

Submission on the Draft Tourism Management Plan of the TWWHA

(This Draft TMP was issued for public comment on 19 March 2020).

Attachments:

'SM and the FP';

'Smith_ Rescuing_ Democracy_ EBook.pdf'

Paul E. Smith

31 May 2020.

Contents

Introduction

1. Seven defects in the Draft TMP (DTMP)
 - 1.1 The DTMP prevents sustainability from being achieved
 - 1.2 A lack of definition, or defective definition, of key concepts
 - 1.2.1 Value
 - 1.2.2 Wilderness quality and wilderness values
 - 1.2.3 Culture
 - 1.2.4 Sustainable tourism
 - 1.2.5 Economic and social impact assessments
 - 1.3 Neglect of cumulative impact
 - 1.4 An incompetent concept of presentation
 - 1.5 Lack of balance in advisory bodies
 - 1.6 Defective Strategic Principles
 - 1.7 Failure to follow Strategic Principle 2
 2. A defective foundation for the DTMP
 - 2.1 The MP's primary function of protecting OUVs
 - 2.2 A lack of definition, or defective definition, of key concepts
 - 2.3 Inadequate glossary
 - 2.4 Inadequate zoning
 - 2.5 Neglect of cumulative impact on wild character
 - 2.6 The MP's corrupt RAA process
 3. The deficiencies of the TWWHA MP and its DTMP are unlikely to be corrected without institutional reform of the State government
 - 3.1 Additional examples of incompetence by the State government
 - 3.1.1 The State government damages the protective function of national parks
 - 3.1.2 Secretive EOI process
 - 3.1.3 State Government's EOI process pre-empts its DTMP
 - 3.1.4 NPWAC recommendation ignored
 - 3.1.5 Inadequate implementation procedures for the MP
 - 3.1.6 Economic incompetence by the State Government: It displays no knowledge of the scarcity multiplier and its impact on sustainability
 - 3.2 The basic cause of strategic dysfunction in the State government and how to correct it
 4. The TMP should be abandoned
- Appendix: Zoning deficiencies in the TWWHA MP that damage wild character
- Acknowledgements
- References

Introduction

The Draft Tourism Management Plan for the TWWHA (DTMP) is defective in the seven major ways discussed below in section 1 (subsections 1.1 to 1.7). Section 2 explains that much of this is inevitable because any TMP must be based on the statutory 2016 TWWHA Management Plan (MP) and this has crippling flaws. Section 3 outlines why such defects occur and why they will continue to occur unless an institutional remedy for government is applied. That section also offers two approaches to finding and applying such a remedy. Section 4 recommends that the DTMP (and TMP) is abandoned and replaced with a thoroughly revised MP. It also suggests that if this is not done, then what the TMP should cover, instead of what the current DTMP covers. An Appendix concludes this submission with more examples of the zoning deficiencies in the MP that are introduced in section 2.4.

In addition to those comments, I observe here that the process of subjecting this DTMP to submissions from the public is defective in that those submissions will not be shared with the general public by being published on a website (with the permission of authors), as is being done with the current review of the Commonwealth EPBC Act. This omission is unacceptable, as carefully considered submissions may have useful or even crucial new insights into the management of a precious public good. Such novel insights may need to be understood by the public at large if our democratic government is to be able to manage the TWWHA in the public interest. I recognize that the PWS may publish points made in submissions that it considers significant, but it should not make such judgments as it is responsible to the Minister and may therefore feel obliged to ignore points of view and concepts that conflict with current government policy.

1. Seven defects in the Draft TMP (DTMP)

1.1 The DTMP prevents sustainability from being achieved

The motivation behind this DTMP is very clearly a desire that the TWWHA contributes to growth of the tourism industry in Tasmania. This is shown by the DTMP stating that although it “does not identify specific tourism products” and “is not a marketing document”, it “identifies opportunities for the delivery of additional visitor experiences

and public infrastructure... to guide and prioritise investment” (DTMP section 1.3) and that “The tourism master planning process is therefore an opportunity to align the presentation of the TWWHA with the strategic approach to tourism throughout Tasmania”. That approach includes the *Tourism 21* project, which targets “growth in visitor numbers and... visitor expenditure through extending stay and increasing yield” (DTMP 1.2). Later in DTMP 1.2 the Draft aims to assist in “achieving strength in the visitor economy” and to “promote desired tourism opportunities”. In DTMP 3.1 the Draft emphasises the commercial potential of the TWWHA by referring to its wild “brand”.

The DTMP Glossary even interprets sustainability (under “Sustainable tourism”) as not only a level “able to be maintained”, but also “a certain rate of growth”. At this point the DTMP’s enthusiasm for economic growth brushes aside its first interpretation of sustainability (“able to be maintained”) as too restrictive.

This orientation (or actually, bias, as explained below) for growth is apparent in many other places throughout the DTMP. It uncritically follows the conventional wisdom that ‘growth is good’, with its implication that endless growth is possible (and even if it isn’t, that it’s essential!). However, a fairly recent piece of economic analysis called ‘the scarcity multiplier’ shows that this ‘wisdom’ is in fact destructively myopic in well-developed economies like those of Tasmania and Australia as a whole. Its short sightedness means that it does not perceive slightly longer-term effects of commercial developments in such places, which make those developments unsustainable. As the DTMP promotes new commercial developments and the expansion of existing ones in Tasmania it is therefore promoting unsustainability and contravening Tasmania’s planning laws and the Commonwealth EPBC Act, all of which require such developments to be sustainable. The DTMP therefore needs a radical revision, one that reverses its current thrust.

To explain how the DTMP is promoting unsustainability, two documents are attached that describe scarcity multiplier theory. The shorter, simpler version is titled “The Missing Argument” (attachment ‘SM and the FP.docx’, originally published - but without its reference to sustainability - by the *Tasmanian Times* on July 9, 2018) and the more detailed one comprises Chapter 5 and the Appendix of the 2016 book *Rescuing Democracy* (Smith_ Rescuing_ Democracy_ EBook.pdf). Chapter

5 of this book gives the theory of the multiplier and its Appendix uses the history of Tasmania's industrial development to illustrate its operation and to draw implications for the State's future.

The part of this theory that is most relevant to the DTMP is its two conclusions, as presented on pages 1 and 2 of The Missing Argument. The **first** of these is that, in any relatively well-developed economy, more economic development (even just one new commercial enterprise or the expansion of an existing one) *does not help to satisfy* the public's wants for more jobs and more income. To the contrary, it increases those wants. The **second** conclusion is that this failure to sustain satisfaction is purchased at the cost of *making natural capital more scarce*. Furthermore, this failure to satisfy produces a political reaction that continually repeats this second effect, so that per capita abundance of natural capital continues to decline, indefinitely.

Those two conclusions of scarcity multiplier theory apply whether these commercial developments utilize natural capital or not. And they mean that in economies such as that of Tasmania, or Australia as a whole, which have conditions that promote the multiplier, **new commercial projects cannot be considered sustainable developments**. As noted above, they fail to be sustainable in two ways: (1) they do not sustain their satisfactions of citizens' desires for more jobs and income; and (2) they do not sustain the per capita abundance of natural capital. It may need emphasizing that these two failures to sustain benefits are *fundamental* failures: the benefits involved are basic requirements for the enduring quality of life of citizens. Dissatisfaction with employment and incomes hobbles welfare and may ultimately lead to political collapse. The election of Donald Trump appears to be a stage in this process for the USA and similar stages seem to be occurring in several other democracies. Diminishing the per capita abundance of natural capital raises the **costs** of private goods (marketed goods such as agricultural products, timber, fish, freshwater and land such as residential, rural and coastal types) and progressively destroys the **free** availability of public goods like national parks, wilderness, wildlife, wild fish stocks, natural scenery, marine and estuarine waterways, free flowing rivers, freedom from noise, a relaxed pace of life, other types of social capital and even, on a global scale, a stable and benign climate.

The interpretation of 'sustainability' applied above means that although a business enterprise may be commercially viable and seem 'sustainable' because it can continue to operate, it cannot be considered sustainable if in doing that it damages or destroys other private or public goods that have a value greater than that produced by the business (for the meaning of 'value' as used here, see 1.2.1 below). This interpretation means that all proposals for new commercial developments in Tasmania contravene the State's planning laws. This may be seen from Schedule 1 of the State's principal planning law, which is reproduced below.

Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993

SCHEDULE 1 - Objectives

PART 1 - Objectives of the Resource Management and Planning System of Tasmania

1. The objectives of the resource management and planning system of Tasmania are –

- (a) to promote the sustainable development of natural and physical resources and the maintenance of ecological processes and genetic diversity; and
- (b) to provide for the fair, orderly and sustainable use and development of air, land and water; and
- (c) to encourage public involvement in resource management and planning; and
- (d) to facilitate economic development in accordance with the objectives set out in [paragraphs \(a\)](#) , [\(b\)](#) and [\(c\)](#) ; and
- (e) to promote the sharing of responsibility for resource management and planning between the different spheres of Government, the community and industry in the State.

2. In [clause 1 \(a\)](#) , *sustainable development* means managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while –

- (a) sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and
- (b) safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and
- (c) avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.

PART 2 - Objectives of the Planning Process Established by this Act

The objectives of the planning process established by this Act are, in support of the objectives set out in [Part 1](#) of this Schedule –

- (a) to require sound strategic planning and co-ordinated action by State and local government; and
- (b) to establish a system of planning instruments to be the principal way of setting objectives, policies and controls for the use, development and protection of land; and

- (c) to ensure that the effects on the environment are considered and provide for explicit consideration of social and economic effects when decisions are made about the use and development of land; and
- (d) to require land use and development planning and policy to be easily integrated with environmental, social, economic, conservation and resource management policies at State, regional and municipal levels; and
- (e) to provide for the consolidation of approvals for land use or development and related matters, and to co-ordinate planning approvals with related approvals; and
- (f) to promote the health and wellbeing of all Tasmanians and visitors to Tasmania by ensuring a pleasant, efficient and safe environment for working, living and recreation; and
- (g) to conserve those buildings, areas or other places which are of scientific, aesthetic, architectural or historical interest, or otherwise of special cultural value; and
- (h) to protect public infrastructure and other assets and enable the orderly provision and co-ordination of public utilities and other facilities for the benefit of the community; and
- (i) to provide a planning framework which fully considers land capability.

In Part 1 of this Schedule, the preamble of clause 2 defines sustainable development as enabling “people and communities to provide for their social, economic... well-being” As the scarcity multiplier prevents new commercial developments in Tasmania from even partially satisfying citizens’ desires for more income and more employment, these developments prevent rather than enable social and economic well-being. They therefore fail to meet this legal requirement for sustainability. Furthermore, as the scarcity multiplier makes new commercial developments diminish the ratio of natural capital to population it will also prevent clause 2(a) of Part 1 from being met. Such diminution is the direct opposite of “sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations”. **This failure “to meet... needs” will very clearly happen if the *present* generation is already protesting politically about perceived misuse of natural resources.** Reduction of the ratio of natural capital to population by the scarcity multiplier also means that new commercial developments and the expansion of existing ones prevent clause 2(c) of Part 1 from being met (“avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects ... on the environment”). So in these three ways, according to the Tasmanian planning system’s definition of sustainable development, the scarcity multiplier prevents all new commercial developments from being sustainable developments and thereby should prevent proposals for them from being approved under state planning laws. **In Part 2 of Schedule 1, clauses (a) “sound strategic planning” and**

(c) “explicit consideration of social and economic effects” clearly call for environmental, social and economic dynamics such as the scarcity multiplier to be very carefully considered by those applying the Tasmanian planning system.

Action A1, recommended on page 47 of the DTMP (delivery of a range of business opportunities for Aboriginal people) ignores the scarcity multiplier by proposing new commercial enterprises. It must either show why this multiplier should not be prevented, or show why Aboriginal people should not join other Tasmanians in helping to prevent it, or the Action should be deleted.

The effects of scarcity multiplication must be included in cost-benefit analysis, but this is not mentioned in the definition of CBA in the DTMP Glossary (page 87).

1.2 A lack of definition, or defective definition, of key concepts

1.2.1 Value

The Draft is far too careless in its use of the word ‘value’. As this carelessness produces subtle but fundamental problems for planning that are not recognized by the public, or by planners and academics, some space is devoted to explaining it here. Section 2.2 below adds to this explanation by showing how the loose use of this word distorts the focus of the TWWHA MP.

Because the concept of ‘value’ provides the justification for having a TMP (apart from it being formally required by the MP) and is the basis of its prescriptions, its meaning in the DTMP should be defined so that its use therein produces a carefully reasoned plan based on a publically stated, socially accepted purpose, or a set of these. The DTMP does not do this, using ‘value’ in popular ways that have loose interpretations, as exemplified by the thirteen meanings of the word listed in the 1991 edition of the Macquarie Dictionary. Instead of this usage, the DTMP should refrain from using the word ‘value’ unless it intends to convey the meaning it has in utilitarian ethics. Ethics is the discipline that studies value, inquiring into whether it really exists (meta-ethics) and if it does, then where it may be found, or what things have positive value (are good) and what things have negative value (are bad). Utilitarianism is recommended as the branch of ethics that should be applied to

matters of public policy, following Robert E. Goodin's explanation of this, as set out in his 1995 book *Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy*

In its careless use of 'value', the Draft is following the TWWHA Management Plan (MP), which in turn follows the World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines (WHCOG). As the DTMP is required to follow the MP, this allegation of carelessness criticises not only the DTMP but the MP and the WHCOG as well. For example, these three documents refer to Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) when it would be more helpful to use a term such as Outstanding Universal Feature (OUF) or Outstanding Universal Asset (OUA). The questions of whether these features or assets have value and if so why, and whether that value is intrinsic or instrumental can be decided after their nomination as outstanding features or assets. An example of where this would clarify the DTMP is on page 90, where its Glossary defines the integrity of a WH property by referring to value and values. Instead of "how it [integrity] conveys the values it [the property] holds" the DTMP would be more explicit here if it read "how well it [integrity] presents its [the property's] features" (or assets). This would then leave the Draft free to discuss the value of those features or assets. A similar looseness occurs throughout the section '4 Aboriginal cultural values initiatives', where it would be sufficient, more accurate and more intelligible to replace 'cultural values' with either 'culture' or 'cultural features' (or cultural assets), where appropriate. The value of that culture and its features or assets could then be unambiguously discussed.

Contrary to my advice on using the word 'value' the DTMP assumes that economics has something important to say about value, as it refers for example to "Valuing the role of tourism", "the value derived, both *tangible* and intangible, from nature-based tourism operators" (emphasis added) and "to ensure the sustainable growth and increasing contribution of the TWWHA to Tasmania's visitor economy" (Strategic Principle 4, page 13). However economics does not consider value even when it uses that word, as it conflates 'value' with 'power of exchange in the market'. We have here, a fundamental flaw in economics and accounting, which comes from the multiple meanings of value in everyday language. The early economists introduced this flaw by turning their attention from the 'value' of something as understood by utilitarian ethics (because such 'value' cannot be objectively measured) to focus instead on the 'revealed preference' for that thing, which *could*

be objectively measured (by the quantity of money that people would pay for it). This switch was made quite deliberately (by luminaries such as Lionel Robbins) as economists wanted to make their discipline more scientific by being able to objectively measure its key variable. In view of the problems this has created for economics and those who use its advice, some critics have accused economists of distorting their discipline because of 'physics envy' (e.g. Skidelsky 2020, Soros and Schmitz 2014). Despite their switch in meaning, economists continue to think, or imagine, that they are talking about value when they talk about revealed preference (purchasing power). They must clear up this mess. One who tried, but without success, was F.Y. Edgeworth, Professor of Political Economy at Oxford University for many years from 1891 (see his "The Hedonical Calculus", *Mind* 1879 Volume 4, Issue 15 (July) p.394-408; and his *Mathematical Psychics*, 1881 (1967) New York: Kelley). As the title of his article indicates, he attempted to do this with **hedonistic utilitarianism, which reasons that things are good or bad *only* if they produce consequences that include net pleasure or net pain, respectively.**

The key clarification that economists and other technical experts, including the writers of this DTMP, must make is to stop using the word 'value' when they mean something other than its specific meaning in utilitarian ethics. So instead of referring to 'value', economists and others should refer to 'revealed preference', 'price', 'power of exchange in the market' or equivalent words or phrases. For example, the common terms 'market value', 'economic value' and 'monetary value' should be replaced respectively with terms like 'market power', 'economic returns' and 'monetary assessment'. Wherever the word 'value' is currently used to refer to 'power of exchange in the market', or 'purchasing power', or 'monetary returns', or 'monetary yield', or 'money', then it should be replaced with one of those terms.

So to be clear, monetary units such as dollars do not measure value. They measure something quite different, which is 'power of exchange in the market'. This begs the question, 'what is the value of a given power of such exchange, like \$100?' **According to utilitarian ethics, the value of \$100 depends on the consequences of that particular \$100, into the indefinite future, in terms of the pleasure and pain it will produce for sentient beings (such as people).** So its value depends on who has the \$100, what they do with it and so on. This means that the value of

something cannot be objectively measured and the best one can do is a careful, subjective assessment of its likely consequences for the feelings of sentient beings, from now into the indefinite future. With this understanding it appears that in places where the scarcity multiplier operates (see section 1 above), then the more money a new or expanded enterprise makes, the more negative value or harm it generates.

So money is the wrong unit for measuring value and despite Professor Edgeworth's efforts there is still no unit that does this. Despite this problem the definition of cost-benefit analysis on page 87 of the Glossary states that in CBA, costs and benefits (which one would think are things of negative and positive value) "are not directly priced in the market but are monetized and included in a CBA". This raises the obvious question: why allocate a 'power of exchange in the market' to something when one is trying to allocate a value to it? Oscar Wilde considered that a person who did that was a "cynic", "one who knows the price of everything but the value of nothing". This absurdity indicates how addicted we are to the market with its simple numbers, and how unpractised we are at considering the value of things. A further problem with CBA can be that it is usually applied by discounting future benefits and costs. Utilitarian evaluation would not do this, as it assumes no difference in value between present feelings and future ones, except for the probability that the future will not arrive. In this it is similar to the approach taken by Ross Garnaut (2019) in his book *Superpower: Australia's Low-Carbon Opportunity*. As currently practised, CBA does not take account of the effects of any scarcity multipliers that operate, as noted above at the conclusion of section 1.1. These defects in cost benefit analysis mean that it is useful for evaluating environmental, social and economic factors *only* if it assesses them without using monetary units. It would then be unrecognizable as CBA and could be called (following Goodin's finding in the second paragraph of this section) 'utilitarian public policy assessment'. As this procedure would require competent judgments of value, rather than comparisons of powers of exchange in the market, it would be a job for citizens and politicians who are free of vested interests and not for business people, nor for economists (who as we have seen, gave up on value a long time ago). One suspects that this calls for either a new breed of politicians, or a new democratic political system that enables ordinary mortals to rise to the task.

This recommendation to tighten up the use of the word ‘value’ should enable the DTMP to actually discuss and consider things of positive and negative value rather than to indulge preconceptions of what it would be good or bad to have. This tightening would also enable the DTMP to state whether a stated value is intrinsic or instrumental, which would further clarify its content. However, to explain these terms and their implications further here is perhaps beyond the task at hand and should be left to a serious engagement with ethics and utilitarianism by those who draw up management plans and the like.

An example of the need for the DTMP to engage at that level of detail is in its section 7.15 where it observes “The *intrinsic* value of the wilderness was a key element in the advocacy for the protection and listing of the TWWHA and is often viewed as its principal value (DPIPWE, 2016, emphasis added).” However if a particular view on value (such as this one) is widely held, including by many ethicists, that does not necessarily make it correct, *especially when it is convenient for those espousing it*. In the following passage, moral philosophers Katarzyna de Lazari-Radek and Peter Singer (2014, 284) note that hedonistic utilitarians reject the assumption or axiom that nature (and by implication wilderness) has intrinsic value.

A hedonist will also resist the ‘reverence for life’ ethic advocated by Albert Schweitzer, for it fails to distinguish between sentient and non-sentient life. The oft-cited ‘land ethic’ of the pioneering American naturalist and ecologist Aldo Leopold does no better, from a hedonist’s perspective. Leopold wrote ‘A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community; it is wrong when it tends otherwise’. The hedonist can, while rejecting these claims about intrinsic value, grant that they may – like claims about the importance of preserving endangered plants – have instrumental value because they encourage a positive attitude to living things and the ecological systems on which all sentient life depends.

The DTMP (and the MP it follows, together with the WHCOG that the MP follows) must be clear about what it seeks to protect and promote: Is it a disembodied entity or concept called nature or wilderness? Or is it quality of life? Or is it economic growth? Or is it something else? And

it must offer a justification for its choice. To do any of this the DTMP (together with its two antecedent documents, the WHCOG and the MP) must utilize one concept of value, not the current plethora of popular interpretations.

1.2.2 Wilderness quality and wilderness values

These terms are far too loosely defined in the DTMP Glossary to be adequate for assessing the value of wilderness and understanding what is needed to most effectively protect it and restore it. Hawes, Dixon and Bell (2108) recognized this as a problem for resolving wilderness issues anywhere in the world and attempted to rectify some of it with their book, *Refining the Definition of Wilderness*. However, although their work expands our knowledge of wilderness, especially the ways in which remoteness impacts wilderness and their identification of two types of remoteness (linear remoteness and access-time remoteness), more of this type of work is needed. An example is where *Refining the Definition of Wilderness* proposes on its page 40 that, for land management purposes, 'wilderness' should be defined as land with a high degree of wild character. It goes on to say that the wild character of a place (which is usually - when mapping wild character - a map grid square of, say, one kilometre sides) has three components: its naturalness, its remoteness and its primitiveness. The first two of these are the condition of the place (its naturalness) and its relationship with its surroundings (its remoteness). However the third, primitiveness (the degree to which 'evidence of modern technological society' is absent), seems to ignore the first two classes by being composed of elements of both.

The ingredient of primitiveness that is a form of remoteness is "viewshed naturalness", which seems to be the inverse of the visibility (the lack of visibility, from the place being assessed for its wild character) of artificial features that are outside that place. This type of remoteness might be called 'apparent remoteness' as was once proposed by The Wilderness Society (1984, page 16) because when such features are very visible to an observer at the place being assessed, their perception of their remoteness at that place is usually diminished. They can see or hear or smell something in the developed world. The ingredient of *Refining's* primitiveness that is a form of naturalness is "transient impacts" such as the number and frequency of visitors temporarily at that place and of aircraft flights over it. As these events occur at this place, they temporarily reduce its naturalness. The visibility

and audibility of such events in the surroundings of that place (but not over it) may be covered by including them as ingredients of the new attribute suggested above, 'apparent remoteness'. Those events affect the wild character of a place perceived by an observer in it, because its surroundings affect their perception of remoteness. Hawes, Dixon and Bell (2018, 37, 40) call for further research on such aspects. Although they don't mention this, such work might be able to simplify their scheme by omitting primitiveness as a third component of wild character by accounting for all its ingredients by (1) introducing at least one other type of remoteness ('apparent remoteness' as suggested above); (2) more criteria for naturalness as suggested above; and (3) transient impacts being considered not as temporary impacts on primitiveness but as temporary impacts on remoteness and naturalness. These might be mapped as probabilities of occurrence and then be combined to give probabilities of wild character. At its most basic level, such modifications would revert the structure of wild character back to what it was in the Australian National Wilderness Inventory, where it was called "wilderness quality" and considered a combination of remoteness and naturalness. This simple structure of wild character might make its calculation easier. In this matter of calculation, *Refining* does not indicate whether ratings of naturalness, remoteness and primitiveness are to be added or multiplied or combined in some other way to produce a rating of wild character. Similarly, it does not indicate how the components of remoteness (linear remoteness and access-time remoteness) are to be combined to produce a rating for remoteness.

Such further additions to the work done in *Refining* seem unlikely to produce big changes in the maps that are now produced with the current method (such as in Hawes 2018), so these should retain their current significance and illustrative power. However, further refinements to wild character mapping concepts should sharpen the details of those maps and also, by more accurately developing those concepts, make the effects on wild character of both development and restoration more meaningful to those who read the maps who draw management zone boundaries.

Another aspect of *Refining* is that it did not tackle the question of the value of wild character or wilderness. This might be considered a major omission, as it would answer the rather obvious (and essential) question: Why bother devoting a whole book to defining wilderness or

wild character? Are these things worth the trouble? Addressing this question might also clear up the confusion about the value of nature that is discussed in the last three paragraphs of 1.2.1. Hawes, Dixon and Bell decided not to tackle the question of value because it would have required much more work. To start with, it needs considerable training in ethics, the discipline that enquires into the nature of value, whether it exists and if so, where. Economics is misleading here as it avoids thinking about value while often pretending that it does, as discussed above in 1.2.1.

As *Refining the Definition of Wilderness* recommends on its page 40 the replacement of “‘wilderness character’ or similar terms” (such as wilderness quality and wilderness values) with “wild character”, the DTMP Glossary should have followed its lead, instead of following the much older and superseded Australian National Wilderness Inventory (NWI), which has been shown to have serious flaws. The Tasmanian PWS is to some extent aware of this and engaged Hawes to produce a better version of NWI mapping for the TWWHA in 2015.

The DTMP Glossary defines ‘wilderness quality’ and ‘wilderness values’ separately but happily conflates them by referring to ‘wilderness values’ in its definition of ‘wilderness quality’, as if it were the same thing. Moreover, ‘wilderness quality’ is not used or defined in the MP. If ‘wild character’ were used instead of these other terms it would leave ‘values’ and ‘value’ for more meaningful uses, as discussed above under *Value*. It would also leave ‘quality’ to be used in ‘wilderness quality’, redefined to refer to the quality of a particular wilderness area for a specified use, such as non-mechanised recreation (like backpacking or rafting), or vicarious contemplation (perhaps because it is too inhospitable to visit without serious mechanical aids). This means that the DTMP Glossary should replace ‘wilderness quality’ with ‘wild character’ and that ‘wilderness values’ should be deleted (see page 92 of the DTMP) as being so vague that it hinders the understanding of both wild character and its value. The DTMP does not define ‘wilderness value’ but uses the term in its heading “7.15 Impacts on wilderness value and quality”. To eliminate this confusion it should change this heading to ‘7.15 Impacts on wild character’, define wild character in its glossary and change its references to “wilderness values” and “wilderness quality” to ‘wild character’.

Of course, such changes in terminology in the DTMP require that the MP also be changed in those respects. As the MP needs changing in many other ways as well, as indicated in section 2 below, it requires a thorough revision that would make any TMP superfluous, because the MP would then directly manage tourism in the TWWHA.

Despite the Wild Foundation's massive tome *Wilderness Management* by Dawson and Hendee (4th ed. 2009) research into wilderness is still in a formative stage. This is largely due to a change that originated in Tasmania from thinking of 'wilderness' as a large area that takes at least two days to cross on foot, to thinking of whether a small area such as a square meter, or one hectare, or a square kilometre, can be considered 'wilderness' and if so, under what conditions (see Kirkpatrick (1979) and Kirkpatrick and Haney (1980)). This change in thinking might be considered a revolution in this field, as it has enabled very useful mapping that identifies not just whether an area can be considered 'a wilderness' but the strength of wild character in all parts of the area mapped and how that character may be most effectively changed in the future. In this approach, those parts of the mapped area that have a wild character stronger than a specified minimum are considered 'wilderness'. The Wild Foundation's book has yet to catch up with this improvement in mapping, but it is increasingly being utilized around the world.

Partly because of this advance in thinking about wilderness, the discipline of defining and mapping it needs further development. Hawes, Dixon and Bell made a useful contribution with their 2018 book, but as indicated above, more needs to be done, including extending this research to clarify the value of wild character, as briefly discussed in the last three paragraphs of 1.2.1. It therefore needs serious funding and the engagement of more experts. This need is urgent because while the core attribute of the TWWHA is its wild character, management plans and a DTMP have been drafted for it while the discipline that seeks to understand wild character and its value is still developing. So it is not surprising that those plans and the DTMP are confused.

Because this need for more research is urgent, the passive observation of the DTMP at the end of 7.15 (on page 76) that wilderness mapping methods need improving should be strengthened to a recommendation that adequate public funds be allocated (by either

the State or the Commonwealth Government) for a research program into the analysis, mapping and valuing of wild character. The valuing aspect requires considerable work, as may be seen from my comments in section 1.2.1, and also in 1.1. It must specifically inquire into the value of wild character as a public good. Until substantial progress is made on such a research program, the conflict between economic growth and protection that has consumed Tasmania for half a century (and has now provoked this drafting of a DTMP) is likely to continue to fester, with the usual physical, political and legal confrontations.

1.2.3 Culture

The words 'culture' and 'cultural' are frequently used in the DTMP to mean 'Aboriginal culture' and 'Aboriginal cultural feature' or the like. This casual lack of qualification implies that the only cultural assets of the TWWHA are Aboriginal, which ignores contemporary culture encompassing activities such as bushwalking, off-road driving, hunting, photography, wildlife observation, fishing, viewing Aboriginal artefacts (such as petroglyphs, middens and Aboriginally modified landscapes), the vicarious appreciation of wild character and active forms of wilderness recreation (such as backpacking, kayaking, river rafting, pack rafting, rock-climbing, skiing and snowshoeing). The main cultural assets of the TWWHA are clearly assets for contemporary culture and the inclusion of 'Wilderness' in its name emphasises this, as wilderness is a contemporary concept, not an Aboriginal one. One of the failures to recognize this in the DTMP is where its 4.4 states: "the Tasmanian Aboriginal people are the custodians of the TWWHA's cultural values and their involvement... is critical to facilitate appropriate and effective presentation of *cultural* values to visitors" (emphasis added). With such statements the Draft fails to acknowledge the importance of the TWWHA for contemporary culture, apparently having been guilt-tripped by the Aboriginal community (over the devastating impact on their forebears - and thus also on them - by the British invasion of what was then, solely their country) into the self-abasement of not recognizing the culture of most of those who now live here. The preface by Rocky Sainty seems to imply that non-Aboriginal readers of the DTMP should feel this shame and thereby ignore their own culture.

This is a difficult political issue for the MP and the DTMP, compounded by the fact that the campaigns to protect areas from development that are now largely included in the TWWHA were mainly (if not exclusively)

led by non-Aboriginal Australians. While the DTMP should retain statements of the importance of Aboriginal cultural attachments to the TWWHA and also of its Aboriginal cultural assets, it should balance this by noting current non-Aboriginal cultural attachments to it and the potential for these to become stronger as wild character becomes more scarce across the planet.

1.2.4 Sustainable tourism

As noted above in the second paragraph of '1.1 The DTMP prevents sustainability from being achieved', the DTMP Glossary interprets sustainable tourism as not only a level of tourism that is "able to be maintained", but also that has "a certain rate of growth, taking into account social, economic and environmental factors." As this provision for growth is for more commercial development it ignores the scarcity multiplier, which makes such development unsustainable in two fundamental ways. As conditions in Tasmania drive this multiplier (see section 1 above, or for details, pages 207-208 in Chapter 5 of *Rescuing Democracy*), the Glossary's definition of sustainable tourism is therefore wrong. Even if one assumes that an activity may be called 'sustainable' not only in terms of its current volume or flow but also in terms of a rate of growth of that volume or flow, common sense indicates that if either form of 'sustainability' can only be achieved by making other activities, or assets, or valued conditions unsustainable, then it cannot be called a 'sustainable' activity. But this is just what the scarcity multiplier does: It prevents other activities, assets and conditions from being sustained and therefore makes new tourism developments unsustainable.

Another way of putting this is that scarcity multiplier theory does what the TMP Glossary definition of 'sustainable tourism' calls for: It takes "into account social, economic and environmental factors". This theory also takes account of democratic politics and thereby comes up with a recommended rate of growth for tourism in Tasmania, of zero. The alternatives to that are a political decision to either abandon sustainability or to halt the drivers of scarcity multiplication in Tasmania; those drivers being growth of population and growth of per capita consumption.

1.2.5 Economic and social impact assessments

The description of EIAs in the Glossary on page 89 should be revised to acknowledge the effect of the scarcity multiplier and the two forms of

unsustainability it produces, as discussed above under ‘1.1 The DTMP prevents sustainability from being achieved’. For example, the Glossary description assumes at the end of its second paragraph that an overall increase in employment increases welfare, whereas the multiplier will convert this short-term increase in welfare into a longer-term loss of welfare. The description of ‘Social impact assessment’ on pages 90-91 should also be revised to cover scarcity multiplication.

1.3 Neglect of cumulative impact

In its section 7.14 (pages 74-5) the DTMP recognises that “Cumulative impact over time from activities assessed on a case-by-case basis is a key risk to the OUV.” However in the absence of any specification of what impact on wild character is acceptable, the DTMP (and the MP) cannot show how the cumulative loss of wild character will be prevented. The DTMP recognises that there is no “recognised cumulative impact assessment methodology” and that “it is appropriate that a tailored methodology is identified” (page 74), but again neither the DTMP nor the MP show how this will be done. As the managing authority, PWS has demonstrated for many years that it has no inclination to prevent the cumulative loss of wild character. Nor, with the lame exception of an inadequate zoning scheme (as discussed below in 2.4 and the Appendix) has it developed any procedures to prevent such loss.

On page 76 the DTMP declares that the MP identifies under KDO 8.5 that impacts on wilderness values [wild character] are considered in any assessment of activities. However, as a high level strategic planning document, it does not provide guidance as to when an impact on wilderness quality [wild character] or wilderness values [wild character] is acceptable or otherwise, or any details of how and when a wilderness quality [wild character] assessment should be undertaken” [alternative terminology added].

So if a high level document doesn’t provide such guidance, what will? Evidently not the DTMP, which doesn’t provide guidance either.

What demonstrably should provide such guidance is the motivation for establishing the TWWHA. As the decades-long environmental campaigns to protect the area now mostly encompassed by the TWWHA clearly showed, **zero impact on wild character and even its restoration was**

required. As those campaigners won this political struggle, specifically over the region now known as the TWWHA, they provided the necessary guidance: All of the wild character of this area should be protected and, wherever possible, it should be enhanced.

1.4 An incompetent concept of presentation

As the name of the Tasmanian Wilderness WHA emphasises, its major characteristic is its wild character, the stronger expressions of which produce wilderness. The Visions of both the MP and the DTMP call for that character, along with other natural and cultural assets of this protected area, to be 'presented' so that people may appreciate it. DTMP 3.1 calls this "a key focus" of the Plan. But both the DTMP and the MP fail to understand that the only way to 'present' wild character is to make sure it exists (including restoring it, wherever possible). Both documents imply that an important part of presentation is to provide access with vehicles, boats and aircraft, ignoring the fact that this destroys wild character by eliminating both remoteness and naturalness. They also fail to recognize that most other modes of presentation destroy wild character. For example photography, films, videos, paintings and drawings show people who are outside wild places some of their features, thereby destroying much of their quality of *terra incognita* and mystery, which is essential to the allure of, and fascination with, wild character. The mystery of the unknown arouses curiosity, motivating initiative and the energy for self-reliant wilderness exploration. It heightens the explorer's perceptions of discovery and achievement. If presentation material were actually installed within a wild place it would directly damage its wild character as a modern artefact that entirely eliminates naturalness at that point. The presentation of Aboriginal history and culture near Melaleuca airstrip has some of this effect as it compounds the damage to wild character that was previously inflicted there by its buildings, mine workings, airstrip, aircraft and flow of visitors.

The Glossary of the Draft TMP defines presentation (page 90) without any comprehension of its potential to damage wild character. It calls for "the consideration of... expectations and demands of different visitor groups" without recognizing that these may completely contradict each other when they focus on 'wild character' and 'wilderness'.

A competent approach to presentation of wild character would recognize that wilderness photography, expedition films and videos, detailed maps such as those of 1:25,000 scale or smaller and verbal and print accounts of journeys in wild places, all to varying degrees damage the mystery of the wild and thereby wild character itself. These communications may compensate to some extent by encouraging people to visit these places and are usually necessary to raise the awareness of the mass public so that they demand their wild character is protected. After this is achieved however, preventing these conventional forms of presentation is necessary to protect it.

One of many examples of the DTMP's (and the MP's) biased and destructive idea of 'presentation' is its statement in section 3.9 (page 35): "The preparation of a South Coast Recreation Zone Plan is a requirement of the Management Plan and is to be used more fully to realize the strategic presentation role of the South Coast Track in the TWWHA." This issue is noted as a zoning fault of the MP in the Appendix.

1.5 Lack of balance in advisory bodies

The Aboriginal advisory body proposed in DTMP 4.4 must be balanced by a non-Aboriginal advisory body, to make sure that contemporary culture is not overruled. Such overruling seems very likely due to the bias discussed above under 1.2.3. Another solution to this problem might be to have an advisory body of which more than half the members are non-Aboriginal and the remainder Aboriginal, to approximate a democratic representation of the Tasmanian community. As we already have such a body with Aboriginal members, the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Committee (NPWAC), why have another one?

1.6 Defective Strategic Principles

The four Strategic Principles are very badly flawed, which summarizes the incompetence of the DTMP. The first two Principles need to be radically rewritten and the last two are so fundamentally mistaken they should be deleted. I suggest that some of these errors were made because they were written in ignorance of the instrumental value of wild character and why that makes it an important public good. But as I commented in the fourth-from-last paragraph of 1.2.1, to explain these issues 'further here is perhaps beyond the task at hand and should be

left to a serious engagement with ethics and utilitarianism by those who draw up management plans and the like’.

Strategic Principle 1 (DTMP section 2.2.1 Protecting and maintaining the OUV) refers to a “paradox between accessibility and wilderness”. That paradox does not exist, except in the minds of those who do not understand wilderness. The essence of wilderness (and more broadly of wild character) is that it is difficult to access. This is crucial as it creates much of the instrumental value of wilderness by making visits to it challenging, adventurous, time consuming, totally immersive and memorable. The reference to “paradox” must be deleted.

This Principle also states that “a balance between the type and nature of visitor experiences in the TWWHA is a core desired outcome” (DTMP page 11), without providing reasons that justify this desire for balance within the TWWHA. As this area was campaigned for and protected mainly to provide wilderness experiences, it is far more logical to see this “core desired outcome” of balance as being achieved across the state, nation or the world, rather than purely within the TWWHA. The paragraph calling for “balance” must be deleted.

This Principle is also defective in focusing on protecting and maintaining OUVs, even though it attempts to broaden this by including the concepts of “integrity” and “authenticity”. It should have been made comprehensive by adding wild character to the OUVs as another object of fundamental concern. This would not be necessary had the WH Convention recognized outstanding wild character as a distinct OUV (either on its own or in combination with another feature or attribute), but as this has not yet been done, the DTMP and the MP must add wild character to the OUVs it cites as attributes to be protected in the Tasmanian Wilderness WHA. As the name of this reserve clearly indicates, it was established mainly to protect that character. This omission appears to encourage section 3.1 of the DTMP to ignore the intentional destruction of wild character in the TWWHA by the State Government’s Expressions of Interest (EOI) process for new tourism developments inside it (currently being prosecuted at Lake Malbena) by claiming that its wild character retains “integrity and authenticity, - when other wild places throughout the world are diminishing”. This hypocrisy might be excused by considering it to be ignorance; but that particular ignorance in a parks service cannot be excused.

The DTMP's emphasis on the importance of protecting the OUV evades the issue of protecting wild character in another way: it **fails to acknowledge the importance of the wilderness experience of existing users**. An example of the importance of this issue is that the vast majority of the submissions to the Central Highlands Council on the proposed Halls Island/ Lake Malbena resort not only opposed it (1,343 versus 3 in favour) but did so because it would destroy the wilderness experience of existing users.

Strategic Principle 1 must be rewritten to correct these faults.

Strategic Principle 2 (DTMP section 2.2.2 Conscious, meaningful and authentic experiences) should be **rewritten to correct the loose uses of the words** value, values, valued, culture and cultural as called for above in 1.2.1 and 1.2.3. In addition, the word 'conscious' should be omitted as superfluous, because 'meaningful' and 'authentic' experiences *are* conscious.

This Principle states: "For an immersive experience of cultural values it must be recognised that Tasmanian Aboriginal people are the custodians." This makes **two additional crucial mistakes, which should also be corrected**. First, as discussed above in 1.2.3, the term "cultural values" is misused here by implying that contemporary Tasmanian culture either does not exist or is irrelevant to the management of the TWWHA. Second, Aboriginal people are not "the custodians" in any realistic sense as Tasmania is democratically governed, which makes all Tasmanians 'the custodians' of this State. It is they who manage it, not the Aboriginal community. When Tasmanians do this, each Aboriginal Tasmanian has as much say as each non-Aboriginal Tasmanian. The Principle's statement "It is therefore crucial that they [Tasmanian Aboriginal people] direct and lead the presentation and interpretation of those values" would damage the experience of wild character if it was implemented in RZ, SRRZ and WZ parts of the TWWHA, so it should be qualified by saying that where this presentation and interpretation is done within the TWWHA it is to be limited to VZs.

Strategic Principle 3 (DTMP section 2.2.3 Supporting regional communities) should be deleted as it is of dubious validity, as partially stated by its last paragraph: "it is acknowledged that tourism can bring

undesirable consequences to regional communities...”. A recent example of this is the rejection by the Central Highlands Council in 2019 of the application by Daniel Hackett to establish a helicopter-accessed resort on Halls Island in the TWWHA at Lake Malbena. Part of this issue is that the continuing improvement of roads and aerial access converts regions into much bigger areas that may become virtually state-wide. In addition to its dubious validity, if ‘supporting regional communities’ entails increasing commercial activity, it then produces the unsustainability generated by the scarcity multiplier. Moreover, as the TWWHA was not established to support regional communities, its management should not be made more difficult by taking on this irrelevant task. These three problems call for this Principle to be deleted.

Strategic Principle 4 (DTMP section 2.2.4 Valuing the role of tourism) should be deleted as it has several basic misconceptions that completely invalidate it. The first of these is the use of the word ‘valuing’ here (e.g. “Valuing the role of tourism”, “value derived... from tourism operators”) assumes that sales revenue has positive value, whereas the scarcity multiplier indicates that this is not so in Tasmania (and Australia), where increases in that revenue have negative value. The word ‘value’ is also conflated in this Strategic Principle with ‘power of exchange in the market’ (in other words, purchasing power, measured in units of currency such as dollars), whereas value is quite different, as discussed above in 1.2.1. Two other serious errors in this Principle are the statements “nature-based tourism operators, whose businesses operate in the TWWHA and contribute to its preservation, presentation and promotion” and “ensure the sustainable growth and increasing contribution of the TWWHA to Tasmania’s visitor economy”. The first of these statements is wrong in that ‘promotion’ sooner or later causes carrying capacity to be exceeded (and is arguably already doing that in some places) and ‘presentation’ damages wild character, as explained above in 1.4. The second statement assumes that growth of the visitor economy is (or may be) sustainable, but this is wrong as the scarcity multiplier makes any growth of commercial activity unsustainable in Tasmania, as explained above in 1.1 and in the two documents attached to this submission.

1.7 Failure to follow Strategic Principle 2

Despite policy guidance being one of the stated rationales for the DTMP, it fails to give this by not stating how Strategic Principle 2 will be

implemented. So it offers virtually no guidance to resolving experiential issues. For example on page 54 the DTMP acknowledges that high visitor numbers can result in “poor experience, injured visitors... environmental impact... recreational/visitor displacement.” Again, on page 57, the DTMP declares: “Aircraft traffic is a significant issue for parks managers... and, if left unmanaged can pose significant risks to a site’s values and the visitor experience... Community concern over air access, in particular helicopters, was a significant theme in the initial engagement process.” The DTMP must specify limits to visitor and aircraft traffic; otherwise it ignores its own Strategic Principle 2.

2. A defective foundation for the DTMP

As the 2016 Management Plan for the TWWHA (MP) is a statutory document, the TMP must be based on it if it is to have authority. However as the MP has major deficiencies, these cripple the DTMP. To make it possible to correct the DTMP, the following six types of deficiency in the MP must first be rectified.

2.1 The MP’s primary function of protecting OUVs

A key feature of the TWWHA is its strong wild character, as indicated by the inclusion of ‘Wilderness’ in its name. However its MP tends to be diverted from fully protecting and restoring this character as it follows the World Heritage Convention, which fails to list exceptional wild character or wilderness as an Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) that would justify a World Heritage listing (either on its own or in combination with another feature as noted above in 1.6 *Strategic Principle 1*. The last paragraph of section 1.2 of the MP notes that a **retrospective Statement of OUV (SOUV) will be written** to further identify cultural criteria for WH listing and that these are expected to be WH criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi). In order to provide a firm basis for the TMP, outstanding wild character should be specified in this retrospective SOUV as an attribute under (iii) that serves “to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition... which is living...” and also under (vi) as “directly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas... of outstanding universal significance.”

2.2 A lack of definition, or defective definition, of key concepts

The MP is riddled with loose terminology and so this failing pervades the DTMP, as noted above in 1.2. These problems include the use of terms such as value(s), wilderness quality, wilderness value(s), culture, cultural, and (arguably) spiritual. Most of the criticisms made above in section 1.2 apply also to the MP.

A particularly damaging example of this vagueness concerns the use of 'values' in the MP's '2.3 Social and Economic Values'. This section lists economic 'values' as if the TWWHA was established to protect these, along with other features or assets. The economic 'values' mentioned there on pages 52 to 55 are Huon pine, rock lobster, abalone, leatherwood honey, hydro-electricity and tourism. Some of the industries producing or utilizing these had to be restrained in order to establish the TWWHA and the reserves of which it is composed. Despite much popular opposition, hydroelectric development destroyed the wild character and scenic integrity of the core of what is now the TWWHA before it could be stopped with another nation-wide struggle, this time over the Franklin and lower Gordon Rivers. The lack of focus in the MP that allows it to regard damage as a positive 'value' is being repeated in the DTMP, this time to help tourism damage the wild character of the TWWHA, apparently to provide more 'jobs and growth' for the State. With a similar motivation, the MP displays the same ignorance of the scarcity multiplier as the DTMP (e.g. "scope to increase" tourism in 'Basis for management' on page 17 of the MP; and the Key Desired Outcome that "economic benefits for local communities are maximised" section 7.4 page 162), despite an account of this dynamic being published seven years before the MP in *Ecological Economics* (Smith 2009) and then another one locally, two years before the MP in *TNPA News* (Smith 2014), the online journal of the Tasmanian National Parks Association. Third and fourth publications of the scarcity multiplier preceded the DTMP but not the MP (the 2016 book *Rescuing Democracy* and "The Missing Argument" in the *Tasmanian Times*, 9 July 2018). A major element of this theory has been widely known for more than half a century: In *The Affluent Society*, eminent economist and diplomat J. K. Galbraith (1958) described the US economy as a giant squirrel wheel in which "wants are increasingly created by the process by which they are satisfied".

Apart from the MP's ignorance of the of the scarcity multiplier and this dynamic's destruction of sustainability, the basic point being made here about value is that anything that is listed as a 'value' of the TWWHA in a plan for managing it must be something *this reserve is intended to protect*; not a by-product of that protection and certainly not a 'value' that persists despite the reserve's intended function of protection. Moreover these 'values' should be called 'features' or 'assets' or 'attributes' or 'characteristics' or 'yields' and so on, to leave 'value' and 'values' for technically defined roles in which 'value' should be identified as either intrinsic or instrumental and either positive or negative.

The irrelevance of some of the 'values' described in the MP make it read as if it were politically campaigning for the TWWHA to be *reserved* for protection. It employs the usual environmentalists' technique of bolstering their case with all the popular arguments they can find, while not worrying too much about their veracity. The DTMP must focus instead on writing the prescriptions required to *produce* the protection that this reservation was campaigned for and was intended to achieve.

In effect, the MP acknowledges its own lack of focus in two ways in the opening comments of its Section 6 (Management for Presentation). The first is its statement that "PWS has entered into a strategic action plan with the Tasmanian tourism industry, Parks 21", which means that **the protective function of PWS and its MP is to be compromised by assisting economic growth**. An incompetent interpretation of 'presentation' by PWS facilitates such compromise, as explained above in section 1.4. **The second implicit acknowledgement of its lack of focus by the MP is its declaration that a Tourism Master Plan is required to deal with a number of issues that are avoided by the MP. Those issues are listed after that declaration and include "marketing strategy", "demand analysis", "investment in facilities", "sustainable use" (see 1.2.4 *Sustainable tourism* above) and "commercial opportunities". This emphasis on economic growth demonstrates that, with this MP, PWS is corrupting its protective focus. It would seem that this corruption would have been far too obvious if a supposedly protective MP dealt with such issues in any detail, so the politically expedient approach was to merely flag them there so that they could be addressed in a separate document, the TMP, which would then utilize the statutory force of the MP.**

2.3 Inadequate glossary

As a statutory, technical manual, the MP's glossary needs expanding along the lines of that of the DTMP, but corrected as discussed above in '1.2 A lack of definition, or defective definition, of key concepts'.

2.4 Inadequate zoning

The MP's zones fail to effectively protect and restore wild character, hindering the execution of the MP's Vision, which on page 34, aims, "if appropriate, to rehabilitate the... values of the TWWHA and to transmit that heritage to future generations in as good or better condition than at present." For example, Recreation Zones (RZs) and Self-Reliant Recreation Zones (SRRZs) allow standing camps, which violate a major intention of Minimum Impact Bushwalking standards (that visitors leave no trace) and unambiguously destroy wild character anywhere in their vicinity, as discussed in the next paragraph. These camps should not be permitted in the TWWHA.

Wherever the WZ is adjacent to the TWWHA boundary it is subject to drastic reductions of its wild character due to developments outside that boundary. So although the WZ covers 82% of the TWWHA (page 75 of the DTMP) that does not mean anywhere near this proportion would permanently retain the wild character it currently has, despite its continuing management status as WZ. This weakness should be compensated for by converting much of the RZ and SRRZ in the TWWHA into WZ as recommended in the Appendix of this submission. **Such conversions would also restore or prevent similar damage to the wild character of the current WZ inflicted by development that is permitted in existing RZs and SRRZs.** For example the Mt McCall road is RZ and thereby open to motor vehicles and commercial activity, which drastically weaken the wild character of the surrounding country, including the nearby Franklin River. The South Coast track is RZ and thus open to commercial visitor accommodation, which would inflict severe damage on the wild character of the surrounding region. This effect is shown by mapping similar to that of Map 7 on page 176 of the MP (where wild character is called 'wilderness value'). Hawes (2018) has produced maps of this type for the proposed resort development on Halls Island in Lake Malbena, showing that wild character would be severely reduced within a five-kilometre radius around the island and also along the proposed flight path of helicopters accessing the resort from Derwent Bridge.

The Tasmanian Land Conservancy's Skullbone Plains property is not covered by the TWWHA zoning scheme. It should be made a condition of its inclusion in the TWWHA that it is covered, which would mean that if my recommendation on standing camps is accepted then Daniel Hackett's camp would be removed, thereby restoring much of the wild character of Lake Ina and its surroundings. This property should be given a WZ zoning, so that the bush reclaims and blocks its road network, increasing wild character both here and in the adjacent public TWWHA.

Other examples of inadequate zoning in the MP are outlined in the Appendix.

2.5 Neglect of cumulative impact on wild character

As stated on page 76 of the DTMP, the MP "does not provide guidance as to when an impact on wilderness quality or wilderness values [that is, on wild character] is acceptable or otherwise, or any details of how and when a wilderness quality [wild character] assessment should be undertaken" (alternative terminology added). These voids in the MP are discussed above in 1.3. They make the MP conspicuously evasive on its main subject, the protection of the wild character of the Tasmanian *Wilderness* WHA.

2.6 The MP's corrupt RAA process

'Corrupt' might seem too strong a word to describe the 2016 MP's Reserve Activity Assessment (RAA) process, but as the function of the MP is to protect natural and cultural assets in the TWWHA from damage, including impacts from development activities, it is apt. The 2016 MP replaced the 1999 MP's relatively effective process for controlling development (the statutory *New Proposals and Impact Assessment Process*) with the new RAA process, which was designed to allow developments to proceed at significant cost to natural and cultural assets. This replacement made many errors: It ignored the scarcity multiplier, which shows that commercial development in this State destroys sustainability; it is not statutory and is defined by department policy, not law, so it can be changed without parliamentary approval; the RAA process has no requirement for public release; and public consultation is mandatory for only one of the four levels of RAA. Not only may there be no public input into these assessments, but the

public may even be unaware of a proposal until far too late to influence the outcome.

3. The deficiencies of the TWWHA MP and its DTMP are unlikely to be corrected without institutional reform of the State government

In addition to the deficiencies of the MP and its DTMP outlined above in sections 1 and 2, the Tasmanian government mismanages national parks and reserves in other ways, six of which are described below in subsection 3.1. These failures form part of a broader failure in **long-term, strategic public policy** (such as failure to recognize the scarcity multiplier). Its cause and remedy are discussed below in subsection 3.2.

The analysis given here may seem a digression from commenting on the DTMP, but as the additional examples below indicate, until government failure on **long-term policy** is addressed and ameliorated, damaging instruments such as the 2016 MP and its DTMP will continue to be produced. A theory of why such failure is very common in democracies, even in one that is as well developed as Australia's, is offered in *Rescuing Democracy* (Smith 2016).

Further evidence that this section on government failure and its remedy is not a digression, but highly relevant to the DTMP, is the boycott of its initial public consultation phase by all major conservation groups in the State. They evidently do not have confidence that the State government will perform its function of providing **long-term public goods**, and in particular that it will protect national parks. Not only does the memory of the fate of Lake Pedder National Park linger, but so too does the political expediency of converting such public goods into private goods.

3.1 Additional examples of incompetence by the State government

3.1.1 The State government damages the protective function of national parks

The President of the Tasmanian National Parks Association, Nick Sawyer (2017) has observed:

At the time that most of Tasmania's current development control legislation was being drafted [the early 1990s] there was a consensus that national parks and reserves were out-of-bounds

for development. Hence Tasmania has never had a process to control development on reserved land defined in legislation because it was seen as superfluous. This has now changed with the current State Government's policy of "unlocking" national parks and reserves for development.

Another possible mechanism to define a statutory assessment process is to define it in a statutory management plan; e.g. the *New Proposals and Impact Assessment Process* defined in the *1999 TWWHA Management Plan*. **The 2016 TWWHA Management Plan contains no equivalent**, only a description of the non-statutory Reserve Activity Assessment process [RAA]. Hence the current situation is that no management plans define a comprehensive development assessment process although some still contain requirements for public consultation on an environmental impact assessment or site plan [emphasis added].

This means that the current process for the assessment of proposals in response to the government's call for expressions of interest (EOI) in tourism developments in national parks and reserves is deficient in that (quoting from Sawyer 2017):

- The only publically available information on any such proposal is the extremely brief description provided on the Coordinator-General's website. This would be quite inadequate as a basis for a development application to a Tasmanian council, for example.
- The assessment panel is unaccountable. Neither their deliberations nor their report to the Minister are available to the public. Again, this contrasts with a council's assessment of a discretionary development application in which the assessment documentation is available to the public, subject to public comment and (potentially) an appeal.
- ... the description of the EOI process is confusing and it... fails to make clear what, if any, opportunities exist for public involvement... the EOI process contains no unambiguous commitment to undertaking a public RAA, which is the key assessment process... (emphasis in original)

Sawyer's observations show that the attributes of a reserve that it was established to protect might be damaged or destroyed by an EOI initiated project, without the public being able to modify or stop it.

3.1.2 Secretive EOI process

Sawyer's three points in the preceding subsection demonstrate secretive behaviour by the Tasmanian government. It seems that nowhere near the full number and nature of the EOIs currently received has been published, although there are rumoured to be about 40 of them. Perhaps the official excuse is that they are "commercial in confidence", but that is not a sufficient reason for secrecy where public assets are involved.

3.1.3 State Government's EOI process pre-empts its DTMP

Section 6 (Management for Presentation) of the 2016 MP states that a Tourism Master Plan is to be developed "in consultation with... key stakeholders. Release the plan for public comment" (page 125). On the following page, this Plan "will provide additional guidance, context and policy direction for tourism in the TWWHA within the planning framework provided by the statutory management plan." As the EOI process has been operating since December 2016, it pre-empts the TMP (which is still under development) by more than 3 years. The obvious question is: What is the point of "public comment" on the DTMP when tourism development in the TWWHA is promoted and approved by the government irrespective of any TMP (as with the EOI process in the case of the resort development at Halls Island, Lake Malbena)?

3.1.4 NPWAC recommendation ignored

The PWS has ignored recommendations from its own advisory body (NPWAC) on the proposed resort for Halls Island at Lake Malbena in the TWWHA, resulting in the Central Highlands Council's decision on this being ignored, a High Court censure of the Federal Minister for the Environment and expensive and time consuming litigation against the PWS approval of this resort, which is still proceeding.

3.1.5 Inadequate implementation procedures for the 2016 MP

The MP is subject to the RAA process applied to all activities proposed in reserves administered by PWS. However this process is seriously deficient in that (a) it is not a statutory obligation of the Parks and Wildlife Service, so there is no possibility of legal action to compel one to be undertaken or to appeal its findings; and (b) It does not invite public review before an RAA can be completed (Sawyer 2017). The availability of such review should be a legal requirement that requires RAAs to be

published, allows at least two months for the public to submit comments, requires each comment to be published (with author permission) together with a considered response before the RAA is finalised, and the RAA must be subject to the right of third party appeals.

Also in respect of all PWS management plans, Sawyer (2017) observes:

In cases where the EOI proposal is not permissible under the current reserve management plan the statutory process for amending a management plan still has to be followed but the three amendments proposed to date (Narawntapu, Freycinet and Tasman) included no reasoned justification or assessment of the impacts on the reserve. Despite claims of openness and transparency, the EOI process amounts to ensuring that the approval meets the requirements of Tasmanian legislation while minimizing opportunities for scrutiny and potentially avoiding any professional assessment of impacts on reserve values including the social and recreational values – the values most likely to [be] affected by a tourism development.

Section 8.8 of the MP (page 183) requires a review of the roads in the TWWHA to be completed within two years, to specify which are to be closed and rehabilitated. An implementation plan is then to be made. More than three years later there is no sign of this review, or of the plan. The review and plan must be produced to establish the preconditions for any TMP, so the drafting of the latter must follow, not precede this review and plan.

Section 1.2 of the MP (page 26) states that a retrospective Statement of OUV (SOUV) will be prepared, but after more than three years have passed this has not been done, despite the urgent need for it due to pressures to commercialize the TWWHA. This retrospective SOUV should incorporate the recommendations given above in 2.1.

3.1.6 Economic incompetence by the State Government: It displays no knowledge of the scarcity multiplier and its impact on sustainability

As discussed above in 1.1 'The DTMP prevents sustainability from being achieved' and in several other parts of this submission, **the State Government is completely unaware of the scarcity multiplier and thus ignores essential requirements for sustainable development. In doing**

that, it routinely and enthusiastically flouts its own planning legislation, which has as its primary object the promotion of sustainable development.

This incompetence of the Tasmanian government in strategic public policy is part of a broader pattern of dysfunction with regard to the long term that is common to most democratic governments (Smith 2016). The reasons for this failure and how it may be ameliorated are discussed in the next section.

3.2 The basic cause of strategic dysfunction in the State government and how to correct it

In 1999 the bitter environmental disputes of the preceding four decades in Tasmania were still roiling. Labor Premier Jim Bacon decided to improve his ability to address such problems by modifying government with a new institution called *TasmaniaTogether*. Although this was intended to engage citizens more constructively, it had virtually no deliberative capacity (Crowley 2009) and other serious defects, so after a few years it was quietly side-lined by the government that introduced it. **But the problem recognized by Premier Bacon still remains. Various manifestations of it appear in democracies around the world.** Some of these are described in Part 1 of *Rescuing Democracy* (Smith 2016) and all of its Chapter 5 is devoted to one in particular: a universal failure of these governments to recognize the scarcity multiplier and even if they did, to be able to control it. **As a general pattern, this failure is an inability of these societies and their governments to exercise restraint and self-discipline. This prevents them from constructively addressing fundamental, strategic issues such as national population size, per capita consumption, national greenhouse gas emissions, pollution, inequalities in income, wealth and employment, and in general, getting citizens to make some sacrifice now for future public goods.** Such problems are analysed in Part 1 of the book to produce a diagnosis of democratic failure called triple dysfunction theory. Such dysfunction is alive and well in Tasmania as, like other modern democracies, its governing structure of selecting representatives by election produces the three modes of failure described in that theory.

The challenge before the Tasmanian Government remains as Premier Bacon found it, more than twenty years ago. Political science indicates that his approach, of institutional innovation, was correct (e.g.

Acemoglu and Robinson 2012) but as his experiment failed, another more soundly designed one is needed. Part 2 of *Rescuing Democracy* utilizes triple dysfunction theory to try to point the way, producing an institutional design called the People's Forum. The theoretical capabilities of this Forum are compared in this book with those of eight earlier institutional designs of similar purpose. The result is that the Forum is not only likely to be the best performer, but also the easiest to launch as in its case it requires money, rather than the usual requirement of political will.

For the State Government to produce a competent DTMP and also a competent MP (which should render a TMP unnecessary) it must be able to recognize the scarcity multiplier and its implications for sustainability. The government must also be able to help citizens carefully decide whether they want sustainability, whether the multiplier should be stopped and help them execute such choices. To do all that, it is abundantly clear that the government requires institutional reform. The same can be said for other governments around the world. I suggest the State government has two alternatives for doing this: (1) establish a People's Forum, or (2) establish a research program in political science to compare all such designs and possibly produce new ones, so that an experiment in governance that may be more promising than launching a People's Forum can be run. *Rescuing Democracy* is one person's attempt to do (2), but it would be prudent to have it reviewed by other experts and improved upon if possible.

4. The TMP should be abandoned

As the DTMP must follow an MP that is seriously defective (as discussed above in section 2) it repeats and elaborates those defects (as discussed in section 1). On page 5 of the DTMP it acknowledges that the TMP is to be "a subsidiary document to the Management Plan" that "provides policy direction and guidance" on activities in the TWWHA. As the legal status of such a subsidiary document has never arisen in any planning appeal hearing or similar context it is uncertain how it would be treated. The complication of this uncertainty, together with the numerous unacceptable flaws of the MP on which the DTMP is based, call for the DTMP to be abandoned and a revised MP produced instead. Tourism in the TWWHA would then remain unambiguously under the management

of the MP. As well as being administratively simpler this would be more politically transparent (thus more democratically legitimate) than having a TMP of uncertain legal status lurking behind a statutory MP.

The Tasmanian government should therefore ask ICOMOS/IUCN that the drafting and adoption of a TMP be abandoned and substituted for with a revision of the 2016 MP. That body might be expected to agree, as it is quite apparent from the current DTMP that it is a device for pandering to commercial and Aboriginal special interests rather than catering to the public interest. As this submission points out, pandering to those two special interests severely damages the protective function of the TWWHA. Commercial interests in particular have an outrageous history of corrupting democratic government, for example the tobacco, asbestos and fossil fuel industries. For democracies, it seems obvious that industries with vested interests in public issues should be prevented by law from lobbying politicians on those issues and from making and financing public statements on them.

An important part of the revised MP should be that it includes limits to visitation; limits that are advisory and voluntary where not enforceable and set at precautionary levels of a 'carrying capacity' that maintains and in some cases enhances wild character. A potentially crucial side-effect of this might be that it encourages Tasmanians to discuss and choose the carrying capacity that they prefer for their State as a whole.

If the State Government persists with producing a TMP, it must be based on a thoroughly revised MP and be brief, simply making the following two points and retaining as much of the DTMP Glossary as is relevant to its new brief format, with the corrections recommended above in 1.2.

1. No new commercial developments, nor expansions of existing enterprises, are to be permitted in the TWWHA including in Visitor Services Zones. This stipulation is made for two reasons. The first is, that because the scarcity multiplier operates in Tasmania, new commercial developments are unsustainable in two basic ways, as discussed above in 1.1. This reason would prevent the installation of such facilities as the cable car to Dove Lake, the Halls Island resort at Lake Malbena and a floating hotel on the lower Gordon River (The Lighthouse Project). It would not be supported by the need to avoid the scarcity multiplier if measures were introduced that will prevent it from operating in

Tasmania, such as enforcement of a zero rate of net migration into the State together with strict limits on sales promotion to restrain per capita consumption by restricting adaptation and positional competition.

The second reason for banning new commercial development is that this prohibition is necessary within the TWWHA if its remaining wild character is to be protected. Although necessary to achieve that protection, it is not sufficient, as further erosion of the wild character of the TWWHA will take place inside its boundary because of future development near to, but outside it.

2. The attributes of the TWWHA and in particular its major one of wild character are to be 'presented' simply by protecting them, thereby allowing people to find out, largely on their own initiative and through conversations and social media, that they are there, thus enjoying the surprise, achievement and delight of discovery. Those attributes may be presented with displays, presentations and the like located within Visitor Services Zones and at locations outside the TWWHA, but these should be limited as they have potential to diminish the satisfaction of self-motivated exploration and also to encourage damage to those attributes (or their settings) by excessive or inappropriate visitation. In addition to presenting wild character by protecting it and thus making it available for people to discover, it should also be presented by enhancing it wherever possible by such measures as closing roads and allowing them to be reclaimed by the bush.

Appendix:

Zoning deficiencies in the TWWHA MP that damage wild character

Recreation Zones (RZs) should be restricted to linear features such as tracks and selected rivers and not spread across considerable areas, such as at Lake Pillans-Double Lagoon, Walls of Jerusalem-Lake Ball, Clear Hill-Sawback-Tim Shea, Mt. Mueller-Mt. Styx-National Park and lower Picton valley-Mt. Riveaux. Linear RZs such as Patons Road and February Plains Road should be converted to Wilderness Zone (WZ), to block those roads and allow their reclamation by the bush. RZs should prohibit prospecting and also private huts such as the one west of Lake Pillans. The current wide areas of RZ and Self-Reliant Recreation Zone (SRRZ) in the Forth

and Mersey valleys and on the Central Plateau should be converted to Wilderness Zone (WZ) so that its stricter requirements for naturalness and remoteness apply. Lake St Clair should be classed as WZ so that motorboat use is shut down in order to increase the wild character of the Overland Track and its surroundings. The Mt McCall road should be converted from RZ to WZ so that it can be blocked and reclaimed by the bush, to restore the wild character of the middle Franklin River valley. SRRZs allow signage, existing public huts, single use bike tracks and commercial tourism such as fishing guiding and river rafting, all of which damage wild character. To protect and restore wild character, these things should only be allowed in linear RZs and even then regarded as temporary and listed for removal by a specified date. **As noted above in section 2.4, developments allowed in RZs and SRRZs may severely damage the wild character of large areas of adjacent WZ.** The Permanent Timber Production Zones between the Counsel and Derwent Rivers and associated logging roads should be rezoned WZ with the roads blocked and allowed to revert to bush. The State Forest and its roads surrounded by the TWWHA in the Picton Valley should be converted to TWWHA and allowed to be reclaimed by the bush. The Future Potential Production Forest Land inside the TWWHA should all be rezoned WZ (such as Dove-Campbell, Arm, Forth and Mersey Rivers and Western Tiers to Arthurs Lake). Hunting should be banned from Farm Cove and Kelly Basin. The waters of Port Davey-Bathurst Harbour-Melaleuca Inlet east of Breaksea Island should be rezoned WZ, to prevent motorized vessels from entering. The wild character of Melaleuca has been virtually eliminated by the erection of the King and Wilson residences, associated mining and the airstrip, the standing camp at Forest Lagoon with its commercial guiding and lately by the Aboriginal interpretation installation and frequent air traffic. As this location is potentially one of the most remote and wildest in the TWWHA, the degradation of wild character here and on the flight path from Hobart is extremely damaging. It is likely to progress further and completely demolish any remnant wild character. It is recommended that the area's zoning as VSZ is revised to WZ so that the airstrip is closed and re-vegetated and the buildings, standing camp and interpretive installations are allowed to be reclaimed by the bush. Orange-bellied parrot research and rehabilitation should be accessed by helicopter. The South Coast Track should be rezoned from RZ to WZ to prevent the installation of private huts and commercial tourism, thereby protecting

the wild character that is the essence of its extraordinary recreational appeal.

Competitive organized events such as marathons, rogaining and geocaching and also commercial activities such as professional river rafting and guiding of anglers should not be permitted in the TWWHA, as they all damage the perception and experience of wild character (see for example, "The intellectual dilemma" on pages 31-2 of Dawson and Hendee 2009).

Acknowledgements

I thank Grant Dixon for reading the first draft of this submission and making many useful suggestions, which was a big help in producing the final version. Thanks also to Martin Hawes for incisive observations on the DTMP and the MP. This submission however, remains entirely my responsibility and does not necessarily represent their views.

References

- Acemoglu, Daron and James Robinson. 2012. *Why Nations Fail. The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*. London: Profile Books.
- Crowley, Kate. 2009. "Can Deliberative Democracy Be Practiced? A Subnational Policy Pathway." *Politics and Policy* 37(5): 995-1021.
- Dawson, Chad P. and John C. Hendee. 2009. *Wilderness Management (Fourth Edition, The Wild Foundation)*. Golden, Co: Fulcrum Publishing.
- de Lazari-Radek, Katarzyna and Peter Singer . 2016. *The Point of View of the Universe: Sidgwick and Contemporary Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press .
- DPIPWE. 2016. *Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan*. Hobart: Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment.
- Garnaut, Ross. 2019. *Superpower: Australia's Low-Carbon Opportunity*. Carlton: La Trobe University.
- Goodin, Robert E. 1995. *Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hawes, Martin. 2018. "Lake Malbena wilderness assessment".
<https://tnpa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Assessment-of-potential-wilderness-impacts-at-Lk-Malbena-Hawes-2018.pdf>.
 Retrieved 24/5/20
- Hawes, Martin, Grant Dixon and Chris Bell. 2018. *Refining the Definition of Wilderness*. Hobart: Bob Brown Foundation.
- Kirkpatrick, J. B. 1979. *Hydro-Electric Development and Wilderness in Tasmania*. Department of the Environment, Tasmania.
- Kirkpatrick, J. B. and R. A. Haney. 1980. "The Quantification of Developmental Wilderness Loss". *Search* 11(10) October.
- Sawyer, Nick. 2017. "Why Tasmania needs a statutory process to control development on reserved land and a possible mechanism for achieving this."
<https://tnpa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Why-Tas-needs-a-statutory-process-to-control-development-on-reserved-land.pdf>
- Skidelsky, Robert. 2020. *What's Wrong With Economics? A Primer for the Perplexed* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Soros, George and Gregor Peter Schmitz. 2014. *The Tragedy of the European Union: Disintegration or Revival?* New York NY: Public Affairs.
- Smith, Paul E. 2009. "How Economic Growth Becomes a Cost: The Scarcity Multiplier." *Ecological Economics* 68(3): 710-18.
- 2014. "How the False Promise of Economic Growth Destroys Our Environment." *TNPA News* 19, pages 10-12.
 <http://www.tnpa.asn.au/uploads/7/6/3/9/7639222/tnpa_news_19.pdf>
- 2016. *Rescuing Democracy: How Public Deliberation Can Curb Government Failure*. Brooklyn NY: punctum books.
- The Wilderness Society. 1984. *Greenprint for a World Class National Park*.