

IPAN SAMPLE EMAIL TO ABC AUSTRALIA

A. Email Tips:

- Please adapt to your own words as much as possible it is much more powerful if the ABC get individually tailored emails
- Consider writing on one aspect of concern raised in the template - not all three (this will help each email look a bit different)
- Some links to articles are included here, but if you can find links to different articles, that would be great
- In the last paragraph – feel free to add suggested guest who could speak about concerns around AUKUS and the use of nuclear power
- Consider ticking the box in the complaints portal to receive an email back from the ABC
- If you have any questions you can contact Jonathan Pilbrow, Executive Officer, IPAN, on 0403 611 815 if you have any questions

B. Afterwards please email Jonathan via ipan.alicesprings@gmail.com to inform that you have sent an email to the ABC.

C. Include Subject Line: (Adapt to your own words: Concerns re ABC 7.30 Report Thursday 4 April 2024: Segment ‘The debate over nuclear power is about to heat up’)

EMAIL TEXT (PLEASE ADAPT THE BELOW TO YOUR OWN WORDS):

I write to express strong concern regarding the segment on the ABC’s 7.30 Report, Thursday 4 April 2024, entitled ‘The debate over nuclear power is about to heat up’. <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2024-04-04/the-debate-over-nuclear-power-is-about-to-heat-up/103671308>

I am concerned that the content in this report constitutes breaches of the ABC’s Editorial Policies

Concerns re non- impartiality

I argue that impartiality was compromised in that the program ultimately adopted a pro-nuclear stance. While time is not the only factor in media coverage, nearly two-thirds of program time was devoted to what I perceived as a pro-nuclear energy position, and in my opinion, diminishing the argument against nuclear power down to ‘the fear factor’ amongst some of the population - which a) seems to invalidate the experiences of First Nations people who have lived nuclear bombs tests in Australia; and b) ignores the large volume of evidence around the high economic, social, public health and environmental costs of nuclear energy and the fact there is still no agreed and proven solution to isolate/dispose or manage high level radioactive waste.

Concerns re inaccuracies with the potential to mislead audiences

The accuracy of the reporting was questionable. For example, the Head of Engineering, UNSW, Edward Obbard stated “I was amazed by the deafening silence when AUKUS was announced, there really wasn’t very much opposition to it.” No effort was made by the ABC reporter to have Mr Obbard substantiate this claim which was stated as a fact rather than the opinion of the speaker.

There has been significant coverage of community concerns about AUKUS. The ABC itself has reported on the opposition within the Australian community. As an example, Laura Tingle’s wrote an on-line article on 19 August 2023 <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2023-08-19/aukus-tensions-labor-national-conference-albanese-ambitions/102749130> which referred to the strong opposition to AUKUS around the time of the ALP national

conference in Brisbane in August 2023. This opposition has arguably since gathered strength, so that as recently as 24 March 2024, Reuters reported on the extensive anti-AUKUS activity across the country <https://www.reuters.com/world/aukus-submarine-base-protests-australia-highlight-challenges-security-pact-2024-03-20/>. This strong national opposition is evident in the activities of the Australian Anti-AUKUS Coalition (AAAC), which sponsored a series of well-attended national public events in mid to late March 2024.

The failure of the ABC to challenge Mr Obbard's comments could have materially misled the audience into thinking there had been very little community opposition to AUKUS. This is patently not the case.

Misrepresentation and minimisation of concerns regarding nuclear energy

The report arguably misrepresented and minimised the concerns of people opposed to nuclear power. For example, the reporter stated that "Time and cost are key issues. But the fear factor is perhaps the biggest barrier to overcome for Australians who have witnessed nuclear disasters at Three Mile Island, Fukushima, and Chernobyl."

Given the catastrophic consequences of each of these disasters - largely due to technical matters that remain unresolved today - it is quite reasonable that concerns are held regarding this form of power. Each of the three disasters referred to have an incalculable immediate and long-term impact on humans, other living creatures and the environment generally.

In terms of long-term health, the documented increase following Chernobyl in the incidence of childhood thyroid cancer (by 2002) within contaminated regions of Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine were largely attributed to high environmental levels of [radioactive iodine](#) shortly after the accident.

The program in question further failed to cover the waste management challenges and environmental impacts of nuclear energy. Nuclear waste remains a huge and unresolved global management issue. Any benefits of uranium must be balanced against the high economic, social, public health and environmental cost and there is still no agreed and proven solution to isolate/dispose or manage high level radioactive waste. A growing number of scholars have documented the complete disregard of the nuclear industry for particularly indigenous peoples on whose lands uranium mining is often conducted. Uranium has an exceedingly poor risk to return ratio: Three years of electricity in a reactor leaves a legacy of 100,000 years of waste - a massive and arguably almost infinite inter-generational burden. In addition, nuclear power requires very large volumes of water. Despite claims by nuclear power advocates in the mainstream press to the contrary, all these matters make such power extremely expensive.

I submit that these issues were not given the attention in the program that they deserve in terms of impartiality.

I also wish to make clear that rather than a critique of the individual reporter covering this story, my primary concerns relate to ABC editorial policies that allowed a program that permitted such an unbalanced account to be presented by the country's public broadcaster.

In conclusion, I would encourage the ABC to conduct further interviews for the 7.30 Report with guests who can convey their concerns about AUKUS and the use of nuclear power. Thank you for considering the matters raised.

(Your signature)