysis for future transformational work towards the health of the whole system.

Problem 4

There exist significant socio-economic-political forces to prevent the development of the map outlined in problem 3. These forces are the power and control of large companies, local and overseas, MISs, whose main task is to increase shareholder wealth. This focus disconnects any ethical responsibility to consider the health of the whole MDB. By withholding the knowledge outlined in Problem 3, these companies work to control markets and to gain access to resources such as water without considering the whole effects of their access and use of the water, on the land and on the river systems.

This is an economic-political problem which has not been described. If this problem is not described and if actions are not taken at a federal level of management to put the health of the river system before shareholder 'entitlements', then the task of asking communities to shoulder the work of change and transformation is a deep fraud. The wrong problem is being addressed as the 'main' problem, and no effective solution for the future can come from this flawed analysis and process.

Proposed solution to Problem 4

All corporations, owners, MIS schemes, be named, and the actions of these groups with commercial interest in the access and use of water in the whole system be made available for public knowledge.

Problem 5

Communicating with communities.

There is already in place a practice of 'consultation' and 'communication' with communities which is deeply entrenched, intractable, contemptuous, and in every way not acceptable, because it

- sees the process of communication with communities as an imposition and intrusion on practices of power and control
- lacks respect for the local knowledge over, in many cases, many generations
- retains power and control in the hands of the government agencies
- has already determined the 'solutions'
- will not listen in a genuine way to the concerns, questions, or proposals developed by groups in the community
- is not transparent in considering knowledge and proposals presented by groups in a community
- seeks to appropriate the knowledge and proposals developed in community forums and by community groups without proper respect or acknowledgement
- acts to 'reward' sections of community to 'gain' and 'maintain' power within a community; and through these practices acts as a divisive, not transformative agency
- rewards through inappropriate financing some schemes which are not fully thought through; and which end up being counter-productive or worsening the environmental conditions
- rewards people inappropriately by 'awards'
- withholds scientific reports from citizens, which they are entitled to have access to in a democracy
- causes significant loss of faith in the supposed democratic system and process
- causes, through this loss of faith in open communication and democratic processes, significant assault on individual and community health and well-being. This point cannot be emphasised too strongly
- creates cultures of secrecy and lack of transparency which distort democratic process and open, transparent sharing of knowledge
- creates cultures of power and communication whose main focus is not the work of advocating for a healthy river system, but whose main focus is retaining perceived power and control. The overwhelming reality of this state of affairs cannot be overstated
- creates the perception, within the community, following from the above, that corrupt practices flourish within these entrenched cultures of power, lack of transparency, and control.

Proposed solution to problem 5

There are at least two stages which are necessary in addressing and solving Problem 5

Firstly, that this problem exists to a depth which significantly threatens the success of future community communication and negotiation.

This problem needs to be described and acknowledged and practices need to change so that they are transparent and accountable. This requires an enormous cultural shift within government departments and agencies.

Secondly, new practitioners need to be brought in to the work of engaging with communities. These people need to have knowledge and experience in the process of transformational learning. They need to be educators with broad experience in bringing about cultural change.

A pattern for this work is to

- acknowledge what a community knows and what it can do. This becomes the substantial platform from which future change is developed
- acknowledge the capability of the members of the community as already being effective agents of change (they are, in many aspects of their lives and history)
- provide the necessary knowledge for the community to do the current work (see 'map' above)
- offer the work to the community as exciting, transformational work for the future, where their real contribution is accepted and valued
- provide high quality assistance in imaging new prospects at all levels of community generation – youth, workers, ageing, educational, recreational, health, land and rivers care, energy use, architecture, shared community assets, transport, food...
- link the transformational work with other knowledge communities, across the whole MDB, across Australia, around the world. This work is current work for the whole world
- understand that much of this transformational work is achieved through the interactivity of high quality, transparent, accessible, science and communication and knowledge practices developed in the arts, such as narrative, story telling, drama, visual arts

Citizens know this kind of transformational work has to take place. They are ahead of the politicians in deeply understanding this. They have a huge untapped commitment to high quality change and change processes. The imaginative outcomes from different communities can inform other communities. This work in itself can restore health and well-being in communities just by the healthy activity of the engagement and by seeing the benefits of the outcomes.

Meaning is changed from acquiring manufactured goods to engaging in healthy, community solutions to new world challenges about the environment as a whole living system.



Peta Brettig
Senior Project Officer, River Murray Water Allocation Plan
Natural Resources, SA Murray Darling Basin
GPO Box 2834
ADELAIDE SA 5001

6 AUG 2018

25 February 2015

Feedback on the draft

Amending the Water Allocation Plan for the River Murray Prescribed Watercourse

Background

My professional field is analysing the discourses of science and the humanities in community settings. Discourse is a technical term whereby the interaction between communication and power is analysed.

I am Director of the Centre for Culture Land and Sea Inc. (CCLS), and I present this submission for the CCLS.

I am a member of the River Lakes and Coorong Action Group (Inc) (RLCAG). This submission is not a formal response on behalf of RLCAG.

I was a member of the now disbanded Save Our Gulf Coalition (SOGC). SOGC developed a critique of the need for, and location, of the Pt Stanvac Desalination Plant.

I attach other papers pertinent to this response in the area of a critical analysis of MDB and SA Desalination issues. These attachments appear with the email.

Thank you.

Ruth Trigg
Director
Centre for Culture Land and Sea