

Albuquerque/ Bernalillo county LWV meeting 1/15/07: Midtown unit meeting to discuss consensus on sustainability positions. Sixteen members were present.

Question one: Sustainability is defined as "meeting the needs of the current generation while not impairing the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." Should League support for any position or action be conditioned on its impact on sustainability?

Pros:

- This process of working on issues has good consequences.
- This is self evident. Sustainability is necessary for life to continue.

Cons:

- This is Pie in the sky nonsense. It's too general to be meaningful. You need to define what you mean by a sustainable society.

Questions:

- Is this to suggest to the legislature that all laws must conform to this?
- Is sustainability more important than anything else? Is it overriding?
- What does water have to do with sustainability?
- Needs and wants are different.
- Every generation will have to define sustainability for itself.
- We need to be more specific about needs. What needs? Mental? physical?
- We don't want to be too broad . Sustainability may be different in the future.
- Does this address the future needs of humans only? What about the needs of the rest of the ecosystem?
- How do we address the needs of other voices who may not be heard.

Question two: Do LWVNM members believe that active, educated citizen participation in a democratically organized system of government is essential for sustainability?

Pros:

- Yes. A democracy needs to have citizens who feel they belong.

Questions and discussion:

- Democracy may not be necessarily the only system that provide sustainability.
- An active citizenry does not always support good laws.
- Reproduction and population also effect sustainability.
- The word educated citizenry is problematic. People can be informed or knowledgeable with out having formal education.
- Greed is also a problem.

- I object to the word active as not everyone can be active.
- The only activity that is really important is voting.
- Voting is not enough. It does not qualify as sufficient. Action and effort are also needed.
- There are problems with the word education. Much religious education does not support the same views as scientific education. Also there are different scientific views, for example about global warming. defining what is relevant and unbiased is problematic.
- The focus of this second question is specific. Democratic and have a voice.
- Educated may be too loaded. Why not knowledgeable or informed.
- Non citizens also need to be involved.
- Sustainability can conflict with the availability of work.
- There are problems with the concepts of active educated citizens.

Question three: Do LWVNM believe that state economic policies and public finance should be more closely tied to the natural resource base of the economy.

Pros:

- I agree with the word should.

Questions:

- What is the natural resource base. I have a problem with the definition.
- Natural resources is more encompassing. It includes water, air, natural resources, money, animals people.
- Why do we say state for economic and public for finance. I feel it needs to be more parallel. Not satisfied with the wording.
- We already have environmental impact statements in the state. but we need more.
- Is this designed to address environmental impact statements or sustainability?

Question four: Do LWVNM members believe that social practices should equip all members of society to participate in and contribute to a sustainable society?

Cons:

- I think this is pie in the sky.

Discussion:

- Social policy should be better defoned.
- We need to add something about responsibility as well as participate and contribute.
- I am bothered by the use of ALL members of society.
- I have a problem with the use of the word equip. Why not compel.

General discussion: the sense of the meeting overall was that there were a lot of problems with the language and definitions and that further refinements and work may be needed.