

## Anton Oliver

Hi Team,

In terms of my sign of change, perhaps what I get most agitated about is that the dominate discourse until now has been that most have sought to interpret the world in order to change it for humans: I try to understand the world in order to conserve and restore it for life – all life.

History has been defined by males who identify with engineered, mechanical and transformative activities that change our landscape. Men like to conquer and have acquired a strong affinity with the human enterprise to dominate their nature surroundings. NZ's history, both indigenous and European, is an exemplary example of this.

The language of economics have shaped the way we view nature, reducing nature to 'assets' and 'resources'; it is then entirely logical to attach a price to nature if we view it this way: control of the language equals controlling the debate. Because we value everything in monetary terms, when something can't be valued in such a way it is immediately seen as not relevant.

Below is an examination of Project Hayes using the language of the day.

***Most attempts I have seen to put an economic value on a non-use resource are highly subjective and/or still face the basic question -how do you credibly value the intangible?***

***Landscapes and views are a non-use resource; how do we put a price on that?***

***In the absence of clear property rights individuals firms can externalise their costs ( or gain the benefits ). In the case of Meridian and Project Hayes polluting the visual landscape is a cost however the problem is that no-one owns vertical space above the land: no-one owns the view. This non-use value has not been calculated thus the full costs of the project have not be realised.***

***The opportunity costs associated with development that impinges on environmental quality, will reflect more closely the full worth that society attaches to its environment when non-use values are included.***

***There are also inter-generational issues for which discount rates in a cost-benefit process would be very hard to define.***

***It has been my experience via Hayes, reading case studies extensively and shared anecdotes that:***

- (a) economic benefits of resource development or use are always overstated by project proponents***
- (b) the claimed benefits do not warrant/justify the impact or loss of environmental qualities resulting.***

I HATE the fact that I even have to talk about nature in the lexicon of economic mumbo jumbo. I say that nature should have the right to exist in of itself and be defined and judged as such. It has its own value, outside of which can be priced by money, and that alone is justification enough for its protection.

Whatever you value in terms of money inevitably becomes an object – nature and place are no objects.

If that spins your wheels then I'm happy to talk around that and extend that for you.

Kindest Regards

Anton