

don't fly...

sically unnec
not need aircraft to
cies or live well as indi
not need aircraft to
corner of the globe -

the environment is itself
cessation of flying in the

The idea that it is a mark of PROGRESS that anyone can take a cheap flight and travel a long distance easily, and to reverse this would be negative, is absurd. It is simply a characteristic of our time that people wish to see technologically supported self-indulgence as a positive development over previous ages. It makes as much sense as saying that having record numbers of prisoners in our gaols is a mark of progress, or living in overpopulated cities with inadequate infrastructures and rife teenage gun crime is a mark of progress, or any other feature of our time. Such views belong to the age which denoted all technological change and expansion as

'progress' - unaware of what it was they were 'progressing' towards. The end result of all this 'progress' is swathes of tarmac, hu gely infl ated energy costs, noise pollu tion, gas pollution, of many species. at that vapour

the cost in terms

a good reason not to fly. No one in their right near future; nevertheless it makes sense to think in terms of

the number of flights undertaken as well as the numbers of planes constructed, airports built and harmful gasses emitted.

As I sat in the sun this morning, looking trail, smelling the gorse, it seemed profoundly sensible and right to think that 'progress' should be aimed at

mind would argue for the total

significantly reducing

of damage done to

preserving nature, wildlife, biodiversity, quiet, and clean air

All this damage is ba
essary- we do
survive as a spe
viduals; we did
chart almost every

- the opposite of the
by-products of aviation.

- Ian Mortimer