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Introduction

*Not Just a Dream* is my attempt to explore how far Australia has travelled along the path to a partnership society. I have not tried to write a learned or academic book. My aim has been to give a panoramic overview of social change from circa 7000 BCE to the present and to illustrate (with examples) the gradual ‘return’ to a partnership society.

My definition of a partnership society is one in which ‘men’ and ‘women’ participate equally and can reach their potential to contribute to society. It is a society where poverty is minimised; race and religion are not hindrances to contribution and the environment is protected. I have tried to describe what a *Partnership Society*,¹ might be like in various areas such as business, gender, the environment etc.

I have been influenced by a book called *The Chalice and the Blade* by Riane Eisler²... a work of enormous scope and impeccable research.

*Not just a dream* differs from *The Chalice and the Blade* in being focussed primarily on the experience of social change within *Australia*. Chapters one to four trace progress to the present. Chapters Five and onwards suggest further steps we might take towards a partnership society (one where male and female attributes are valued equally and men and women work together to improve people’s lives).

Starting this book was difficult. I wrote one beginning, then another and another. I knew I wanted to write about the social impact of differences between masculine and feminine attributes but the subject was complex and issues went off in all directions like fleas from a matchbox. I discarded one after another inadequate attempt before I had the good fortune to find Eisler’s book.

I unashamedly borrowed her approach while adapting some of the content to my own purposes. Gradually my own story emerged. *Not just a dream—towards a partnership society in Australia* is my own creation although I owe Riane Eisler³ a significant debt for her vision, her extra-ordinary grasp of history and social change and also the effort it must have taken to write *The Chalice and the Blade*. I can whole-heartedly recommend it to everyone wanting to understand the way male and female differences have affected social history.

Like Riane Eisler I believe ‘It is hardly surprising to find a correlation between the status of women and whether a society is peaceful or warlike, concerned with people’s welfare or indifferent to social equity, and generally hierarchical or egalitarian. For as we have seen throughout this book (her book), the way a society structures the relations between the two halves of humanity has profound, and highly predictable, systems implications.’⁴

It is my hope that *Not Just a Dream* will clarify issues around contemporary trends and events that threaten our world—that it can be a blue-print for everyone seeking to hasten the return of an inclusive society free of war and want, a society filled with peace, happiness and love.
INTRODUCTION

NOTES:

Note 1: Centre for Peace and partnership studies. The mission of the Center for Partnership Studies is to accelerate movement to partnership systems of human rights and nonviolence, gender and racial equity, economic prosperity, and a sustainable environment through research, education, grassroots empowerment, and policy initiatives that promote:

- Human development
- Social well-being, and

Long-term economic success, with special emphasis on valuing the work of caring and caregiving still primarily done by women. [http://www.partnershipway.org]


Note 3: RIANE EISLER, JD is President of the Center for Partnership Studies and internationally known as a systems scientist, attorney working for the human rights of women and children, and author of groundbreaking books such as The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future, now in 26 foreign editions, and The Real Wealth of Nations: Creating a Caring Economics. Dr. Eisler has received many honors, including honorary PhDs and peace and human rights awards. She lectures worldwide, with venues including the United Nations General Assembly, the U.S. Department of State, Congressional briefings, universities, corporations, conference keynotes, and events hosted by heads of State. [http://rianeeisler.com]
Not just a dream

I dream of a world without violence and war—a world where everyone has shelter and food, children grow up surrounded by love and joy and wisdom and everyone has the opportunity and the challenge to achieve their highest potential.

This will be a world where poetry and art, music and dance is prized and the natural world is understood and revered—a world with gratitude and respect for the earth, the plants and the animals.

I am convinced this will one day become a reality and not just a dream—that it is the reason for human existence and our sacred duty to work towards this day with every ounce of our energy.

But it will be an evolutionary process—taking its time, with diversions and setbacks and disappointments. Our individual efforts will seem puny compared with the slow and certain progress towards the fulfilment of this dream.
PARTNERSHIP AND GLADATORIAL MODELS COMPARED

The partnership model
The partnership model is a mediator model rather than a gladiatorial model. People who support this model are active peacemakers. They believe in participation, compassion, inclusiveness. They are kind-hearted and thoughtful. Their role is to take care of children and the family. From early childhood, they develop nurturing skills. They have a full emotional range and use it in their role as peacemakers. Around them develops a flat management system where everyone is valued for themselves without a need to prove their worth. Their role is a virtuous and beautiful one. More females than males are in this category but there are also many males.

Equality for females is extremely important to social change as women are more closely aligned to the partnership model of life and when their voice is truly heard and respected then society is more likely to change for the better.

The gladiatorial model
The role of gladiators is to fight. They are reared knowing they will be gladiators and are trained for their role. They are competitive, heroic and tough. They must be courageous and have an intense will to win. In times of war they are in the forefront of the battle and keep the rest of their community safe. The most successful gladiators develop leadership skills, are decisive and good in crises. They learn to guard their emotions and to switch them off when hard decisions are required. Around them develops a hierarchical system where they test their strength and courage against the next gladiator on the ladder. The hierarchical system is valued also for its ability to instil obedience to commands as well as ensuring quick and effective responses to dangerous situations. Gladiators are generally male although not always.

However, if the role is distorted, domination, brutality, war and destruction ensue. Weaker individuals are crushed. There is poverty and misery. Technology is turned from peaceful goals to war-like goals. Free speech becomes difficult. The arts and gentler pursuits are corrupted.

A society where gladiators are encompassed within the partnership model.
The Dream.

Few people would actively disagree with these hopes. The yearning for peace and security and love lives in us all. Given the state of the world, however, many would think it the height of stupidity to claim it could ever eventuate.

Nonetheless, I am willing to say not only do I think it will come to pass, but also that we (that is we in Australia) are already more than halfway there.

In *The Chalice and the Blade*, Riane Eisler describes society 9000 years ago, (and potentially for millennia prior to that) where the dream was a reality and communities of people lived it. War and violence was almost unknown. Everyone had food and shelter. Children were brought up in relative harmony. The female aspect of life was respected. The earth, source of their well-being, was cherished. Art and technology flourished. Life may have been difficult but it was overall peaceful.

With the coming of agriculture, Paleolithic and Neolithic peoples across fertile valleys of Europe operated through co-operation between men and women. They practised Goddess worship which supported values associated with the nurture of the land and of children. These communities were inclusive and co-operative. They were communities with a partnership model of governance. [Paleolithic (early phase of the stone-age); Neolithic (latter part of the stone-age)]

Archaeological diggings from this period provide no sign of weapons of war, no fortifications. There is evidence of Goddess worship as well as art, creativity and technical discoveries also the sharing of wealth and prosperity to all levels of society.

Eisler claims that around 3500 BCE the situation changed abruptly when raiders from the outer edges of their world invaded the communities. These raiders killed and looted. Peaceful communities were disrupted time and again. Life changed.

This idea originated in the work of renowned archaeologist, Marija Gimbutas,

**Marija Gimbutas** (Lithuanian: Marija Gimbutienė; January 23, 1921 – February 2, 1994), was a Lithuanian-American archaeologist known for her research into the Neolithic and Bronze Age cultures of "Old Europe" and for her widely accepted Kurgan hypothesis, which located the Proto-Indo-European homeland in the Pontic Steppe. Gimbutas asserted that Neolithic sites in Lithuania and across Europe provided evidence for pre-Indo-European societies that were neither matriarchal nor patriarchal, although she was later characterized in certain scholarly circles as having proposed that those societies were matriarchal. [Note 1: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marija_Gimbutas April 19, 2015]

For a first-hand presentation of the evidence for her views go to the following address on the internet.

**Video presentation by Marija Gimbutas:**

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yU1bEmq_pf0
Over time, the social balance changed. Outsiders who came to live among the communities they had raided adopted some of their social skills. They appropriated the art and technology, perhaps even had their warlike attitudes modified. However, in general, the ideals of the conquered were submerged. The communities no longer valued partnerships (or egalitarian style management) but developed gladiatorial models.¹

Because the customs and the values of the vanquished were no longer respected, war-like forces grew increasingly powerful. Violence increased and the conquerors reconstructed society into their own image. From then to now society has been, in general, controlled by powerful groups which mainly seek their own goals.

Marija Gimbutas’ theory (of Goddess worship and peaceful, partnership societies) has been contested and anyone wanting an overview of these different views could refer to the following reference. [http://www.christinehoffkraemer.com/eisler.html]

Despite the disagreements, I am inclined to believe that early tribes and early agricultural societies were relatively peaceable and that over time aggressive male behaviour overtook these early societies. There seem to be parallels in the tribal societies of Papua which were based on descent lines and in the Australian aboriginal communities, pre-settlement. Both of which were overcome by stronger (more violent) opponents.

Responding to violence
This is a typical dilemma for peaceful people. What can they do when over-whelmed by superior force?

They lived under tyrannical rulers (whose names have long been lost). They were oppressed, and hardly had a voice. Does one copy the violent methods or simply comply? In most cases the answer is... Hide. Plan. Network. Work underground. Persist. which is what I believe the early Paleolithic and Neolithic people did (and peaceful people since then have done).

Underneath it all, however, people who still believe in a co-operative model remain aware of what has been lost. They continue their way of living as well as they can and from time to time have modest successes. Their light has not been entirely extinguished. Indeed, in the early part of the 21st century, there is evidence that a partnership model is beginning to re-emerge as the solution to many of the world’s problems.

Between 7000 BCE and 3500 BCE early people across Europe had lived peaceably but now, ejected from this peaceful ‘Garden of Eden’, they went into a harsher world to confront its challenges. This was the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil—the certainty that whatever brutality and ignorance could be, would be. They would have to work through it with the sweat of their brow (through their own efforts). Nothing would be easy. And of course, Eve (and the snake) would be blamed. Why didn’t the Goddess protect them? Why? Why? The eternal cry of Job. Yahweh, why have you done this to me? [Tree of the knowledge of good and evil. See Genesis 2.17 onwards]

¹. See Appendix A: Partnership and Gladiatorial models compared (pp 156-9)
How did the gladiatorial mode gain so much control and why has it persisted for so long? The answer is simple. The invaders had weapons and the original people had none. The gladiators were ruthless and appeared to have no moral boundaries. They had powerful leaders who brutally enforced their leadership. They introduced new ideas to undermine the belief systems of the past. Goddess worship was replaced by the worship of male, war-like deities. Thus, women in particular, were stripped of equality and respect.

Despite all this, the dream lived on and to this day the knowledge of a time of peace and partnership remains in our deeper consciousness and we dream of one day returning to our ‘Garden of Eden’. If it was possible once, then why not again? This time, however, we must earn it by the ‘sweat of our brows’.

And that is how it has been. Every social gain has met resistance and been hard-won. Australians have inherited some of these gains without needing to win them for ourselves, but then every society has its own issues and its own journey to travel.

In Australia, the disadvantages of the Aboriginal people must be rectified; individuals (particularly women and children) must be freed from violence and denigration; the environment needs to be valued and repaired; education must widen and deepen.

There are so many opportunities in a country like Australia. We can lead the way because our institutions and people are not weighed down by centuries of binding traditions or a multitude of excoriating memories. Most of us see the need for equality and freedom and opportunity and recognize the value of collective endeavours. As a people, we are not keen on domination. While we are compliant and far from extreme, we love freedom. We are outspoken—some would say brash. We are hopeful. We have already led the way in many respects. Perhaps in decades to come we will see our role as an even more energetic promoter of a partnership model.
Social change inherited from the past

Christianity, Law,
Trade unions, Education
Vestiges of the partnership societies remained
While in the main the new rulers imposed their own ways, there were a few instances where remembrance of the peaceful past was sustained. The Old Testament records the ‘worship of Baal’ amid groves of trees—a remnant of Goddess worship which was still being practised in the land now known as Palestine. Many Israelites carried it on much to the annoyance of their prophets.

Ancient Crete, with its rich artistic culture may have maintained some of the original themes from the agricultural era.

In Greece, the idea of Priestesses and Oracles continued on the margins and a sense of male and female equality is occasionally recorded in the literature of the time. It is interesting to speculate how this may have influenced the remarkable achievements of Greece in art, science, philosophy and the rise of a form of democracy.

The period from 300 BCE (before the Common Era) and into 400 CE (of the Common Era) was known as the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Greece had been conquered by Rome but the Greek language was commonly spoken around the Mediterranean and as a result Greek culture was disseminated widely. Many leading Romans citizens were tutored by learned Greeks. Roman rule spread both East and West.

To the west was Britain which came under the influence of the Romans for several centuries. It had previously been influenced by forms of law brought by the Saxons and the Celts. Roman colonisation built upon these influences and through our relationship with Britain Australians inherited many of its social gains—Christianity, a body of law, improved working conditions, education, a canon of literature, voting rights.

Christianity
Western society has benefitted greatly from ideas originating in the Mediterranean—Greece and Rome particularly and during this era Christianity emerged. Its founder espoused values very like those of the original partnership societies—equality, compassion, inclusiveness. This was a short-lived experiment as masculine values soon over-took the new movement and the subsequent history of the Christian religion is marred by aggression and dominance.

This is not to say the experiment came to nothing as, although submerged within a hierarchical organisational structure, original Christian values still existed within the movement. Many subsequent social gains in Britain were influenced by these values. John Wesley was an Anglican preacher whose influence drew many out of poverty and crime to a morality based on the Christian gospel. Some historians credit the revival morality in Britain with its escape from the rampant bloodshed experienced during the French Revolution.

Wilberforce who worked steadily for the abolition of slavery was a convert to Christianity and the Tolpuddle Martyrs who began the movement which morphed into Trade Unions were led by a man called George Loveless, a Methodist local preacher. Members of the group were
arrested and transported to Australia but widespread public protests subsequently lead to their release and eventual return as heroes.¹ [Note 1: Tolpuddle Martyrs]

**Law**

Romans maintained social order and a system of law for several thousands of years—a rough kind of law—harsh and violent that is true but an advance on the way life was lived previously. They brought their law to Britain where it continued to develop and create social stability.

In Britain over many centuries a body of law was created which treated everyone equally. This was a major achievement. The Divine Right of Kings was quashed. Everyone was subject to the law. Both King and commoner had the right to be heard and could bring their case to court. Habeas corpus is often quoted as a major achievement. Its object was to restrain unlawful imprisonment.² [Note 2: Habeas corpus] British and Australian law is not yet a perfect system—not at all. More can be done; however, it is an example of what can be achieved by generations of people who believe in equality.

**The abolition of slavery**

William Wilberforce and many others campaigned for slavery to be banned across the British-controlled world. It took almost thirty years to achieve their goal. It was not an easy or short task as Britons who owned land in the West Indies relied on slaves to do the work on their plantations, but finally, in 1807 slavery was abolished.³ [Note 3: William Wilberforce]

**Conditions for workers**

In Britain and Ireland, following the Close of the Commons from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, country folk lost the opportunity to farm and have a few cattle graze on common land. Land previously available and useable by everyone, was closed for purposes related (supposedly) to agricultural reform. Thousands of the displaced left to find work in the new mines and factories arising from the start of the Industrial Revolution.⁴ [Note 4: Closing the Commons]

Working conditions in the mines and factories were terrible, not just for men but also for women and children. Long hours. Abuse. Wages, a pittance and dangerous and frightening work not just in factories but more particularly in the mines. Women and children (called hurriers) worked twelve hour shifts pulling small wagons full of coal along dark mineshafts.⁵ [Note 5: A Hurrier]

It took until the middle of the 19th century to effect changes to some of the worse conditions for women and children working in mines and factories. In 1842 The Mines and Collieries Act created a minimum working age for boys in mines.⁶ [Note 6: The Mines and Collieries Act]

Then in 1867, Trade Unions were decriminalised in the United Kingdom and in 1871 they were legalised. Their goal was to reform ‘socio-economic conditions for working men in British industries’. The arrival of Trade Unions was soon followed by the establishment of the Labour Party whose charter was also to improve conditions for workers.⁷ [Note 7: Trade Unions]

The role of Trade Unions in English-speaking countries is everywhere under assault. This is not surprising as they are defenders of workers’ rights. However, they manage to survive and offer
a measure of protection despite the difficulties. Workers in many other countries around the world lack even the protection of unions and as a result working conditions, wages and health issues are often major concerns.

Health
The name of Florence Nightingale is synonymous with reform to hospitals in Britain. She is known as the ‘Lady of the Lamp’ tending soldiers wounded in the Crimean War. What she learned during that period led her to challenge authorities to improve the medical system. After the war, she wrote and worked tirelessly for improvements to hospitals and nursing. \[Note 8: Florence Nightingale\]

Education
In Australia education has been available for children since European settlement over 200 years ago, however at first it was only those with sufficient funds to pay. Free, universal primary education came in the 19th century and since then has been extended first to secondary and then to tertiary in the Whitlam Government’s term.

Education is a major key to hastening the return of a partnership society. Citizens who understand history can recognise their rights and with an understanding of science can assist the natural world to survive rampant industrialism.

The United Nations
People in many countries throughout the world do not yet have equal rights to the protection of well-intended laws. Following World War I, the League of Nations was established as nations came together to find ways to prevent warfare and to promote international co-operation. This then became The United Nations organisation following World War II. It struggles sometimes with funding, nationalism and other issues, but has been successful in bringing health and well-being to many.

United Nations’ peace-keeping forces have settled minor wars and prevented further destruction and calamity. \[Note 9: United Nations\]

What is outlined above is a selection of achievements from the social evolution of our world. It doesn’t stop. Slowly, steadily from the peaceful subconscious of thousands of participants, the silent revolution is taking place. In the following chapter, we will look more closely at lesser issues that are indicators of significant change occurring in society.
Chapter 2—Social change inherited from the past

Note 1: The Tolpuddle Martyrs were a group of 19th century Dorset agricultural labourers who were arrested for and convicted of swearing a secret oath as members of the Friendly Society of Agricultural Labourers. The rules of the society show it was clearly structured as a friendly society and operated as a trade-specific benefit society. At the time, friendly societies had strong elements of what are now considered to be the predominant role of trade unions. The Tolpuddle Martyrs were subsequently sentenced to penal transportation to Australia. The society, led by George Loveless, a Methodist local preacher, met in the house of Thomas Standfield. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tolpuddle_Martyrs February 28, 2015]

Note 2: Habeas corpus is a recourse in law that may be applied before a court in cases where the unlawful detention or imprisonment of a person is suspected. A writ of habeas corpus, also known as the great writ, is a summons with the force of a court order; it is addressed to the custodian (a prison official for example) and demands that a prisoner be taken before the court, and that the custodian present proof of authority, allowing the court to determine whether the custodian has lawful authority to detain the prisoner. If the custodian is acting beyond his or her authority, then the prisoner must be released. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Habeas_corpus February 12, 2015]

Note 3: William Wilberforce (24 August 1759 – 29 July 1833) was an English politician, philanthropist, and a leader of the movement to abolish the slave trade. A native of Kingston upon Hull, Yorkshire, he began his political career in 1780, eventually becoming the independent Member of Parliament for Yorkshire (1784–1812). In 1785, he underwent a conversion experience and became an evangelical Christian, which resulted in major changes to his lifestyle and a lifelong concern for reform. In 1787, he came into contact with Thomas Clarkson and a group of anti-slave-trade activists, including Granville Sharp, Hannah More and Charles Middleton. They persuaded Wilberforce to take on the cause of abolition, and he soon became one of the leading English abolitionists. He headed the parliamentary campaign against the British slave trade for twenty-six years until the passage of the Slave Trade Act of 1807. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Wilberforce February 12, 2015]

Note 4: The term "commons" derives from the traditional English legal term of common land, also known colloquially as "Commons". However, while common land might have been owned collectively, by a legal entity, the crown or a single person, it was subject to different forms of regulated usage, such as grazing of livestock, hunting, lopping of foliage or collecting resines. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commons February 12, 2015]

The process of enclosing property accelerated in the 15th and 16th centuries. The more productive enclosed farms meant that fewer farmers were needed to work the same land, leaving many villagers without land and grazing rights. Many of them moved to the cities in search of work in the emerging factories of the Industrial Revolution. Others settled in the English colonies. English Poor Laws were enacted to help these newly poor.

Some practices of enclosure were denounced by the Church, and legislation was drawn up against it; but the large, enclosed fields was needed for the gains in agricultural productivity from the 16th to 18th centuries. This controversy led to a series of government acts, culminating in the General Enclosure Act of 1801 which sanctioned large-scale land reform. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_Agricultural_Revolution February 12, 2015]

Note 5: A hurrier, also sometimes called a coal drawer or coal thruster, was a child or woman employed by a collier to transport the coal that they had mined. Women would normally get the children to help them because of the difficulty of carrying the coal. Common particularly in the early 19th century, the hurrier pulled a corf
(basket or small wagon) full of coal along roadways as small as 16 inches in height. They would often work 12-hour shifts, making several runs down to the coal face and back to the surface again.

Some children came from the workhouses and were apprenticed to the colliers. Adults could not easily do the job because of the size of the roadways, which were limited on the grounds of cost and structural integrity. Hurriers were equipped with a "gurl" belt – a leather belt with a swivel chain linked to the corf. They were also given candles as it was too expensive to light the whole mine. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hurrying February 12, 2015]

Note 6: The Mines and Collieries Act 1842 In August 1842 the Children's Employment Commission drew up an act of Parliament which gave a minimum working age for boys in mines, though the age varied between districts and even between mines. The Mines and Collieries Act 1842 also outlawed the employment of women and girls in mines. In 1870 it became compulsory for all children aged between five and thirteen to go to school, ending much of the hurrying. It was still a common profession for school leavers well into the 1920s. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hurrying February 12, 2015]

Note 7: Trade unions in the United Kingdom were first decriminalised under the recommendation of a Royal Commission in 1867, which agreed that the establishment of the organisations was to the advantage of both employers and employees. Legalised in 1871, the Trade Union Movement sought to reform socio-economic conditions for working men in British industries, and the Unions' search for this led to the creation of a Labour Representation Committee which effectively formed the basis for today's Labour Party, which still has extensive links with the Trade Union Movement in Britain [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trade_unions_in_the_United_Kingdom February 12, 2015]

Note 8: Florence Nightingale, OM, RRC (/ˈfloʊrəns ˈnætɪŋɡəl/; 12 May 1820 – 13 August 1910) was a celebrated English social reformer and statistician, and the founder of modern nursing. She came to prominence while serving as a manager of nurses trained by her during the Crimean War, where she organised the tending to wounded soldiers. She gave nursing a highly favorable reputation and became an icon of Victorian culture, especially in the persona of "The Lady with the Lamp" making rounds of wounded soldiers at night.

Some recent commentators have asserted Nightingale's achievements in the Crimean War were exaggerated by the media at the time, to satisfy the public's need for a hero. Nevertheless, critics agree on the decisive importance of her follow-up achievements in professionalizing nursing roles for women. In 1860, Nightingale laid the foundation of professional nursing with the establishment of her nursing school at St Thomas' Hospital in London. It was the first secular nursing school in the world, now part of King's College London. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Florence_Nightingale March 29, 2015]

Note 9: The United Nations (UN) is an intergovernmental organization established 24 October 1945, to promote international co-operation. A replacement for the ineffective League of Nations, the organization was created following the Second World War to prevent another such conflict. At its founding, the UN had 51 member states; there are now 193. The headquarters of the United Nations is situated in Manhattan, New York City, and enjoys extraterritoriality. Further main offices are situated in Geneva, Nairobi and Vienna. The organization is financed by assessed and voluntary contributions from its member states. Its objectives include maintaining international peace and security, promoting human rights, fostering social and economic development, protecting the environment, and providing humanitarian aid in cases of famine, natural disaster, and armed conflict. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations February 12, 2015]
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Australia—the ‘lucky’ country?

Freedom, Wealth,
Stability
The ‘lucky’ tag was an accident. When Donald Horne wrote his book ‘The Lucky Country’, he meant it as satire. Just the same it sort of fits us and we have decided to own it.

Australia has space, mineral resources and, although much of the country is arid, underground water. There is good agricultural land, intriguing animals and unique geographical features. It is also an island far away from the old world and, with the dismal exception of violence against the original people, we have been spared the horrors of wide-spread war.

From the beginning of Aboriginal habitation some 60,000 years ago, the continent has been a challenging place in which to live. The first peoples devised ways to protect their food and water sources. They were stewards of the land and built a way of life which did not impact too severely on the countryside.

European habitation in the 18th century was destructive. Settlers imposed agricultural systems suitable to Britain but not so suitable to a country with a different climate and soil. They hewed down trees, cleared land, dammed creeks and rivers with no understanding of the eventual outcomes. They were ignorant of the knowledge accrued by the first peoples and as their influence spread they destroyed indigenous communities and their food sources.

Over time the new settlers introduced foxes, cats, rats and rabbits which had a negative impact on native flora and fauna and blundered about in ignorance of the harm they were doing. In later years, Prickly Pear, Lantana and Cane Toads would become serious environmental problems.

Convicts sent to Australia were treated harshly, but in time many were freed. The majority made the most of their opportunities in the new land and many flourished. However, it was soon realised European settlement would need more people if it were to succeed. Additional free settlers came and brought capital, knowledge and a sense of adventure.

Early pioneering days were challenging and filled with mistakes. Settlers were arrogant as well as ignorant. They over-grazed. They used water unsustainably. They felled trees and disrupted habitats. The original inhabitants were pushed out.

However, despite this unpromising start, the seeds of future success were planted. A spirit of comradeship developed among the new settlers. Distances were vast and difficulties greater than individuals could manage alone so the incomers banded together to help one another.

The ‘Free States’ (those which did not start as convict settlements) seem to have a different ethos. South Australia has sent many notable people to parliament (Julie Bishop, Julia Gillard, Alexander Downer, Nick Xenophon—to mention just a few—and has begun several influential political movements. Similarly, in Victoria.

**Indigenous rights**

Treatment of Aboriginal people in Australia during the period of European settlement until the present is a terrible story. They were decimated by diseases for which they had no immunity. They had their land stolen; they were shot and poisoned and killed and put in jail; their children were stolen; they were locked in reserves under the control of bureaucrats. They had no way to make their voices heard. In relation to voting rights, indigenous people
lagged well behind other citizens. It was 1967 before Aboriginal people obtained the right to vote or even, for that matter, the right to be counted in the national census.¹ [Note 1: Indigenous rights]

Only in 1993, after years spent in fruitless efforts to have their land claims recognized, was a Land Titles Bill enacted by the Keating Labor government.² [Note 2: Native title]

Paul Keating’s Redfern speech is a memorable record of this event. The speech was a turning point after which reconciliation between indigenous and other Australians began to improve.³ [Note 3: The Redfern speech]

On February 13, 2008, Prime Minister Rudd made the ‘Sorry’ speech—an apology for the way indigenous children had been taken from their families.⁴ [Note 4: The sorry speech]

Indigenous peoples in Australia are making considerable progress in a wide range of activities—art, dance, music, sport, literature, business and politics although many still suffer as a result of the devastation previously wreaked on their social structures. Aboriginal communities have had their links with the land severed. They can no longer move about freely living as they once did on the land where they exercised stewardship because Europeans have taken it for other uses—grazing and mining. They need to find alternative ways to sustain a living but this is incredibly difficult and communities are often disrupted by alcohol and violence when there is no paying work or other useful occupation. According to Noel Pearson, an Aboriginal leader from Cape York:

‘Today there’s much to be optimistic about in relation to the entrepreneurs and businesses that have emerged these past ten years. Many companies have been constructive in supporting the emergence. But the aggregate story is one of an enormous swindle perpetrated against Aboriginal Australians…

Ten years later, following the largest mining boom in the history of the world, Western Australia, the province that was the largest driver and beneficiary of that boom, has announced the potential closure of up to 150 remote indigenous communities. Many of these communities live in the shadows of the very mines that were part of that boom. Was there any province anywhere on the planet that generated as much revenue as this one? How could it be that after this boom, the government of this province could say that it could not afford to continue to support theseuviable remote communities?⁵ [Note 5: Pearson, Noel. An article in The Monthly. May 2015. Published by Morry Schwarz as The Monthly Pty Ltd.]

Europeans have learned a great deal from indigenous peoples and may have learned more had we been of a mind to. We are enriched by their art and influenced by their knowledge of and love for the land we all call Australia. As we learn more from them I believe we will realise just how well they had organised their societies to suit the country they moved around and how, in turn, it repaid their methods by providing sustenance.

The right to vote
Wealthy Australians had many advantages but common people (informed by a rebellious,
convict past) were not of a mind to allow a British style class system develop in Australia to the extent it was embedded in Britain. Freed convicts as well as free settlers, happy to escape the tight control of class-domination, wanted Australia to become a more egalitarian society—this did not initially include women, indigenous, non-British or even most males. It would take years for those classes of citizens to be included. ⁶ [Note 6: Right to vote]

**Growth of the Australian Trade Union movement**

Melbourne workers banded together in 1856 and succeeded in their demands for an eight-hour working day. By 1866 demands for an eight-hour day for all workers were made by the International Workingmen’s Association at a convention in Geneva, but it wasn’t until the middle of the next century that this condition was widely recognized throughout the world. ⁷ [Note7: eight-hour day]

The Trade Union movement in Australia was militant. There was a cleavage down the middle of society with workers on one side and bosses on the other. Major strikes occurred during the 1890’s—the 1890 maritime strike, the 1891 shearsers’ strike, the 1892 Broken Hill miners’ strike and the 1894 shearsers’ strike. Unionists endured violence from authorities who wanted to end the strikes. ⁸ [Note 8: Strikes]

Following the 1891 shearsers’ strike a political party for workers was established—the first Labor Party in the world. ⁹ [Note 9: Australian Labor Party]

Trade Unions were a working man’s movement but dedicated to improving the lives of families, particularly working class families. In that sense and to some extent it modified the patriarchal society, although it would take many years to wear down patriarchy within the movement itself.

**Women’s rights**

Women sharing tough conditions alongside their men developed a feisty outlook but this was not sufficient to change the effects of a patriarchal system. It was not until late in the 19th century that women achieved a measure of legal equality with men. They’d had second-class citizenship—could not borrow money without a guarantee from a husband or a male, were blocked out of some types of work and had lower pay and working conditions. Only late in the 19th century did they get the right to vote.

The Suffragette movement had a world-wide impact on female suffrage. Women attained the right to vote in South Australia in 1894/5, Western Australia in 1899, federally in 1902 and in other States by 1911. Since then there has been slow but steady change to the status of women. ¹⁰ [Note 10: The Suffragette movement]

The modern women’s movement (‘Feminism’), which gained momentum in the United States following the Second World War and reached Australia in the 1970’s, influenced attitudes regarding the rights of women. Women pushed against restrictions and experienced the excitement of doors opening a little to their efforts. Feminist groups were active over several decades advocating changes to the conditions for women—in the home, the workplace and in relationships.
In the late 1980’s a significant change took place in Australia when English language usage was changed to make it more female-friendly. After a period of resistance to the suggested changes Australia’s printed and spoken media moved almost wholly to a form of language that did not disadvantage women.¹ [Note 11 Gender inclusive language]

Important legislative and social changes occurred in the 1980’s during the Hawke/Keating Government. These changes improved the living conditions of Australian families through the introduction of family allowances as well as increased spending on housing, education and health. Chief among governmental supporters of gender equality was Senator Susan Ryan. She ‘served in several ministerial roles in the Hawke government; and most notably as the inaugural Minister assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women. Her legislative contributions to the Australian political landscape include the Sex Discrimination Act, 1984 (Cth) and the Affirmative Action (Equal Opportunities in Employment) Act 1986 (Cth).¹² [Note 12: Senator Susan Ryan].

The 1984 Sex Discrimination Act improved the rights of women in the workplace, and similarly in 1986, the Equal Opportunity Act supported affirmative action on behalf of women.

Following these changes, more women aspired to leadership in politics and the work-place. A high point was the 2013 federal parliament where there were 65 women members, including the Prime Minister, the Speaker and 14 ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries. Many clerks and attendants were women and the Governor-General was a woman.

Increasingly, women are writing and speaking about what is still needed to enable recognition and advancement for women at higher levels of business and politics. They are joined by men like the previous Chief of the Army, Lieutenant General David Morrison, who has made his view clear (in the face of opposition) that abuse against women soldiers will not be tolerated.

Writing has been a tool used by women from very early times. Scores of female writers have highlighted the plight of women through a variety of mediums—letters, diaries, novels, reports. Their voices are finally reaching the ears of more legislators.

Taking care of the environment
Environmental and ‘green’ movements gained recognition and support during the 1970’s and 1980’s. The Australian Democrats (formed in 1978) were a political party with an environmental mission. They were involved in the movement to save the Franklin River in Tasmania. This was possible because of Whitlam Government legislation which ratified the World Heritage Convention. Then in 1999 the Australian Democrats in the Senate supported the Environmental Protection Act and Biodiversity Conservation Act. ¹³ [Note 13: The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999]

By 2007 when the Australian Democrats were no longer a force, the Greens Party was gaining more support and campaigning to save forests in Tasmania and Northern Queensland. They had voted against a carbon pricing system to tackle global warming because it didn’t meet their expectations and the years from 2007 to 2013 saw a titanic struggle to pass carbon reduction legislation. It passed during the Gillard Government’s term but was then rescinded
in 2014 by the Abbot Government. Climate warming remains an important issue for many people.¹⁴ [Note 14 Carbon Pricing mechanisms]

**Warfare**

Australians are fortunate to live in a country which has not known the ravages of wide-spread war. There has been little violent conflict on Island Australia with the exception of violence committed against the first inhabitants, one short-lived attempt attempted revolution at the Eureka Stockade in Victoria and the bombing of Darwin, Broome and Townsville by the Japanese in World War II. But that did not stop the nation from fighting on behalf of its colonial cousins in numerous wars—the Boer War, World War I and II, Malaysia, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq. It would seem we have been a warlike country. Every small town in Australia has monuments to soldiers, sailors and airmen lost in battle over-seas and there are constant reminders through services of remembrance and annual rituals to honour those lost in battle. In a ‘manly’ country like Australia it was an honour to go to war. However, the realisation that many soldiers come back from wars not only wounded or maimed physically but with post-traumatic stress disorders possibly indicates a changing ethos towards the acts of violence seen or committed in a war zone.

The Peace Movement is active. One such example is ‘Women in Black, a world-wide network of women committed to peace with justice and actively opposed to injustice, war, militarism and other forms of violence.’¹⁵ [Note 15: Women in Black]

**Violence against women and children**

Domestic violence and child sexual abuse has been (and is still) rife in Australia. The recent Royal Commission¹⁶ [Note 16: 2013- Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse] has uncovered the hidden horror of child sexual abuse committed over previous decades and no doubt prior to that without arousing official comment.

Sexual abuse within families is far more common than that in institutions.

The issue of violence against women and children is troubling, although it is reassuring to realise that the reason we hear so much is that, finally, it is seen as an issue of national importance and given the attention it deserves. As well the scourge of child pornography on the internet is being tackled vigorously.

Men are also seriously affected by domestic violence

**Some positives**

Australians are fortunate to live in a country with a modest population and sufficient wealth to create a good life-style. We have enjoyed national governments of a reasonably high standard for most of the 200 years of the federation and had governments at a few critical times make some excellent decisions—abolition of the White Australia Policy, free university education, universal medical insurance, environmental protection laws, Aboriginal land rights and so on...

After World War II an influx of migrants from war-torn Europe brought additional skills and knowledge to Australia and the beginning of a vibrant multi-cultural ethic. In the 1980’s migration was widened to include people from the Middle East and Asia. While some of these
waves of migration took a while to bed down, they changed the Australian culture significantly and mostly for the better.

**The digital revolution**

From the late 20th century and in the early years of the 21st century the wide-spread use of computers and digital phones brought about the phenomena of social media where people get and give information (and opinions) freely. Opinion changes rapidly. The information cycle is now shorter; it is no longer controlled exclusively by a few major news organisations but is diffuse.

Political parties and politicians feel the brunt of these changes. The electorate is not as forgiving as it may once have been. The amazing outcome of the 2015 Queensland election is an example of this. The LNP government of Campbell Newman which had over-whelmed the Labor Party government at the previous election rushed ahead with unpopular decisions—reducing Public Service employment, introducing harsh laws against bikies, reducing the level of accountability, and deciding to sell public assets. Premier Campbell Newman was perceived as arrogant and lost his seat. The swing against the LNP in some seats was as high as 22 per cent. The ALP, led by a woman, promised a ‘different way of governing’—a consensus approach, an inclusive approach. A potential leader of the LNP, also a woman, voiced a similar view.

The digital revolution has also brought about technologies which can identify social progress. One such is the Global Peace Index. It came about when an Australian IT entrepreneur called Steve Killelea[^17] turned his mind to the creation of a computer program to measure peace and its benefits. It has been running now for 9 years and in the latest survey Australia moved up four places in the index to rate ninth in the world as a peaceful society.

So, is Australia moving from being a society based on a gladiatorial system towards a system with a more egalitarian approach? *Yes, but gradually.*

Generally speaking, we are a law-abiding and peaceful continent with little internal violence. The majority of people expect a fair deal from their governments and also expect social problems will be tackled to ensure citizens are treated equally and have equal opportunity to achieve their goals. According to ex-Prime Minister, John Howard ‘Australians are not extremists’. [Speech at St. James Ethics Centre, May 18, 2015.]

The position of women has improved, although there is still a lot to be done. Women encounter prejudice and disadvantage in achieving their goals—particularly when they aspire to authority roles. Men who adopt the partnership model can also experience difficulties.

We have managed multiculturalism reasonably well. Most waves of migrants have been happily absorbed into the Australian life-style and become ‘true-blue’ Australians. Succeeding waves (English, Italian, Greek, Asian) have been integrated (after some minor teasing). The country is now in the process of assimilating people from the troubled Middle-East who have different religious and cultural backgrounds from the historically Christian background of most Australians. This may prove more difficult, although (it seems to me) that except for a
small proportion of extremists, most new citizens appreciate the Australian way of life and have their own valuable contributions to make.

The rising antagonism against people with an Islamic faith is troubling. Issues of terrorism, refugees and radical youth are being used to create fear—sometimes with a political end in view. Nonetheless, I am convinced the core Aussie attitude of ‘a fair-go’ will eventually win the battle for the minds of ordinary Australians.

Male violence against women and children occurs frequently, particularly in domestic situations, and a woman is more likely to be killed in her own home by a male partner than by an outsider. This year (2015) from January to May, 14 women were killed in Queensland by their partners.

There remains significant resistance to the idea of a ‘partnership’ society—one where men and women are equally responsible and given full support by the community. It is slow, and sometimes hidden, but is moving just as certainly as the tectonic plates under our feet.

NOTES:

Chapter 3  Australia the ‘lucky country’

Note 1: Indigenous Voting rights: The acquisition of voting rights by Indigenous Australians began in the late-19th century but was not completed in every jurisdiction until the mid-20th century. Under Australia’s federal system, restrictions on Aborigines voting in state and federal elections varied until the 1960s, during which decade all remaining restrictions were eradicated.

In 1962, the Menzies Government (1949-1966) amended the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918 to enable all Aboriginal Australians to enroll to vote in Australian federal elections. In 1965, Queensland became the last state to remove restrictions on Aborigines voting in state elections. [See also http://www.aec.gov.au/aboriginal/about.htm]


Note 2: Native title: In Australia, the common law doctrine of Aboriginal title is referred to as native title, which is "the recognition by Australian law that Indigenous people have rights and interests to their land that come from their traditional laws and customs"...The foundational case for native title in Australia is Mabo v Queensland (No 2) (1992). One year after the recognition of the legal concept of native title in Mabo, the Keating Government formalised the recognition by legislation with the enactment by the Australian Parliament of the Native Title Act 1993 ("NTA"). The Act attempted to clarify the legal position of landholders and the processes to be followed for native title to be claimed, protected and recognised through the courts. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Native_title_in_Australia February 11, 2015]

Note 3: Transcript
Redfern Speech (Year for the World’s Indigenous People) – Delivered in Redfern Park by Prime Minister Paul Keating, 10 December 1992

Ladies and gentlemen

I am very pleased to be here today at the launch of Australia’s celebration of the 1993 International Year of the World’s Indigenous People. It will be a year of great significance for Australia. It comes at a time when we have committed ourselves to succeeding in the test which so far we have always failed. Because, in truth, we cannot confidently say that we have succeeded as we would like to have succeeded if we have not managed to extend opportunity and care, dignity and hope to the indigenous people of Australia – the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island people. This is a fundamental test of our social goals and our national will: our ability to say to ourselves and the rest of the world that Australia is a first rate social democracy, that we are what we should be - truly the land of the fair go and the better chance.

There is no more basic test of how seriously we mean these things. It is a test of our self-knowledge. Of how well we know the land we live in. How well we know our history. How well we recognise the fact that, complex as our contemporary identity is, it cannot be separated from Aboriginal Australia. How well we know what Aboriginal Australians know about Australia. Redfern is a good place to contemplate these things. Just a mile or two from the place where the first European settlers landed, in too many ways it tells us that their failure to bring much more than devastation and Demoralisation to Aboriginal Australia continues to be our failure. More I think than most Australians recognise, the plight of Aboriginal Australians affects us all.

In Redfern, it might be tempting to think that the reality Aboriginal Australians face is somehow contained here, and that the rest of us are insulated from it. But of course, while all the dilemmas may exist here, they are far from contained. We know the same dilemmas and more are faced all over Australia. That is perhaps the point of this Year of the World’s Indigenous People: to bring the dispossessed out of the shadows, to recognise that they are part of us, and that we cannot give indigenous Australians up without giving up many of our own most deeply held values, much of our own identity - and our own humanity.

Nowhere in the world, I would venture, is the message more stark than it is in Australia. We simply cannot sweep injustice aside. Even if our own conscience allowed us to, I am sure, that in due course, the world and the people of our region would not. There should be no mistake about this - our success in resolving these issues will have a significant bearing on our standing in the world. However intractable the problems seem, we cannot resign ourselves to failure - any more than we can hide behind the contemporary version of Social Darwinism which says that to reach back for the poor and dispossessed is to risk being dragged down. That seems to me not only morally indefensible, but bad history. We non-Aboriginal Australians should perhaps remind ourselves that Australia once reached out for us. Didn’t Australia provide opportunity and care for the dispossessed Irish? The poor of Britain? The refugees from war and famine and persecution in the countries of Europe and Asia? Isn’t it reasonable to say that if we can build a prosperous and remarkably harmonious multicultural society in Australia, surely we can find just solutions to the problems which beset the first Australians - the people to whom the most injustice has been done.

And, as I say, the starting point might be to recognise that the problem starts with us non-Aboriginal Australians. It begins, I think, with that act of recognition. Recognition that it was we who did the dispossessing. We took the traditional lands and smashed the traditional way of life. We brought the diseases. The alcohol. We committed the murders. We took the children from their mothers. We practised discrimination and exclusion. It was our ignorance and our prejudice. And our failure to imagine these things being done to us. With some noble exceptions, we failed to make the most basic human response and enter into their hearts and minds. We failed to ask - how would I feel if this were done to me? As a consequence, we failed to see that what we were doing degraded all of us. If we needed a reminder of this, we received it this year. The Report of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody showed with devastating clarity that the past lives on in inequality, racism and injustice. In the prejudice and ignorance of non-Aboriginal Australians, and in the demoralisation and desperation, the fractured identity, of so many Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders.

For all this, I do not believe that the Report should fill us with guilt. Down the years, there has been no shortage of guilt, but it has not produced the responses we need. Guilt is not a very constructive emotion. I think what we need to do is open our hearts a bit. All of us. Perhaps when we recognise what we have in common we will see the things which must be done - the practical things. There is something of this in the creation of the Council for
Aboriginal Reconciliation. The Council’s mission is to forge a new partnership built on justice and equity and an appreciation of the heritage of Australia’s indigenous people. In the abstract those terms are meaningless. We have to give meaning to “justice” and “equity” - and, as I have said several times this year, we will only give them meaning when we commit ourselves to achieving concrete results. If we improve the living conditions in one town, they will improve in another. And another. If we raise the standard of health by twenty per cent one year, it will be raised more the next. If we open one door others will follow. When we see improvement, when we see more dignity, more confidence, more happiness - we will know we are going to win.

We need these practical building blocks of change. The Mabo Judgement should be seen as one of these. By doing away with the bizarre conceit that this continent had no owners prior to the settlement of Europeans, Mabo establishes a fundamental truth and lays the basis for justice. It will be much easier to work from that basis than has ever been the case in the past. For that reason alone we should ignore the isolated outbreaks of hysteria and hostility of the past few months. Mabo is an historic decision - we can make it an historic turning point, the basis of a new relationship between indigenous and non-Aboriginal Australians. The message should be that there is nothing to fear or to lose in the recognition of historical truth, or the extension of social justice, or the deepening of Australian social democracy to include indigenous Australians. There is everything to gain. Even the unhappy past speaks for this.

Where Aboriginal Australians have been included in the life of Australia they have made remarkable contributions. Economic contributions, particularly in the pastoral and agricultural industry. They are there in the frontier and exploration history of Australia. They are there in the wars. In sport to an extraordinary degree. In literature and art and music. In all these things they have shaped our knowledge of this continent and of ourselves. They have shaped our identity. They are there in the Australian legend. We should never forget - they have helped build this nation. And if we have a sense of justice, as well as common sense, we will forge a new partnership. As I said, it might help us if we non-Aboriginal Australians imagined ourselves dispossessed of land we had lived on for fifty thousand years - and then imagined ourselves told that it had never been ours. Imagine if ours was the oldest culture in the world and we were told that it was worthless.

Imagine if we had resisted this settlement, suffered and died in the defence of our land, and then were told in history books that we had given up without a fight. Imagine if non-Aboriginal Australians had served their country in peace and war and were then ignored in history books. Imagine if our feats on sporting fields had inspired admiration and patriotism and yet did nothing to diminish prejudice. Imagine if our spiritual life was denied and ridiculed. Imagine if we had suffered the injustice and then were blamed for it. It seems to me that if we can imagine the injustice we can imagine its opposite. And we can have justice. I say that for two reasons: I say it because I believe that the great things about Australian social democracy reflect a fundamental belief in justice. And I say it because in so many other areas we have proved our capacity over the years to go on extending the realms of participation, opportunity and care. Just as Australians living in the relatively narrow and insular Australia of the 1960s imagined a culturally diverse, worldly and open Australia, and in a generation turned the idea into reality, so we can turn the goals of reconciliation into reality.

There are very good signs that the process has begun. The creation of the Reconciliation Council is evidence itself. The establishment of the ATSIC - the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission - is also evidence. The Council is the product of imagination and good will. ATSIC emerges from the vision of indigenous self-determination and self-management. The vision has already become the reality of almost 800 elected Aboriginal Regional Councillors and Commissioners determining priorities and developing their own programs.

All over Australia, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities are taking charge of their own lives. And assistance with the problems which chronically beset them is at last being made available in ways developed by the communities themselves. If these things offer hope, so does the fact that this generation of Australians is better informed about Aboriginal culture and achievement, and about the injustice that has been done, than any generation before. We are beginning to more generally appreciate the depth and the diversity of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures. From their music and art and dance we are beginning to recognise how much richer our national life and identity will be for the participation of Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders.

We are beginning to learn what the indigenous people have known for many thousands of years - how to live with our physical environment. Ever so gradually we are learning how to see Australia through Aboriginal eyes, beginning to recognise the wisdom contained in their epic story. I think we are beginning to see how much we
owe the indigenous Australians and how much we have lost by living so apart. I said we non-indigenous Australians should try to imagine the Aboriginal view. It can’t be too hard. Someone imagined this event today, and it is now a marvellous reality and a great reason for hope. There is one thing today we cannot imagine. We cannot imagine that the descendants of people whose genius and resilience maintained a culture here through fifty thousand years or more, through cataclysmic changes to the climate and environment, and who then survived two centuries of dispossession and abuse, will be denied their place in the modern Australian nation. We cannot imagine that. We cannot imagine that we will fail. And with the spirit that is here today I am confident that we won’t. I am confident that we will succeed in this decade. Thank you


Note 4: Kevin Rudd’s sorry speech

The text of Prime Minister Kevin Rudd’s speech to Parliament on February 13, 2008. I move:

That today we honour the indigenous peoples of this land, the oldest continuing cultures in human history. We reflect on their past mistreatment. We reflect in particular on the mistreatment of those who were stolen generations - this blemished chapter in our nation’s history.

The time has now come for the nation to turn a new page in Australia’s history by righting the wrongs of the past and so moving forward with confidence to the future. We apologise for the laws and policies of successive parliaments and governments that have inflicted profound grief, suffering and loss on these our fellow Australians.

We apologise especially for the removal of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families, their communities and their country. For the pain, suffering and hurt of these stolen generations, their descendants and for their families left behind, we say sorry. To the mothers and the fathers, the brothers and the sisters, for the breaking up of families and communities, we say sorry.

And for the indignity and degradation thus inflicted on a proud people and a proud culture, we say sorry. We the parliament of Australia respectfully request that this apology be received in the spirit in which it is offered as part of the healing of the nation. For the future we take heart; resolving that this new page in the history of our great continent can now be written.

We today take this first step by acknowledging the past and laying claim to a future that embraces all Australians. A future where this parliament resolves that the injustices of the past must never, never happen again. A future where we harness the determination of all Australians, indigenous and non-indigenous, to close the gap that lies between us in life expectancy, educational achievement and economic opportunity. A future where we embrace the possibility of new solutions to enduring problems where old approaches have failed.

A future based on mutual respect, mutual resolve and mutual responsibility. A future where all Australians, whatever their origins, are truly equal partners, with equal opportunities and with an equal stake in shaping the next chapter in the history of this great country, Australia.

There comes a time in the history of nations when their peoples must become fully reconciled to their past if they are to go forward with confidence to embrace their future. [http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/kevin-rudds-sorry-speech March 28, 2015]


Note 6: Right to vote Upon first white settlement in New South Wales in 1788, the appointed Governors had autocratic powers within the colony, but agitation for representative government began soon after the settlement...The first parliamentary elections in Australia took place in 1843 for the New South Wales Legislative Council under the Constitution Act 1842. The Council had 36 members, of which 12 were appointed by the
Governor and the remainder was elected. The right to vote was limited to men with a freehold valued at £200 or a householder paying rent of £20 per year, both very large sums at the time.

In the 1850s, limited self-government was granted to South Australia (1856), Victoria (1857), New South Wales (1858) and Tasmania (1896): all adult (21 years) male British subjects were entitled to vote. This included indigenous people but they were not encouraged to enrol. Queensland gained self-government in 1859 and Western Australia in 1890, but these colonies denied indigenous people the vote. An innovative secret ballot was introduced in Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia.

In 1856, under a new Constitution, the New South Wales Parliament became bicameral with a fully elected Legislative Assembly and a fully appointed Legislative Council with a Government taking over most of the legislative powers of the Governor. On 22 May 1856, the newly constituted New South Wales Parliament opened and sat for the first time. The right to vote was extended to all adult males in 1858. Tasmania retained a small property qualification for voting, but in the other states all male British subjects over 21 could vote. Only in South Australia and Tasmania were indigenous Australians even theoretically entitled to vote. A few may have done so in South Australia. Western Australia and Queensland specifically barred indigenous people from voting.

In 1902, the Commonwealth Parliament passed the Commonwealth Franchise Act 1902, which established a uniform franchise law for the federal Parliament. The Act declared that all British subjects over the age of 21 years who had been living in Australia for at least 6 months were entitled to a vote, whether male or female, and whether married or single. Besides granting Australian women the right to vote at a national level, it also allowed them to stand for election to federal Parliament. This meant that Australia was the second country, after New Zealand, to grant women’s suffrage at a national level, and the first country to allow women to stand for Parliament. However, the Act also disqualified Indigenous people from Australia, Asia, Africa and the Pacific Islands, with the exception of Māori, from voting, even though they were British subjects and otherwise entitled to a vote. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Suffrage_in_Australia February 5, 2015]

Note 7: **Eight hour day** The International Workingmen’s Association took up the demand for an eight-hour day at its convention in Geneva in August 1866, declaring The legal limitation of the working day is a preliminary condition without which all further attempts at improvements and emancipation of the working class must prove abortive, and The Congress proposes eight hours as the legal limit of the working day.

Although there were initial successes in achieving an eight-hour day in New Zealand and by the Australian labour movement for skilled workers in the 1840s and 1850s, most employed people had to wait to the early and mid-twentieth century for the condition to be widely achieved through the industrialized world through legislative action.

The eight-hour day movement forms part of the early history for the celebration of Labour Day, and May Day in many nations and cultures. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eight-hour_day March 28, 2015]

Note 8: **Three great strikes** convulsed the continent of Australia one after another: the 1890 maritime strike; the 1891 shearsers’ strike; the 1892 Broken Hill miners’ strike; and the 1894 shearsers’ strike. When a large number of sheep shearers in Queensland struck against poor conditions and wages that were being lowered, the Queensland police responded with violence and broke up the strike.

The early labour movement was much broader than trade unions. As there was no social welfare, many workers and their families were members of a Friendly society to insure against sickness, accident or unemployment. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Suffrage_in_Australia February 5, 2015]

Note 9: **The present Australian Labor Party** has its origins in the Labour parties founded in the 1890s in the Australian colonies prior to federation. Labor tradition ascribes the founding of Queensland Labour to a meeting of striking pastoral workers under a ghost gum tree (the "Tree of Knowledge") in Barcaldine, Queensland in 1891. The Balmain, New South Wales branch of the party claims to be the oldest in Australia. Labour as a parliamentary
party dates from 1891 in New South Wales, 1893 in South Australia and Queensland, and later in the other colonies. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australian_Labor_Party_February_5, 2015]

Note 10: Suffragettes were members of women's organization (right to vote) movements in the late 19th and early 20th century, particularly militants in Great Britain such as members of the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU). [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Suffragette February 5, 2015]

Note 11: Gender-neutral language, gender-inclusive language, inclusive language, or gender neutrality is a form of linguistic prescriptivism that aims to eliminate (or neutralize) reference to gender in terms that describe people. For example, the words policeman and stewardess are gender-specific; the corresponding gender-neutral terms are police officer and flight attendant. Other gender-specific terms, such as actor and actress, may be replaced by the originally male term; for example, actor used regardless of gender. Further, some traditionally gender-neutral terms, such as chairman, are increasingly seen by some, but not all, as being gender-specific. Gender-neutral language may also involve the avoidance of gender-specific pronouns, such as he, when the gender of the person referred to is unknown; they may be replaced with gender-neutral pronouns – possibilities in English include he or she, s/he, or singular they. It has become common in academic and governmental settings to rely on gender-neutral language to convey inclusion of all sexes or genders (gender-inclusive language).

Historically the use of masculine pronouns in place of generic was regarded as non-sexist, but various forms of gender-neutral language became a common feature in written and spoken versions of many languages in the late twentieth century. Feminists argue that previously the practice of assigning masculine gender to generic antecedents stemmed from language reflecting "the prejudices of the society in which it evolved, and English evolved through most of its history in a male-centered, patriarchal society." Various languages employ different means to achieve gender neutrality. See the following articles for specific discussions:

- Gender neutrality in languages with grammatical gender
- Gender neutrality in genderless languages
- Gender neutrality in English

Particular issues are discussed in more detail in the following articles:

- Gender marking in job titles
- Gender-specific and gender-neutral pronouns

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gender-neutral_language]

Note 12: Senator Susan Ryan Susan Maree Ryan AO (born 10 October 1942), an Australian educator, is the Age Discrimination Commissioner, since 2011, within the Australian Human Rights Commission. Ryan has previously served as a Senator for the Australian Capital Territory between 1975 and 1987, representing the Australian Labor Party. During her term in the Parliament of Australia, Ryan served in several ministerial roles in the Hawke government; and most notably as the inaugural Minister assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women. Her legislative contributions to the Australian political landscape include the Sex Discrimination Act, 1984 (Cth) and the Affirmative Action (Equal Opportunities in Employment) Act 1986 (Cth).

Ryan was born in Sydney and educated at the Brigidine Convent in Maroubra. She graduated from the University of Sydney in 1962 with a Bachelor of Arts and worked as a school teacher. She married Richard Butler in 1963 and they have one son and one daughter—they divorced in 1972. From 1966 she was a residence officer at the Australian National University in Canberra while studying and tutoring in English literature. In 1969 she helped to establish the Labor Club in Belconnen. She graduated with a Master of Arts in English Literature from the ANU in 1972. Following graduation she served as a delegate to the ACT Australian Labor Party from 1973 to 1976.

Political career
In 1974 Ryan was appointed to the non-governing ACT Advisory Council and elected to the non-governing ACT House of Assembly, serving briefly between 1975 and 1976.
In 1975 she was elected as one of the first two Senators for the ACT, on the slogan "A woman's place is in the Senate". She was the ACT’s first female senator and first Labor senator. When the Hawke Labor Government was elected in March 1983, Ryan was appointed Minister for Education and Youth Affairs and Minister assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women. She was Minister for Education in the second Hawke Ministry and opposed the reintroduction of fees for tertiary education despite strong support in Cabinet for the user-pays principle. She lost the education portfolio in the third Hawke Ministry and was instead given a much reduced role as Special Minister of State. Subsequently the Higher Education Contribution Scheme was introduced to partially fund higher education.[31] Ryan resigned from the Senate on 16 December 1987.

Ryan had a strong focus on gender equality in politics. A private member’s bill written by her in 1981 was crucial to the development of the Sex Discrimination Act 1984, the Affirmative Action (Equal Employment Opportunity for Women) Act 1986, the Public Service Reform Act 1984 and the Equal Employment Opportunity (Commonwealth Authorities) Act 1987. She was also a founding member of the Women’s Electoral Lobby ACT branch.

After politics
Following her resignation from politics, Ryan has worked as an editor and in the insurance, plastics and superannuation industries. In November 1998 Ryan was appointed one of the first two Pro-Chancellors of the University of New South Wales, a position she held until 2011. She was President of the Australian Institute of Superannuation Trustees from 2000 to 2007. She has also campaigned for an Australian Bill of Rights. She was deputy chairman of the Australian Republican Movement from 2000 to 2003. She has published a political autobiography, ‘Catching the Waves: life in and out of politics’.

In July 2011, she was appointed as Australia’s inaugural Age Discrimination Commissioner with the Australian Human Rights Commission. Ryan was appointed an Officer of the Order of Australia (AO) in June 1990. She has received honorary doctorates from the University of Canberra, Macquarie University and the University of South Australia. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Susan_Ryan]

Note 13: The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) is an Act of the Parliament of Australia that provides a framework for protection of the Australian environment, including its biodiversity and its natural and culturally significant places. Enacted on 17 July 2000, it established a range of processes to help protect and promote the recovery of threatened species and ecological communities, and preserve significant places from decline. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environment_Protection_and_Biodiversity_Conservation_Act_1999_February_11, 2015]

Note 14: Carbon pricing — the method favored by many economists for reducing global-warming emissions — charges those who emit carbon dioxide (CO₂) for their emissions. That charge, called a carbon price, is the amount that must be paid for the right to emit one tonne of CO₂ into the atmosphere. Carbon pricing usually takes the form either of a carbon tax or a requirement to purchase permits to emit, generally known as cap-and-trade, but also called "allowances".

Carbon pricing solves the economic problem that CO₂, a known greenhouse gas, is what economics calls a negative externality — a detrimental product that is not priced (charged for) by any market. As a consequence of not being priced, there is no market mechanism responsive to the costs of CO₂ emitted. The standard economic solution to problems of this type, first proposed by Arthur Pigou in 1920, is for the product - in this case, CO₂ emissions - to be charged at a price equal to the monetary value of the damage caused by the emissions. This should result in the economically optimal (efficient) amount of CO₂ emissions. Many practical concerns mar the theoretical simplicity of this picture: for example, the exact monetary damage caused by a tonne of CO₂ is uncertain. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carbon_price]

Note 15: Women in Black is a world-wide network of women committed to peace with justice and actively opposed to injustice, war, militarism and other forms of violence. As women experiencing these things in different ways in different regions of the world, we support each other’s movements. An important focus is challenging the militarist policies of our own governments. We are not an organisation, but a means of communicating and a formula for action.
Vigils Any group of women anywhere in the world at any time may organize a Women in Black vigil against any manifestation of violence, militarism or war. Women in Black (WiB) actions are generally women only. Our actions often take the form of women wearing black, standing in a public place in silent, non-violent vigils at regular times and intervals, carrying placards and handing out leaflets.

Other non-violent actions We use non-violent and non-aggressive forms of action. In addition to vigils Women in Black groups use many other forms of non-violent direct action such as sitting down to block a road, entering military bases and other forbidden zones, refusing to comply with orders, and "bearing witness". Wearing black in some cultures signifies mourning, and feminist actions dressed in black convert women's traditional passive mourning for the dead in war into a powerful refusal of the logic of war.

A worldwide movement It is impossible to know exactly how many Women in Black groups exist, how many women they include and how many actions have been held. When Women in Black in Israel/Palestine, as part of a coalition of Women for a Just Peace, called for vigils in June 2001 against the Occupation of Palestinian lands, at least 150 WiB groups across the world responded. Countries reporting vigils included: Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, England, France, Germany, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Maldives Islands, Mexico, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the USA. The organisers estimate that altogether 10,000 women may have been involved.

International women's solidarity International Women in Black conferences and encounters have been held in Jerusalem, Beijing, Serbia, and Brussels. Another is planned for Italy in 2003. In 2001 Women in Black was awarded the Millennium Peace Prize for Women by the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and International Alert. Women in Black in Israel/Palestine and former Yugoslavia were also nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize and the Right Livelihood Award.

A feminist perspective Women in Black groups do not have a constitution or a manifesto, but our perspective is clear from our actions and words. It is evident for instance that we have a feminist understanding: that male violence against women in domestic life and in the community, in times of peace and in times of war, are interrelated. Violence is used as a means of controlling women. In some regions, men who share this analysis support and help WiB, and WiB are supporting men who refuse to fight.

Women's different experience of war Women-only peace activism does not suggest that women, any more than men, are “natural born peace-makers”. But women often inhabit different cultures from men, and are disproportionally involved in caring work. We know what justice and oppression mean, because we experience them as women. Most women have a different experience of war from that of most men. All women in war fear rape. Women are the majority of refugees. A feminist view sees masculine cultures as especially prone to violence, and so feminist women tend to have a particular perspective on security and something unique to say about war.

Women's different and varied voices WiB includes women of many ethnic and national backgrounds, co-operating across these (and other) differences in the interests of justice and peace. We work for a world where difference does not mean inequality, oppression or exclusion. Women’s voices are often drowned out in mixed actions of men and women. When we act alone what women say is really heard.

Choosing our own forms of action Sometimes even peace demonstrations get violent, and as women alone we can choose forms of action we feel comfortable with, non-violent and expressive. Demonstrating together can give us a sense of the richness and scope of our varied experiences, and solidarity and purpose as women. Women in regions differently situated in relation to armed conflicts, including those that perpetrate violence and those that are victims of it, can lend support to each other. Together we can educate, inform and influence public opinion, and so try to make war an unthinkable option.

As women experiencing these things in different ways in different regions of the world, we support each other’s movements. An important focus is challenging the militarist policies of our own governments. We are not an organisation, but a means of communicating and a formula for action. [http://womeninblack.org/pagina-ejemplo/]

Note 16: [2014 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse official website] [https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/]
Stephen (Steve) Killelea AM is an Australian IT entrepreneur. He began his career, after doing a crash course in computing and working for a computer manufacturer, by developing a product for computer systems management that became internationally successful and led him to set up a US company, Software Products, that went public.

In August 1988, Killelea formed the Australian company Integrated Research, which was listed on the Australian Stock Exchange in 2000. The company's main business is systems management for international corporations such as Visa, Mastercard and American Express; the New York, London and Hong Kong stock exchanges; and most of the world's ATMs. Having stepped down as chief executive November 2004, he is still chairman of the company that now branches into the field of internet telephony. Killelea also has an IT venture capital fund named Smarter Capital, which is one of the investors behind Australian software firm Emagine International.

Killelea is the creative force behind the Global Peace Index study, launched in May 2007, that attempts to rank the world’s nations’ and regions’ peacefulness. The Index is endorsed by the Dalai Lama, Desmond Tutu and Jimmy Carter. He is the founder of the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) which is "analysing the impact of peace on sustainability, defining the 'Peace Industry', estimating the value of peace to the world economy, and uncovering the social structures and social attitudes that are at the core of peaceful societies". In 2013, Steve Killelea’s founding of IEP was recognized as one of the 50 most impactful philanthropic gifts in Australia’s history by a coalition including the Myer Family Company, The Myer Foundation and Sidney Myer Fund, Pro Bono Australia, Swinburne University and Philanthropy Australia. He is also notable as being Australia's largest individual donor to overseas aid. He sits on the advisory board of the Washington DC based Alliance for Peacebuilding and is a member of the Presidents Circle of the Club of Madrid.

In 2008, Killelea was the producer and chief financier for the documentary Soldiers of Peace, which was shown at the 2009 Cannes Film Festival, where it received The Club of Budapest World Ethic Film Award. The documentary also won Best Feature Film at the Monaco International Film Festival.

In June 2010, Steve Killelea was appointed a Member of the Order of Australia for his service to the community through the global peace movement and the provision of humanitarian aid to the developing world. In 2013 he was nominated one of the "Top 100 Most Influential People in Armed Violence Reduction" by the UK group Action on Armed Violence. In 2015, he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steve Killelea]
Signs of the time

Volunteerism, Child-rearing, Indigenous rights
Small matters often register monumental changes that are underway. They can, like leaves and twigs floating in a stream, show us which way the tide is flowing. Everywhere today there are scraps of evidence of a ‘mysterious female’ presence coming back to life.

The Chinese philosophical work of *Dao De Jing*, uses the metaphor of water as the ideal agent of change. Water, although soft and yielding, will eventually wear away stone. Change in this model is to be natural, harmonious and steady, albeit imperceptible.¹ [Note 1: Dao De Jing]

**The rise of voluntarism** This is one such positive sign in our modern Australian society. Millions of Australians engage in voluntary activity: delivering meals on wheels to the elderly or house-bound; coaching sports teams; joining in to clean-up Australia; being part of organisations like the Red Cross, Amnesty, Rotary, Lions and many other community groups. There are also millions donating to charities like Life Line, St. Vincent de Paul, The Red Cross, Save the Children and World Vision.

There is a willingness to help the ‘down and out’. When people hear of anyone suffering they are quick to step up to assist. Part of this attitude may come from our heritage as a nation that has risen from the tribulations of our convict past and the crushing of aboriginal society but it also rests on the fact that Australia has a good standard of living and is peaceful. In such circumstances generosity becomes possible.

**Indigenous people are increasing their participation** in education, business and the arts. The Land Title Act, the *Redfern Speech* and the *Sorry Speech* have contributed to a more reconciliatory attitude between the original inhabitants and the peoples who displaced them. More is being done to give them what they need to achieve their full potential. Not before time either. Indigenous people have struggled since Settlement to have their claims heard. This included several protests over the way they were being treated. One such was the 1946 Aboriginal Stockmen’s Strike. Another was the 1966 Wave Hill Walk-Off. By the 1970’s a Land Rights movement² [Note2: Native Land Rights Movement] had evolved and led finally to The Native Title Act 1993 which established methods for determining Native right to certain lands.³ [Note 3: The Native Title Act 1993]

**A heightened interest in spirituality and self-improvement** is another sign, as is the flight of many from organised religion. Seen by the religious as a problem, it may actually be a sign of the need for change to religious traditions. Some Christian churches are modifying their doctrines and liturgy. The idea of ‘Hell’ has been dropped almost entirely from the lexicon and replaced with more positive themes.

There is **more acceptance of people with differences and disabilities**. Building regulations require alternative access for people in wheel-chairs. Spaces are set aside in theatres where occupants of wheel-chairs can park. Road crossings have ramps. Traffic lights are equipped with sound for individuals who are sight-impaired. There are often sign-language translators at lectures and public events. Disability pensions and carer’s allowances provide assistance for any whose disability prevents them from working. The list goes on.

**Attitudes to child-rearing have changed.** Once it was ‘Spare the rod and spoil the child.’ Thinking back to when I was a young woman in the sixties, I remember how often in public I
saw a screaming child being smacked vigorously by its also screaming mother. I seldom see that now. Child-rearing is informed by better knowledge about child development. Community attitudes have changed. The rights of the child have been enshrined in Declarations by the United Nations. This is not to say every child in Australia has the best possible upbringing. Sadly, this is not yet the case, but there has been considerable improvement and I think we may be confident of more. ⁴ [Note 4: Rights of children]

Corporal punishment is subject to legal regulation in Australia. It is no longer acceptable in schools and increasingly parents are becoming aware of other more effective methods of discipline. ⁵ [Note 5: Physical punishment]

**Australian children are developing a knowledge of and concern for the environment.**

Excellent documentaries appear on our television screens with the beauty and wonder of the universe and the diversity of life on the planet. As the current generation of children mature we may expect to see more concern for animals, for plants, for water and land and the oceans. We will be more aware of the urgency of these issues and willing to put time and effort and our voices behind moves to protect them.

**The issue of child sexual abuse** is being investigated by a Royal Commission and, if followed by concrete and positive action, will lead to more awareness and a safer environment for children. ⁶ [Note 6: Child sexual abuse]

In general men are learning more about the needs of women. There is a willingness by many to accommodate differences, to discuss issues and share decision-making. Some of these changes are fueled by the new freedoms women have obtained—financial security, better wages and working-conditions, more possibilities and prestige, the capacity to leave marriages and partnerships that are not working, better custody arrangements and alimony payments. This is creating an understanding among men that they are no longer completely in the driving seat.

There is a backlash over the increased freedom and equality available to women which is reflected in groups advocating Men’s Rights. Men are confused (as well they might be) by the changing power balance; can no longer control their own destiny. They are hurting from marriages which break up when women are dissatisfied.

It may not be typical of many angry comments from these groups but a comment which comes from a website called Manbook is chilling: ‘We would ask you women to respect our rights as you wish your rights to be respected. If you are unwilling to respect our right to freedom of association do not expect men to respect your right to life. OK?’⁷ [Note 7: From an article in The Saturday Paper (No. 52) ‘Inside men’s rights groups’, by Martin McKenzie Murray]

On the other hand, men of ability and insight are stepping up as **Champions of Change**. Their task is to help raise women to leadership positions in industry. ⁸ [Note 8: Champions of change]

**The change in dress codes** may seem a very small matter, but has freed individuals (particularly women) from social control. In my grand-mother’s era, women wore corsets, petticoats and uncomfortable dresses. Gloves and hats were required on formal occasions.
When women first went swimming in public they swam fully clad and were constrained by tunics and bloomers. Bikinis (or less) are now the norm. Women compete in swimming contests wearing thin speedo-type costumes. They exercise in gymnasiums in skimpy shorts and tops and most women now wear slacks instead of skirts or dresses. Once there was a dress code which demanded conformity. Now it is up to each individual what they choose to wear.

**Women are finding their voices and speaking out.** They are rising in the professions, in business and in politics. Many own their own businesses.⁹ [Note 9: Women working in their own small business]

Women are climbing tall mountains; sailing solo around the world and walking with camels across deserts. They are coming into their own again with confidence and élan. They direct films; conduct orchestras; design buildings; speak as leaders on the world stage; inspire millions with their selfless lives; dedicate themselves to science and medicine and research and put their lives on the line in dangerous places as reporters and volunteers. Women are increasingly free to pursue their goals.

Their message is an ancient one which has been driven underground for centuries but now finds conditions suitable for its re-emergence. Female strengths are subtle, enduring and powerful without being overly aggressive. They are consensual rather than adversarial.

A 2015 intervention into the tax debate highlighted the positive effect of female engagement. While the Prime Minister and the Opposition Leader traded blows and refused to consider options in a balanced manner, the leaders of ACOSS (Australian Council of Social Services) the BCA (The Business Council of Australia) and the ACTU (Australian Council of Trade Unions) joined forces to introduce a plan to increase revenue, fairness and productivity.¹⁰ [Note 10: Joint plan by BCA, ACOSS and the ACTU to tackle revenue shortfalls]. This unusual cooperation between the welfare sector, business community and the trade unions was arranged by three capable women leaders—Dr. Cassandra Goldie, CEO of ACOSS,¹¹ [Note 11: Dr. Cassandra Goldie], Jennifer Westagott, Chief executive of BCA,¹² [Note 12: Jennifer Westagott] and Ged Kearny, President of the ACTU,¹³ [Note 13: Ged Kearny] who saw the value of cooperation.

Professor Karen Healy¹⁴ [Note 14: Professor Karen Healy] National President of the AASW (Australian Association of Social Workers) was swift to support the proposal.¹⁵ [Support for joint tax proposal]

Seeing the steady rise of female fortunes gives me cause to think social evolution is turning a corner in this part of the world. I am making these observations about Australian conditions. Clearly, many of the changes occurring here are not occurring everywhere in the world. Australia has some special advantages and perhaps will show the world a way back to a partnership society.
Chapter 4  Signs of the times


Note 2: The passing of Aboriginal land rights legislation in Australia was preceded by a number of important Aboriginal protests, including the 1946 Aboriginal Stockmen's Strike, the 1963 Yolngu Bark Petition, and the 1966 Wave Hill Walk-Off, as well as the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966 (SA), which established the South Australian Aboriginal Lands Trust. However, it was not until the 1970s, when indigenous Australians (both Australian Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders) became more politically active, that there emerged powerful movement for the recognition of Aboriginal land rights.

In 1971, Justice Richard Blackburn of the Supreme Court of the Northern Territory ruled against the Yolngu in *Milirrpum v Nabalco Pty Ltd* (the "Gove land rights case") under the principle of *terra nullius*. However, Justice Blackburn did acknowledge the claimants' ritual and economic use of the land and that they had an established system of law (Madayin). In this way, this was the first significant legal case for Aboriginal Land Rights in Australia.

In the wake of Milirrpum, the Aboriginal Land Rights Commission (also known as the "Woodward Royal Commission") was established in the Northern Territory in 1973. This Royal Commission, chaired by Justice Woodward, made a number of recommendations in favour of recognising Aboriginal Land Rights. Taking up many of these recommendations, the Whitlam Labor Government introduced an Aboriginal Land Rights Bill to Parliament; however, this lapsed upon the dismissal of the government in 1975. The succeeding conservative government, led by Malcolm Fraser, reintroduced a Bill, though not of the same content, and it was signed by the Governor-General of Australia on 16 December 1976.

The Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1976 established the basis upon which Aboriginal people in the Northern Territory could claim rights to land based on traditional occupation. The statute, the first of the Aboriginal land rights acts, was significant in that it allowed a claim of title if claimants could provide evidence of their traditional association with land. Four Land Councils were established in the Northern Territory under this law.

The Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1976 established a procedure that transferred almost 50 per cent of land in the Northern Territory (around 600 000 km2) to collective Indigenous ownership. The subsequent Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act 1981 had a similar effect in South Australia.

In 1981 South Australian Premier David Tonkin returned 102,650 square kilometres of land (10.2% of the state's land area) to the Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara people. The land rights legislation was introduced by Premier Don Dunstan in November 1978, several months prior to his resignation from Parliament. An amended bill, following extensive consultation, was passed by the Tonkin Liberal Government. In 1984 Premier John Bannon's Labor Government passed legislation to return lands to the Maralinga Tjarutja people. The legislation was proclaimed in January 1985 and was followed by a ceremony in the desert attended by Maralinga Tjarutja leader Archie Barton, John Bannon and Aboriginal Affairs Minister Greg Crafter. In May 2004, following the passage of special legislation, Premier Mike Rann handed back title to 21,000 square kilometres of land to the Maralinga Tjarutja and Pila Nguru people. The land, 1000 km Northwest of Adelaide and abutting the Western Australia border, was then called the Unnamed Conservation Park. It is now known as Mamumgari Conservation Park. It includes the Serpentine Lakes and was the largest land return since 1984. At the 2004 ceremony, Premier Rann said the return of the land fulfilled a promise he made to Archie Barton in 1991 when he was Aboriginal Affairs Minister after he passed legislation to return lands including the sacred Ooldea area (which also included the site of Daisy Bates' mission camp) to the Maralinga Tjarutja people. The Maralinga Tjarutja lands now total 102,863 square kilometres.

Paul Coe, in *Coe v Commonwealth* (1979), attempted (unsuccessfully) to bring a class action on behalf of all Aborigines claiming all of Australia.

---

*NOTES:*

---

Paul Coe, in *Coe v Commonwealth* (1979), attempted (unsuccessfully) to bring a class action on behalf of all Aborigines claiming all of Australia.
In 1995 the Indigenous Land Corporation was established by the Federal Government to assist Indigenous Australians to acquire land and manage Indigenous held land sustainably and in a manner that provides cultural, social, economic and environmental benefits for themselves and future generations. The corporation is funded by an annual payment from the investment returns of the Australian Government’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Account. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aboriginal_land_rights_in_Australia February 16, 2015]

Note 3: The Native Title Act 1993 (“NTA”) is a law passed by the Australian Parliament the purpose of which is “to provide a national system for the recognition and protection of native title and for its co-existence with the national land management system”. The Act was passed by the Keating Government following the High Court’s decision in Mabo v Queensland (No 2) (1992). The Act commenced operation on 1 January 1994. This legislation aimed to codify the Mabo decision and implemented strategies to facilitate the process of recognising native title. The Act also established the National Native Title Tribunal, to register, hear and determine native title claims. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Native_Title_Act_1993 February 16, 2015]

Note 4: Rights of children. The League of Nations adopted the Geneva Declaration of the Rights of the Child (1924), which enunciated the child’s right to receive the requirements for normal development, the right of the hungry child to be fed, the right of the sick child to receive health care, the right of the backward child to be reclaimed, the right of orphans to shelter, and the right to protection from exploitation. The United Nations General Assembly adopted the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child (1959), which enunciated ten principles for the protection of children’s rights, including the universality of rights, the right to special protection, and the right to protection from discrimination, among other rights. Consensus on defining children’s rights has become clearer in the last fifty years. A 1973 publication by Hillary Clinton (then an attorney) stated that children’s rights were a “slogan in need of a definition”. According to some researchers, the notion of children’s rights is still not well defined, with at least one proposing that there is no singularly accepted definition or theory of the rights held by children. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Children’s_rights February 15, 2015]

Note 5: The degree of physical punishment that a parent or carer can use with a child is subject to legal regulation in Australia. In most states and territories, corporal punishment by a parent or carer is lawful provided that it is carried out for the purpose of correction, control or discipline, and that it is “reasonable” having regard to:

- the age of the child;
- the method of punishment;
- the child’s capacity for reasoning (i.e., whether the child is able to comprehend correction/discipline); and
- the harm caused to the child (Bourke, 1981).

Corporal punishment that results in bruising, marking or other injury lasting longer than a 24-hour period may be deemed to be "unreasonable" and thus classified as physical abuse. [https://www3.aifs.gov.au/cfca/publications/corporal-punishment-key-issues February 15, 2015]

Note 6: In November 2012, a senior officer of the NSW Police revealed that he was stood down from his investigation while he was compiling "explsive" evidence from a key witness and that "......the church covers up, silences victims, hinders police investigations, alerts offenders, destroys evidence and moves priests to protect the good name of the church". On 9 November 2012, the Premier of New South Wales, Barry O’Farrell, announced the appointment of a Special Commission of Inquiry into allegations raised about police handling of abuse by clergy in the Roman Catholic Church in the Hunter region. The commission is headed by Margaret Cunneen SC. On 12 November 2012, Prime Minister Julia Gillard announced that she would be recommending to the Governor-General the creation of a Royal Commission. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Royal_Commission_into_Institutional_Responses_to_Child_Sexual_Abuse February 16, 2015]

Note 7: Men’s rights groups [From an article in The Saturday Paper (No. 52) ‘Inside men’s rights groups’, by Martin McKenzie Murray]
Note 8: **Champions of change:** In April 2010, Commissioner Broderick was instrumental in bringing together some of Australia’s most influential and diverse male CEOs and Chairpersons to form the Male Champions of Change group. The group aims to use their individual and collective influence and commitment to ensure the issue of women’s representation in leadership is elevated on the national business agenda. [https://www.humanrights.gov.au/male-champions-change February 14, 2015]

Note 9: **Women working in their own small business** In 1994-95 there were 310,000 women working in their own business, nearly 33 per cent of people working in their own business. Over the period 1984-85 to 1994-95, this has grown from 225,000, which was 30 per cent of people working in their own business. The average annual growth rate of women working in their own business over this period has been 3.3 per cent. This compares to an average annual growth of men working in their own business (518,000 in 1984-85 to 639,000 in 1994-95) of 2.1 per cent. [http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats February 14, 2015]

Note 10: **Joint plan to by BCA, ACOSS, ACTU to tackle revenue shortfalls**

Today the Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS), the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) and the Business Council of Australia (BCA) released a joint statement outlining how the three organisations will cooperate to tackle entrenched disadvantage through collaborative action.

The statement is the first of its kind in Australia and outlines a shared commitment by the three peak bodies to work collaboratively towards:
- providing employment opportunities for Australians who are disadvantaged in the labour market; and
- giving employers access to workers who meet their skills needs.

“Our organisations share a belief that well-managed economic growth shared amongst all Australians is the key to enduring prosperity and is the best way to tackle entrenched disadvantage,” said Australian Council of Social Service Chief Executive Cassandra Goldie, speaking on behalf of the collaboration.

Our vision for shared prosperity is based on the following key principles:
- a strong economy with competitive businesses and enterprises
- robust public institutions that engender confidence
- healthy, safe, productive and fair workplaces
- greater access to employment for those currently missing out
- access to lifelong education and training opportunities
- a social safety net that provides adequate income support without impeding transition to work
- effective and efficient support services targeted to those in most need.

“Everyone wins if we can bring people currently excluded from the labour market into regular decent work that is productive and delivers a fair income in conditions of freedom, equity and security in line with human dignity. This is one of the best ways to ensure that prosperity is shared by people who are currently missing out,” Ms Goldie said.

“The joint statement represents a commitment from our three organisations to contribute to enduring prosperity for all Australians by focusing on the areas of common ground between us rather than those areas we disagree on.

“By working together collaboratively it has become clear that we actually share many common aspirations and agree on many important principles. To that end this alliance will:

- convene an expert roundtable to discuss best practice policies that support ‘demand-led’ employment assistance for disadvantaged jobseekers;
- investigate options for better linking of pre-employment training initiatives with demand-led approaches; and
- host a forum to explore the importance of reducing inequality and entrenched disadvantage for Australia’s future economic growth and prosperity.
“All three organisations believe that by working together we will be able to achieve better social outcomes for Australia. We can reduce poverty and reliance on social security, and at the same time, grow the economy,” Ms Goldie said.

“Cooperation is fundamental to achieving lasting reform, which is essential to building enduring prosperity,” Business Council President Tony Shepherd said.

“Business wants to see all Australians in a position to contribute to and benefit from economic growth. Growth is fundamental to prosperity but we know that it must be well managed, it must be fair and there must be equality of opportunity.”

Ged Kearney, President of the ACTU, said: “There are groups of people in Australia – long-term unemployed, people with fewer skills, women caring for a child alone, people with disabilities, many Indigenous Australians, as well as people new to Australia – who remain excluded from society.

“We must ensure that everyone, irrespective of background or position in society, has the opportunity to participate in, contribute to, and benefit from our shared prosperity.

“If we can bring people currently excluded from the labour market into regular decent work, we can reduce poverty, enhance human dignity, and improve the economy,” Ms Kearney said.

“This alliance shares the vision that pursuing social and economic objectives at the same time is in our nation’s long-term interest,” Ms Kearney said. [http://www.acoss.org.au/media_release/ACOSS_welcomes_BCA_call_for_long_term_plan_and_strong_relationship_with_com]

Note 11: Dr. Cassandra Goldie
Many readers would have heard that Cassandra Goldie was recently appointed as CEO of the Australian Council of Social Service. As such, she is now one of the main leaders of the Not for Profit sector in Australia. But where does she come from, what makes her tick, and why? David James, Co-publisher of Pro Bono Australia, went in search of answers. Cassandra Goldie believes in the law. Her conviction about the importance of the law comes through strongly during our hour chat on the phone. She is also, I discover, engaging, positive, energetic, and highly articulate. Cassandra believes that, through the law, we can make the world a better place. This is not, for her, a matter of high theory, an ideology. Rather, she emphasises, “It’s about a practical approach”, which “remains a consistent theme through all my work”. Cassandra formed this view as a young woman, which is why she headed from her high school in Perth to study law at the University of Western Australia. “But, like many young people, I soon learned that the legal profession directs most of its efforts towards people who can pay. Many people who need justice can’t afford it.” So: not for her a lucrative career as a partner in a corporate law firm. Where did she head to after graduating? “It helps to think in five year blocks,” she offers. For the first five year block, she travelled overseas, completed further studies in the UK, which is where she became involved in human rights. Rejecting the possibility of a life of academia, she returned to Australia, and joined the Legal Aid Western Australia, ending up as Solicitor-in-Charge of Client Services, cutting her legal teeth working with people who could not afford private lawyers. Then it was off to the tropical heat of Darwin, and out of the strictures of a large semi-government body. For this five years stint, she was Principal Solicitor of the Darwin Community Legal Centre – small, financially strapped, but working even closer with those most in need of access to legal services. Then – and, yes, for a further five years – she studied her PhD – its Dr. Cassandra Goldie, LLB, Masters, PhD, to give her full and proper title. “Congratulations on finishing, many don’t”, I offer. “Umm…I do remember sitting besides the pool in Darwin reading a booklet on ‘How to get your PHD done quickly!” No doubt Cassandra would have completed her doctorate more quickly if she had not also set up the Homelessness Legal Rights Project, at UNSW; a clearing house on legal and human rights for homeless people and a core part of the hub of newly emerging homeless people legal clinics. And if she had not also worked internationally, as the Asia-Pacific Consultant for the Centre of Housing Rights and Evictions. As is usually the case, the subject of a doctorate tells us much about the author. Cassandra’s title: Living in Public Spaces, a Human Rights Wasteland? It focuses on the legal status and needs of one of the most disadvantaged groups in Australia: people who live in the “long grass” around Darwin, whose are regularly moved on and criminalised. Using human rights law, Cassandra mounts a critique, and a direct challenge, to the Darwin City Council’s bylaw that bans sleeping in public places between sunset and sunrise. The themes of law, human rights, social justice - and a practical approach – shine
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through. Next. The now Dr. Goldie then joined the Australian Human Rights Commission (formally known as the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission, for those of us yet to catch up with the name change), as Director of Sex and Age Discrimination. It was a period of significant achievement. After a listening tour in 2007, the Commission put paid parental leave firmly on its agenda. Extraordinarily, come 2010, both Labor and the Coalition, with the support of the Greens, took major policies on this issue into the last election (with the Coalition ‘outbidding’ Labor with a more generous scheme funded by a new tax on big business). Cassandra is quick to point out that this achievement resulted from a broad based campaign that attracted support from many sectors.

Yes. And. The ball has to be formed, and then rolled up the hill. And the Commission was instrumental in this process. Another big achievement was reform of the Sex Discrimination Act, which had not been looked at for a quarter century. The Commission’s research on Equal Employment Opportunity legislation showed that Australia had actually been going backwards over the last decade, in terms of representation of women at senior executive and Board levels. That’s why, from January 1, 2011, public companies will be required to report every year on the representation of women on their Boards and in senior management. And if, over the next five years, their performance does not improve, then they will face the prospect of legislation. Well done the Commission; well done Cassandra. Cassandra was appointed as new CEO of ACOSS, commencing a week into the election, replacing Clare Martin, who has returned to Darwin. She is not new to the COSS world: In Darwin, she soon joined the NT COSS Board, and was soon elected its President and, through that, was soon a member of the ACOSS Board. She was also ACOSS’s Law and Justice Policy Advisor for several years. In her new role, Cassandra seems to have cemented her commitment to social justice, which includes the somewhat legalistic remit of human rights law and equity in legal representation, and extends well beyond. “What is your personal philosophy?”, is my closing, and perhaps unfair question; not the easiest question, especially on a Monday afternoon on the phone. Cassandra does not hesitate: “Human rights starts at home. It is about the small things in our personal lives, in our homes, in our work places – and then all the way through to the big national and international agendas”, she says, “it’s about the fundamental values of fairness and equity, expressed through our personal lives, the life of our society, and all our institutions. That is what we need.” Having served on the ACOSS Board myself, many years ago, it was affirming, exciting even, to hear Cassandra’s positive, energetic, intelligent approach to the Not for Profit sector and the people it serves. ACOSS can look forward to an exciting and productive next five years.

Note 12: Jennifer Westacott

Chief Executive of the Business Council of Australia since 2011, bringing extensive policy experience in both the public and private sectors. For over 20 years Jennifer occupied critical leadership positions in the New South Wales and Victorian governments. She was the Director of Housing and the Secretary of Education in Victoria, and most recently was the Director-General of the New South Wales Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources.

From 2005 to 2011 Jennifer was senior partner at KPMG, heading up the firm’s Sustainability, Climate Change and Water practice and its NSW State Government practice. Jennifer was also a board director for the firm. During her time at KPMG, Jennifer advised some of Australia’s major corporations on climate change and sustainability matters, and provided advice to governments around Australia on major reform priorities.

Jennifer facilitates the contribution of the Business Council of Australia’s CEO members across a policy agenda that includes economic policy and competitiveness; regulation; infrastructure and sustainable growth; labour market, skills and education; engagement with Indigenous Australians; global engagement; healthcare policy; and innovation.
Jennifer coordinated the development and release of the BCA’s landmark Action Plan for Enduring Prosperity in 2013, which is widely recognised as one of the most significant contributions to economic policy debate in Australia in recent years.

Jennifer has a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) from the University of New South Wales, where she is an Adjunct Professor at the City Research Futures Centre. She was a Chevening Scholar at the London School of Economics.

Jennifer is a National Fellow of the Institute of Public Administration Australia and a Fellow of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and since 2013 has been a Non-Executive Director of Wesfarmers Limited and Chair of the Mental Health Council of Australia.

Note 13: Ged Kearny President, Australian Council of Trade Unions

Gerardine "Ged" Kearney (born 29 October 1963) is an Australian trade unionist. Since 2010 she has been the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, the peak trade union organisation in that country.

[She] was born the second-youngest of nine children in the Melbourne suburb of Richmond, her father being a publican. She qualified as a registered nurse in 1985 and participated in the nurses’ strike in 1986. She also gained a Bachelor of Education. She worked as a nurse and nurse educator, including a period managing clinical nurse education at Austin Health.

She was elected an official of the Australian Nursing Federation in 1997. She served as Assistant Federal Secretary, Federal President and Victorian Branch President, before being appointed Federal Secretary of the Federation in April 2008.

Following the departure of Sharan Burrow, Kearney was elected President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions from 1 July 2010.

On 31 May 2013 she indicated she was considering nominating for Australian Labor Party preselection for the seat of Batman in the Australian House of Representatives, to contest the 2013 federal election (at that time scheduled for 14 September). The seat was to become vacant following the retirement of Martin Ferguson prior to the election. On 1 June, she said she had decided not to seek pre-selection. Ged Kearney has four adult children. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ged_Kearney]

Note 14: Professor Karen Healey

Positions:
- Research Director for the School of Social Work and Human Services
- National President, Australian Association of Social Workers (current)
- National Director, The Benevolent Society (current)

Mail Address:
School of Social Work & Human Services
Chamberlain Building, Campbell Road
The University of Queensland
St Lucia, 4072

Contact Details:
Telephone: +61 7 336 51847
Fax: +61 7 3365 1788
Email: k.healy@uq.edu.au
Office:
Room 327
Chamberlain Building
St Lucia Campus
The University of Queensland

Academic & Research Interests:
Social work theory and practice, social work education and workforce development, child protection and family support, service user participation and empowerment.

Teaching Areas:
Direct practice, social work theory and social work with children, young people and families.

Note 15: Support for joint tax proposal

AASW response to the Joint Statement by ACOSS, ACTU and BCA Cooperation to tackle disadvantage

The Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW) strongly supports the joint statement released this week (Opportunity for All) from the Australian Council of Social Services (ACOSS), the Business Council of Australia (BCA) and the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) in relation to a collaborative approach to tackling disadvantage in the Australian community, with particular emphasis on workforce.

In August 2012, the AASW lodged a submission with the Australian Senate relating to the disadvantage experienced by people caught in the social security system, with particular emphasis on Newstart allowance. In this submission the AASW argues that “it is necessary to separate the consideration of the adequacy of allowance payments as a form of guaranteed minimum income and relief of poverty from employment related processes and incentives to work, study or care for others”. The AASW also argued that: “in-work credits to supplement low incomes and out-of-work allowances to encourage study, workforce participation and sustainable independent living should be seen as labour market programs rather than as an element of an integrated income security system. Efforts to increase workforce participation and provide incentives to work need to relate to the level of economic activity and unemployment without placing destructive pressures on those that have not been successful in gaining employment.” [http://www.aasw.asn.au/document/item/3657]
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Governance within a Partnership Society

Neither Utopia
nor Anarchy
How can we begin to remodel a whole society upon partnership principles?

It isn’t an easy question, but it’s not as if we need to start from zero. Australia has covered a lot of ground already in moving from a Gladiatorial Model towards a Partnership Model.

The journey began far away and a long time ago in Greece with the invention of the rudiments of democracy—not for all but with a degree of equality previously unknown. Governance was once the divine right of kings and dictators but has moved steadily with the blood of martyrs and the efforts of wise people (often men—although perhaps nudged in the background by their wives or mothers or sisters) towards a more egalitarian model—perhaps even by women whose names have not been recorded in a history written by men.

It is the same with the principle of law. There were times when the only law was the word of the King or High Priest. Decisions were taken at his whim. The invention of laws that were the same for everyone and to which everyone (including leaders) was subject was a major step forward in the civilizing efforts of humanity. Not every country in our present world operates within the jurisdiction of laws made by a democratically-elected government, but at the very least, the principle is widely acknowledged as best practice.

Where to from here?

The Law, by its nature, is very prescriptive. It is a formula applied to every situation equally. It is modified to an extent by judicial involvement, but is none-the-less somewhat rigid. This is its strength, but also its weakness.

For example, for a very long time women who turned on their husbands after years of violence and battering were simply charged and convicted of murder. Well, why not? They killed someone—often in a premeditated way. Only recently have the presumptions behind this way of viewing their actions been questioned. Circumstances, intent and provocation are now considered.

Women are not physically strong. They can be conflicted by emotions of loyalty and love and often stay in a violent situation either for the sake of their children or because of fear and uncertainty. Until recently they had no property or wealth of their own. Battered, they had little way to respond effectively. Only when a man was sleeping or unwary could they disable him. The law made no allowance for these circumstances, so their crime was pre-meditated.

Why was this not observed sooner? Well, until very recently wives were the property of their husbands.

A 90-year old woman told me about leaving her husband in the fifties. The law at the time said she could take just two suit-cases and a sewing machine with her. Her husband subsequently gave her nothing else. After years of dedicated service to her family and work on the property, she received nothing and spent years in poverty. Even if the law had been more equal, she would have had insufficient means to promote her cause.¹ [Note 1: The emancipation of women]

The Law can only be as good as society and laws are made in parliaments filled mainly by men who have a dominating attitude to women. Their perceptions circle around their own
interests. They are often (although not always, of course) of a gladiatorial bent and believe everyone should fight for their own interests and if they don’t then they deserve what they get. Many have, by training and instinct, been desensitised to emotional or intangible conditions.

**Parliament**

The first requirement of change will be to **rebalance numbers in the parliament**. Diversity is one key to the improvement of the law. Alpha males will give way first to other males, then to women, people of other cultures, youth, and the disadvantaged of all types.

A cultural change will be necessary in the way parliament is conducted. At present, it is an adversarial contest and in some respects, has almost become a blood sport—very ‘gladiatorial’. This affect women even before they get in to parliament. Behind the scenes, the fighting is even dirtier. Bill Shorten’s battle for preselection in Maribyrnong reminds us how different women’s strengths are. No wonder there are fewer women in parliament. In general, female strengths are subtle, enduring and powerful without being overly-aggressive. Fighting dirty is much more difficult for most of them. We NEED equal numbers of men and women in the parliament. NOW. ‘Equality is not a concept. It is a necessity (Josh Whedon).’

I ask myself if there is a better way for women to obtain pre-selection? A partnership way. Consensus rather than competition. Quotas? Yes. Total membership ballots? Yes. Lists? Yes. In fact, whatever clever minds can devise to bring it about.

Do we want women to fight like blokes if the very qualities they are needed for in the parliament are put at risk while they fight their way through?

There are other structural ways the parliament could be changed for the better. For example, Members of Parliament often do their work in small committee groups which consider Bills in detail. Membership of the committees includes parliamentary representation from various parties as well as independent members. This Parliamentary Committee system allows a modicum of decent, intelligent conversation between people of different views. If it were strengthened it would allow less belligerent parliamentarians a voice. The outcomes of committee discussions need to be publicised and social media would allow this to occur in one way or another. The conduct of Question Time in parliament could be restructured to create a less adversarial atmosphere. Ministers might give updates on the business of their departments which could then become the basis for questions.

Parliament needs to be **more about a consensus of views** (dare I say ‘compromise’?) than a conquest by the strongest. Now, you say, you are asking the impossible. Not at all. It could happen. What it will require is assistance (pressure?) from outside the parliament.

One novel idea is the establishment of an organisation to ‘**allow people to work together to create complex policy solutions to difficult problems**’. The organisation would formulate a ‘concise, clearly understood statement of purpose that centres on respect for people across the generations, on a better environment and on a sustainable economy...and this would become the yardstick.’ Citizens could join the organisation and would take part (through social media) in policy formulation. While this is a simple overview of a well-worked idea, the idea has merit and there are other ideas available with similar goals of capitalising on public
knowledge and goodwill to devise solutions to policy issues.² [Note 2: Tim Flannery and Catriona Wallace: FIXING POLITICS] The authors claim the old political system seems to have reached breaking point and they make a good point.

There are already organisations like The Australia Institute (whose goal is ‘to develop new ideas and practical policy solutions that a progressive Australia needs’) and the Institute of Public Affairs (‘an independent, non-profit public policy think tank, dedicated to preserving and strengthening the foundations of economic and political freedom.’) but they do not appear to have engaged with the wider community to develop policy ideas.³ [Note 3: Think Tanks]

Parties dominate policy discussion. Because individuals have little chance of being elected without the support of a political party, when elected, they conform to the views of their party and curb their real opinions to stay in favour. In a similar way, political parties need finance to publicise their views and seek donations from groups to whom they then owe policy favours. What a catch 22. Members of parliament (except for independents, but them sometimes also) are effectively side-lined. Add to that the pressures from the electorate in a 50% plus one takes all election, progressive voices are silenced. Major Parties batter the electorate with slogans, and repetitive nonsense somewhat like TV advertising we have all learned to ignore or mock.

The Australian Democrats, formed in 1977 and, holding the balance of power in the upper house of the federal parliament for many of the 30 years the Party survived, fore-shadowed a way of doing politics worthy of consideration.

Australian Democrat MPs were not bound to a party-line. They could (and often did) exercise their right to a conscience vote. They were capable of compromise and endeavoured to achieve progressive outcomes of benefit not just to vested interests but for all Australians.

Party members could call for a leadership ballot and they participated in policy-formation. It must be said that voting for policies was complicated and time-consuming however participatory policy development would be easier with present-day advanced technology.

Members of the party had a common belief that policy making should be far-sighted—not just for the immediate future and not simply in the interests of an insular Australia. It needed to be future-orientated and to have a global perspective.

While the Australian Democrats didn’t always exhibit tolerance and compassion among themselves, it was among their guiding principles and certainly their policies reflected the concern they had for less well-favoured groups in society—Aboriginal communities, the poor, women, workers, the LGBT community. In their public statements, they tried to speak honestly and sensibly and not to ‘spin’. They wanted to problem-solve rather than denigrate opponents or enhance their own profile. They were also early environmental protectors and made significant progress in that area.

They mainly won seats in upper houses because of the proportional representation method of voting and this may be the answer to some of the electorate pressures politicians and political parties face. Proportional representation (PR) is used in the upper houses of most
Australian Parliaments. Because it is based on a quota system, it allows the election of voices representing otherwise disadvantaged groups.

An interesting, although seldom reported, fact about the Australian Democrats is the huge involvement of women in the party and the rise of capable women to leadership. Haines, Powell, Kernot, Lees, Stott Despoja and Allison were all remarkable leaders and brought aspects of the female spirit to the Senate. One example that stands out for me is the cooperative way Lyn Allison handled the Health Minister’s veto over RU486—the nonsurgical abortion option. Lyn was the fifth woman to lead the party and one of the last Democrat senators. She led the party from 2004 to 2008. She was progressive in women’s rights, winning the fight against a veto over RU486, the nonsurgical abortion option. The struggle showed the importance of women in the Parliament because many men opposed RU486, which had the support of almost 90% of the women parliamentarians. Allison says: ‘It took months of patient negotiation to even get a vote on anything to do with women’s reproductive health despite the serious threats by the health minister and others to limit access to abortion. We could have gone it alone but opted in the end for co-sponsorship because, although the accolades would have to be shared, this made a win on the ground much more likely’.⁴ [Lyn Allison]

Present political parties might take on-board the possibility of change, although of all the optimism I can manage about various issues in society, change within political parties and religious groups taxes my abilities most. They are bound up in ideology and fixed views. It seems their security—almost their being—depends on these views being preserved. We might have to go around them!

If progressive policy decisions begin to flow from a regenerated parliament there will be an opportunity for the judicial system to modify some of their strict application of ‘The Law’. ‘The Law’ could then have more built-in flexibility for the wisdom of judges and empanelled jurors. Perhaps also, the composition of the judicial system will become more representative of the community.

The legal system has recognized the worth of mediation processes. Mediation is already working satisfactorily to resolve inter-personal conflicts, but also in several other areas including industrial relations. Many conflicts simply do not lend themselves to a yes/no answer which is the basis of much law. Properly-conducted mediation is often more appropriate.

The law is a flawed institution and mistakes are not uncommon. People have been sent to prison for things they haven’t done or for which they should have received a lesser punishment. I came across one such story recently. A young man of reasonable character became annoyed with the behaviour of another man towards women and ended up punching him. Our young man was represented in court by a young lawyer appointed by the State as his counsel. The lawyer asked the court for bail which was refused as he had been accused of ‘glassing’ which is a serious crime. He was sentenced to six months’ jail on a ‘Grievous bodily harm’ charge and served five and a half months. He felt aggrieved so sold his motor-bike to pay another lawyer $4000 to appeal the sentence. It was clear there had been no ‘glassing’. Either it was a false claim or the person punched was mistaken. Our young man should have
been eligible for release on bail but accused may only have one bail application and that had already been refused. Other aspects of the case could have been considered. The young man currently in jail seldom drank mainly because he suffered from epilepsy and the medicine for this condition did not sit well with alcohol. On this occasion, he had decided not to take the medicine and to have a couple of drinks. Would this have changed his behaviour? We don’t know. What we do know is that ‘justice’ in this case was hasty and ill-informed. A mediation process may have picked up on some of these issues.

**Prison reform**

Australia no longer has capital punishment or corporal punishment in its legal system. What we do have is a penal system which almost denies individuals the chance to rehabilitate themselves. It is more concerned with retaliation than with rehabilitation. Most parents understand punishment is less effective than redirection, why can we not apply this adage to the criminal justice system?

Criminal justice could be improved by devising ‘punishments’ that ‘fit the crime’—by sending fewer non-violent offenders to a prison but rather reducing their freedoms within the community while engaging them in activities to redress the harm they have caused. Not only could this be marginally less expensive, but it might also lead to less recidivism. What could be better than reforming offenders instead of further harming them? ⁵ [Note 5: Crime and Punishment]

It would also allow families to stay connected. The present system punishes not only offenders but whole families. Keeping non-violent offenders out of jail would benefit their children, their partners, and their parents. It would keep them in a more normal setting and not mixing with other offenders where they might be harmed or influenced to further crime.

Prisons would then only contain violent and dangerous individuals and even for them a humane attitude would be adopted. They would have visitors, amenities such as libraries and educational opportunities, psychological and medical assistance to redress their problems. We need to remember that most criminals do not remain in prison for the term of their lives. They will be released sooner or later and the more they can do to improve their behaviour, the better it will be for society.

We need to remind ourselves constantly that redemption from a gladiator type society to a partnership society will happen over the long term. In the first flush of activism we want everything to happen immediately. ‘What do we want? When do we want it? NOW!’ However, while we need to be patient and persistent, we can be consoled by the thought that if we are all clear where we are heading, change may happen sooner.
Chapter 5  Governance within a partnership society

Note 1:  The emancipation of women  The end of the Victorian era has seen the ending of many long established forms of social organisation. Relevantly for the present discussion, this included the beginning of the end of male dominance and the growth in the emancipation of women. It has been a slow process, which is by no means complete. Its steps, therefore, are not always discernible, until the reaching of some milestone, like achieving women’s votes, the admission of women to higher education, as members of parliament, as medical or legal practitioners and judges, as members of the police, the military, the clergy, including even bishops, and many other professions that were once closed to women.

Even today, however, at the beginning of a new millennium, some of these steps are still in their infancy. Where there have been breakthroughs, they have not yet resulted in anything like complete equality in fact, as well as in law. While women have been admitted to professions and careers on ostensibly equal terms that were formerly closed to them, their advancement in these professions has, in many cases, been significantly slower than that of their male counterparts. The saying that there is always room at the top must sound, to many young women embarking on a professional career as a cruel joke. Thus, in the legal profession, for example, most of the top positions are almost invariably filled by men. Justice Michael Kirby, of the High Court of Australia described the situation in a recent address:

Although women now represent about 50 percent of the graduates of Australia’s law schools, five years after graduation there has been a big attrition. Women are significantly under-represented among the partners of law firms. They tend to congregate at the lower scale of earnings. Often, they are confined to less interesting work. A survey of the Victorian bar in July 1998 showed that women tend to be disproportionately engaged in shorter cases and cases involving family and criminal law. Men still get the lion’s share of big, important cases. Women are less likely to be briefed regularly than men. Among the 10 largest Melbourne law firms, 91 percent went to male barristers.

What is important, however, for the purpose of the present discussion, is the realisation that the road to equality is no longer closed. As we look forward into the future, we may be conscious today of the limitations, of the obstacles with which that road is still littered. It is only when we look back that we become aware of the big steps forward that have been taken. They have resulted in a significant widening of the parameters of gender expectation, both among women and among the general public. With that comes a belief, amounting to a firm conviction, that the road ahead is not closed to the eventual achievement of complete and effective equality.


Henry Finlay, BA, LLB, PhD
Associate Professor of Law, University of Tasmania
122 Nelson Road, Sandy Bay, Tasmania, Australia, 7006

Presentation to a seminar at the Australian Institute of Family Studies, 20 September 2001


Note 4: Lyn Allison Quoted from 30 Years Australian Democrats, p.46ff

Note 5: In [his book] Crime & Punishment, Russell Marks argues that the lives of most criminal offenders—and indeed of many victims of crime—are marked by often staggering disadvantage. For many offenders, prison only increases their chances of committing further crimes. And despite what some media outlets and politicians want us to believe, harsher sentences do not help most victims to heal.
According to conventional wisdom, severely punishing offenders reduces the likelihood that they’ll offend again. Why, then, do so many who go to prison continue to commit crimes after their release? What do we actually know about offenders and the reasons they break the law?

Drawing on his experience as a lawyer, Marks eloquently makes the case for restorative justice and community correction, whereby offenders are obliged to engage with victims and make amends. Crime & Punishment is a provocative call for change to a justice system in desperate need of renewal. [http://www.blackincbooks.com/books/crime-and-punishment February 14, 2015]
Husbands and wives within a Partnership Society

A relationship built on equality and respect
In Australia, the relationship between husbands and wives has improved a great deal during the preceding 200 years. A wife can now have independent means, equal rights within the marriage and the capacity to divorce and to receive compensation for contributions to a marriage. A huge change really but, as with other aspects of social change, the process still has further to go. After divorce, for example, while the process isn't easy for either party, a higher proportion of women and children are impoverished than are men. Apart from anything else, this has ramifications for the well-being of children.

Women do not enjoy the same levels of pay as men and a lot of effort is going towards rectifying this problem. The voices of many have been joined recently by Pope Francis:

In 2014 Pope Francis strongly urged Christians to endorse the struggle for equality between men and women. Of equal pay for similar work he said, ‘Why is it expected that women must earn less than men? They have the same rights. The disparity is a pure scandal.’¹

While looking for evidence of progress made in formal relationships between husbands and wives, I found an interesting historical over-view in a presentation to a 2001 seminar at the Australian Institute of Family Studies by Henry Finlay, then Associate Professor of Law, University of Tasmania. The presentation recounts the history of divorce within the British and Australian contexts but also gives an insight into the state of ‘wedded bliss’ during the history of Britain and Australia.

Finlay’s account describes the situation in the early part of the 19th century.² [Note 2: The role of a wife] ‘A wife was legally a complete nonentity. Her function in life was to ‘love, honour and obey’. A married woman’s total dependence on her husband was reinforced by a social system that was built upon that dependence. With all her worldly goods, she had endowed him. Being under coverture, she was completely under his tutelage without any legal rights of her own.’

Progress

In 1857 the British passed the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act and the colonies began to pass similar legislation shortly afterwards. The grounds for divorce were still minimal but the legislation was a step towards fairer dealing for both men and women and no longer accessible only to the wealthy, although there was a double standard in adultery with that of a wife being more culpable than that of a husband.³ [Note 3: The double standard in adultery] In 1975 The Family Law Act established ‘no fault’ divorce which was granted simply on the ground of irretrievable breakdown.⁴ [Note 4: The Family Law Act 1975]

De-facto relationships

Since 1999 Australian law has recognized relationships where couples have lived together, as if married, for a certain amount of time—about three years—as legally binding regarding children and property and welfare payments. This regulation includes same-sex partners.⁵ [Note 5: De facto relationships]

There is more fluidity in relationships than ever before. We live in a world of almost endless choice. Engagements? Marriage? Sex before marriage? Same sex relationships? Multiple partners? As in many aspects of life, the rules have almost disappeared. It seems everything
is up to the individual to decide. One reason for this (among many) is the creation of ‘the pill’ for contraception. An important consequence of sexual freedom is now avoidable. There are other reasons for the lack of rules. It seems this is a phase humanity is passing through. For thousands of years we were bound by tradition and social conventions and the release has apparently made us ‘giddy.

Australia has long been a secular society but gradually churches are losing their authority for many. Families and communities no longer command the kind of respect they once did. The parliament generally, has stopped being an adjudicator of sexual activity. Education and technological change has created generational differences difficult to bridge. Family members are scattered across the globe, but even if they were together, the idea of children conforming to their parents’ expectations is long gone. Some may, but overall the emphasis is on individual rights and expectations.

Where are the positive models, the heroes, the useful roles? They appear to have been overwhelmed by commercial advertising or media influence. Authority is now vested in the individual and a great many find it difficult to distinguish between positive and negative models. They may decide anything goes—try everything and wish later they hadn’t.

The percentage of births outside of marriage has risen and a growing number of children do not have the legal security they once had when children were mostly born into families where a mother and father were legally married, although the law relating to de facto relationships has improved this situation. ⁶ [Note 6: The proportion of children born outside marriage]

Another factor of concern is the increase in one-parent families. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics in 2012, one-parent families were 15% of all families. ⁷ [Note 7: One parent families] Not all single parents are young. Some are widowed, deserted or choose to bring up children alone for a variety of reasons. However, in a partnership society, single parenting will come under scrutiny—not necessarily because it is immoral, but because single-parent families are more difficult to sustain. It is difficult enough for two parents to nurture and care for children and much more difficult for single parents. Added to this, most single parents are financially less well-off. Children of single parents need more assistance from society, but with the numbers growing and the cost high, how this could be done is problematic.

Young people who engage in early sexual conduct (apart from the risk of unexpected pregnancies or sexual disease) may miss critical education opportunities and/or opportunities for satisfactory psychological development.

Pornography is wide-spread. Sadism and rough sex is increasing. Images are also being accessed by young children through the internet which most likely is not a good thing. Young men and women are practising sexuality in a way that may be harmful or unpleasant. People are adaptable, but some experiences are best left off the agenda. And when children are exposed to pornography no-one really knows what effect it may have.

[See APPENDIX B: Bringing about a partnership society]

It is time to ask a very important question. Why are so many men angry—angry enough to abuse, rape and even kill women?
This is my answer. For thousands of years we have been ruled by a hierarchical system which relies on achieving power by aggression and force. In this system males are trained into an understanding of their masculinity that relies on aggression and force for them to find their place in the hierarchy. Every boy learns this either from his father or from other boys in the playground. Those who take up the challenge to be ‘a man’ will fight their way up the ladder, sometimes with their fists and sometimes with their intellect. But whatever the method, the goal is the same—to get to the top. How they do it is left up to them. It seems to be all right to step on the head of anyone who might get in the way.

Not all boys are comfortable with this definition of masculinity and they have an internal struggle about whether to conform or whether to opt out. Opting out is a very difficult decision. Boys will be bullied and tormented. They will be told they are ‘wimps’ or ‘girls’. For many, this internal struggle lasts their whole lives. I heard recently about an elderly man who said ‘I am 87 and I still don’t know what it means to be a man.’

What happens to men who do not (or cannot) reach the top of the tree? They were promised power if they succeeded but only a few can succeed. In the modern world, they no longer even have control over their households, their wives or their children. They are stranded. Frustrated. Confused. A man should have ‘power”. Right? Who is responsible for this? Really it is the men who are stronger (or meaner) than themselves, but they are too difficult to tackle. So, angry men wreak havoc on those weaker than themselves. Moreover, their wives and children (and peaceful men) have for thousands of years been at the bottom of the pile in all kinds of ways. They are fair game for angry men. Even men who reach the top may be angry when they realise they still must fight to stay there.

The gladiator society tends to exclude people who cannot make the grade. On the other hand, a partnership society welcomes the weak, the needy and the unloved. It is inclusive. Therefore, we need to move as soon as possible to a more inclusive system. If a hierarchical society continues to push men out of shape, then we can only expect violence against the weak to continue.

Aggression and violence in relationships. The hierarchical, competitive gladiatorial system damages both men and women. Men who cannot ‘make the grade’ turn their violence against women. Men who reach the top learn to control others through aggression and violence, but using violence to resolve issues is no longer acceptable.

Women feel trapped, lessened—unable to fulfil their potential. They might fight back or they might express their feelings through passive aggression. Neither of these options is adequate.

Through education and example, we must dismantle the gladiatorial system that teaches young boys to fight for recognition. We will still expect them to work hard to reach their full potential—even to compete—but they will learn it is not acceptable to be aggressive or domineering. We must teach both boys and girls how to face up to and resolve problems in their relationship. The sooner we do this the better.

I recently heard a heart-breaking story from the son of a marriage where a father continually abused his wife. He would come home drunk and drag his wife about by the hair. Smash her
into the walls. Mother and son would go to the police to ask for protection but it was the days when police weren’t keen to get involved in ‘domestics’. Mother and son would come home and the next time the father drank too much the scenario would be repeated. The boy grew up. When he was 18 he fought his father, and told him ‘If you ever hurt my mother again, I will kill you’. He must have been convincing because the father stopped drinking. His wife, who also had a drinking problem, started dealing with it and they began to overcome their problems.

I started thinking seriously about this story. Why were both drinking? When did their problems begin? The son had fond memories of his father before the abuse began and he loved his mother. There must have been a point when problems began. Individuals are not blank sheets when they marry. They have scars and pre-occupations and prejudices which need to be worked through if they are to live in harmony with another person and to raise children. Perhaps a critical point occurs at the birth of the first child or perhaps at some other stressful moment. If the problems arising at these times could be resolved, even partially, perhaps—just perhaps—we might see less aggression and violence in relationships.

**Early intervention**

Government agencies and others interested in resolving the problem of violence in relationships might consider strategies of early intervention. If society could adopt a ‘problem-solving’ mentality; if people learned ‘problem-solving’ skills and put them into practice; if we could accept the need for assistance at critical points in a relationship, we might see significant changes to the current resort to violence when problems become too difficult to handle.

It should be said that violence is often triggered by stress, illness, alcohol or drugs and clearly these issues need to be addressed vigorously. However, the background to male violence is the underlying gender system in which men either have, or expect to have, the upper hand. It appears also that one of the reasons men are less likely to address the onset of depression, stress or illness is the idea drummed into them from childhood that it is ‘unmanly’ to seek help—somehow a failure of masculinity. Real men don’t ‘give in’.

Society must accept the need to do everything possible to prevent domestic violence against women and children. Rosie Batty—Australian of the year—whose son was killed by his father has this to say: ‘As this conversation grows, we will see more women find their voices. We will see more women leaving unhealthy relationships. We need to be certain we have the infrastructure to support these women. We have rounded a corner in terms of awareness, in terms of reducing stigma, but that places huge strain on existing organisations. Services continue to be under-resourced and cut back.’ ⁸ [Note 8: Domestic violence]

More women are in the workforce and this works both for and against them. On one hand it helps the family budget and may well be satisfying socially for them. On the other, women are under a lot of pressure as they are still doing most of the house-work and caring for family. As Annabel Crabb wrote recently in her book *The wife drought*— ‘Men get wives, and women don’t. That is how it works. I had wife envy and I had it bad’.

It seems the modern life style in Australia cannot be sustained unless both parents work but the burden of both parents working must be shared more equally or else done by others. In the latter option part of the family income is set aside for child-care and home up-keep.
Another option is for families to live more simply and forgo expenditure so either or both parents may reduce their working hours.

There are as many variations of these scenarios as there are people and like most activities in the modern world, there is no one correct way. We are in the process of creating new ways of doing our lives. This is not an entirely bad thing. In fact, it is a process which could lead to long-term positive changes.

While fewer people might be officially married, it seems there may be some settling of relationships between men and women. There is more understanding of the need for equality and individual rights. More couples are deciding not to marry. Others live together before they marry and have children. It seems they enter marriage with more understanding which could be one reason the divorce rate is declining slightly.

There is a lot of good parenting happening. Better knowledge of psychology and child development is available to parents. There are more services and support. Many organisations in the community assist people struggling to keep their families together.

To travel further on the road to a partnership society, families will need additional support. Childcare is a critical issue in families where both parents are working. Not only is it difficult to obtain, but it is expensive and beyond the reach of some. In future, all large firms will be required to provide childcare on or near their premises (at an affordable price).

The nuclear family is disadvantaged by having few kin to assist with child-rearing duties, but the availability of child carers might be increased if elders (who wished to) were given incentives and remuneration to enable them to care for children.

Parental leave at the birth of children is important, not simply for women but also (and especially) for men. For too long men have been restricted from engaging with their children. Long work hours, traditional expectations and peer group pressure has robbed many of the joy to be experienced within the family. It is good to note that fathers are already spending two to three hours on average more per week with their children than previously.

In a partnership society, women will learn better how to be combative when necessary and men will learn gentleness and compassion. One of the best ways to foster this is for men to be more involved with the nurture and care of children. It didn’t happen when I was a child and it is a great pleasure for me to see modern men carrying their children fondly and looking happy.
Chapter 6  Husbands and wives within a partnership society

Note 1: Equal pay (the fight for women’s rights) Pope Francis’ recent comments on marriage and women’s rights can be read in the light of the October Synod on the family. His most interesting and trenchant remarks were on women’s rights. He strongly urged Christians to endorse the struggle for equality between men and women. Of equal pay for similar work he said, ‘Why is it expected that women must earn less than men? ... They have the same rights. The disparity is a pure scandal.’

He went on to reflect on the decline in the number of marriages in many parts of the world, remarking that ‘many consider that the change occurring in these last decades may have been set in motion by women’s emancipation’. He considered that view an insult, and untrue, declaring that the attempt to lay the blame for fewer marriages on the struggle for women’s rights ‘is a form of chauvinism that always wants to control the woman’. The place of women in society and the struggle for women’s rights are important background issues in the Synod. To insist that women and men should receive the same remuneration for similar work is not radical. But the assumption that women will normally work is not universally shared among Catholics, including delegates to the Synod. Some believe that ideally women would be able and want to work at home and care for their families.

The Pope is realistic in assuming that many women will need and want to work. He hopes that the Synod similarly will address the realities of family life, and offer encouragement and compassion to people in their struggles.

In insisting that the diminishing number of marriages does not flow from women’s struggle for rights, Francis takes a position on another underlying issue of the Synod. Some Catholics have traced the troubles of families to a pervasive secularism and to radical feminism. This view naturally inclines those who hold it to demand that the Synod take a strong stand against these currents of thought.

Francis’ remarks undercut this analysis and reassert the need to reach out to people on the margins of church and society. In asserting his support for women’s right to equal salary and other rights Francis ensures that further questions will be put to him. As the battle for equal pay is being won, another war is being lost.

The foreshadowed discrimination against non-working mothers in child support makes it clear that women are coming to be valued purely on their contribution to the economy. This subordination of human beings to the economy, so destructive in Australian public life, should be central to the Synod’s deliberations on the family.

In Western societies, too, the acceptance of the right of women to work and to equal pay has been built on their full participation by being able to vote and to be voted for. If the Catholic Church is to have credibility in endorsing the continuing struggle for women’s rights, it will need to find effective ways in which women can participate equally in the governance of the church at all levels. Although this is not an immediate priority for Pope Francis, he is ensuring that it will become so for his successors. [http://www.eurekastreet.com.au April 3, 2015]

Note 2: [A wife] was legally a complete nonentity. Her function in life was to ‘love, honour and obey’. A married woman’s total dependence on her husband was reinforced by a social system that was built upon that dependence. With all her worldly goods she had endowed him. Being under coverture, she was completely under his tutelage without any legal rights of her own. Blackstone’s notorious dictum: that ‘By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law; that is, the very being of legal existence of the woman is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband: under whose wing, protection, and cover, she performs everything.’ … So great a favourite is the female sex of the laws of England was a rationalisation in its time. It provided for someone—the husband—who could be called to account for any legal liabilities incurred by his wife, in a society in which married women were without disposable means, and without any ability to defend themselves. As for the prevailing social attitude towards the husband-wife relationship among the upper classes, this was described in the ecclesiastical court in 1847:

‘It is the duty of a wife to conform to the tastes and duties of her husband, to sacrifice much of her own comfort and convenience to his whims and caprices, to submit to his commands and to endeavour, if she can, by prudent resistance and remonstrance, to induce a change and alteration.’ [http://www.aifs.gov.au/institute/seminars/finlay.html February 13, 2015]
Note 3: The double standard in adultery remained entrenched in England until its removal in 1923. In most Australian jurisdictions it was abolished earlier. However, in the State of Victoria it was to continue until 1959—when the Commonwealth Matrimonial Causes Act was enacted and superseded the separate State laws of divorce. But even after the double standard had been removed from the law, it took a long time to disappear from public attitudes. A social stigma continued to adhere to adultery and to divorce and to those caught up in it, until well into the nineteen hundreds, affecting women more severely than men. Only in the second half century, or to be more specific, in the last quarter of the twentieth century did it diminish to almost vanishing point. At the same time, the social significance of legal marriage also declined, while divorces greatly increased in number, and de facto marriage took over much of the importance of legal marriage. [https://books.google.com.au/books?id=C2p_Pe_lzyC&pg=PA54&lpg=PA54&dq=The+double+standard+in+adultery]

Note 4: The Family Law Act 1975 abolished all fault grounds and replaced them with the present ground of irretrievable breakdown. What is important, however, for the purpose of the present discussion, is the realisation that the road to equality is no longer closed. As we look forward into the future, we may be conscious today of the limitations, of the obstacles with which that road is still littered. It is only when we look back that we become aware of the big steps forward that have been taken. They have resulted in a significant widening of the parameters of gender expectation, both among women and among the general public. With that comes a belief, amounting to a firm conviction, that the road ahead is not closed to the eventual achievement of complete and effective equality. [http://www.aifs.gov.au/institute/seminars/finlay.html February 13, 2015]

Note 5: De facto is a Latin expression that means "concerning fact". In law, it often means "in practice but not necessarily ordained by law" or "in practice or actuality, but not officially established". It is commonly used in contrast to de jure (which means "concerning the law") when referring to matters of law, governance, or technique (such as standards) that are found in the common experience as created or developed without or contrary to a regulation. When discussing a legal situation, de jure designates what the law says, while de facto designates action of what happens in practice....

In Australia and New Zealand, the phrase de facto by itself has become a colloquial term for one's domestic partner. [Since 1999] in Australian law, it is the legally recognized relationship of a couple living together (opposite-sex or same-sex). [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/De_facto February 13, 2015]

Note 6: The proportion of children born outside marriage is rising in all EU countries, North America, and Australia. In Europe, besides the low levels of fertility rates and the delay of motherhood, another factor that now characterizes fertility is the growing percentage of live births outside marriage. In the EU, this phenomenon has been on the rise in recent years in almost every country; and in seven countries, mostly in northern Europe, it already accounts for the majority of live births.

In 2009, 41% of children born in the United States were born to unmarried mothers (up from 5% a half century ago). That includes 73% of non-Hispanic black children, 53% of Hispanic children (of all races), and 29% of non-Hispanic white children. In April 2009, the National Center for Health Statistics announced that nearly 40 percent of American infants born in 2007 were born to an unwed mother; that of 4.3 million children, 1.7 million were born to unmarried parents, a 25 percent increase from 2002. Most births to teenagers in the USA (86% in 2007) are non-marital; in 2007, 60% of births to women 20–24, and nearly one-third of births to women 25–29, were non-marital. In 2007, teenagers accounted for just 23% of non-marital births, down steeply from 50% in 1970. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Legitimacy_(family_law)#Extramarital_births February 13, 2015]

Note 7: One parent families In June 2012, there were 961 thousand one parent families, making up 15% of all families. About two-thirds of these one parent families (67%) had dependants living with them. There were 780 thousand single mother families in June 2012, making up the vast majority of one parent families (81%). [http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs February 13, 2015]

Note 8: Domestic violence [Rosie Batty, Why passion must lead to change. The Monthly February 7-13, 2015]
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Religion within a Partnership Society

Why are we here? What is life all about?
How should we live?
Australia was settled in a time when Britain was at a peak of its Christian history. The Church was responsible for education and a lot of time was spent reading the Judeo-Christian bible and learning about Christianity. The Methodist revival brought about by John and Charles Wesley had not long swept across the country-side and resulted in massive changes and improvements to society.

Convicts, soldiers and free-settlers alike were well-versed in the knowledge and precepts of Christianity, and it is likely this had a significant impact on the new nation. Governance, education, hospitals, newspapers, banks and most other institutions were founded by people with a Christian understanding. However, over time this knowledge diminished—partly because education became secular and partly because the growth of science undermined the certainty of religious doctrines. According to Roy Williams, author of ‘A Post-God Nation’ the ingrained precepts of Christianity are beginning to lose their currency.¹ [Note 1: Post-God Nation]

When sections of Islam seem so committed to their faith, people in Australia must sometimes wonder what it is they (themselves) base their lives upon.

Everyone needs to believe something—about the world, its meaning—and about their own reason for living, yet belief is difficult these days. Rationality (in the form of science) has interrupted the ability for simple belief. Nothing is simple so many of us are existing on an ad-hoc diet with undigested bits of science, bits of religion and bits of magic. It is a dangerous place to be. We need a clearer view of what it really means to be ‘Religious’.

My childhood and young adult-hood was nurtured by the certainties of the Christian religion. It gave me direction, a tradition and support. I accepted what I was taught although as I grew in confidence I began to question some of its foundations and to claim some of my own. I started devising my own path in life. I still value the early years. I learned a lot. The challenge of stepping out of the certainties was also character-forming. I am now in a religious place I find satisfying. I tell myself a different story and while it may turn out to be lacking in some aspects, I am satisfied with where I have landed. I also have the understanding that ‘my story’ can be modified if I learn more or if there are significant changes that I could not have foreseen.

I no longer think of religion as churches and commandments and so on. I think of it as a desire to know why and how. Why are we here? Why do wars happen? What is the meaning of it all? How should I live my life? How should society develop? That is my definition of religion and from the earliest times people have asked these questions.

Religion defined in this way is a thoroughly useful occupation. It is a means of crystalizing ideas about the mysterious and formulating responses. Of course, we want to understand why the world is here; why we are here; what our purpose is; how we should respond to the many dreadful events we see around us; how we can obtain grace and favour in difficult times; how best to behave. Many of the institutions of our common life in Australia—universities, hospitals, the law and science were promoted by religious people (the Christian church or Christian lay people in Australia’s case) who were essential to social advancement of all kinds.
Religion has existed from earliest times. It is recorded as far back as the pre-historic Neolithic period where agricultural communities in parts of Europe appear to have centred their religious understanding and practice on Goddess worship. In the middle-east, the worship of male Gods replaced Goddess worship and then, eventually became the worship of a single God (monotheism)—although many countries (India, Japan, the Americas, Russia, or Africa) have non-monotheistic religions.

The search for meaning is universal. People everywhere ask the question ‘Why does the universe exist? Why am I here?’ The answers have been many and varied, but commonly include the idea of a Creative power or Being responsible for creation.

Goddess worship in early human communities was a natural first step in this process. Women gave birth. Children, small replicas of another human being, still seem a miracle even nowadays when we are completely familiar with the process that brings it about. What must it have seemed back then? Along with the idea of an all-wise, all-caring mother-figure Goddess went respect for actual women and respect for the soil which provided the miracle of food.

Religions often form around a charismatic person and then evolve to a settled form. Stories and beliefs are presented to adherents. In time the practice may be formalised and become dogmatic. Sadly, many religious organisations have become institutionalised—rigid, punitive, demanding and undemocratic and that is anathema in the modern era. Authoritarian attitudes are no longer acceptable to most people and this is another reason for fewer members in church congregations. We are no longer keen on being told what to do or how to live.

Years of gladiatorial influence have had significant effects on religious Institutions. They have become bastions of male privilege; been used to maintain political and psychological control; encouraged ignorance and delayed sensible progress. And this is not to mention many wars fought in the name of religion.² [Note 2: Wars fought in the name of religion]

Along with a search for meaning, religion has, over millennia, attempted to codify moral precepts. If viewed as a static activity this is unsustainable as when circumstances change, behaviour will adapt and change to fit, leaving the religious behind adhering to moral codes that have become painfully irrelevant. The Ten Commandments of the Old Testament are an example of cultural change overtaking religious prescription. Of course, there is still much that is worthwhile—Honour your father and mother; Do not murder; Do not steal; Do not lie about your neighbour, but if the commandments are read carefully it will be obvious many of them relate to a past society not our current society. It was a time before general acceptance of monotheism. The commandments deal with this by saying God is a jealous God. There is a clear indication in one commandment about the lowly status of women who are included in a list of possessions. The idea of respecting a Sabbath is related to the concept of God creating the world in six days and resting on the seventh and so on.³ [Note 3: The Ten Commandments].

A current issue is the attitude to women who are treated as second-class citizens by many forms of religion. The rhetoric of male theologians and priests over time, degraded their position. The mediaeval campaign against ‘witches’ was a gender thing—its aim to bring capable women under control. Within just a few centuries of its inception the Christian church
had somehow absorbed lock, stock and barrel the attitudes of surrounding cultures and lost the true message of Jesus who respected women.

In opposition to the culture of his time, he met them; they were among his early followers. As he was dying he arranged for his mother to be cared for by one of the twelve disciples. Women occupied an important place in the formation of the Christian church.

The apostle Paul has a reputation for putting women in a secondary place although there is still doubt if he wrote the negative comment or if they were later additions. This view is upheld by other of Paul’s writings which are quite positive about the role of women. In his letters to young churches he mentions women frequently and positively. Many of the early Christian meetings were held in their houses. Women preached and taught. Paul also formulated a striking commentary on the culture of the early Christian church. ‘There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.’ [Letter to the Galatians, chapter 3, verse 27.]

There was fellowship and acceptance for all classes of people.

A particularly contentious decision by the Catholic Church has been to ban contraceptives and birth control ⁴ [Note 4: Ban on birth control]. This causes concern to people working to slow the rate of population growth. It is fortunate that most Catholics (according to some surveys about 78%) do not agree with the ban and believe it should be lifted. However, in countries such as Africa and other mainly Catholic countries, the ban on contraception has the potential to damage the cause, not simply of population control, but also efforts to reduce (and perhaps eventually eliminate) diseases such as HIV/AIDS.

There are major problems with the nature of religious practice yet still at the heart (even of organised religion) is legitimacy, a true search for meaning, a connection with the mysterious and a desire to bring about a better society. This latter has been a continuing, positive side of religious institutions. In Australia, many individuals have been taught, healed and supported in Christian institutions and Christians have been at the forefront of many positive social changes.

What is it that turns so many people towards religion? For some it is tradition; for others, it is a need to feel secure. For yet others, it satisfies a desire to exercise what appears to put them in touch with mysterious and numinous or super-natural activity. Bonds which attach people to a world-view are powerful. A world-view becomes the framework for their lives and to remove or change it can create mental and emotional turmoil. Even gradual enlightenment and change can be difficult although many religious people are now making that journey to a more productive world-view without necessarily giving up their core religious sensibilities.

If one were to balance the good accruing from religion against the harmful, it might be a close thing, however, as in every aspect of life there appears to be slow but steady progress towards a partnership model.
Meanwhile, Science has become an important influence on our lives. A lot of what was once mysterious is now common knowledge and thus some religious beliefs have become difficult to accept.

The method which has brought about these discoveries is based on testing a theory until it is proven true or not. This is the ‘scientific method’ and is meant to be ‘value neutral’ although clearly, some scientists may have values that impinge upon the way they practice science. It seems an irony to me that when a scientist such as Richard Dawkins denounces religion he is not using the scientific method, but is operating based on his own belief and experience. He needs to be quite clear that when he speaks as an atheist he is not speaking as a scientist. There is no way to prove (or disprove) scientifically the existence of God or the value of religion. On this issue science is necessarily agnostic even though many scientists (as individuals) have beliefs either for or against religion.

Science does not deal with belief systems or the super-natural. That is not its realm. Scientific method deals with the natural realm—what can be seen and heard and/or measured whereas religion is based on belief and experience. The scientific method is incredibly valuable, but its scope is necessarily limited. For that reason, religion will most likely remain an integral part of human societies. Science will never fill the role of Religion. It is no use saying—‘Just get rid of religion.’ It isn’t an option because we want to know not just the ‘what’, but also the ‘why’ and the ‘how’. This is not to denigrate or displace science. Its role in bringing about enlightenment and advancement has been magnificent.

An alternative point of view on the role of science is expressed in a recent book *The Moral Landscape* by Sam Harris. ⁵ [Note ⁵: Sam Harris] He proposes that science could play a role in deciding which moral values would best bring about the well-being of people. Harris studied Neuroscience and philosophy; has obviously thought deeply and carefully about the problems of the world and could bring his knowledge of these disciplines into the discussion of morality. I have no argument against this claim as I think every ounce of skill and effort we can muster to improve well-being should be brought to bear. If science can make progress in this area, so much the better.

I am curious however about Harris’ interest in morality. He is a secularist; a member of a group of men (mainly American and described as The Young Atheists) who campaign vigorously against religion.

*The Moral Landscape* reveals Harris’ bias against religion. He denies the first tenet of religion—a creative power behind the existence of the universe and from there on bases all his arguments on the *failures* of religion instead of balancing the slate with some of its successes. On views about the origin of the universe, despite his knowledge of Neuroscience and philosophy, I consider him no more capable than the lowliest and most uneducated person as there is no way to know certainly about the origin or meaning of our universe. It is a matter of belief or faith.

How did he come to his beliefs? One reason, I think, is the extreme influence of religion in the USA and in the Islamic world. There is much to criticise. However, another hidden factor may lie in the method of his upbringing. His father was a Quaker, his mother a non-practicing Jew.
According to Harris, he was brought up in a secular household where religion was not discussed, although I dare say it was an underlying factor. As a young man, he tried the drug ecstasy and experienced altered states of mind; went to India to enquire into Buddhism and spent many years doing so before returning to academia. He is clearly motivated by a concern for people and would like to improve their well-being. He also believes in *moral truth* which distinguishes him from many others of his generation who think morality is relative.

Roy Williams [Author of *Post-God Nation*] talks about the natural physical laws (which he ascribes to God) extending to laws about morality. Perhaps in our meandering way we are all trying to discover ‘laws’ for the best way to live. While the method of science in discovering natural laws does not seem suitable to discovering ‘laws’ about how to be and how to behave, if Sam Harris is right then it might be possible to establish some moral principles based on careful study.

It is possible we are entering a phase of our quest for moral truths where religion and science may be able to co-operate.

Australia is now a multi-cultural society and religions from other parts of the world are part of our culture. But, while still a force to be reckoned with, established religions may not be the sole voices. Various groups in society have discovered their voices and will have a say. Many individuals are also groping for their own belief systems.

In his book *The Tao of Physics*, Fritjof Capra⁶ [Note 6: Fritjof Capra] explores the parallels between modern physics and eastern mysticism (Hinduism, Buddhism, Chinese thought, Taoism, Zen). In 1976 when his book was first published, these issues were to the fore-front in public discussion. Since then the ideas have faded. However, as sometimes happens, ideas resurface and I believe this is part of the ‘evolutionary movement’ that Capra discusses. He writes: ‘The strong interest in Eastern mysticism that arose in the West during the last twenty years... I now see this interest as part of a much larger trend which attempts to counteract a profound imbalance in our culture—in our thoughts and feelings, our values and attitudes, and our social and political structures. I have found the Chinese terminology of *yin* and *yang* very useful to describe this cultural imbalance. Our culture has consistently favoured *yang*, or masculine, values and attitudes, and has neglected their complementary *yin*, or feminine, counterparts. We have favoured self-assertion over integration, analysis over synthesis, rational knowledge over intuitive wisdom, science over religion, competition over cooperation, expansion over conservation, and so on. This one-sided development has now reached a highly alarming stage; a crisis of social, ecological, moral and spiritual dimensions.’⁷ [Note 7: The Tao of physics]

E.F. Schumacher in his book *A Guide for the Perplexed* talks about convergent problems and divergent problems. A convergent problem is one where clever people may come to an agreement on an answer to a problem if they have sufficient information. A divergent problem is one where clever people *may* discuss forever without agreeing. ⁸ [Note 8: Schumacher E.F.] Ethical and religious questions fall into the latter category and based on their answer people form small cliques. This would be all right if they did not insist their answer was the only and best one. However, as we know only too well, they do!
In a partnership society, Religion and Science will find a way to work together. There will be a marriage of both aspects of the human brain—an inspired piece of imagination followed by the hard work of research and proof. This is the way of a partnership society—logic and emotion in harmony. Science is thought of as a creature of Logic/Right Brain activity and perhaps the essence of religion is the other aspect of the brain which is now sometimes downplayed—the imaginative, creative, emotional—perhaps even ‘moral’ side. To an extent, males have associated themselves with the idea of the former while women have mostly been associated with the latter. Where religion was once seen as the one true way to knowledge, Science now seems to hold this position although it is a different kind of knowledge.

How will this work out? Will we eventually achieve universal acceptance of an over-arching belief system or moral code? Will it be dynamic—and change to suit the circumstances? How could it be upheld? All is yet to be revealed and will most likely take a long time to emerge. Individuals need a framework of belief for their lives. We do still, however, require a moral compass and established religion is likely to continue to play a role for quite a while.

In a partnership society informed both by science and religion, youngsters will have the opportunity to develop their own world-views. They will choose what to believe themselves with, in the main, no pressure to conform to traditional beliefs although they will need assistance to discover the options. For the rest of us there is no simple answer. It is a matter of finding our own path—testing our experiences (and what we read, see, or are told), before moving step by step in the direction we have chosen. It is quite a challenge.

While religion goes off the rails a lot, it is often also right on the mark when it encourages people to love one another; support peace and compassion and build a better future. However, religion, along with many of our institutions, has lost its moorings. It needs to change; listen more; devise clever ways to minister not just to believers but also to others who would like to believe something clearly but have been unable to cut through to the essentials.

How can the study and practice of ‘Religion’ be re-introduced to Australia? Perhaps we could just begin talking more about religion and morality in a sensible kind of way. We could try to discover what Australians believe by beginning a national conversation. Maybe that would stimulate religious authorities and individuals to make choices that better reflected our modern situations.

Conversations about religion and morality might lead to new centres of religious practice where like-minded people discussed their belief systems. No-one would be excluded based on belief. Churches/Mosques/Synagogues or whatever the new centres ended up being called would be truly part of society. They would act as a navigational guide to its progress and provide love and concern and sustenance to those in distress or despair. The St. Mary’s Catholic congregation in the West End of Brisbane was a step in the direction of an inclusive centre. ‘It regarded denominational allegiances as peripheral and was increasingly at home with the idea of religionless Christianity or even a post-Christian spirituality’ and ‘crossed over to become part of a growing movement of humanity that puts more emphasis on following the way of Jesus rather than believing certain things about Jesus.’⁹ (p.167, Chapter by Noel Preston of Peter Kennedy, the man who threatened Rome.)
Almost inevitably it drew down the displeasure of the Catholic hierarchy and the priests, Fathers Peter Kennedy and Terry Fitzpatrick, were chastised. Undaunted, a large proportion of the congregation relocated to a location nearby and continued their religious observations and humanitarian practices.

I would not be surprised to hear that there are many experiments of this kind going on as I write these words. When the movement expands, it could be the pathway forward for religious organisations which are at present losing credibility every day they try to impose unworkable and unwanted beliefs on people who have moved on.
NOTES:

Chapter 7 **Religion within a partnership society**

Note 1: Roy Williams, *Post-God Nation*. Published by Harper Collins Australia, Pty. Ltd. 2015.

Note 2: A **religious war** or **holy war** (Latin: *bellum sacrum*) is a war primarily caused or justified by differences in religion. The account of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites in the Book of Joshua, the Muslim conquests of the 7th and 8th centuries, and the Christian Crusades (11th to 13th centuries) and Wars of Religion (16th and 17th centuries) are the classic examples but a religious aspect has been part of warfare as early as the battles of the Mesopotamian city-states. In the modern era, arguments are common over the extent to which religious, economic, or ethnic aspects of a conflict predominate: examples include the Yugoslav Wars and the civil war in Sudan. In several ongoing conflicts including the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the Syrian civil war, and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, religious arguments are overtly present but variously described as fundamentalism or religious extremism depending upon the observer’s sympathies. At the same time, members of many religions have been and are active members of the modern anti-war movement. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religious_war March 30 2015]

Note 3 **The Ten Commandments** [Exodus 20: 1-17]

And God spoke all these words:

1 “I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery. “You shall have no other gods before me.

2 “You shall not make for yourself an image in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below. You shall not bow down to them or worship them; for I, the LORD your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the parents to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing love to a thousand generations of those who love me and keep my commandments.

3 “You shall not misuse the name of the LORD your God, for the LORD will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses his name.

4 “Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy. Six days you shall labour and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your male or female servant, nor your animals, nor any foreigner residing in your towns. For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh day. Therefore, the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy.

5 “Honour your father and your mother, so that you may live long in the land the LORD your God is giving you.

6 “You shall not murder.

7 “You shall not commit adultery.

8 “You shall not steal.

9 “You shall not give false testimony against your neighbour.

10 “You shall not covet your neighbour’s house. You shall not covet your neighbour’s wife, or his male or female servant, his ox or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbour.” [https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Exodus+20]
Religious adherents vary widely in their views on birth control. This can be true even between different branches of one faith, as in the case of Judaism. Some religious believers find that their own opinions of the use of birth control differ from the beliefs espoused by the leaders of their faith, and many grapple with the ethical dilemma of what is conceived as "correct action" according to their faith, versus personal circumstance, reason, and choice.

Among Christian denominations today there are a large variety of positions towards contraception. The Roman Catholic Church has disallowed artificial contraception for as far back as one can historically trace. Contraception was also officially disallowed by non-Catholic Christians until 1930 when the Anglican Communion changed its policy. Soon after, most Protestant groups came to accept the use of modern contraceptives as a matter of Biblically allowable freedom of conscience.

The Catholic Church is opposed to artificial contraception and orgasmic acts outside of the context of marital intercourse. This belief dates back to the first centuries of Christianity. Such acts are considered intrinsically disordered because of the belief that all licit sexual acts must be both unitive (express love), and procreative (open to procreation). The only form of birth control permitted is abstinence. Modern scientific methods of "periodic abstinence" such as natural family planning (NFP) were counted as a form of abstinence by Pope Paul VI in his 1968 encyclical Humanae Vitae. The following is the condemnation of contraception:

Therefore, We base Our words on the first principles of a human and Christian doctrine of marriage when We are obliged once more to declare that the direct interruption of the generative process already begun and, above all, all direct abortion, even for therapeutic reasons, are to be absolutely excluded as lawful means of regulating the number of children. Equally to be condemned, as the magisterium of the Church has affirmed on many occasions, is direct sterilization, whether of the man or of the woman, whether permanent or temporary. Similarly excluded is any action which either before, at the moment of, or after sexual intercourse, is specifically intended to prevent procreation—whether as an end or as a means.

A number of other documents provide more insight into the Church’s position on contraception. The commission appointed to study the question in the years leading up to Humanae Vitae issued two unofficial reports, a so-called "majority report" which attempted to express reasons the Catholic Church could change its teaching on contraception, and a "minority report" which explains the reasons for upholding the traditional Catholic view on contraception. In 1997, the Vatican released a document entitled “Vademecum for Confessors” (2:4) which states "[t]he Church has always taught the intrinsic evil of contraception." Furthermore, many Church Fathers condemned the use of contraception.

The 1987 document Donum Vitae opposes in-vitro fertilization on grounds that it is harmful to embryos. Later on, the 2008 instruction Dignitas Personae denounces embryonic manipulations and new methods of contraception.

Many Western Catholics have voiced significant disagreement with the Church’s stance on contraception. The Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops issued what many interpreted as a dissenting document, the Winnipeg Statement. In it, the bishops recognized that many Catholics found it "either extremely difficult or even impossible to make their own all elements of this doctrine" (that of Humanae Vitae). Additionally, they reasserted the Catholic principle of primacy of conscience, a principle that they said should be properly interpreted, since they insisted that "a Catholic Christian is not free to form his conscience without consideration of the teaching of the magisterium, in the particular instance exercised by the Holy Father (i.e., the Pope) in an encyclical letter". Theologians such as Charles Curran have also criticized the stance of Humanae Vitae on artificial birth control. According to the American Enterprise Institute, 78% of Catholics say they believe the Church should allow Catholics to use birth control, though other polls reflect different numbers.
Sandra Fluke reading her U.S. congressional testimony on why her Catholic university should be required to offer contraceptives in spite of their opposition to artificial birth control

The Vatican’s opposition towards birth control continues to this day and has been a major influence on United States policies concerning the problem of population growth and unrestricted access to birth control.

As an implementation policy of the 2009 Affordable Health Care for America Act, the Department of Health and Human Services developed a mandate requiring all insurance policies to provide free contraceptives. In 2012, the GOP led an attempt to exempt insurance policies sponsored or paid for by religious institutions opposed to birth control on religious or moral grounds, from the mandate to provide free contraceptive care. The GOP opposition to this mandate is based on the view that it violates the "Free Exercise Clause" of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. The bill was dismissed by the U.S. Senate by a vote of 51-48 along largely partisan lines and is viewed as a victory for President Barack Obama’s health care law. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religion_and_birth_control]

Note 5: Sam Harris was born on born April 9, 1967 in Los Angeles. Harris grew up in a secular home, the son of actor Berkeley Harris and TV producer Susan Harris, who created The Golden Girls. His father came from a Quaker background and his mother is a secular Jew. Harris has stated that his upbringing was entirely secular, and his parents rarely discussed religion, though it was always a subject that interested him.

In 1986, as a young student at Stanford University, Harris experimented with the drug ecstasy, and has since written and spoken about the powerful insights he felt psychologically under the drug’s influence.

Harris became interested in spiritual and philosophical questions when he studied at Stanford University. He was fascinated by the idea that he might be able to achieve spiritual insights without the use of drugs. Leaving Stanford in his second year, he went to India, where he studied meditation with Hindu and Buddhist religious teachers, including Dilgo Khyentse. Eleven years later, in 1997, he returned to Stanford, completing a B.A. degree in philosophy in 2000 Harris began writing his first book, The End of Faith, immediately after the September 11 attacks.

He received a Ph.D. degree in cognitive neuroscience in 2009 from the University of California, Los Angeles using functional magnetic resonance imaging to conduct research into the neural basis of belief, disbelief, and uncertainty. His thesis was titled “The moral landscape: How science could determine human values”, and his advisor was Mark S. Cohen.

Harris says that religion is especially rife with bad ideas, calling it “one of the most perverse misuses of intelligence we have ever devised.” He compares modern religious beliefs to the myths of the Ancient Greeks, which were once accepted as fact but which are obsolete today. In a January 2007 interview with PBS, Harris said, “We don’t have a word for not believing in Zeus, which is to say we are all atheists in respect to Zeus. And we don’t have a word for not being an astrologer”. He goes on to say that the term atheist will be retired only when “we all just achieve a level of intellectual honesty where we are no longer going to pretend to be certain about things we are not certain about”.

Harris states that he advocates a benign, non-coercive, corrective form of intolerance, distinguishing it from historic religious persecution. He promotes a conversational intolerance, in which personal convictions are scaled against evidence, and where intellectual honesty is demanded equally in religious views and non-religious views. He also believes there is a need to counter inhibitions that prevent the open critique of religious ideas, beliefs,
and practices under the auspices of “tolerance”. He has stated on his blog that he has received death threats for some of his views on religion.

Columnist Madeleine Bunting quotes Harris from his book The End of Faith: “Some propositions are so dangerous that it may even be ethical to kill people for believing them.” Bunting declares that Harris’s statement “sounds like exactly the kind of argument put forward by those who ran the Inquisition”. Quoting the same passage, theologian Catherine Keller asks, “could there be a more dangerous proposition than that?” and says that the “anti-tolerance” it represents would “dismantle” the Jeffersonian wall between church and state. Writer Theodore Dalrymple described the passage as “quite possibly the most disgraceful that I have read in a book by a man posing as a rationalist”. A fellow contributor at The Huffington Post, R. J. Eskow, has written a number of columns commenting on Harris’s statements. In one column, Eskow characterized Harris as espousing a “brand of evangelical atheism,” and questioned whether it was a creed of “intolerance.”

In response to some of the most frequent criticisms of his work—many of which he says are unfair and which misunderstand or distort his true positions—Harris maintains a long and frequently updated post on his personal website where he addresses each claim.

In positive book reviews of The End of Faith, Nina Burleigh agrees with Harris’ premise that religious “faith” is leading humanity into ruin, and the world would be better off without the three major religions, and Richard Dawkins cheers the fact that while the book won’t “change the minds of idiots,” it will encourage other intelligent people to come out and raise their voices.

Compared to some other major world religions, Harris considers Islam to be “especially belligerent and inimical to the norms of civil discourse.” He asserts that the “dogmatic commitment to using violence to defend one’s faith, both from within and without” to varying degrees, is a central part of the doctrine of Islam not found in many other religions, “and this difference has consequences in the real world.”

In 2006, after the Jyllands-Posten Muhammad cartoons controversy, Harris wrote, “The idea that Islam is a ‘peaceful religion hijacked by extremists’ is a dangerous fantasy—and it is now a particularly dangerous fantasy for Muslims to indulge. It is not at all clear how we should proceed in our dialogue with the Muslim world, but deluding ourselves with euphemisms is not the answer. It now appears to be a truism in foreign policy circles that real reform in the Muslim world cannot be imposed from the outside. But it is important to recognize why this is so—it is so because the Muslim world is utterly deranged by its religious tribalism. In confronting the religious literalism and ignorance of the Muslim world, we must appreciate how terrifyingly isolated Muslims have become in intellectual terms.” He has voiced support for profiling, stating, “We should profile Muslims, or anyone who looks like he or she could conceivably be Muslim, and we should be honest about it.” He states that his criticism is aimed not at Muslims as people, but at the doctrine of Islam as an ideology, acknowledging that not all Muslims subscribe to the ideas he is criticizing.

Anthropologist Scott Atran has criticized Harris for what he believes is an unscientific highlighting of the role of belief in the psychology of suicide bombers. Atran later followed up his comments in an online discussion for Edge, in which he criticized Harris and others for combating religious dogmatism and faith in a way that Atran believes is “scientifically baseless, psychologically uninformed, politically naive, and counterproductive for goals we share”.

In an article in The Nation reviewing three of Harris’ books, Jackson Lears, states that, when Harris’ arguments are evaluated “according to their resonance with public policy debates, the results are sobering...”, continuing:

“From him we learn, among other things, that torture is just another form of collateral damage in the "war on terror”—regrettable, maybe, but a necessary price to pay in the crucial effort to save Western civilization from
the threat of radical Islam... As in the golden age of positivism, a notion of sovereign science is enlisted in the service of empire. Harris dispenses with the Christian rhetoric of his imperialist predecessors but not with their rationalizations for state-sponsored violence."

Several columns, one in Al Jazeera and one in Salon, have accused Harris and the New Atheists of expressing irrational anti-Muslim animus under the guise of rational atheism, Glenn Greenwald wrote a column saying he agreed: "The key point is that Harris does far, far more than voice criticisms of Islam as part of a general critique of religion. He has repeatedly made clear that he thinks Islam is uniquely threatening ... Yes, he criticizes Christianity, but he reserves the most intense attacks and superlative condemnations for Islam, as well as unique policy proscriptions of aggression, violence and rights abridgments aimed only at Muslims." Harris has responded to the controversy stating that he believes critics of Islam are unfairly labelled as bigots.

Harris has criticized the term "Islamophobia". "My criticism of Islam is a criticism of beliefs and their consequences," he wrote following a controversial clash with Ben Affleck in October 2014 on the show Real Time with Bill Maher, "but my fellow liberals reflexively view it as an expression of intolerance toward people." "Islamophobia is a term of propaganda designed to protect Islam from the forces of secularism by conflating all criticism of it with racism and xenophobia. And it is doing its job, because people like you have been taken in by it."

Harris's views have received support. Writing in the New York Post, Rich Lowry defended Harris and Maher by arguing that their liberal critics are unable to "talk frankly about the illiberalism of much of the Muslim world" as "it entails resisting the reflex to consider any criticism of the Third World as presumptive racism." Other writers have expressed support.

Christianity
Harris has roundly criticized Christianity, and has reserved additional and particular derision for specific branches. He has described Mormonism as less credible than most Christianity, "because Mormons are committed to believing nearly all the implausible things that Christians believe plus many additional implausible things", such as Jesus returning to earth in Jackson County, Missouri. Harris has referred to Catholicism as "ghoulish machinery set to whirling through the ages by the opposing winds of shame and sadism", and criticized the Catholic Church for spending "two millennia demonizing human sexuality to a degree unmatched by any other institution, declaring the most basic, healthy, mature, and consensual behaviors taboo." Harris has also criticized the Catholic Church's structure and forced celibacy within its ranks for attracting pedophiles, and blames its opposition to the use of contraception for poverty, shorter lifespans, and proliferation of AIDS.\[52\]

Judaism
Harris, who was raised by a secular Jewish mother and a Quaker father, has stated that his upbringing was entirely secular. Fellow religion critic Christopher Hitchens once referred to Harris as a "Jewish warrior against theocracy and bigotry of all stripes".

In The End of Faith, Harris is critical of the Jewish faith and its followers:

"The gravity of Jewish suffering over the ages, culminating in the Holocaust, makes it almost impossible to entertain any suggestion that Jews might have brought their troubles upon themselves. This is, however, in a rather narrow sense, the truth. [...] the ideology of Judaism remains a lightning rod for intolerance to this day. [...] Jews, insofar as they are religious, believe that they are bearers of a unique covenant with God. As a consequence, they have spent the last two thousand years collaborating with those who see them as different by seeing themselves as irretrievably so. Judaism is as intrinsically divisive, as ridiculous in its literalism, and as at odds with the civilizing insights of modernity as any other religion. Jewish settlers, by exercising their "freedom of belief" on contested land, are now one of the principal obstacles to peace in the Middle East."

Harris has said he holds somewhat paradoxical views about Israel and Judaism, and is still genuinely undecided on some things. "I don’t think Israel should exist as a Jewish state. I think it is obscene, irrational and unjustifiable
to have a state organized around a religion. So I don’t celebrate the idea that there’s a Jewish homeland in the Middle East. I certainly don’t support any Jewish claims to real estate based on the Bible. Though I just said that I don’t think Israel should exist as a Jewish state, the justification for such a state is rather easy to find. We need look no further than the fact that the rest of the world has shown itself eager to murder the Jews at almost every opportunity. So, if there were going to be a state organized around protecting members of a single religion, it certainly should be a Jewish state. Now, friends of Israel might consider this a rather tepid defense, but it’s the strongest one I’ve got. I think the idea of a religious state is ultimately untenable.”

On atheism
Although Harris has associated himself with the “New Atheism”, he considers the term “atheism” to be problematic. He has stated “I never thought of myself as an atheist before being inducted to speak as one.”

On spirituality, mysticism, and the paranormal
Despite his anti-religion sentiments, Sam Harris also claims that there is “nothing irrational about seeking the states of mind that lie at the core of many religions. Compassion, awe, devotion and feelings of oneness are surely among the most valuable experiences a person can have.” Similarly, Margaret Wertheim, who considers herself to be an atheist, contends that Harris’s account of religious faith as the source of many social evils should be viewed “with considerable skepticism”. “I would like to stand up for religion and the value of faith”, she said, and concluded after her mother told her it was Catholicism which motivated her extensive charitable works, “that the left hand of God is also one of the greatest powers for social change on this planet.”

In January 2007, Harris received criticism from John Gorenfeld, writing for AlterNet. Gorenfeld took Harris to task for defending some of the findings of paranormal investigations into areas such as reincarnation and xenoglossy. He also strongly criticized Harris for his defense of judicial torture. (Harris has stated that he believes torture should be illegal, but that it in certain extreme circumstances it may be ethical to break the law.) Gorenfeld’s critique was subsequently reflected by Robert Todd Carroll, writing in The Skeptic’s Dictionary. On his website, Harris disputed that he had defended these views to the extent that Gorenfeld suggested.

Science and morality
In his third book, The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values, Harris says that “Human well-being is not a random phenomenon. It depends on many factors—ranging from genetics and neurobiology to sociology and economics.” Harris says that it is time to promote a scientific approach to normative morality, rejecting the idea that religion determines what is good. He believes that once scientists begin proposing moral norms in papers, supernatural moral systems will join “astrology, witchcraft and Greek mythology on the scrapheap”.

A number of reviews in the media have criticized various arguments advanced by Harris in the book. Soon after the book’s release, Harris responded to some of the criticisms in an article for The Huffington Post.

In a review of The Moral Landscape published in The National Interest, anthropologist Scott Atran stated that

"Contrary to Harris’s latest screed, there is no such thing as a science-based universal morality. And abolishing religion will do nothing to rid mankind of its ills."

Academic philosophers have also criticized The Moral Landscape. Massimo Pigliucci evaluates the attempt by Harris to "mount a science-based challenge to Hume’s famous separation of facts from values" as errant, while identifying himself as a "moral realist", along with Harris. In his review of the book, Pigliucci notes that Harris is a consequentialist, and states

"...Harris entirely evades philosophical criticism of his positions, on the simple grounds that he finds metaethics "boring." But he is a self-professed consequentialist -- a philosophical stance close to utilitarianism -- who simply ducks any discussion of the implications of that a priori choice, which informs his entire view of what counts for morality, happiness, well-being and so forth. He seems unaware (or doesn’t care about) the serious philosophical objections that have been raised against consequentialism, and even less so of the various moves in logical space (some more convincing than others) that consequentialist have made to defend their position".
**Free will**

Harris says the idea of free will is incoherent and "cannot be mapped on to any conceivable reality". Humans are not free and no sense can be given to the concept that we might be. According to Harris, science "reveals you to be a biochemical puppet." People's thoughts and intentions, Harris says, "emerge from background causes of which we are unaware and over which we exert no conscious control." Every choice we make is made as a result of preceding causes. These choices we make are determined by those causes, and are therefore not really choices at all. Harris also draws a distinction between conscious and unconscious reactions to the world. Even without free will, consciousness has an important role to play in the choices we make. Harris argues that this realization about the human mind does not undermine morality or diminish the importance of social and political freedom, but it can and should change the way we think about some of the most important questions in life.

Commenting on Harris's book *Free Will*, Daniel Dennett disagrees with Harris' position on compatibilism, and asks if Harris is directing his arguments against an unreasonably absolute or "perfect freedom" version of compatibilism, which Dennett would describe as an incoherent, straw man version.

**Social and economic politics**

Harris describes himself as a liberal, and states that he supports raising taxes on the wealthy, decriminalizing drugs, and the rights of homosexuals to marry. He was critical of the Bush administration's war in Iraq, fiscal policy and treatment of science.

**Organizational affiliations**

In 2007 Harris and his wife, Annaka Harris, founded Project Reason, a charitable foundation devoted to spreading scientific knowledge and secular values in society.

Harris is also a member of the advisory board of the Secular Coalition for America, a national lobbying organization representing the interests of nontheistic Americans.

**Neuroscience**

Building on his interests in belief and religion, Harris completed a PhD in cognitive neuroscience at UCLA. He used fMRI to explore whether the brain responses differ between sentences that subjects judged as true, false, or undecidable, across a wide range of categories including autobiographical, mathematical, geographical, religious, ethical, semantic, and factual statements.

In another study, Harris and colleagues examined the neural basis of religious and non-religious belief using fMRI. Fifteen committed Christians and fifteen nonbelievers were scanned as they evaluated the truth and falsity of religious and nonreligious propositions. For both groups, statements of belief (sentences judged as either true or false) were associated with increased activation of ventromedial prefrontal cortex, a region of the brain involved in emotional judgment, processing uncertainty, assessing rewards and thinking about oneself. A "comparison of all religious trials to all nonreligious trials produced a wide range of signal differences throughout the brain," and the processing of religious belief and empirical belief differed in significant ways. The regions associated with increased activation in response to religious stimuli included the anterior insula, the ventral striatum, the anterior cingulate cortex, and the posterior medial cortex.

**Writings and media appearances**

Harris’s writing focuses on neuroscience and criticism of religion, for which he is best known. He blogs for the Washington Post, the Huffington Post, and formerly for Truthdig, and his articles have appeared in such publications as Newsweek, The New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, the Boston Globe, and the British national newspaper The Times.

Harris has made numerous TV and radio appearances, including on The O’Reilly Factor, ABC News, Tucker, Book TV, NPR, Real Time, The Colbert Report, and The Daily Show. In 2005, Harris appeared in the documentary film *The God Who Wasn’t There*. Harris was a featured speaker at the 2006 conference Beyond Belief: Science, Religion, Reason and Survival. He made two presentations and participated in the ensuing panel discussions. Harris has also appeared a number of times on the Point of Inquiry radio podcast. Harris engaged in a lengthy debate with Andrew Sullivan on the internet forum Beliefnet. In April 2007, Harris debated with the evangelical
pastor Rick Warren for Newsweek magazine. In April 2011, he debated William Lane Craig on the nature of morality.

In September 2011 Harris’s essay Lying was published as a Kindle single. Harris has appeared as a guest on The Joe Rogan Experience podcast four times, most recently in April 2015. The conversations have each lasted around three hours and have covered a variety of topics related to Harris’s research, books, and interests.

On September 28, 2012, Harris spoke at the Festival of Dangerous Ideas in Sydney, Australia. His speech was on the delusion of Free Will, which is also the topic of his book of 2012.


Note 6: Fritjof Capra (born February 1, 1939) is an Austrian-born American physicist. He is a founding director of the Center for Ecoliteracy in Berkeley, California, and is on the faculty of Schumacher College.


Born in Vienna, Austria, Capra attended the University of Vienna, where he earned his Ph.D. in theoretical physics in 1966. He conducted research in particle physics and systems theory at the University of Paris (1966–1968), the University of California, Santa Cruz (1968–1970), the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (1970), Imperial College, London (1971–1974) and the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory (1975–1988). While at Berkeley, he was a member of the Fundamental Fysiks Group, founded in May 1975 by Elizabeth Rauscher and George Weissmann, which met weekly to discuss philosophy and quantum physics. He also taught at U.C. Santa Cruz, U.C. Berkeley, and San Francisco State University.

He has written popular books on the implications of science, notably The Tao of Physics, subtitled An Exploration of the Parallels Between Modern Physics and Eastern Mysticism. The Tao of Physics asserts that both physics and metaphysics lead inexorably to the same knowledge. After touring Germany in the early 1980s, Capra co-wrote Green Politics with ecofeminist author Charlene Spretnak in 1984. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fritjof_Capra]

Note 7: Capra, Fritjof ‘The Tao of Physics’ Third edition published by Flamingo, 77-85 Fulham Palace Road, Hammersmith, London W6 8JB. 1992. See pp15-6 of Preface to the second edition. ‘We are witnessing, at the same time (as a crisis of social, ecological, moral and spiritual dimensions) the beginning of a tremendous evolutionary movement that seems to illustrate the ancient Chinese saying that ‘the yang, having reached its climax, retreats in favour of the yin.’ The 1960s and 1970s have generated a whole series of social movements which all seem to go in the same direction. The rising concern with ecology, the strong interest in mysticism, the growing feminist awareness, and the rediscovery of holistic approaches to health and healing are all manifestations of the same evolutionary trend. They all counteract the overemphasis of rational, masculine attitudes and values, and attempt to regain a balance between the masculine and feminine3 sides of human nature. Thus, the awareness of the profound harmony between the world view of modern physics and the views of Eastern mysticism now appears as an integral part of a much larger cultural transformation, leading to the emergence of a new vision of reality that will require a fundamental change in our thoughts, perceptions and values.’


Note 9: Flanagan, Martin Peter Kennedy, The man who threatened Rome. Published by One day hill. Chapter by Noel Preston p.167.
Gender in a Partnership Society

A vexed question? —or not?
Gender in a partnership society will be seen differently—more like a continuum than a division. To the left on the gender span we have alpha males¹ [Note 1: Alpha definition] and to the far right submissive women. From left to right there is a graduation from high testosterone² [Note 2: Testosterone] to high oestrogen. ³ [Note 3: Oestrogen] A proportion of individuals in the centre of the spectrum share both male and female characteristics.

Carl Jung, ⁴ [Note 4: Carl Jung] a psychologist who followed in Freud’s footsteps, taught there were both masculine and feminine aspects of individual personalities and believed individuals reached their full potential when they merged the masculine and the feminine within themselves and became ‘androgynous’. ⁵ [Note: androgyny] The division of humanity into two categories was never realistic. It was a rude approximation that suited the purposes of a hierarchical society—a cut and dried formula to simplify decisions. It also reflected the nature of the gladiators who wanted clarity, yes/no divisions and ascendency. But to be fair, the scientific knowledge on which our present understandings are built was simply not available.

In our modern era, scientific knowledge has revealed the complexity of the gender ‘genes’ and education has disseminated that knowledge. As a result, the simplistic division of the world into two genders is no longer acceptable which means we should be free to be who we are and what we wish to become. Some are alpha males and will always be so. Some are strong and combative females. Some are gentle and compassionate men. Some are both or neither. Some don’t know yet.

Transgender
At birth it sometimes happens that gender is ambiguous. Male sexual organs may not be obvious and a child is labelled female. The appearance of sexual organs may be confusing and the attending doctor chooses the most likely gender. In later years if this decision is found to be incorrect the individual will feel the need to change gender.

Gender theorist Susan Stryker in a book titled Transgender History discusses the history of the transgender movement in the United States and, to a smaller extent, in Europe.

‘Transgender was pathologized from the 1850s through the 1950s by the medical community and any type of gender nonconformity was treated as an illness.’ ⁶ [See Note 6: Transgender]

The society of the future will not stigmatize or denigrate people for being who they naturally are. Without the age-old male/female divisions there will be no need. Financial, medical, legal and social assistance will be available for transgender individuals to choose the role they prefer. In Australia, we are already well on the path to this outcome.

Same-sex partnership
Same-sex partnership is not really about gender, however it seems convenient to discuss it at this point as individuals who prefer same-sex partners have often been stigmatized and denigrated in a similar manner to transgender individuals. ⁷ [Note 7: Societal attitudes towards same-sex relationships] How does it come about? Well, it seems a small proportion of children, just as they might have blue eyes or brown skin, are born with the tendency. And that’s just how it is.
Same-sex relationships in the UK ‘Before and during the formation of the UK, Christianity and homosexuality clashed. Same-sex sexual activity was characterised as sinful and, under the Buggery Act 1533, was outlawed and punishable by death. LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender) rights first came to prominence following the decriminalisation of same-sex sexual activity across the UK between 1967 and 1982.’ [See Note 8: Same sex relationships in the UK]

In 1955 the Wolfenden Committee (UK) investigated the same-sex issue and its decriminalisation. [Note 9: The Wolfenden Committee UK]

Same-sex relationships in Australia ‘Early laws in Australia were based on then-current laws in Britain, which were inherited upon colonisation in 1788. Lesbianism was never illegal in Britain nor its colonies, including Australia. Sodomy laws, however, were part of Australian law, from 1788 through to 1994 under Human Rights (Sexual Conduct) Act 1994. The punishment for "buggery" (sodomy) was reduced from execution to life in prison in 1899.’ [See Note 10: Same-sex legislation in Australia]

Since settlement days LGBT individuals have steadily gained equal rights and since the 1970’s even more ground has been gained. [Note 11: 1972 legislation in South Australia]

A great deal of misery and pain has resulted from inadequate understandings of gender and sexuality. Suicide within the LGBT [Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender] community is higher than among the surrounding community. [Note 12: Suicide in LGBT community] Bullying and name-calling is common. Discrimination, though illegal, still occurs. Thousands have suffered simply for being different.

I heard how a woman lost her child because Lesbianism was thought to make her an unfit mother. I know similar stories but this one was very compelling. It was 1978 in London where she and her husband had been living for several years. When she realised her sexuality and fell in love with a woman, it became intolerable for her to continue living in a married relationship. She left the family home taking their five-year-old son with her.

A court case ensued for custody in which the woman was disadvantaged by lack of access to bank accounts from which she had been blocked. She had to rely on Legal Aid, while her husband could hire a lawyer and a barrister. Six weeks before the case went to court her lawyer pulled out of the case saying it was too ‘controversial’ which left her to find and brief another law firm.

The case lasted four days and was held ‘in camera’ which meant there was no support from friends or family as no-one else was allowed in the court room other than for giving evidence. The question of divorce had not crossed her mind as she was concentrated solely on custody issues, however to her confusion the first half hour of the case was devoted to the difference between the parents’ religious beliefs and summarily getting divorced. However, this was just one of the shocks which lay ahead. Having never been in a law court and having no warning of the remorseless questioning by her husband’s barrister left her unprepared for the ensuing battle. They threw everything they could find at her; used her poems—seeking explanations to their
meaning and implying they showed she was unstable; used an admission that she had been to an hotel with her female partner and drunk a scotch suggesting they were drunkards. Even scarves she had purchased to make a quilt were used to imply she was a would-be bondage queen. The gloves were off—at least from the husband’s corner. You were” unworldly” I commented. ’Yes’, she said ‘I was’.

The outcome was custody awarded to the husband with the judge saying the child would be in moral danger if he were to be left in the care of the mother. She also granted the mother no access saying she could go back to Australia and seek it there.

The mother sought further advice from a higher authority and discovered the case was quite a talking point and would make the law books in the United Kingdom.

Before the court case her husband had declared he would bring her down and see her in the gutter. This he did not achieve. But the experience changed the mother’s character. It made her stronger and more of a risk taker (she said she felt she had lost so much when she had to part from her child that nothing could hurt her again) which stood her in good stead in future years in business and life.

Eventually back in Australia she gained access to her son and maintained a good relationship with him. She told me her view had been that both she and her former husband loved their son and both wanted to be the one to care for him, but she could not accept the treatment she had received and the reasons she was judged so wrongly.

In a strictly-controlled society diversity is not tolerated. However, we are breaking out of that mind-set to discover freedom and diversity do not need to lead to anarchy. True, we need to set some boundaries, but those can be minimal compared to what has gone before.

**Pedophilia** is a condition where an adult experiences sexual attraction to children. Pedophiles cannot have the right to be who they naturally are as their actions endanger the well-being of children and would be harmful in a society where children are cherished. Nonetheless, they (pedophiles) should be treated with compassion. In general, they did not choose to be who they are and while every care is taken to limit their behaviour, we should also be concerned for their safety and welfare. Pedophilia should not be confused with same-sex relationships.

Australia has yet to legalise same-sex marriage. No doubt it will come eventually. In 2017 the government has initiated a postal survey to give people a say, and the process is divisive. It is interesting to note that just as the popularity of marriage is declining in the hetero-sexual population it is gaining popularity among LGBT communities.

Treating people equally regardless of gender, sexuality, race, religion or disability is not only compassionate and fair, it is also a great gain to the nation’s economy and stability. People who are treated fairly and compassionately and accepted as valuable members of a community are free to develop their potential and will contribute more than they would if derided and held back.
Chapter 8  Gender within a partnership society

Note 1: In social animals, an alpha is the individual in the community with the highest rank. Male or female individuals or both can be alphas, depending on their species. Where one male and one female fulfill this role, they are referred to as the alpha pair. Other animals in the same social group may exhibit deference or other symbolic signs of respect particular to their species towards the alpha or alphas.

In hierarchical social animals, alphas usually gain preferential access to food and other desirable items or activities, though the extent of this social effect varies widely by species. Male and/or female alphas may gain preferential access to sex or mates, and in some species only alphas or an alpha pair is permitted to reproduce.

Alphas may achieve their status by means of superior physical prowess and/or through social efforts and building alliances within the group. The position of alpha also changes in some species, usually through a physical fight between a dominant and subordinate animal. Such fights may or may not be to the death, with relevant behavior varying between circumstance and species. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alpha_(ethology)]

Note 2: Testosterone is a steroid hormone from the androgen group and is found in humans and other vertebrates. In humans and other mammals, testosterone is secreted primarily by the testicles of males and, to a lesser extent, the ovaries of females. Small amounts are also secreted by the adrenal glands. It is the principal male sex hormone and an anabolic steroid.

In men, testosterone plays a key role in the development of male reproductive tissues such as the testis and prostate as well as promoting secondary sexual characteristics such as increased muscle, bone mass, and the growth of body hair. In addition, testosterone is essential for health and well-being as well as the prevention of osteoporosis.

On average, in adult males, levels of testosterone are about 7–8 times as great as in adult females. As the metabolic consumption of testosterone in males is greater, the daily production is about 20 times greater in men. Females are also more sensitive to the hormone. Testosterone is observed in most vertebrates. Fish make a slightly different form called 11-ketotestosterone. Its counterpart in insects is ecdysone. These ubiquitous steroids suggest that sex hormones have an ancient evolutionary history. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Testosterone]

Note 3: Estrogen or oestrogen is the primary female sex hormone that is responsible for the development and regulation of the female reproductive system and secondary sex characteristics. Estrogen may also refer to any substance, natural or synthetic that mimics the effects of the natural hormone. The steroid 17-β-estradiol is the most potent and prevalent endogenous estrogen, but several metabolites of estradiol also have estrogenic hormonal activity. Synthetic estrogens are used as part of some oral contraceptives, in estrogen replacement therapy for postmenopausal women, and in hormone replacement therapy for trans women. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Estrogen]

Note 4: Carl Gustav Jung (/jʊŋ/; German: [ˈkarl ˈɡʊstaf jʊŋ]; 26 July 1875 – 6 June 1961), often referred to as C. G. Jung, was a Swiss psychiatrist and psychotherapist who founded analytical psychology. His work has been influential not only in psychiatry but also in philosophy, anthropology, archaeology, literature, and religious studies. He was a prolific writer, though many of his works were not published until after his death.

The central concept of analytical psychology is individuation—the psychological process of integrating the opposites, including the conscious with the unconscious, while still maintaining their relative autonomy. Jung considered individuation to be the central process of human development.

Jung created some of the best known psychological concepts, including the archetype, the collective unconscious, the complex, and extraversion and introversion. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carl_Jung]
Note 5: **Androgyny** is the combination of masculine and feminine characteristics. Sexual ambiguity may be found in fashion, gender identity, sexual identity, or sexual lifestyle. It can also refer to biological intersex physicality, especially with regard to plant and human sexuality. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Androgyny]

Note 6: **Transgender** was pathologized from the 1850s through the 1950s by the medical community and how any type of gender nonconformity was treated as an illness. At the same time...the earliest forms of the transgender movement began and groups and organizations began to form. During this period, the ideas of sexuality and gender, homosexuality and transgender specifically, were not as clearly defined and often were assumed to be synonymous or at least closely related. Efforts to clearly differentiate gender into its own subject were seen through the actions of people like Magnus Hirschfeld and groups like the self-described androgynes that made up the Cercle Hermaphroditos. These social and medical discussions helped to advance the visibility of transgenderism and to bring it into the public sphere. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transgender_History February 13, 2015]

Note 7: **Same-sex relationships in the UK.** Before and during the formation of the UK, Christianity and homosexuality clashed. Same-sex sexual activity was characterised as sinful and, under the Buggerity Act 1533, was outlawed and punishable by death. LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender) rights first came to prominence following the decriminalisation of same-sex sexual activity across the UK between 1967 and 1982. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT_rights_in_the_United_Kingdom]

Since the turn of the 21st century, LGBT rights have increasingly strengthened in support. Some discrimination protections had existed for LGBT people since 1999, but were extended to all areas under the Equality Act 2010. In 2000, Her Majesty’s Armed Forces removed its ban on LGBT individuals serving openly. The age of consent was equalised, regardless of sexual orientation, in 2001. Transgender people have had the right to change their legal gender since 2005. The same year, same-sex couples were granted the right to enter into a civil partnership, a similar legal structure to marriage, and also to adopt in England and Wales. Scotland later followed on adoption rights for same-sex couples in 2009, and Northern Ireland in 2013. Same-sex marriage was legalised in England, Wales and Scotland in 2014, but remains illegal in Northern Ireland where it is recognised as a civil partnership.

Today, LGBT citizens have most of the same legal rights as non-LGBT citizens and the UK provides one of the highest degrees of liberty in the world for its LGBT communities. In ILGA-Europe’s 2014 review of LGBTI rights, the UK received the highest score in Europe, with 82% progress toward “respect of human rights and full equality.”

An Integrated Household Survey estimated 1.5% people in the UK identify themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual – far lower than previous estimates of 5–7%. Interpreting the statistics, an Office for National Statistics (ONS) spokesperson said, "Someone may engage in sexual behaviour with someone of the same sex but still not perceive themselves as gay." LGBT rights organisations and very large LGBT communities have been built across the UK, most notably in Birmingham, Blackpool, Brighton, Leeds, Liverpool, London, Manchester and Newcastle, which all host annual pride festivals. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT_rights_in_the_United_Kingdom February 13, 2015]

Note 8: **Societal attitudes towards same-sex relationships** have varied over time and place, from expecting all males to engage in same-sex relationships, to casual integration, through acceptance, to seeing the practice as a minor sin, repressing it through law enforcement and judicial mechanisms, and to proscribing it under penalty of death. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_homosexuality February 13, 2015]

Note 9: **Wolfenden Report** Disregarding the conventional ideas of the day, the committee recommended that "homosexual behaviour between consenting adults in private should no longer be a criminal offence". All but James Adair were in favour of this and, contrary to some medical and psychiatric witnesses’ evidence at that time, found that "homosexuality cannot legitimately be regarded as a disease, because in many cases it is the only symptom and is compatible with full mental health in other respects." The report added, "The law’s function is to preserve public order and decency, to protect the citizen from what is offensive or injurious, and to provide sufficient safeguards against exploitation and corruption of others... It is not, in our view, the function of the law to intervene in the private life of citizens, or to seek to enforce any particular pattern of behaviour." The recommended age of consent was 21 (the age of majority in the UK then). [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wolfenden_report February 14, 2015]
‘Early laws in Australia were based on then-current laws in Britain, which were inherited upon colonisation in 1788. Lesbianism was never illegal in Britain nor its colonies, including Australia. Sodomy laws, however, were part of Australian law, from 1788 through to 1994 under Human Rights (Sexual Conduct) Act 1994. The punishment for “buggery” (sodomy) was reduced from execution to life in prison in 1899.’

Throughout the transportation period there was a severe imbalance between the sexes, convict and free, and large numbers of convicts were kept in relative or complete isolation from the other sex. Ample evidence exists of the prevalence of homosexual behaviour; it is intermittent in the early years but more abundant after the term of Governor Lachlan Macquarie. Some historians have suggested that anti-sodomy rhetoric was utilised effectively against the practice of transportation, resulting in its eventual conclusion in the 1840s, although the emergence of gold mining also led to an increase in free migration and settlement.

In 1796 Francis Wilkinson became the first man to be charged with buggery (but acquitted). Class differences appear to have been involved in tolerance and indulgence of gay sex amongst convicts, with little attention paid by working-class convicts, but condemnation from middle-class or upwardly mobile transportees.

In 1822 an official inquiry into the sexual scandal that resulted from the movement of thirty female prisoners to the male prison farm at Emu Plains reported the rumour that the women had been placed there to prevent “unnatural crimes” on the part of the men.

In a secret dispatch of 1843 the Lieutenant Governor of Van Diemen’s Land stated that women in the Hobart female factory have “their Fancy-women, or lovers, to who they are attached with as much ardour as they would be to the opposite sex, and practice onanism to the greatest extent.”

Note 11: In 1972, the Dunstan Labor government introduced a consenting adults in private type defence in South Australia. This defence was later introduced as a bill by Murray Hill, father of former Defence Minister Robert Hill, in 1975, South Australia became the first state or territory to legalise sexual conduct between males.

Other states and territories repealed their laws between 1976 and 1990. The exception was Tasmania, which retained its laws until the Federal Government and the United Nations Human Rights Committee forced their repeal in 1997.

An estimated 500 people marched down George Street to a rally in Martin Plaza in Sydney on 24 June 1978. Organisers said the march and rally were part of “international homosexual solidarity day” to demonstrate against sexual repression in Australia and other countries. The event recurred annually, becoming the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras which celebrated its 30th anniversary in 2008.

In 1984, the Australian Medical Association removed homosexuality from its list of illnesses and disorders.

The last gay man was arrested on 14 December 1984 in Hobart, Tasmania, when he was found having sexual conduct with another man on the side of the road in a car. He was sentenced to eight months jail.

In 1991, after consistent pressure from Gay and Lesbian Immigration Task Force (GLITF), the Migration Amendment Act (No. 2) 1991 (Cth) was passed, amending the Migration Act 1958 (Cth) to allow Australian Citizens and Permanent Residents to sponsor their same-sex partners to Australia through a new Interdependency Visa.

In 1994, the Commonwealth passed the Human Rights (Sexual Conduct) Act 1994 – Section 4, legalising sexual activity between consenting adults (in private) throughout Australia. It wasn’t until 1997 however when the law in Tasmania prohibiting gay male sexual conduct was repealed in Tasmania. However the ban on gay male sexual conduct was overturned in the courts in 1996 following Toonen v. Australia that gay male sexual conduct became formally legal in all Australian states and territories when the federal government passed the Human Rights (Sexual Conduct) Act 1994.
Note 12: Researchers have found that attempted suicide rates and suicidal ideation among lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQQ) youth is comparatively higher than among the general population. LGBT teens and young adults have one of the highest rates of suicide attempts. According to some groups, this is linked to hetero-centric cultures and institutionalised homophobia in some cases, including the use of rights and protections for LGBT people as a political wedge issue like in the contemporary efforts to halt legalising same-sex marriages. Depression and drug use among LGBT people have both been shown to increase significantly after new laws that discriminate against gay people are passed.

Bullying of LGBT youth has been shown to be a contributing factor in many suicides, even if not all of the attacks have been specifically addressing sexuality or gender. Since a series of suicides in the early 2000s, more attention has been focused on the issues and underlying causes in an effort to reduce suicides among LGBTQQ youth. The Family Acceptance Project’s research has demonstrated that "parental acceptance, and even neutrality, with regard to a child's sexual orientation" can bring down the attempted suicide rate. Suicidal ideation and attempts seem to be roughly the same for heterosexual youth as for youth counterparts who have same-sex attractions and behavior but do not identify as being LGBTQQ. This correlates with the findings of a large survey of US adults that found higher rates of “mood and anxiety disorders, key risk factors for suicidal behavior,” are linked to people who identify as gay, lesbian, and bisexual, rather than sexual behaviors, especially for men.

The National Action Alliance for Suicide Prevention notes there are no national data (for the U.S.) regarding suicidal ideation or suicide rates among the LGBT population as a whole or in part, for LGBT youth or LGBT seniors, for example. In part because there is no agreed percentage of the national population that is LGBTQQ, or even identifies as LGBTQ, also death certificates do not include sexuality information. A 1986 study noted that previous large scale studies of completed suicides did not “consider sexual orientation in their data analyses.” [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Suicide_among_LGBT_youth]
Growing older in a Partnership Society

Security, health, companionship
Living longer

Growing older in Australia is now much better—not for every single person—but for most of us. Australians are living longer. 80 is the new 60. Older citizens are also healthier and wealthier. More services cater to their needs.

‘In 2014, 3.4 million Australians were aged 65 and over and 456,600 people were aged 85 and over. Women accounted for 54% of people aged 65 and over and 65% of people aged 85 and over’.¹ [ Note 1: Statistics on ageing. http://www.aihw.gov.au/ageing/about/]

‘Increases to life expectancy are good news, reflecting older Australians’ improved health and well-being. Various health surveys have found that an increasing proportion of older Australians rate their health as good, very good or excellent. Almost three-quarters of older Australians rated their health as good, very good or excellent in the 2011–2012 Australian Health Survey.’¹ [ Note 1: Statistics on ageing. http://www.aihw.gov.au/ageing/about/]

In 1880, average life expectancy was about 47 for men and 51 for women and about 10 years less for Aboriginal people. Life was difficult in the early days in Australia. Welfare payments were sparse.

‘Prior to 1900 in Australia, charitable assistance from benevolent societies, sometimes with financial contributions from the authorities, was the primary means of relief for people not able to support themselves. The 1890s economic depression and the rise of the trade unions and the Labor parties during this period led to a movement for welfare reform.

In 1900, the states of New South Wales and Victoria enacted legislation introducing non-contributory pensions for those aged 65 and over. Queensland legislated a similar system in 1907 before the Australian labor Commonwealth government led by Andrew Fisher introduced a national aged pension under the Invalid and Old-Aged Pensions Act 1908. A national invalid disability pension was started in 1910, and a national maternity allowance was introduced in 1912.

During the Second World War, Australia under a labor government created a welfare state by enacting national schemes for: child endowment in 1941 (superseding the 1927 New South Wales scheme); a widows’ pension in 1942 (superseding the New South Wales 1926 scheme); a wife’s allowance in 1943; additional allowances for the children of pensioners in 1943; and unemployment, sickness, and special benefits in 1945 (superseding the Queensland 1923 scheme).² [Note 2: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_security_in_Australia#History]

Super-annuation is compulsory and wide-spread among people with regular employment and provides a financial safety-net for older Australians.

The pension age is now 65 and rising. As the average age increases it may rise to 70 although few are still capable of working at that age particularly if they have been accustomed to manual labour.

Housing is becoming problematic. The number of elderly people not owning a dwelling is growing; rentals are higher in major cities and homelessness is increasing.

Unemployment is likely to grow as technology plays more of a role. This will impact severely across a wide spectrum and will need to be met with changes to the welfare system and services.
What happens to older people nowadays when they become infirm?
I remember hearing Eskimos left their old and infirm relatives to perish in the snow when they could no longer keep up with the travelling party so I checked. The last reported case was in 1939, but the custom was a rarity long before that. In any case, the common perception of taking Granny out to the nearest ice floe and setting her adrift is wrong. I can’t prove it never happened, but it wasn’t the usual method. [Note 4: Senilicide]

As I grow older, it is reassuring to know this custom is not the norm. The Australian way is a little kinder. There are retirement villages. There are nursing homes. There are granny flats attached to family homes. Government regulation ensures that most of these facilities provide adequate and safe care.

Caring for older relatives
I often use the ‘Normal Curve’ to describe the range of behaviours that can be expected statistically. Explained simply, it means some small % of behaviours are on the left of the curve; a small % on the right but most are under the middle.

About 68% of values drawn from a normal distribution are within one standard deviation $\sigma$ away from the mean; about 95% of the values lie within two standard deviations; and about 99.7% are within three standard deviations. This fact is known as the 68-95-99.7 (empirical) rule, or the 3-sigma rule.

This is how we could expect people to treat elder relatives. Some show the utmost care and love; most do pretty well; a few mistreat the people in their care.

Elder abuse
This can take several forms but the most common are Financial, Physical and Psychological. In 2007, 4766 cases of suspected abuse, neglect, or financial exploitation involving older adults were reported (42% material or financial, 12% physical and 59% psychological.) an increase of 9% over 2006.’

‘Although evidence about the prevalence of elder abuse in Australia is lacking, it is likely that between 2% am 10% of older Australians experience elder abuse in any given year, and the prevalence of neglect is possibly higher. The available evidence suggests that most elder abuse is intra-family and intergenerational, with mothers most often being the subject of abuse by sons, although abuse by daughters is also common, and fathers are victims too. Financial abuse appears to be the most common form of abuse experienced by elderly people, and this is the area where most empirical research is available.’ [Australian Government Australian Institute of Family Studies. Aifs.gov.au]
1. Financial abuse
   The following are given in the Monash Study as common examples of financial abuse:
   - Theft
   - Misappropriation or misuse of money, property or assets
   - Exerting undue influence to give away assets or gifts
   - Putting undue pressure on the older person to accept lower-cost or lower-quality services in order to preserve more financial resources to be passed to beneficiaries on death
   - Carrying out unnecessary work or overcharging for a service
   - Misuse of powers of attorney
   - Denial to access funds
   - Failure to repay loans
   - Living with the older person and refusing to contribute money for expenses
   - Forging or forcing an older person’s signature
   - Promising long-term care in exchange for money or property and then not providing the promised care
   - Getting an older person to sign a will, contract or power of attorney through deception, coercion or undue influence
   - Abusing joint signatory authority on a blank form
   - Getting an older person to be a guarantor for a loan where the benefit of the loan is for someone else without sufficient information or knowledge to make an informed decision

   One of my relatives fell into the category of financial abuse when her son’s business went bankrupt. He had persuaded her to be a director, and when the axe fell, ran off and left her to bear the burden of repaying creditors. She lost everything. Her final years were a catalogue of anxiety. There was a struggle to keep up interest payments on her home and years of illness.

2. Physical abuse
   There are reports of physical abuse in nursing homes and residential care facilities..... neglecting the need for food and medical assistance as well. This issue has surfaced since an ABC Four Corners program in June, 2017. It seems obvious some problems are the result of privatisation of aged care and the necessity to make a profit. My solution would be to move towards aged care with the involvement of the community and a democratised form of management.

   There is certain to be physical abuse or neglect in homes where it is less easily observed. General practitioners, home nursing care and Meals on Wheels play a part in identifying and reporting this and arranging assistance. Neighbours, friends and relatives are also important.

3. Psychological abuse
   This is the most common form of abuse. Elderly people are at the mercy of their carers. If they are treated in a thoughtless or deliberately cruel way it can be difficult to alleviate
their suffering. Where, however, older people stay active for as long as possible and maintain a network of friends, alternative solutions may be possible.

I knew someone, sexually abused as a child and abused by her husband, who had a nervous break-down. For years, she was medicated on the assumption she was bi-polar. In a retirement village, her situation was difficult. She was on a Community Treatment order and was hospitalised when her moods caused upset. She had little money. A carer from the Health services took a risk and became a friend—just a friend but he was criticised by his supervisors and taken off her case. Yet, this was the breakthrough she needed. She had never been able to share her grief and pain. He had broken through and his friendship opened her world to the possibility of improvement. She began to work for a release from excessive medication and to be taken off the Community Treatment Order. She had many setbacks and sorrows; married a man she met in the home and had a year of happiness before he died. Was reconciled with her daughter. It took almost six years to achieve her goal but she is now off the Community Treatment Order and her medication is being gradually reduced. I consider her treatment a form of elder abuse. Although I am not a psychiatrist or medically qualified, I have seen a lot I think could have been done much better. The person in charge of her case didn’t visit her for years...would just sign a continuation of her CTO.

Another case is more positive. A friend was horrendously abused mentally and physically as a child. She married young and had four children before the memories of her past caught up with her and she could no longer cope. Her husband put her into mental care and left the family. Her sister stepped into the breach. My friend received psychiatric support and therapy and found another way to live. She was never free of the past pain but in all the years I knew her she was loving and kind, a good person to have as a friend. She couldn’t work but was supported by a disability pension and her family.

And my 94-year-old friend is amazing. She lives in a housing complex run by a Christian church; pays a modest rent which she can afford and is taken care of. A carer comes once a week to help with chores and her shopping. She has access to medical care through Medibank and the public hospital. My friend is contented. She has independence as well as security.

For myself, I am looking at what I may need to see out the last of my days. I’m aware of the years closing in. As a child, I was helpless and needed constant care. As I age I may return to the same condition. I have decisions to make. I am sorting my belongings; making an Advance Health Care plan—deciding if I will donate organs; settling my financial affairs; looking for a simpler place to live. It’s a bit disconcerting having to face termination but it’s made a lot easier because there are a lot of services available to help me through.

There are many options available to me that my grand-parents could not even have imagined. Medical treatment by visiting nurses; Meals on Wheels; Pension and other aged-care benefits; Discounts on electricity and phone bills; Concessions for travel and entry to shows.... The list goes on....And...the question of euthanasia is often discussed, but so far Australia hasn’t bitten the bullet. Palliative care is much improved and fewer people face extreme pain in their final days...however, there is a move to introduce VAD in Victoria...Voluntary Assisted Dying and I guess that is as good a place as any to end this chapter.
Chapter 9. Australia’s population is ageing

Australians aged 65 and over

Australia’s population is much older today than it has been in the past, and both the number and proportion of older people is growing steadily. In 1964, the median age in Australia was 28.5 years, and 8% of the population (948,100 people) were aged 65 and over. Only 0.4% of the population (50,100 people) were aged 85 and over.

In 2014, the median age had increased by almost a decade to 37.3 years, and the number of people aged 65 and over had more than tripled to 3.4 million. Older people now account for an increasing share of the population—15% of Australians were aged 65 and over in 2014, compared to 8% in 1964. In addition, there has been a nine-fold increase in the number of people aged 85 and over, up to 456,600 or 1.9% of the population in 2014.

These trends are predicted to continue, particularly as the baby boomer generation ages. The first baby boomers were born in 1947 and turned 65 in 2012, and will slowly be moving into the ‘old’ cohort—those aged 85 and over. Based on population projections by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, by 2064 there will be 9.6 million people aged 65 and over, and 1.9 million aged 85 and over, constituting 23% and 5% of Australia’s projected population respectively.

Life expectancy is increasing

Australia has one of the highest life expectancies in the world. In 2012, the combined life expectancy at birth for both boys and girls was 82.1 years—the sixth highest among Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries.

Life expectancies have been steadily increasing over time, both at birth and at later stages in life. For example, in the mid-1960s, women who were 65 could expect to live an additional 15 years, while men who were 65 could expect to live another 12 years.

By contrast, women who were 65 in 2013 could expect to live another 22 years to 87 years old, while their life expectancy at birth was 73. Likewise, males aged 65 in 2013 could expect to live another 19 years to 84 years old, although their life expectancy at birth was 67 [7].

Indigenous life expectancy gap narrowing

For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander boys born in the 2010–2012 period, estimated life expectancy at birth was 10.6 years lower than for non-Indigenous boys—69.1 years compared with 79.7.

For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander girls, estimated life expectancy was 9.5 years lower than for non-Indigenous girls—73.7 compared with 83.1. This gap has narrowed slightly over time as life expectancies have increased for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians.

The 2010–12 estimates indicated an increase of 1.6 years for boys and 0.6 years for girls, narrowing the gap by 0.8 and 0.1 years, respectively.

Further information

- Life expectancy
- Indigenous life expectancy: see the Indigenous observatory

Most older Australians in good health

Increases to life expectancy are good news, reflecting older Australians’ improved health and well-being. Various health surveys have found that an increasing proportion of older Australians rate their health as good, very good or excellent. Almost three-quarters of older Australians rated their health as good, very good or excellent in the 2011–2012 Australian Health Survey.
More years free of disability
From 1998 to 2012, there was a clear trend observed in an increasing number of years that were free of disability and severe or profound core limitation. Gains in life expectancy at age 65 were, on average, for more years without severe or profound limitation than years with it. Men who were aged 65 in 2012 gained 2.3 years without and 0.7 years with limitation, while women gained 2.0 years without and 0.3 years with limitation. Overall, Australians are living longer, and they are doing so in better health and with fewer functional restrictions.

Common health conditions affecting older Australians
The 2011–12 Australian Health Survey was the largest, most comprehensive health survey ever conducted in Australia. The survey asked people living in the community a range of questions about their health status, lifestyle and circumstances. The prevalence of a range of health conditions increases with age, and the survey found that older Australians were more affected by specific conditions.

The most commonly reported condition (excluding short- and long-sightedness) was arthritis, affecting half of people aged 65 and over. Hypertensive disease and hearing loss followed. Other conditions that had higher prevalence rates in older Australians included heart, stroke and vascular diseases, diabetes, and osteoporosis.

Dementia is also a significant health concern for older Australians. More information regarding this diverse group of degenerative neurological conditions can be found on the AIHW’s topic pages for dementia.

Leading causes of death among older Australians
Chronic diseases, rather than acute or infectious diseases, injuries or accidents, cause most deaths in Australia. In 2013, the median age at death was 81.7 years, and over 80% of deaths were amongst people aged 65 and over.

In 2013, the leading causes of death of older Australians were coronary heart disease, dementia (including Alzheimer disease), and cerebrovascular disease (such as stroke). Circulatory diseases, including coronary heart disease, have consistently been a leading cause of death of Australians over the last century. Deaths due to cerebrovascular disease have historically been the second leading cause of death in Australia; however, in 2013 this moved to the third leading cause. Deaths due to dementia have increased over the last decade, and in 2013, for the first time, dementia and Alzheimer disease became the second leading cause of death. Twice as many women as men died from dementia, and the overall number of deaths from dementia had increased by 137% since 2004.

[Trend in life expectancy](http://www.aihw.gov.au/ageing/about/)

Trends in life expectancy
Life expectancy in Australia has improved dramatically for both sexes in the last century, particularly life expectancy at birth. Compared with their counterparts in 1881–1890, boys and girls born in 2013–2015 can expect to live around 33 and 34 years longer, respectively.

Figure 1: Life expectancy (years) at birth by sex, 1881–1890 to 2013–2015
Life expectancy changes over the course of a person’s life because as they survive the periods of birth, childhood and adolescence, their chance of reaching older age increases. The life expectancy at different ages can be presented as the number of additional years a person can expect to live, or, their expected age at death in years.

Men aged 65 in 2013–2015 could expect to live another 19.5 years (an expected age at death of 84.5 years) and the life expectancy of women aged 65 in 2013–2015 was 22.3 years (an expected age at death of 87.3 years).

Table 1: Life expectancy (expected age at death in years) at different ages by sex, 1881–1890, 1960–1962 and 2013–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (birth)</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: ABS 2014a; ABS 2016

Life expectancy of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people
For the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population born in 2010–2012, life expectancy was estimated to be 10.6 years lower than that of the non-Indigenous population for males (69.1 years compared with 79.7) and 9.5 years for females (73.7 compared with 83.1).

Between 2005–2007 and 2010–2012, Indigenous life expectancy at birth for boys increased by 1.6 years and by 0.6 years for girls. Over the same period, the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous life expectancy narrowed by 0.8 years for males and 0.1 years for females.

For more information of Indigenous life expectancy, see the Indigenous observatory.

International comparisons of life expectancy

Australia enjoys one of the highest life expectancies of any country in the world, at 82.4 years in 2014 for males and females at birth combined—ranked seventh among Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. The highest life expectancy at birth was 81.3 for males in Iceland, and 86.8 for females in Japan.

Table 2: Life expectancy (years) at birth, top 10 OECD countries by sex, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.3</strong></td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td><strong>84.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4. **Senilicide** (the killing of old people) was never universal among Eskimos. It was common in some parts of their range but more so among the Inuit (Greenland to Northern Alaska) than the Yuit (western and southwestern Alaska). Even among the Inuit, some groups found the custom repugnant.

5. Where it was practiced, senilicide was rare except during famines. As long as there was enough food to go around, everyone got their share, including the relatively unproductive. Given that the usual diet consisted of fairly dependable catches of caribou, fish, and sea mammals, many years could pass between episodes of scarcity. Considering the dangers of hunting, the old and infirm who weren't expected to hunt could outlive a hunter in his prime.

6. On the other hand, when food did run short, the old and sick were looked upon as drains on the community's resources. Sometimes they were killed - thrown into the sea, buried alive, locked out in the cold, or starved to death.¹ [Note 1: Eskimo http://www.straightdope.com/columns/read/2160/did-eskimos-put-their-elderly-on-ice-floes-to-die]
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Doing business in a Partnership Society

Barter, money, economy, benefit
Trading developed as an exchange of goods or services so what one had might be shared with another to their mutual benefit. Then money became a ‘medium of exchange’. The system evolved, became more complex and moved from the original intention—to benefit each party to the exchange—to a system which benefited individuals or groups with more ‘money’.¹ [Note 1: Trade]

We now have ‘Capitalism’. It is not the only economic system in the world, but is the most widely accepted. While the essence of capitalism is private ownership, competition and profit, it has more than one form.² [Note 2: Capitalism]

‘The degree of competition, the role of intervention and regulation, and the scope of state ownership vary across different models of capitalism. Economists, political economists, and historians have adopted different perspectives in their analyses of capitalism and have recognized various forms of it in practice. These include laissez-faire or free market capitalism, welfare capitalism, crony capitalism, corporatism, "third way" social democracy and state capitalism. Each model has employed varying degrees of dependency on free markets, public ownership, obstacles to free competition, and inclusion of state-sanctioned social policies.’

The other main rivals were ‘Communism’³ [Note 3: Communism] and ‘Socialism’.⁴ [Note 4: Socialism]. In the communist system, the State owned the means of production and and decided what products and services would be provided. ‘Socialism’ has some of the features of State ownership, but calls it ‘common ownership’ and society can operate in a less controlled manner.

However, since the 1980’s, through the global influence of the United States of America, Capitalism has overtaken both communism and socialism.

Free-market economic theories originating in the USA have also increasingly overtaken the global economy. When Ronald Reagan was the USA President, economic rules for major corporations were deregulated and capitalism across the world adopted a laissez-faire or free market form where profit is given precedence over civil benefits. This system is sometimes called ‘Economic Rationalism.’ I think it a pernicious doctrine which benefits the rich at the expense of the poor; which treats workers as cogs in a wheel and puts to one side some of the most fundamental virtues of democracy.

An American documentary called ‘Capitalism—a love story’ (by film-maker Michael Moore) outlines the damage being done by ER (Economic Rationalism). [See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capitalism:_A_Love_Story]

Australia, which prior to the 1980’s had a democratic socialist approach to the economy was impacted by the rise of the new liberal economic approach and global changes. Succeeding governments in Australia have deregulated aspects of the economy, however, compared to the United States we have retained a fair amount of positive regulation—particularly of banks and financial mechanisms. This was of great assistance in 2007-8 during the Global Financial Crisis (GFC). Our well-regulated banks and other financial mechanisms (along with good economic guidance from the government) withstood financial pressures which almost brought down economies in other parts of the world.
What would be done differently in a partnership system?
Society needs adequate and well-thought-out regulation for the economy and financial institutions. Let us not throw out these safe-guards with the idea of ‘getting rid of red-tape’. Like the requirement of vaccination, careful regulation can benefit everyone in the community. It is a matter of balance.

Australians also need good, well-made products and services that pay attention to the needs of the environment—healthy products made in a way that provides participation and work for citizens. It needs opportunities for creativity and new inventions. It needs jobs to allow its people to obtain food, shelter, personal achievement and satisfaction.

Jobs
At present, not everyone wishing to do meaningful work can find employment. This will remain an important issue for the community (especially in respect of young people) as worthwhile work gives individuals a stake in the community and a reason for starting the day.

There are more constraints on the creation of jobs in a partnership society. Work should not harm the environment or the community. It should not create products that are dangerous or unhealthy. It should not harm workers, but rather increase their happiness and satisfaction. None of these worthwhile goals can be mandated, but legislation can guide the way to better forms of employment that are in line with our Australian character.

So should we, as the Labor and Green Parties are suggesting, speed up the transition to forms of national income such as renewable energy and services like health or tertiary education? Should we begin phasing out older industries such as coal mining and power created by coal? These are questions for the politicians and will also be questions for voters at the 2016/7 election. They are not easy questions as such massive economic change is challenging. They may make long-term sense, but they have a short-term cost and it will be interesting to see if politicians and voters are prepared to accept the cost.

Creating meaningful and worthwhile work for people will require imagination and risk-taking. Jobs may need to be shared—and, of course, remuneration. Perhaps for the sake of finding work people may agree to reduce their material and consumption needs.

Businesses may need to be subsidised to provide additional employment.

It might be possible to create service jobs through offering ‘micro-financing’—just enough to buy some equipment to begin offering a mini paying service, for example, a cleaning business, dog-washing, gardening, shoe cleaning, nanny service, digging bait and so on.

Youth employment—possibilities
In a partnership society after completing year twelve or its equivalent every young person will be offered a full year of modestly-paid employment or a year abroad as an Australian volunteer or student. The aim will be to broaden their experience and to bring assistance to the communities they visit. Young school leavers will be encouraged to put forward suggestions about potential employment that could benefit the community.

Jobs will be found doing work which otherwise might not be undertaken; protecting the environment; providing services for the elderly; tutoring or mentoring younger children;
coaching sporting teams; collecting litter or volunteering to assist overseas communities. These jobs may not be well-paid or even congenial, but will benefit both the community and the young people who do them.

**The YES fund**
There is a lot of worthwhile work to be done if a way can be found to fund it, for example, by a voluntary levy—the Youth Employment Support fund (The YES Fund). Australian citizens would have the opportunity to donate to a Government established fund to support jobs and other activities for young people. Every dollar donated would be matched by two dollars from the Federal Government. The fund would be managed by well-chosen individuals from industry and youth welfare groups.

Individuals would be under no obligation to accept the offer however incentives could be attached to encourage acceptance.

In a partnership society, we cannot allow up to 50% youth unemployment. It is a terrible waste of potential. We need to support our young people until they are able to make their own way in the world.

**Australian inventiveness and ingenuity**
Australian inventors and entrepreneurs need encouragement and assistance. In the past many Australian inventions have been lost because a ready market or funding assistance was unavailable. Perhaps funding and support could be obtained from a sophisticated version of crowd funding supported by government guarantee. \(^5\) [Note 5: Crowd funding]. It also seems we will need to grow the population of Australia as our inventors have not been able to find a ready market for their ingenuity in Australia. Much Australian creativity has gone offshore and been capitalised by others. [See Chapter 10 (final paras)]

**Participation**
We need to provide a more participatory environment for workers. Large hierarchical organisations impose restrictions on individual participation because they believe ‘control’ is in the interest of increased productivity. These organisations have a tendency to become impersonal and to dehumanise individuals in the process. We need to encourage more diversity and to understand how diversity (properly managed) can improve productivity and happiness.

When I was teaching Business Management principles and Quality Management to Advanced Diploma students at TAFE (Technical and Further Education), my students and I devised a way they could practise the lessons they were learning in class within their actual workplaces. They were to think of one small improvement to workplace productivity; work out precisely how this could be done, and then write up a plan for its implementation. When that was done satisfactorily it was my turn to assist them with ways to get their employers on side.

I used TAFE letter-head and set the proposals out professionally; I schooled the students carefully on how to present their proposals and how to invoke the participation of the teams they worked with. Almost all the organisations went along with the activity.
Several months later, when projects had been implemented, there were some great outcomes. One young man (in his twenties) wanted his firm (which was involved in gravel processing) to install a third machine as he believed the cost would be adequately covered by the increased productivity. He had worked out his plan to perfection. Management listened to him, acted on his suggestion and it all happened just as he had suggested it would.

Another wanted to work on medical devices in hospitals. While doing practical training as part of his TAFE course, he came up with a positive idea to keep devices maintained; went through the hoops we had worked out and not only brought improvement to the hospital but was employed there.

These are only two examples. Imagine if this idea were to be actioned through every TAFE college around Australia.

**Equality for women, children and families**

Present business models and political action have not yet resulted in equality for women in business. In a partnership society women, will fill an equal number of top roles. Men and women will work together each contributing their own strengths and relying upon each other where they lack skills or knowledge.

Child-care will be the mutual responsibility of both parents and working hours will be flexible for either parent in case of family emergencies. Fathers will be strongly encouraged to take parental leave at the birth of their children. Child-care facilities will be found in all workplaces or at least in close proximity to all work-places. An ethos will prevail where children and family are prioritised. A work-family balance will become the accepted norm with exceptions only in exceptional cases or business emergencies.

**Fair wages and conditions**

Complex negotiations will surround these issues until the aims of workers and employers are more closely aligned. Only when ethical considerations are taken into account by both groups will more positive outcomes begin to emerge. There will be more participation in decision-making within the firm, a less hierarchical management style and transparency in the accounts of businesses. Front-line workers will be encouraged to contribute their first-hand knowledge and ideas.

All firms will be required by law to engage in training apprentices and their own staff. They will be required to hire fairly when it comes to minorities and people with disabilities, and there will be a reasonable balance between casual and permanent employment.

However, there is no speedy route to these desirable outcomes, although introducing a form of industrial democracy (as Germany has done) might bring it about sooner. While this has been done successfully in Germany, an Australian version might be quite different⁶ [Note 6: German industrial relations]

**Industrial democracy**

Industrial democracy—where workers play a greater part in decisions made in the workplace and where they may own shares in the company or business where they work—is the way of
the future. In some businesses, workers may decide to share work and profits to create employment opportunities for other workers. ⁷ [Note 7 Industrial democracy]

**Ethical business practices**

A surprising development in business is the understanding of ways in which ethical business practices can lead to more productivity and more sustainable businesses. The move towards ethical business principles was fanned initially by public disappointment with the way many businesses were operating. A movement began to boycott firms the public deemed to be acting badly. The boycotts and accompanying action had a substantial effect. To regain public approval, organisations began to support community projects and to re-organise their firms towards more ethical outcomes. While this was done initially to avoid public criticism, businesses soon discovered substantial advantages. What they had been manoeuvred into by public pressure turned out to be positive for their bottom line as well. ⁸ [Note 8: Business ethical norms]

Workplace bullying has been a serious issue in many work-places. This became very obvious in the late 1980s and 90s. Pressures from globalisation, competition policy, constant restructuring and the effects of computerisation, meant businesses and institutions were struggling to keep up with government and/or profit requirements. New forms of management were common—many because of incursions by economic rationalism which was sweeping the world. During the time of the Howard government’s ‘Work Choices’ legislation (from 2006, until its repeal by the Rudd Labor government in 2009) bullying and depersonalisation of the work-force intensified. ⁹ [Note 9: Work Choices]

In 2010 the Gillard Labor government set up an inquiry into Workplace Bullying¹⁰ [Note 10: Workplace Bullying] and the Committee returned a report to the Parliament in 2013.

From Chapter 1.22, the Report comments on the extent of workplace bullying in the Australian context. ‘The prevalence of workplace bullying in Australia cannot be determined with any precision due to the absence of a national evidence base from which such indicators might be drawn. Consequently, various studies report widely different estimates of the prevalence of bullying in Australian workplaces.’

It is difficult to be certain. Some put the figure at 33%. Others as low as 6.8%. In my workplace in the 90’s it was very high indeed.

Recently the ABC reported bullying by surgeons: ‘A recent study into bullying by surgeons has discovered serious and sustained bullying. It was commissioned after vascular surgeon Dr Gabrielle McMullin said complaining about harassment could ruin a trainee’s career. Dr McMullin said she was saddened by the results. "I wasn't probably aware of the degree of the problem," she said. "It's a great deal more prevalent than I thought it was both for men and women. It's surprised me how many men have been damaged."

The report found bullying was the most common, reported by almost 40 per cent of surgical fellows, trainees and international medical graduates. Almost 20 per cent of surgeons reported discrimination and workplace harassment, with 7 per cent detailing instances of sexual harassment. The most prevalent form of discrimination was cultural, with one response reading: “They want you out of the country or they want you dead.”
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Bullying is illegal, but still continues. It needs to be over-whelmed by an expectation of respect and support. We should not be afraid to make ‘happiness’ one of the goals of business. Happiness for the investor, of course, but also for workers and customers.

Gail Kelly, CEO of Westpac had this to say:
‘At Westpac, our vision is to be one of the most respected companies in the world: helping our people, our customers and our communities prosper and grow.’¹¹ [Note 11: Westpac vision]

**Well-made products**
The Quality Movement has had a significant effect on business and to some extent been taken into the home environment as people are trained how to improve processes in their workplace. Methods of doing business continue to improve—better products, more responsiveness to the needs of customers and cheaper prices (although sometimes at the expense of primary producers).

At the same time, due to trading arrangements with overseas countries we are often not protecting customers from products made in countries with less stringent quality processes. In a partnership society, such trading arrangements will be re-negotiated to ensure only quality materials and products enter the Australian market.

**Sustainability**
More attention will be paid to the way products are developed, packaged, labelled, marketed and distributed. Strenuous efforts will be required to reduce waste and the over-use of natural materials and to limit the use of materials that cannot be recycled. Labelling and marketing will be improved to ensure customers can clearly identify the source of ingredients as well as the contents of food and other such products. Questions will be raised about products that could harm the health or welfare of the community or that of the environment. Carbon trading will be the norm. Solar power will have come into its own. Pollution will be reduced.

Regionalising economies as much as possible could maximise income for local businesses as well as employment opportunities and reduce the cost of duplication and transport. It makes sense to rationalise the way we grow and transport goods around the country. Instead of sending potatoes from Victoria to Queensland and from Queensland to Victoria, streamlining the process would save time and effort and fuel. This already happens to some extent.

The concept of bartering for goods and services will allow money-poor but skills-rich individuals to live well. Cooperatives may have a role to play in some local regions if there is the capacity to support them.

Local farmer markets are showing the way by giving customers access to fresh vegetables. They are getting a fair price while at the same time less is taken for transport and by middle-men.
It has always concerned me that we slaughter sentient animals for food. This is a personal foible and I confess I eat meat. But perhaps if we started babies and young children on a healthy diet minus meat we might eventually stop killing for food. Millions of people around the world exist on a mainly vegetarian diet and there are ways to prepare vegetables to make them tasty. Indian cuisine has developed a sumptuous range of dishes.

Supposing my hare-brained scheme to raise non-meat-eating children and adults worked, what would happen to cattle/sheep stations, piggeries and chicken farms across Australia and to the people whose incomes depend upon them? The number of cattle, sheep, pigs and chickens would decline. Fodder crops could be replaced by food crops. Reducing the impact of millions of cattle would help the environment.

The stations, farms and piggeries would gradually disappear. People would change the way they earned a living. It is likely, however, that the process would be glacially slow and carefully planned.

One alternative income-earner is to grow trees and to improve the soil. This depends on an adequate supply of water. A recent conversation with a taxi-driver (who else!) touched on the need for dams in Queensland to let go thousands of litres of water as they reached their capacity level. Meanwhile, some areas of the State are suffering one of the worst droughts in Queensland’s history. What stops us from transferring excess water in the east to places inland that desperately need it? Money, of course. However...

In Western Australia, a water pipe-line stretches hundreds of kilometres from a dam on the outskirts of its capital, Perth, to the inland town of Kalgoorlie. When the pipe-line was constructed in 1903, its cost was amply repaid by the amount of gold that came from the mine. No such immediate cost-retrieval would be possible with a scheme to move water inland for tree-farming and crop-growing but over time perhaps year by year we could put aside sufficient cash to construct it when the time is ripe.¹² [Note 12: Water pipe line in Western Australia]

Catching, processing and eating insects for protein could be a potential replacement for animal meat. This is already working in Asia.

Railways would be rebuilt (where possible) and used more extensively for transport—again a saving in time, effort, fuel and the repair of roads now damaged by heavy transport vehicles.

The big picture Since the 1960’s, business practices in Australia have changed remarkably. Super-markets are now the norm and have replaced many smaller shops. Similarly, agribusinesses have taken over many of what used to be small family-run farms. This was explained as ‘economy of scale and has probably resulted in cheaper prices and profitability for the consumers and the companies. However, size has its own problems one of which is the power that accrues to the businesses and subsequently the difficulty suppliers and customers to ensure a fair reward for their produce. Another emerging problem is the damage to biodiversity with mega-farming and mono-cultures.
Across the world mega-businesses may have larger budgets and more influence in some cases than governments. ‘Economic Rationalism’ (the view that it is better to let the market decide issues) has gained hold but does not go unchallenged by those who think it important for governments to play a part in modifying social impacts of the ‘Market’. To modify this business environment, efforts is needed to ensure these mega businesses pay their full share of taxes for the benefits they receive. To achieve this will need international co-operation.

‘Globalisation’ means we are now more connected to trends in the rest of the world and need to adapt our industry, economies and businesses to those of our trading partners.

Since the 1980’s Australia has turned more towards Asia to find business partners. The dislocation associated with these changes has been disruptive for Australians and created a lot of insecurity about work and wages. In most families, both parents now work and this is also stressful. On the other hand, women have access to the wider world throughout their working life and this is bringing more awareness and skill to the family.

Australia has a relatively small population which makes sustaining secondary industries problematic. The market here is too small; other countries are a good way off and costly to trade with. Our wages are high, which is another problem particularly in comparison to many Asian countries.

The response to this is not to lower Australian wages and conditions, but rather to create new business opportunities that appeal to home and overseas customers—new products and new ways of doing business. One such is the use of 3-D printing technology to manufacture parts for industry. Australian ingenuity is sufficient for this challenge. What is needed is Government and industry support. Often ideas come from the least expected places. If workplace participation is sought and respected, it is likely that some of the best ideas for the future of industry and business in this country will come from workers on the work-face—people who know the customers and the issues with the work they are doing each day.

NOTES

Chapter 10. Doing business within a partnership society

Note 1: The original form of trade, barter, saw the direct exchange of goods and services for other goods and services. Later one side of the barter started to involve precious metals, which gained symbolic as well as practical importance. Modern traders generally negotiate through a medium of exchange, such as money. As a result, buying can be separated from selling, or earning. The invention of money (and later credit, paper money and non-physical money) greatly simplified and promoted trade. Trade between two traders is called bilateral trade, while trade between more than two traders is called multilateral trade.

Trade exists due to the specialization and division of labor, in which most people concentrate on a small aspect of production, trading for other products. Trade exists between regions because different regions may have a comparative advantage (perceived or real) in the production of some trade-able commodity, or because different
regions' size may encourage mass production. As such, trade at market prices between locations can benefit both locations. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trade]

Note 3: **Capitalism** is an economic system and a mode of production in which trade, industries, and the means of production are largely or entirely privately owned. Private firms and proprietorships usually operate in order to generate profit, but may operate as private nonprofit organizations. Central characteristics of capitalism include private property, capital accumulation, wage labour and, in some situations, fully competitive markets. In a capitalist economy, the parties to a transaction typically determine the prices at which they exchange assets, goods, and services.

The degree of competition, the role of intervention and regulation, and the scope of state ownership vary across different models of capitalism. Economists, political economists, and historians have adopted different perspectives in their analyses of capitalism and have recognized various forms of it in practice. These include laissez-faire or free market capitalism, welfare capitalism, crony capitalism, corporatism, "third way" social democracy and state capitalism. Each model has employed varying degrees of dependency on free markets, public ownership, obstacles to free competition, and inclusion of state-sanctioned social policies.

The extent to which different markets are free, as well as the rules defining private property, become matters of politics and of policy. Many states have a mixed economy, which combines elements of both capitalism and centrally planned economics. Capitalism has existed under many forms of government, in many different times, places, and cultures. Following the decline of mercantilism, mixed capitalist systems became dominant in the Western world and continue to spread. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capitalism]

Note 3: **Communism** is a social, political, and economic ideology and movement whose ultimate goal is the establishment of the communist society, which is a socioeconomic order structured upon the common ownership of the means of production, absence of social classes, money, and the state.

Communism includes a variety of schools of thought, which broadly include Marxism, anarchism (anarchist communism) and the political ideologies grouped around both. All these hold in common the analysis that the current order of society stems from its economic system, capitalism, that in this system, there are two major social classes: the working class – who must work to survive, and who make up a majority of society – and the capitalist class – a minority who derive profit from employing the proletariat, through private ownership of the means of production (the physical and institutional means with which commodities are produced and distributed), and that political, social and economic conflict between these two classes will trigger a fundamental change in the economic system, and by extension a wide-ranging transformation of society. The primary element which will enable this transformation, according to this analysis, is the social ownership of the means of production. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communism]

Note 4: **Socialism** is a social and economic system characterised by social ownership of the means of production and co-operative management of the economy, as well as a political theory and movement that aims at the establishment of such a system. "Social ownership" may refer to cooperative enterprises, common ownership, state ownership, citizen ownership of equity, or any combination of these.

A socialist economy is based on the principle of production for use, to directly satisfy economic demand and human needs, and objects are valued by their use-value, as opposed to the principle of production for profit and accumulation of capital. In the traditional conception of a socialist economy, coordination, accounting and valuation are performed in kind (using physical quantities), by a common physical magnitude, or by a direct measure of labour-time in place of financial calculation. For distributing output, two alternative principles have been proposed: to each according to his contribution and from each according to his ability, to each according to his need. The advisability, feasibility and exact way of allocating and valuing resources are the subjects of the socialist calculation debate. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialism]

Note 5: **Crowd funding** is the practice of funding a project or venture by raising monetary contributions from a large number of people, typically via the internet. One early-stage equity expert described it as “the practice of
raising funds from two or more people over the internet towards a common Service, Project, Product, Investment, Cause, and Experience, or SPPICE.

The crowdfunding model is fueled by three types of actors: the project initiator who proposes the idea and/or project to be funded; individuals or groups who support the idea; and a moderating organization (the "platform") that brings the parties together to launch the idea. In 2013, the crowdfunding industry grew to be over $5.1 billion worldwide. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crowdfunding February 26, 2015]

Note 6: German industrial relations Germany, with its highly legalistic, expansive system of codetermination, is usually regarded as the prototype of Industrial Democracy, having achieved workers’ participation in managerial decision-making through legal rights for works councils and workers’ representatives at companies’ supervisory boards. [http://personal.lse.ac.uk/fregec/PDF%20articles%20Democracy.pdf March 9, 2015]

Note 7: Industrial democracy is an arrangement which involves workers making decisions, sharing responsibility and authority in the workplace. While in participative management organizational designs workers are listened to and take part in the decision-making process, in organizations employing industrial democracy they also have the final decisive power (they decide about organizational design and hierarchy as well).

In company law, the term generally used is co-determination, following the German word Mitbestimmung. In German companies with more than 1000 employees (coal and steel industries) resp. more than 2000 employees (other industries) half of the supervisory board of directors (which elects management) is elected by the shareholders, and the other half by the workers.

Although industrial democracy generally refers to the organization model in which workplaces are run directly by the people who work in them in place of private or state ownership of the means of production, there are also representative forms of industrial democracy. Representative industrial democracy includes decision making structures such as the formation of committees and consultative bodies to facilitate communication between management, unions, and staff. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial_democracy February 25, 2015]

Note 8: Business ethical norms reflect the norms of each historical period. As time passes norms evolve, causing accepted behaviors to become objectionable. Business ethics and the resulting behavior evolved as well. Business was involved in slavery, colonialism, and the cold war.

The term 'business ethics' came into common use in the United States in the early 1970s. By the mid-1980s at least 500 courses in business ethics reached 40,000 students, using some twenty textbooks and at least ten casebooks along supported by professional societies, centers and journals of business ethics. The Society for Business Ethics was started in 1980. European business schools adopted business ethics after 1987 commencing with the European Business Ethics Network (EBEN). In 1982 the first single-authored books in the field appeared.

Firms started highlighting their ethical stature in the late 1980s and early 1990s, possibly trying to distance themselves from the business scandals of the day, such as the savings and loan crisis. The idea of business ethics caught the attention of academics, media and business firms by the end of the Cold War. However, legitimate criticism of business practices was attacked for infringing the “freedom” of entrepreneurs and critics were accused of supporting communists. This scuttled the discourse of business ethics both in media and academia. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business_ethics March 10 2015]

Note 9: WorkChoices was the name given to changes made to the federal industrial relations laws in Australia by the Howard Government in 2005, being amendments to the Workplace Relations Act 1996 by the Workplace Relations Amendment Act 2005, that came into effect on 27 March 2006.

WorkChoices was ostensibly designed to improve employment levels and national economic performance by dispensing with unfair dismissal laws for companies under a certain size, removing the "no disadvantage test" which had sought to ensure workers were not left disadvantaged by changes in legislation, thereby promoting individual efficiency and requiring workers submit their certified agreements directly to Workplace Authority rather than going through the Australian Industrial Relations Commission. It also made adjustments to a
workforce’s ability to legally go on strike, enabling workers to bargain for conditions without collectivised representation, and significantly restricting trade union activity.

The passing and implementation of the new laws was strongly opposed by the left side of politics, particularly the trade union movement. It was argued that the laws stripped away basic employee rights and were fundamentally unfair. The Australian Council of Trade Unions consistently ran television advertisements attacking the new laws. WorkChoices was a major issue in the 2007 federal election, with the Australian Labor Party (ALP) under Kevin Rudd vowing to abolish it. Labor won government at the 2007 Australian federal election and repealed the whole of the WorkChoices legislation with the passing of the Fair Work Act 2009. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WorkChoices.]

Note 10. **Extent of Workplace Bullying in Australia**

‘1.22 The prevalence of workplace bullying in Australia cannot be determined with any precision due to the absence of a national evidence base from which such indicators might be drawn. Consequently, various studies report widely different estimates of the prevalence of bullying in Australian workplaces.’

1.23 A commonly accepted estimate of the prevalence of workplace bullying in Australia comes from the Australian Workplace Barometer (AWB) project (2009-11). The AWB project found that 6.8 per cent of Australian workers had been bullied at work in the six months prior to being surveyed, with 3.5 per cent experiencing bullying for longer than a six-month period.

1.24 This figure is supported by the Personality and Total Health through Life project, a longitudinal study on mental and physical health managed by the Australian National University. This study also found that 6.8 per cent of workers had been bullied at work in the six months prior to being surveyed. The survey data was collected in 2011.

1.25 However, the prevalence of workplace bullying could be far greater than this statistic. The Assistant Commissioner of the Productivity Commission (the PC) stated that ‘it is probably higher than that ... it could be over 15 per cent’.30 Professor Maryam Omari commented further:

We are not capturing in whatever studies are done the actual rates of workplace bullying, which would be far higher than the 22 to 33 per cent that I have found.

1.26 Similarly, DTC commented that every year they respond to 10,000 cases that relate to some form of workplace bullying. The Chief Executive Director, Ms Michele Grow, stated that the number who present or report their bullying is significantly higher than statistical analysis has found. Ms Grow commented that the figure is possibly closer to ‘one in three’ workers experience bullying at work.

1.27 The Australian Public Service Commission (the APSC) found that 17 per cent of staff had experienced harassment or bullying at work. Only 0.13 per cent of these cases are investigated. The APSC believes that this higher rate of reported bullying could involve unfounded accusations. The full report can be read at [http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House_of_Representatives_committees?url=ee/bullying/report.htm]. Recommendations by the Inquiry are listed from Chapter 1.64 onwards.

Note 11. ‘At Westpac, our vision is to be one of the most respected companies in the world: helping our people, our customers and our communities prosper and grow.’ The communication of this is key. I talk about it everywhere and expect our team members to know and understand our vision and strategy. In the last two employee engagement surveys, 97 per cent of our people say ‘yes, I understand how the work I do supports the vision of the company’. That’s fantastic for alignment and for productivity.’ See [http://www.westpac.com.au/about-westpac/westpac-group/company-overview/our-strategy-vision/]

Note 12: **Water pipe-line in Western Australia** [Http://En.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Goldfield May 1, 2015]
Minding the environment within a Partnership Society

Soil, earth, water and air are the ground of our being.
Australia is an ancient land. Its soils are fragile and across large swathes of the country, water is scarce. We have used water irresponsibly; have not understood the ancient soil and tilled it almost to extinction. Marginal land has been over-grazed and degraded. Some has been over-irrigated and huge tracts are unproductive because of rising salinity. Bio-diversity is at risk. Invasive plants are spreading and a lengthening list of native animals and birds are threatened with extinction.

We could also be doing more to avert the calamity of global warming. 80% of Australia’s population lives on coastal fringes where land is more fertile and rainfall more plentiful, but if we do nothing about global warming the oceans will in time rise and could engulf a lot of low-lying land on the eastern side of the Great Dividing Range. Although the rise would likely be no more than 20-30 metres, many Australian cities would be affected.

The Abbot Government waged a campaign against renewable energy. They didn’t like ‘the look’ of wind turbines; they tried to eliminate the Renewable Energy Corporation and failing to achieve that gave it instructions which changed its investment options; They wanted to reduce the Renewable Energy Targets (RET). The motivation for these policy positions is not clear. Were they favoring coal miners who donate large amounts to the coalition parties? Were their efforts representative of their members and supporters? Or did they think the introduction of renewable energy was proceeding too fast for the coal industry and power generators to manage and would lead to industrial disruption? I do not know. Perhaps there were elements of all three. However it is clear that the public favours the use of renewable energy—particularly roof-top solar panels.

More generally, it seems the tide is turning in favour of intervention—saving water, rehabilitating degraded land, protecting at risk animal species, preserving habitat, battling pollution. Environmental groups keep a watching brief on a wide range of environmental issues that need attention. They never have sufficient funds to do everything they would like to, but they play a vital part in high-lighting problems and suggesting solutions. Universities, the CSIRO (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation) and State Parks and Wildlife departments are valuable contributors to the protection of the environment.

Tim Lowe in his excellent book Where Song Began¹ [Note 1 Where Song Began (p.305)] records changing attitudes to the protection of bird-life.

‘Early bird-lovers accepted and participated in the exploitation and killing of birds, but after federation a more protective sentiment took over, as Australia went from being a frontier in which nature needed taming to a land in which nature increasingly required protection. Today birds are protected for their own sake—for they are held to have intrinsic value—and not for their benefit to us. A Phillip Island resident proudly showed me the mutton-bird burrows she watches over in her front yard: that anyone would fry the eggs for breakfast has become inconceivable.’

Governments are following public opinion and there are now laws to ensure commercial development can only proceed if an environmental scan shows no long term negative effects on the environment. The legislation is certainly not fool-proof but it is a good beginning.
Areas of the country (and the seas) have been set aside as National Parks and their bio-genetic inheritance protected. Recent reports on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) have shown a remarkable return of fish in areas where:

‘The reserves were no-take zones, in which fishing is banned; the ban was well-enforced; the reserve was more than 10 years old; it was relatively large in area; and isolated from fished areas by deep water or sand. MPAs with these characteristics had on average twice as many large fishes and 14 times more sharks than fished areas.’

In areas where these conditions did not apply the changes were not significant. ² [Note 2: Results of study into Marine Protected Areas]

When Marine Protected Areas were first mooted, some fishermen were opposed but opposition appears to have died down as the positive effects become obvious. With proper management, fishing in the waters surrounding Australia could become sustainable.

We cannot live without healthy soil, clean air and sufficient water. Soil is literally the ground of our being. It feeds us; grows the trees that purify our air and nurtures the birds and animals. According to ANZECC (The Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council). ³ [Note 3: Biodiversity]

‘The true value of biodiversity to our society is far greater than most people would ever imagine. We now know that we have been taking for granted the many services maintained by natural and managed ecosystems: the provision of fresh water and fertile soil, pollination of our agricultural crops, pest control, flood mitigation and breakdown of pollutants. Our biodiversity provides fish and timber, plants and animals for breeding programs, and genetic material for biotechnology applications. We recognise the intrinsic value of our biodiversity. A great proportion of our tourists are attracted to Australia to see our unique wildlife in landscapes made beautiful by rich natural ecosystems.’

Public awareness is rising. Many of us try to save water and power; do our bit to recycle and reduce waste. We are beginning to understand the inter-connectedness of everything and that every little helps.

Across the world individuals are working furiously to counteract the destructive power that greed for profit has generated. It will be a close thing—a contest between utter destruction on one hand and sustainability on the other and it is not yet possible to foresee the outcome.

Children are being engaged—through education and practical activities in efforts to save elements of the environment that have been damaged. Their engagement is very significant as they are the future. We are starting to get it right.

People in a partnership society will have come to a complete realisation that nothing matters more than the preservation of our planetary home. We will become better natural resource managers, able to repair the damage as much as is possible and to maintain productive natural and managed ecosystems into the future. We may need to live more simply to conserve natural resources.
We have begun small programs to rehabilitate areas of land—rescuing it from salinity through tree-planting or drainage. We are safe-guarding some of the ‘at-risk’ species of birds or animals by fencing in reserves and clearing out predators. Perhaps we could extend these activities and people who would otherwise be unemployed as well as refugees, and young people in a gap year might find this kind of task meaningful.

We will need to change completely from reliance on fossil fuels like coal as an energy supplier to renewable energy sources such as solar, wind and tides. Coal is the past, but coal-fired power stations could reinvent themselves as they transition by supporting (and profiting from) the new industries.

**A reason for hope**

In his book *Blessed Unrest*, Paul Hawken notes that there are 1-2 million organizations working toward ecological sustainability and social justice, forming a new kind of social movement. This is the largest social movement in all human history. It is the story of *what is going right.*¹⁴

[Note 4: Hawken, Paul, Blessed Unrest. Published by Viking. 2007.]

**The reinvention of market-based economics**

Something quite astonishing is happening; different concepts of ‘business’ are emerging—business designed specifically to cause the least harm to the environment—Circular Economies (or Closed Loop economies); Social Entrepreneurship; B-Corporations.

**Circular Economies promote:**

‘...product-life extension, long-life goods, reconditioning activities, and waste prevention. It also insists on the importance of selling services rather than products, an idea referred to as the “functional service economy” and sometimes put under the wider notion of “performance economy” which also advocates “more localisation of economic activity”.

In broader terms, the circular approach is a framework that takes insights from living systems. It considers that our systems should work like organisms, processing nutrients that can be fed back into the cycle—whether biological or technical—hence the “closed loop” or “regenerative” terms usually associated with it.’¹⁶

[Note 6: Closed Loop Economies]


**Social entrepreneurship** is the attempt to draw upon business techniques to find solutions to social problems. This concept may be applied to a variety of organizations with different sizes, aims, and beliefs. Conventional entrepreneurs typically measure performance in profit and return, but social entrepreneurs also consider a positive return to society. Social entrepreneurship typically attempts to further broad social, cultural, and environmental goals is often associated with the voluntary sector. At times, profit also may be a consideration for certain companies or other social enterprises. ⁸

[Note 8: Social Entrepreneurship]


‘There are continuing arguments over precisely who counts as a social entrepreneur. Thus far, there has been no consensus on the definition of social entrepreneurship, so many different
sorts of fields and disciplines are associated with social entrepreneurship. Philanthropists, social activists, environmentalists, and other socially oriented practitioners are referred to as social entrepreneurs. For a clearer definition of what social entrepreneurship entails, it is necessary to set the function of social entrepreneurship apart from other socially oriented activities and identify the boundaries within which social entrepreneurs operate. Some have advocated restricting the term to founders of organizations that primarily rely on earned income—meaning income earned directly from paying consumers. Others have extended this to include contracted work for public authorities, while still others include grants and donations.'

**B-Corporations (Benefit corporations)**

‘In the United States, a B-corporation is a type of for-profit corporate entity, legislated in 28 U.S. states, that includes positive impact on society and the environment in addition to profit as its legally defined goals. B corps differ from traditional corporations in purpose, accountability, and transparency, but not in taxation.’ ¹⁰ [Note 9: B-Corporations]

**Population control**

Across the world there has been some success in slowing down the rate of population increase. According to the United Nations the global birth-rate is now at replacement levels and by 2050 the global population will have stabilised. This has been achieved by voluntary means everywhere but African deaths from AIDS has been the main cause. However the rapidly growing population of the globe still continues and the resources of planet earth are not infinite. According to Syngenta, an organisation devoted to resolving these issues, by 2050 the world’s population (which at 4.45pm on April 4, 2015 was 7,305,856,941) will have increased by almost a third: ¹⁰ [Note 10: Planetary resources]

We have only one planet, and we’re using its resources 50% faster than it can take. What we’re asking it to provide is simply not sustainable. Every day, our planet wakes with 200,000 more mouths to feed. [http://www.syngenta.com/ April 4, 2015]

**What will happen to people born into a world that can no longer provide sustenance?**

Their is a dismal prospect. No homes. No employment. Little food. Little education. Dislocation. I think nations presently with low population may need to step up to the plate and offer them refuge.

**Could Australia’s population be increased without worsening ecological problems?**

That is an intriguing question. If it were possible, Australia could become a home for many of the World’s homeless. Why should we even consider such a thing? Are there advantages for Australia? Are there potential disadvantages (or dangers)? Could it be done? How?

**Why should we even consider such a thing?**

- The charitable aspects come to mind initially and despite the inspiration it would be if our country could do such a kindly thing, charity might not of itself be a sufficient reason to embark on a costly and politically difficult task.
• There is the idea that contributing to the well-being of refugees and the displaced will help restore order and well-being to areas of the world where it is missing. This could be an advantage to us as concerned world citizens—leading to less international disruption and costly warfare.

• We are fortunate to have a well-developed multi-cultural society. We have accepted people from many different cultures and woven them into our national life. It isn’t perfect and, if social conditions deteriorated, might collapse. However, Australia has a real advantage in being able to relocate people relatively smoothly.

• There is space. Sunlight. Roads and infrastructure. Our country towns need an influx of people to make them viable again. There is a body of knowledge about how to live sustainably. There is environmental work to be done.

• Australia’s population is ageing. We need younger folk to grow and work and support our older citizens.

Are there advantages for Australia?

• Refugees can bring with them valuable skills and knowledge. If managed well, this would be a great boon to our nation.

• Our relatively low population has always hindered the economy as the domestic market cannot support the production of some of Australia’s most amazing inventions. Our inventors usually need to go overseas to win support for their creativity. With a larger population, this could be changed.

• We could manage the process carefully to encourage the growth of renewable technologies and embed them into the future Australian economy. Sooooo........

What are the difficulties and disadvantages?

• The first is water. Australia is a dry continent. Its soils are spent and degraded. Where would we find water resources?

• Another difficulty is getting started. Careful planning would be needed to ensure the first attempt was successful and had positive community acceptance.

Could it be done? And if so...how?

• The KPI (Key performance indicator) is to balance the energy equation so the intake of refugees increases the amount of biological and financial capital rather than draining it. It is a question of living sustainably. Has it ever been tried? I don’t think it has been completely.

• Incomers would need to contribute more than they use. They would need to access environmentally sustainable materials and methods. They would need to improve the environment. Is this possible?

• Cities already have population and infrastructure difficulties so many of the new Australians would be placed in country areas with suitable resources.
• There are rural towns devising some amazing survival plans for their citizens. Where a rural town adopted a program, its success would be more or less assured. Initially, it would be helpful to interest other Australians to volunteer time or cash to get projects started. Some of the preparatory work could be accomplished this way.

**Water**
Sufficient for personal use might not be a difficulty if projects were sponsored by rural centres already losing population. The water previously available to residents would be available to newcomers. Water for projects such as revegetation and crop growing would be another matter and need careful planning; perhaps also significant infrastructure—such as piping water from places where it is abundant.

**Food**
There have been some remarkable experiments throughout the world where food is grown in the most unlikely places. The Israelis have learned to make the most of virtually waterless places.¹¹ [Sustainable development] Deserts can bloom. Items not grown would be purchased with income from employment.

**Housing**
Dwellings would be constructed from local materials—mud bricks, hay or timber and would be very simple. Tent cities would be transformed into villages designed by the occupants. Housing would be built co-operatively and extra materials sold to provide income.

**Energy**
Electricity would be produced without harm to the environment—by water, solar or wind power. Any unused energy would be sold to provide income.

**Transport**
As many of the incomers would be some distance away from cities, transport could be problematic.

**Employment**
Necessary work revegetating, saving species, eliminating weed species and other activities would become employment paid by Councils, Governments or charitable grants.

**Other income**
Cash to support the project could be generated by tourism—the kind of tourism where people from around Australia and elsewhere come to see what is happening and pay for the privilege. The sale of craft items, concerts, handiwork, teaching and other odd jobs could provide the incomers with additional funds.

**Funding such a large project**
A significant outlay would be needed to begin the process, although it would most likely begin with pilot studies. Most of the funding would be for research and planning; a good deal would go to finding suitable recruits from overseas (families where possible); more would go to rural towns to establish infrastructure and support systems.
The process would be lengthy. This is a long-term investment and the exercise would need to operate for a considerable time before the original inputs were balanced out by the benefits. However, the results could be calculated with a fair degree of accuracy.

NOTES
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Note 1:  Low, Tim. Where Song Began. Published by the Penguin Group, Melbourne Australia. 2014. p.305.

Note 2: Results of study into Marine Protected Areas  
[http://www.abc.net.au/environment/articles/2014/02/05/3938713.htm April 5, 2015]

Note 3: Biodiversity The true value of biodiversity to our society is far greater than most people would ever imagine. We now know that we have been taking for granted the many services maintained by natural and managed ecosystems: the provision of fresh water and fertile soil, pollination of our agricultural crops, pest control, flood mitigation and breakdown of pollutants. Our biodiversity provides fish and timber, plants and animals for breeding programs, and genetic material for biotechnology applications. We recognise the intrinsic value of our biodiversity. A great proportion of our tourists are attracted to Australia to see our unique wildlife in landscapes made beautiful by rich natural ecosystems.

In seeking to provide for Australia’s growing population and development 1, we have damaged vast areas of Australia. Dryland salinity, soil acidification, toxic algal blooms, soil erosion, siltation, reduced estuarine productivity 2 and declining fish catches are symptoms of ecosystem dysfunction. Unsustainable management practices are impacting on industry productivity and native biodiversity. We now recognise the need to plan for biodiversity and ecosystem service conservation in local areas and across catchments and bioregions. This involves the dual activities of protection of habitat and maintenance of the processes that drive ecosystem function. The research priorities identified in this report will assist Australians to become better natural resource managers, able to repair the damage as much as is possible and to maintain productive natural and managed ecosystems into the future.

In 1999, the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council (ANZECC) Standing Committee on Conservation recognised that there was no system in place for identifying areas of biodiversity conservation research that have national priority. A working group of the Biological Diversity Advisory Council was formed to develop a framework that could guide research and funding bodies throughout Australia. The Council produced a discussion paper which was disseminated for public comment in August and September 2000 to stakeholders including research institutions, industry, non-government conservation organisations and government agencies involved in natural resource management. The report was finalised by the newly formed statutory Biological Diversity Advisory Committee.

Fifteen key areas of biodiversity research have been identified. Recommendations are made within each area for research of national importance, much of which needs to be supported on an ongoing basis to complete the work. Areas identified as highest priority research represent key knowledge gaps in our ability to manage and protect Australia’s biodiversity resources and the processes that enable ecosystems to be healthy. The application of the recommended research is outlined, as are relevant policy commitments and legislative requirements.

This report provides an explanatory background to the identified biodiversity research priorities, addressing a series of questions:

- What is Australia’s biodiversity? Where does it occur, when and why?
- How does our biodiversity function?
- What is the value of our biodiversity?
- What is changing and why?
- What are the risks and the management options?

Some management actions and institutional changes required to conserve our biodiversity have been outlined and a set of principles are suggested for assessing the relative merit of biodiversity research proposals. [http://www.environment.gov.au/node/14378 April 4, 2015]

Note 5: ‘A vast world-changing “movement with no name” [which] is now forming; Hawken believes it will prevail. “It is axiomatic that we are at a threshold in human existence, a fundamental change in understanding about our relationship to nature and each other. We are moving from a world created by privilege to a world created by community. The current thrust of history is too supple to be labeled, but global themes are emerging in response to cascading ecological crises and human suffering. These ideas include the need for radical social change, the reinvention of market-based economics, the empowerment of women, activism on all levels, and the need for localized economic control. There are insistent calls for autonomy, appeals for a new resource ethic based on the tradition of the commons, demands for the reinstatement of cultural primacy over corporate hegemony, and a rising demand for radical transparency in politics and corporate decision making. It has been said that environmentalism failed as a movement, or worse yet, died. It is the other way around. Everyone on earth will be an environmentalist in the not too distant future, driven there by necessity and experience” [http://www.scribd.com/doc/15700520/Paul-Hawken-Blessed-Unrest-2007-Synopsis#scribd April 1, 2015]

In their 1976 Hannah Reekman research report to the European Commission, "The Potential for Substituting Manpower for Energy", Walter Stahel and Genevieve Reday sketched the vision of an economy in loops (or circular economy) and its impact on job creation, economic competitiveness, resource savings, and waste prevention. The report was published in 1982 as the book Jobs for Tomorrow: The Potential for Substituting Manpower for Energy.

Considered as one of the first pragmatic and credible sustainability think tanks, the main goals of Stahel's institute are product-life extension, long-life goods, reconditioning activities, and waste prevention. It also insists on the importance of selling services rather than products, an idea referred to as the "functional service economy" and sometimes put under the wider notion of "performance economy" which also advocates "more localisation of economic activity".

In broader terms, the circular approach is a framework that takes insights from living systems. It considers that our systems should work like organisms, processing nutrients that can be fed back into the cycle—whether biological or technical—hence the "closed loop" or "regenerative" terms usually associated with it. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Circular_economy April 2 2015]

Note 6: Circular Economies
[GO TO: http://www.circle-economy.com/circular-economy/ April 2 2015]
Note 7: **Social entrepreneurship** is the attempt to draw upon business techniques to find solutions to social problems. This concept may be applied to a variety of organizations with different sizes, aims, and beliefs.

![Muhammad Yunus, founder of Grameen Bank](image)

Conventional entrepreneurs typically measure performance in profit and return, but social entrepreneurs also take into account a positive return to society. Social entrepreneurship typically attempts to further broad social, cultural, and environmental goals is often associated with the voluntary sector. At times, profit also may be a consideration for certain companies or other social enterprises.

Note 8: **Social Entrepreneurs**

There are continuing arguments over precisely who counts as a social entrepreneur. Thus far, there has been no consensus on the definition of social entrepreneurship, so many different sorts of fields and disciplines are associated with social entrepreneurship. Philanthropists, social activists, environmentalists, and other socially oriented practitioners are referred to as social entrepreneurs. For a clearer definition of what social entrepreneurship entails, it is necessary to set the function of social entrepreneurship apart from other socially oriented activities and identify the boundaries within which social entrepreneurs operate. Some have advocated restricting the term to founders of organizations that primarily rely on earned income—meaning income earned directly from paying consumers. Others have extended this to include contracted work for public authorities, while still others include grants and donations.

Social entrepreneurship in modern society offers an altruistic form of entrepreneurship that focuses on the benefits that society may reap. Simply put, entrepreneurship becomes a social endeavor when it transforms social capital in a way that affects society positively. It is viewed as advantageous because the success of social entrepreneurship depends on many factors related to social impact that traditional corporate businesses do not prioritize. Social entrepreneurs recognize immediate social problems, but also seek to understand the broader context of an issue that crosses disciplines, fields, and theories. Gaining a larger understanding of how an issue relates to society allows social entrepreneurs to develop innovative solutions and mobilize available resources to affect the greater global society. Unlike traditional corporate businesses, social entrepreneurship ventures focus on maximizing gains in social satisfaction, rather than maximizing profit gains. Both private and public agencies worldwide have had billion-dollar initiatives to empower deprived communities and individuals. Such support from organizations in society, such as government-aid agencies or private firms, may catalyze innovative ideas to reach a larger audience.

Prominent innovators associated with the term include Pakistani Akhter Hameed Khan and Bangladeshi Muhammad Yunus. Yunus was the founder of Grameen Bank, which pioneered the concept of microcredit for supporting innovators in multiple developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. He received a Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts and also inspired programs such as the Infolady Social Entrepreneurship Programme. Others, such as Stephen Goldsmith, former Indianapolis mayor, focused social efforts on a more local level, engaging the private sector in providing many city services.

Note 9: **B-Corporations**

The purpose of a benefit corporation includes creating general public benefit, which is defined as a material positive impact on society and the environment. A benefit corporation’s directors and officers operate the business with the same authority as in a traditional corporation but are required to consider the impact of their decisions not only on shareholders but also on society and the environment. In a traditional corporation shareholders judge the company’s financial performance; with a B-corporation shareholders judge performance based on how a corporation’s goals benefit society and the environment. Shareholders determine whether the corporation has made a material positive impact. Transparency provisions require benefit corporations to publish annual benefit reports of their social and environmental performance using a comprehensive, credible,
independent, and transparent third-party standard. In some states the corporation must also submit the reports to the Secretary of State, although the Secretary of State has no governance over the report’s content. Shareholders have a private right of action, called a benefit enforcement proceeding, to enforce the company’s mission when the business has failed to pursue or create general public benefit. Disputes about the material positive impact are decided by the courts.

There are around 12 third-party standards that meet the requirements of the legislation. Benefit corporations need not be certified or audited by the third-party standard. Instead, they use third-party standards similarly to how the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) are applied during financial reporting, solely as a rubric a company uses to measure its own performance. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benefit_corporation April 2 2015]

Note 10: Planetary resources

We have only one planet, and we're using its resources 50% faster than it can take. What we're asking it to provide is simply not sustainable. Every day, our planet wakes with 200,000 more mouths to feed. By 2050, the world's population will have increased by almost a third. [http://www.syngenta.com April 4, 2015]

Note 11: Sustainable development

The Arava Center for Sustainable Development (ACSD) aims to reduce poverty, enhance sustainability and empower communities by supporting locally driven, environmentally focused development programs worldwide. ACSD’s mission is to provide global access to sustainable technologies and knowledge developed in the south of Israel.

Directed by Dr. Shmuel Brenner, the ACSD is comprised of a partnership between three leading research and academic institutions located in the Southern Arava region of Israel’s Negev desert. They include the Arava Institute for Environmental Studies (AIES), the Dead Sea and Arava Science Center (DSASC), and the Southern Arava Agricultural Research & Development Station (Arava R&D). ACSD disseminates its expertise to developing communities in the Middle East and around the globe by collaborating with local and international partners to design and implement small-scale, technology-based sustainable development projects. [http://arava.org/arava-research-centers/arava-center-for-sustainable-development/]
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The role of Media in a Partnership Society

Newspapers, Magazines, Radio, TV, Social media
Following the invention of the printing press in the sixteenth century newspapers became the main source of public information. From the beginning, they have been imperfect. ‘News was highly selective and often propagandistic. Readers were eager for sensationalism, such as accounts of magic, public executions and disasters.’¹ [Note 1: History of newspapers].

Sensationalism in newspapers remains although there are examples of newspapers throughout the world with exceptional standards of journalism—The Times and the Guardian in the UK; The New York Times, The Chicago Tribune and The Washington Post in the USA and The Age in Australia.

Journalist Malcolm Farnsworth² [Malcolm Farnsworth] in a 2011 article (Why I gave up Australian Newspapers) had this to say. ‘overall though, the Australian newspapers have lost me. They’re drab now. The quality is uneven. The journal of record days are gone. Even the practical reasons for buying a newspaper—finding a job, selling a car, buying a house, checking the TV guide, doing the crossword—have fallen away as the digital alternatives multiply. As sales numbers have fallen and advertising revenue has bled away, Fairfax broadsheets like The Age and the SMH have struggled to maintain a clear sense of identity. Every new re-design seems to produce bigger headings, more pictures, fewer words and more lift-outs. By contrast, News Limited’s The Australian maintains a serious demeanour but is increasingly characterised by bizarre preoccupations that cast doubt on its news values.’

I would like to think the role of the media is to investigate, inform, clarify and entertain, but ‘No’. Speaking generally, it seems the primary role of newspapers is to make money and they are failing even at that. The Australian (Newspaper) has been making a loss since 2008. It is however, a useful political tool wielded by its owner, Rupert Murdoch. ³ [Note 3: The Australian, unprofitable]

Newspapers around the world are struggling to find a profitable financial model. ‘Caught in a pincer movement by two different forces – the new technology of digitalised online publication and an unrelenting global financial crisis, newspapers find themselves in a pickle. Losing advertising revenue and subscribers, finding a new way on how to survive is now more urgent than ever.’⁴ [Note 4: Profitable financial model]

One might hope newspapers would stick to the facts and report objectively and that media organisations employed the most knowledgeable and talented people, but that would be unrealistic. There is a cross-section of Australians with the talents but also the foibles and short-comings generally found in the Australian community, however, media management is mostly male and the sub-text from many media outlets is that of a gladiator society.

Women have been writers for a long time and there have been women journalists since the 1800s, however, in the 21st century while more women train to be journalists still only a few rise to the top jobs. According to an article by Suzanne Franks, Professor of Journalism at City University London: ‘Women in journalism still cluster around particular subject genres. Historically, they were almost totally confined to “pink ghettos”, but as more women entered the industry, there was an expectation that their opportunities would expand and that they would duly embrace areas that had been traditionally male, like hard news, crime, politics.’⁵ [Note 5: Women in journalism]. That expectation is still not fully realised.
Also important is an ethic that says reporting objectively and fairly is a primary function of a responsible newspaper. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. It seems that political bias, policy bias, gender bias are not open to challenge. The print media is going into *niche mode*, where the selection and tone of articles panders to a particular audience.

For this reason, I seldom read the Australian or other News Corp newspapers. Biased reporting is poor journalism. It divides the community. An example from the Murdoch group of papers is its treatment of scientific research about climate change. Their approach hasn’t been to write in a balanced manner about climate research (which is accepted by the majority of the scientific community) but to support the views of a minority of climate sceptics who read its newspapers.

I recently picked up a copy of the Queensland Courier Mail (a News Corp production). There were 16 pages of sport mostly covered with excellent photos of muscular blokes playing football. I scoured the pages looking for something about female sport. Aha! There it was at the bottom of the second-last page—eight lines contained in an article about foot-ball. It was a tiny photo and a reference to the footballer’s partner (She was also an athlete). I estimated the reference was one/fifth of one column and there were four columns to each page. My arithmetic is sometimes rickety, but I computed that as 1/320 or 0.3125%. It almost goes without saying that male managers aren’t really tuned into this level of unfairness. The paper’s lack of gender balance in sports reporting is breath-taking. Much of this is due to the lack of women editors and journalists in sports reporting. In the 1980’s The Courier Mail had separate sections of the classified advertisements for Male jobs and Female jobs. It would annoy me if I saw a job a woman might have liked in the Male section.

Similarly with women’s voices on radio and TV; ‘Women newsreaders were not seen on prime time, major network television until the late 1970’s such as ABC’s Margaret Throsby and Channel 7’s Katrina Lee.’ [Note 6: Women news-readers]. I recall discussions from the 1970s when the idea of women news-readers was being mooted. There was fierce disagreement—‘Voices too high-pitched’, ‘Too emotional’ and so on. According to BBC radio presenter Anne Karf [Note 7: Fear and loathing of Women on the radio] ‘This characterisation of women’s voices as somehow deficient is an enduring theme in the history of broadcasting, dogging women’s attempts to get on air. According to the Daily Express in 1928: "Some listeners-in go so far as to say that a woman’s voice becomes monotonous after a time, that her high notes are sharp, and resemble the filing of steel, while her low notes often sound like groans."

Morry Schwartz Publishing has provided alternatives in the newsprint area with The Quarterly Essay, The Monthly and in 2014, The Saturday Paper which is ‘focussed upon long-form journalism and sets out its aims to “Challenge orthodoxy...question authority and provoke debate”.’ [Note 8: Schwartz Publishing.] Some of the best Australian journalist contribute articles. Making a profit will be an issue in the survival of these productions but meanwhile there are alternatives which offer quality information and writing.
In settled times, traditions of good journalism and media conduct might be expected but the present cannot be described as ‘settled times’.

The media is undergoing radical change. Some segments are going forward while others are losing traction. The Australian Broadcasting Commission (ABC) has accepted the challenge of the digital era and while experiencing some tight budgeting retains its reputation as a quality Radio and TV outlet, as has the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS).

The Free to air channels 10, 7, 9 and their offshoots are struggling with the loss of advertising to other digital outlets.

Book-stores are experiencing competition between their products and digital E-books. As a result a number of them have closed.

Meanwhile, there is a tendency to use hyperbole and exaggeration to attract readers/viewers. Shock-Jocks (so-called) on radio and TV are pushing the idea of freedom of speech past what the majority of Australians would find reasonable.

The media is traditionally recognized as an important arm of democratic societies—the fourth estate. In this capacity, its role is to inform and clarify and thus enable citizens to decide on matters political and social. With segments of the media under financial and political pressure, this role is being distorted—one could even say discarded. Society is poorly served without trust-worthy news and commentary.

**How would these difficulties be tackled within a partnership society?**

Reform of the media would be a multi-pronged affair.

*Media ownership must be shared.* Parliament will diffuse ownership by an Act of Parliament. This will not be an easy task, particularly in present circumstances. Few investors have the capital, the experience or the desire to take on the risk. The first principle is the people’s right to fair and unbiased reporting and media access to promote their own views. Achieving this goal will take the combined efforts of all sections of the community. It may be worth considering (similarly to the original commercialisation of Telstra) setting aside shares for purchase by community groups or individuals.

*A regulatory body* is needed to monitor standards. The Finkelstein Report into the Media [Independent Inquiry into the Media and Media Regulation] released in March 2012, recommended the establishment of a statutory body (similar to the ABC) funded by the Government and at arm’s length from both the Government and influential media owners.

In *Rise and Fall of the Australian Democrats* I made the following comment: ‘I liked the Finkelstein recommendation... The present self-regulating system has little credibility and isn’t working satisfactorily. The recommendation of a half-way regulatory mechanism—separate both from government and industry—is not an impossible ask, yet it is difficult to see how this could be implemented by any government if media and conservative opinion is against it. However, it might be achievable with perseverance.’"
**Monitoring media standards.** With a regulatory body in place, journalists’ organisations and the public will have an opportunity to monitor media standards and bring irregularities to its notice. Their task would be to fact check and uncover irresponsibility on the part of media owners, managers or journalists.

**Media management** must be balanced. When the balance is right between Progressive /conservative; Male/female; white Australian/coloured—Australian media will more fairly represent the concerns and understandings of the community.

Universities will highlight the need for **ethical journalism.** Seminars and workshops are needed on revitalising the media. Detailed critiques, commentary and analysis must go on the record time and time again. Education and training will assist people to use social media responsibly.

**Independent media outlets**—the ABC, SBS as well as internet bloggers will highlight media shortcomings. ABC programs *The Fact Check* and *Media Watch* are valuable as they provide a ruler to set against fantastical opinion pieces sometimes seen (or heard) in the media.

In a partnership society, there would be better protection for the public broadcasters (ABC and SBS). They would face fewer difficulties about funding or unbalanced attacks such as recent comments by the Prime Minister that the ABC is a ‘Lefty lynch mob’.¹⁰ [Note 10: Lefty lynch mob’] Freedom of speech needs to be upheld vigorously but the community is better served if careful thought and constructive criticism is the rule rather than the exception.

The Australian public will need to **challenge media organisations** to lift their game. Letters, feed-back, boycotting the product are a few methods already being used.

The above suggestions are not novel, but because a well-informed populace is essential to a partnership society, efforts to improve the way news and opinion are transmitted in a partnership society will be essential.

**Role of the internet**

The digital age is well-entrenched. A lot of news and information is shared ‘online’ and a significant amount of advertising has moved from traditional media to the newer digital media. This has made possible an increase in what I would call ‘Voluntary news-gathering’. An example of the power of this new mode of news-gathering is the up-roar in the USA over mobile camera records of police attacking black suspects.

In a strange way, the new facility (for most of us to know a lot about the others of us) takes us back to the past and to life in small towns and times where it was difficult to keep a secret or to hide a misdoing for too long. Everyone knew what everyone else was up to!
Chapter 12 The role of the media in a partnership society

Note 1: History of newspapers. Before the invention of newspapers in the early 17th century, official government bulletins were circulated at times in some centralized empires. The earliest newspapers date to 17th-century Europe when printed periodicals began rapidly to replace the practice of hand-writing newsheets. The emergence of the new media branch has to be seen in close connection with the simultaneous spread of the printing press from which the publishing press derives its name. News was highly selective and often propagandistic. Readers were eager for sensationalism, such as accounts of magic, public executions and disasters; this material did not pose a threat to the state, because it did not pose criticism of the state. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_newspapers_and_magazines]

Note 2: Malcolm Farnsworth publishes AustralianPolitics.com. He also contributes articles for the ABC, and a number of other publications. See the article ‘Why I gave up Australian newspapers’ [http://www.abc.net.au/news/2011-04-28/why-i-gave-up-australian-newspapers/380470]

Note 3: The Australian has struggled to be profitable since the global financial crisis of 2008 its editor-in-chief Chris Mitchell has conceded in a video interview. [http://www.abc.net.au/mediawatch/transcripts/correction_mumbrella.pdf]


Note 5: Journalism is changing, and so is the role of women in the workplace. But the two are not always evolving in harmony. Women substantially outnumber men in journalism training and enter the profession in (slightly) greater numbers, but still only a relative few rise to senior jobs. The pay gap between male and female journalists remains stubbornly wide, and older women - especially if they have taken a career break - find it difficult to retain a place in the industry.

Women in journalism still cluster around particular subject genres. Historically, they were almost totally confined to “pink ghettos”, but as more women entered the industry, there was an expectation that their opportunities would expand and that they would duly embrace areas that had been traditionally male, like hard news, crime or politics.

But a byline analysis of UK national newspapers in 2012 indicates that some areas still have very few women, in particular politics, sport and opinion writing. These findings are also supported by qualitative interview data. There are similar lacunae in the US press.

So, in addition to the problem of vertical segregation, where women are not reaching the highest ranks of journalism, there is a continuing problem of horizontal segregation: gender division by subject matter. [http://theconversation.com/hard-evidence-is-there-still-a-gender-bias-in-journalism-19789]

When women did speak, men drew on a thesaurus of contempt to describe their voices. In 17th-century America, women characterised as a “scold”, “nag” or just plain “unquiet” were submerged on a ducking-stool. As late as the 18th and 19th centuries it was argued that if women persisted in speaking in public, their uteruses would dry up. Henry James compared the female voice to the “moo of the cow, the bray of the ass and the bark of the dog”.

One might imagine that the invention of the megaphone, loudspeaker and microphone would have challenged the belief that women made poor orators because their voices weren’t sufficiently powerful. And yet this is where we find some of the most blatant prejudice. According to Bell Laboratories in 1927: “The speech characteristics of women, when changed to electrical impulses, do not blend with the electrical characteristics of our present-day radio equipment.” The fault lying obviously with the women rather than the equipment.

This characterisation of women’s voices as somehow deficient is an enduring theme in the history of broadcasting, dogging women’s attempts to get on air. According to the Daily Express in 1928: “Some listeners-in go so far as to say that a woman’s voice becomes monotonous after a time, that her high notes are sharp, and resemble the filing of steel, while her low notes often sound like groans.”

Women were indicted for conveying too much personality through their voices (the Sunday Dispatch in 1945: “Critics consider that women have never been able to achieve the ‘impersonal’ touch. When there was triumph or disaster to report, they were apt to reflect it in the tone of their voices”) and too little (“For some reason a man ... can express personality better by voice alone than can a woman” – Southern Daily Echo in 1928) – or sometimes both at the same time. It was a catch-22, argues Jean Seaton, the official historian of the BBC: either women were deemed too emotional for broadcasting or, if they weren’t, then they weren’t proper women.

Certainly women were not mute in the early days of the BBC. The first female comedian Helena Millais, “Our Lizzie”, made her debut in November 1922. In 1944, Audrey Russell became the first and only British woman to be accredited as a war correspondent. Others who played a prominent cultural role – such as Virginia Woolf, or the composer Ethel Smyth – broadcast regularly. But, as Seaton remarks, women weren’t permitted to take on positions such as announcers and newsreaders in which the audible authority of the BBC was invested.

On 21 August 1933, Mrs Giles Borrett stormed the ramparts, reading the BBC six o’clock evening news bulletin for the first time (going under her husband’s name, as was customary at the time). BBC officials declared the experiment a failure because female listeners didn’t like listening to a woman – the culprit once again presumed to be her own sex.

As with so many of the professions, the war was a breakthrough for women, enabling them to fill posts in radio vacated by men who’d been called up, their timbre reminding male listeners of home. But although it’s no longer surprising to hear female voices, from Annie Nightingale to Jane Garvey, on air, the old rationale for their marginalisation proved remarkably resilient. As recently as 1999, the head of news and speech of a commercial radio station in Manchester described a potential recruit to Janet Haworth, a lecturer in broadcasting, as “a great reporter, a very good journalist, but I couldn’t put her on air with that voice. She sounds like a fishwife or a washerwoman” (in Women and Radio, edited by Caroline Mitchell). The “acceptable” female radio voice of today – that of, say, Charlotte Green and Harriet Cass – occupies such a narrow pitch range that it’s protected from any such charge. That only one in five of the Today programme’s guests and reporters are female is eloquent testimony not only to editors’ belief that female experts aren’t available (thewomensroom.org.uk found 40 in 48 hours last November after Today failed to find one) but also that a woman needs to be exceptionally prominent to earn the right to speak. And young: a report by Skillset for Sound Women, a support group set up in 2011 for women working in audio, found that only 9% of women working in radio are aged 50 and over, compared with over 19% of men.

If, as Simone de Beauvoir argued, women are made, not born, then the voice is one of the ways in which we are made male or female, through which we perform our gender. And this changes over time. Seaton notes that the (corseted) educated women who broadcast in the 30s and 40s in the Received Pronunciation now so out of favour had high, thin, strangulated, crystalline voices, like the Queen (who herself no longer sounds quite so much like the Queen). Joan Bakewell struggled to erase the Lancashire from her voice after hearing her fellow students at Girton, possessing voices that sounded like they could boom across the entrance hall of Harrods; now, on occasion, she’s told she’s too posh to broadcast. When Radio 5 Live was launched in 1994, an editor asked Bridget
Kendall, the BBC’s diplomatic correspondent, “Do you think when you go on 5 Live you could lower your voice a social class or two?” She declined.’ [http://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2013/feb./01/fear-loathing-women-radio]

Note 8: Swartz Publishing [en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schwartz_Publishing May 3, 2015] and comment by Crikey.com

‘It’s been the talk of the media for the past 18 months: what is the secretive “Project X” that Morry Schwartz, publisher of The Monthly and Quarterly Essay, has been cooking up in his Collingwood headquarters?

At a time when other publishers are abandoning print, Crikey can reveal the property developer is preparing to bankroll a new weekly newspaper — a weekend publication that will be tabloid in size but not in tone. The title for the soon-to-be announced publication is top secret, but multiple sources told Crikey that The Saturday Paper was a recent working title. The Schwartz vehicle, said to be a modern-day successor to the legendary National Times, is expected to focus on in-depth features, analysis, investigations and arts and culture.

This paper will be available on news-stands in Sydney and Melbourne, meaning it will go head-to-head with Fairfax’s prized former cash cows The Saturday Age and Sydney Morning Herald. Canberra would be another likely market for the up-market title.

Erik Jensen, a former journalist at The Sydney Morning Herald, has spearheaded the project and is expected to be foundation editor. A former Walkley Young Journalist winner aged in his mid-20s, Jensen left his job at the SMH and relocated to Melbourne to become Schwartz Media’s director of special projects. Crikey understands mock-up editions are circulating and potential contributors are being sounded out about story ideas.

“They’re approaching writers and advertisers left and right,” a source familiar with the project said. “There are a lot of writers on the loose with other jobs that aren’t taking up all their time.”

The newspaper is expected to have a small full-time staff, with most copy filed by freelancers. The writing community is said to be salivating at the prospect of a Schwartz-backed newspaper given his commitment to paying writers fairly. The Monthly pays a flat rate of $1 a word, an amount few others can match. The Monthly, launched in 2005 as an Australian answer to the New Yorker and The Atlantic, has been a loss-maker through most of its life, but editor John van Tiggelen recently said the magazine is “as close as it’s ever been” to a continued profit.

The National Times was launched in 1971 and became renowned for its fearless investigative journalism under editors including Max Suich, David Marr and Brian Toohey. The paper closed in 1987 after the share-market crash and Warwick Fairfax’s failed takeover.’ [http://www.crikey.com.au/2013/11/07/saturdays-with-morry-schwartz-to-launch-new-newspaper/]

Note 9: Floyd, B. Rise and Fall of the Australian Democrats. Published by Watson Ferguson & Company an imprint of Boolarong Press. 2014. P. 182.

Note 10: PM Tony Abbott labels program a ‘lefty lynch mob’ as ABC admits error in judgement over former terrorism suspect Zaky Mallah’s appearance. Prime Minister Tony Abbott has slammed the ABC over its decision to feature a former terrorist suspect on the Q&A program on Monday night, questioning which “side” the national broadcaster is on. [http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-06-23/abc-to-review-acquitted-former-terror-suspect-qa-appearance/6565886]
13

Creativity in a Partnership Society

Art, Music, Dance, Poetry, Film, Literature, Theatre, Sculpture, Comedy.
In the beginning, when humanity first emerged, someone invented a ‘digging stick’. Another discovered the uses of fire. We don’t really know if those individuals were male or female and it wouldn’t matter except we have inherited a tradition that implies all the major discoveries and inventions were made by men. That misunderstanding most likely came about when language included everyone under the heading of ‘mankind’.

Even today, in tribal societies, it is women who dig for food. It is women who use bowls and implements for cooking and it is mostly women who carry food and water and house-hold goods from place to place. It would seem likely that pottery and weaving and sewing and suchlike were invented by women. It might also be reasonable to think that flint-knapping and weapon-making was invented by men to improve their hunting skills, but perhaps women also helped with the hunting and used weapons. Decoration we can’t be very sure about. Carving designs in stone might follow from flint-knapping but the paintings and decorations we find on rock walls and deep underground could have been done by either males or females. Then there is dance and music and singing and ritual which gradually emerge as humanity progresses. As earliest societies appear to have venerated women, it is likely that women were fully involved in the accoutrements of religious ritual—decoration, singing and dance.

Then came the overthrow of simple, relatively peaceful agricultural societies and their replacement with a gladiatorial system. As agriculture prospered and harvests increased there was more than individuals or even communities needed. Wealth accumulated in the hands of the powerful and they were not averse to looting and plundering as well. There have been thousands of years of repression of segments of humanity, women in particular—as we know.

Potentially such a change might have had a dire effect on the human desire to create. However, even in the grimmest of situations, human creativity, like seeds sprouting through hard soils and managing to crack through flint-like concrete, will find a way to express itself. Some of the greatest works of art and literature emerged in this way—Milton’s blindness, The Diary of Anne Frank; Michelangelo’s Pieta; Picasso’s Guernica; Solzhenitsyn’s Gulag Archipelago; Beethoven’s symphonies.

Women began writing novels about 300 years ago, when their standing in society and their capacity for a personal life was extremely narrow. They used their novels to describe the alienation and subjection of women in society. Annis Pratt, in Archetypal patterns in women’s fiction, has this to say:

‘I discover in women’s novels a clear sense that we are outcasts in the land; that we have neither a homeland of our own or an ethnic place within society. Our quests for being are thwarted on every side by what we are told to be and to do, which is different from what men are told to be and to do.’¹ [Note 1: Women novelists]

The first half of the twentieth century was dominated by two major world wars. Millions died; countries were devastated; a dark pall of dissatisfaction descended. After World War II, people were querulous and wanted life to improve. The Holocaust had to be understood and its terrible message assimilated. Men who had fought for a better world were bitterly disappointed when they were demobbed and came home to a life that seemed bleak and unfriendly. Everything had changed. Women who had experienced equality when their labour
and skills were needed for the war did not easily retire to a less engaging life-style. The genie had escaped from the box and could not be put back. The soul-searching went deep.

Into the maelstrom came the Freudian concept of the sub-conscious. Freud [Note 2: Sigmund Freud] could have had little idea of what its impact would be. The world was already changing but his ideas were revolutionary. A window opened to another aspect of human life. The creative arts changed. Authors and artists and musicians began exploring the sub-conscious, discovering new ways of seeing and being; challenging settled way of doing things.

Poetry, art, music, literature, drama thrive on strong emotions, love and sorrow and death; tries to make sense of them, although often at enormous cost. If we can achieve a partnership society some of the worst aspects of warfare, dictatorship, poverty, social disruption—will either no longer exist or will be ameliorated.

However, it mustn’t be thought there will be no pain or sorrow or sadness in a partnership society. There will still be storms and earthquakes and droughts. People will die. Loved ones will leave. There will be problems to solve. Life will sometimes not work out the way we would wish. We may not be entirely happy, but poetry, music, craft and art will continue to raise our spirits and lift us to a higher level.

Music will expand our consciousness and awareness as new ways of combining notes and sounds arouse our curiosity, stir memories and soothe our anxieties. Poetry will alert us to the infinitesimal subtleties of emotion and feeling. Art will enhance our capacity to communicate in a visual language and to discover and enjoy the artist’s insights. Architects will design structures to improve the way we live and work together.

The human desire to create will flourish in a partnership society. If the theory of evolution teaches us anything, it is that life proceeded from the simple single cell, through varieties of shapes and conditions until it crossed a border into consciousness. And now consciousness is being reshaped across the globe through multiple links between people and technologies. The direction is towards more complexity but also higher consciousness. It seems likely that humanity’s goal is ultimately self-actualisation not just individually but globally.

In a partnership society, creativity will be valued more than economics or business. Because our future lies in the direction of self-actualisation, creativity will be more helpful in the next stage of our journey than money or profit. Extra resources will be given to the creative arts. Everyone will be encouraged to develop their unique talent and to express their unique ideas. The wonderful nature of being human is the fact that no-one is entirely or exactly the same as anyone else. Each person, each citizen, can make a unique contribution. When individual and group creativity flourishes, society will flourish.

Not only do the creative arts add to the world’s store of experience and emotion, they also have a healing aspect. They can be therapeutic. Hospitals nowadays fill their walls with beautiful art. Colour, if used creatively, may influence moods. Writing a journal can reveal the long-hidden wounds and take the hurt from them. Dance can free a spirit that has been traumatised and imprisoned in an unresponsive body. Music has the power to heal. [Note 3: Music Therapy] The more we can free ourselves from the mental scars and wounds of
childhood and other traumas we have experienced, the more we can be available for others. Music, dance, poetry and art aid us in that task.

The arts must be protected. They are so important for the development of a truly perceptive society. The keynote address at the 2015 National Play Festival by play-right Joanna Murray-Smith highlights the need for individuals and organisations to be courageous in their defence of the arts.⁴ [Note 4: Joanna Murray-Smith] and listen to her speech on ABC Radio National at [http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/booksandarts/].

The creative arts change history. Most know the Gettysburg address by Abraham Lincoln—Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.’. ⁵ [Note 5: Abraham Lincoln Gettysburg address]

And the speech by Martin Luther King—‘I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.’. ⁶ [Note 6: Martin Luther King speech]

Into the same category I would put the 1992 Redfern Speech delivered by Paul Keating—‘And, as I say, the starting point might be to recognise that the problem starts with us non-Aboriginal Australians. It begins, I think, with that act of recognition. Recognition that it was we who did the dispossessing. We took the traditional lands and smashed the traditional way of life. We brought the diseases. The alcohol. We committed the murders. We took the children from their mothers. We practised discrimination and exclusion. It was our ignorance and our prejudice. And our failure to imagine these things being done to us. ⁷ [Note 7: Redfern Speech]

The Redfern speech is not as well-known as the former two but deserves to be learned by generations of Australian school-children for its honesty and the inspirational message it conveys.

A partnership society will give the creative arts more scope, but while not eliminating our concerns about food and shelter and profit. While we still exist on earth they will remain important. We will simply refocus on concluding the task evolution set itself so many millions of years ago—helping the human race become fully human.
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Note 1: Pratt, Annis. Archetypal patterns in women’s fiction. Published by The Harvester Press. 16 Ship Street, Brighton. Sussex. 1981. P.6. Writing in 1980 about 300 years of women’s writing she has this to say:

‘I .. discover in women’s novels a clear sense that we are outcasts in the land, that we have neither a homeland of our own or an ethnic place within society. Our quests for being are thwarted on every side by what we are told to be and to do, which is different from what men are told to be and to do: when we seek an identity based on human personhood rather than on gender, we stumble about in a landscape whose signposts indicate retreats from, rather than ways to, adulthood. In existential terms, our desire for responsible selfhood, for the achievement of authenticity through individual choice, comes up against the assumption that a woman aspiring to selfhood is by definition selfish, deviating from norms of subservience to the dominant gender. If authenticity depends upon totality of self—the greatest possible exercise of our capacities for significant work, intellectual growth, political action, creativity, emotional development, sexual expression, etc.—then women are supposed to be less than total selves. Sartre’s quality of “mauvaise foi,” the “bad faith” of avoiding human responsibility, can be chosen by men: for women, it is not a matter of choice but a precondition for social acceptance.’

Note 2: Sigmund Freud (/frɔɪd/; German pronunciation: [ˈziːkmʊnt ˈfʁɔʏt]; born Sigismund Schlomo Freud; 6 May 1856 – 23 September 1939) was an Austrian neurologist, now known as the father of psychoanalysis. Freud qualified as a doctor of medicine at the University of Vienna in 1881, and then carried out research into cerebral palsy, aphasia and microscopic neuroanatomy at the Vienna General Hospital. Upon completing his habilitation in 1885, he was appointed a docent in neuropathology in the same year and became an affiliated professor (professor extraordinarius) in 1902.

In creating psychoanalysis, a clinical method for treating psychopathology through dialogue between a patient and a psychoanalyst, Freud developed therapeutic techniques such as the use of free association and discovered transference, establishing its central role in the analytic process. Freud’s redefinition of sexuality to include its infantile forms led him to formulate the Oedipus complex as the central tenet of psychoanalytical theory. His analysis of dreams as wish-fulfillments provided him with models for the clinical analysis of symptom formation and the mechanisms of repression as well as for elaboration of his theory of the unconscious as an agency disruptive of conscious states of mind. Freud postulated the existence of libido, an energy with which mental processes and structures are invested and which generates erotic attachments, and a death drive, the source of repetition, hate, aggression and neurotic guilt. In his later work Freud developed a wide-ranging interpretation and critique of religion and culture. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sigmund_Freud]

Note 3: Music therapists are found in nearly every area of the helping professions. Some commonly found practices include developmental work (communication, motor skills, etc.) with individuals with special needs, songwriting and listening in reminiscence/orientation work with the elderly, processing and relaxation work, and rhythmic entrainment for physical rehabilitation in stroke victims. Music therapy is also used in some medical hospitals, cancer centers, schools, alcohol and drug recovery programs, psychiatric hospitals, and correctional facilities.

Note 4: Joanna Murray Smith (born 17 April 1962) is a Melbourne based Australian playwright, screenwriter, novelist, librettist and newspaper columnist.

Murray-Smith was born in Mount Eliza, Victoria; her father was the literary editor and academic Stephen Murray-Smith (1922–1988). She attended Toorak College and graduated with a BA (Hons) from the University of Melbourne. On a Rotary International Scholarship in 1995, Murray-Smith attended the writing program at Columbia University, New York. In 2003, she took a sabbatical in Italy. She is married to husband Raymond Gill and has two sons Sam and Charlie, an established rock and roll star and a daughter Lucy.
Many of Murray-Smith’s plays have been performed around the world. Honour has been produced in more than three dozen countries, including productions on Broadway and at the Royal National Theatre in London.

‘Honour’ was created in 1995 when Murray-Smith was studying in the writing program at Columbia University in New York. There, the play’s first public appearance was in a reading with Meryl Streep, Sam Waterston and Kyra Sedgwick. The play was then performed at the Belasco Theatre on Broadway in 1998 with Jane Alexander, Robert Foxworth, Laura Linney and Enid Graham; it earned Alexander and Graham Tony Award nominations, Enid Graham winning a Tony. It was performed at London’s Royal National Theatre with Eileen Atkins who won best actress in the Laurence Olivier Awards for the role. Its West End performance took place at Wyndham’s Theatre in 2006 with Diana Rigg, Martin Jarvis and Natascha McElhone.

‘Ridge’s Lovers’ was performed in New York under the direction of Brian Leahy Doyle. Honour, Nightfall, Rapture, Ninety and Day One, a Hotel, Evening have all had staged readings or productions at the annual New York Stage and Film Festival at Vassar College.

‘Scenes from a Marriage’ was performed in January 2008 at the Belgrade Theatre, Coventry, directed by Trevor Nunn, with Iain Glen and Imogen Stubbs.

‘The Female of the Species’, based on events in the life of Germaine Greer, opened in the West End at the Vaudeville Theatre in July 2008, directed by Roger Michell and starring Eileen Atkins. A Broadway production, originally planned for 2008 with Annette Bening was postponed. It was nominated for best comedy in the 2009 Olivier Awards. In February and March 2010, the play was staged at the Geffen Playhouse in Los Angeles with David Arquette and Annette Bening. Charles Isherwood of The New York Times wrote about this production: "The Female of the Species is not just antifeminist. In its depiction of women as variously pompous, deluded, self-obsessed, hypocritical, sexually obsequious or just plain crazy, it comes closer to being antifemale."

The plays and novels of Murray-Smith have been translated and performed widely around the world. According to the Australia Council, “Joanna Murray-Smith and Daniel Keene account for half of all foreign productions of Australian plays”. However, Murray-Smith feels that within Australia, and especially at the Sydney Theatre Company, her work and that of other Australian writers, e.g. David Williamson’s, is insufficiently supported. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joanna_Murray-Smith]
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Ethics, responsibility and regulation in a Partnership Society

Right and wrong?
Many books have been written about ethics so before I considered the matter I realised I would need help. I asked a friend ‘What do you think ethics is all about?’ His answer was simple. ‘Do unto others as you would like them to do unto you.’ The golden rule.¹ [Note 1: The Golden Rule] Can it be as simple as that? Hmmmm. Well Yes and No.

Yes, because the task of ethics is to smooth the conflict between the differing needs of others and ourselves.

No because there are a thousand and one things that must be known before we understand ourselves and that is even before we begin thinking about knowing others. People who measure their actions by The Golden Rule must work hard to decide firstly what they want themselves and then what others would want. Not easy. It is also necessary to consider what is best for society.

Take the topical issue of measles vaccinations. If I thought there could be a risk (although tiny) that vaccination might harm my child, perhaps I would decide not to have my child vaccinated. Then I pause to think about others and wonder ‘What if my child gets measles and passes it on to another child?’ It gets confusing. To add to the confusion, I think it is necessary then to do what is for the greater good of society. If I do not have my child vaccinated and if others do not, then measles (which has almost died out because of years of vaccination programs) is likely to become endemic again. So, I decide to have my child vaccinated. Although there is a small risk of them being harmed, I will take that risk for the greater good.

Does society have the right to regulate my decision so I have no choice? That is tricky. Regulation may bring people into line or it may cause them to fight back. On the other hand, no-body grumbles too much that governments insist on which side of the road we travel or how fast we drive. (Well, some do but their voices are not in the majority.)

To complicate matters, traditional ideas about ethics are fragmented. Individualism is today’s theme and everyone must invent or choose their own ethical framework. What a mess! Or is it?

We are emerging from thousands of years of being ‘ordered about; ‘following traditions’; ‘being conventional’. Some of us are kicking up our heels and thinking we are ‘free’ to ‘do whatever we want’. We are ‘thinking for ourselves’. We are ‘having a ball’; ‘anything goes’. We are ‘pushing the boundaries’ in all directions; ‘kicking over the traces’; ‘sowing our wild-oats’ metaphorically speaking.

This is often what happens when individuals come of age and similarly humanity appears to be learning to rely upon inner authority rather than an external one.

Is there a way forward from this apparent ethical anarchy?

Probably. Eventually most of us ‘put away childish things’ and become solid citizens—usually when we become responsible for children. In the meantime, we are still somewhat rudderless. Post-modern forces swept away our social moorings by questioning the basis of everything.

What shoul
Can individuals work it out for themselves or is there a need for social agreement about ethics? Sam Harris, in his book *The Moral Landscape*, proposes that the human sciences accumulate facts about moral truths and values to discern which are of most benefit to people’s well-being. I’m not sure if this is realistic but, if possible, it would make a real contribution. Even crediting the notion that morality is not simply relative would make a big difference.

Perhaps we could have a public debate about this issue—maybe even a summit! We have *Summits* and *Retreats* for all kinds of other things why not for something even more important—how we arrange to get along with each other?

How might it be conducted?

If participants were divided into groups, for example, Business ethics, Medical ethics, Political ethics, Workplace ethics, Sporting ethics, International ethics, etc. it would become obvious that most areas of life already have guidelines and it is probable common themes would emerge.

Another stage in the debate would deal with questions about living harmoniously within our families and neighbourhoods. No doubt the debate would be intense, as grand-parents, family members, kids and neighbours are likely to have widely differing views.

Perhaps there is no need for just one set of guidelines. It may be that the very process of discussion would help individuals and families create codes of their own. Filming and airing debates and discussions would help this process along.

While pondering the question of ethics, I realised that every day of our lives (and moment by moment) we are making decisions which are actually ethical in nature. ‘Will I visit my grandmother today?’ ‘What should I say to the head-teacher about my son’s absence from school?’ ‘Can I write my resume without saying I lost a job once because I was frequently late?’ ‘What do I think of homelessness in Australia?’ As one young person told me vigorously just the other day ‘It isn’t right!’ I agreed with her. The next logical step is to ask ‘What can we do to end it?’

Maybe at the end of the day we could turn each of these decisions over in our minds and see if they are ‘right’ or ‘not right’ and resolve to do better the following day. Perhaps ethics is just that simple. Hmmm.

And perhaps, just perhaps, over time, views on ethics would converge and society would come to a consensus about how to behave in particular circumstances.

I have tried my hand at a few issues and as you would expect, these relate to male/female actions. There is a vast range of behaviours in the male/female continuum. It is no longer adequate to stereotype men and women. True, a male-dominated world-view still holds sway across the world and even in Australia, but that does not mean each male or each female fits snugly into the categories established by that world-view.
In social settings where people are not agitated or angry, my first guideline would be to respect and listen to understand where people are coming from. The next would be to tolerate and the third to make responses based on reason and respect.

Listen—Understand—Tolerate—Respond with reason and respect. This is not rocket science. Many of us already do this. In situations of stress or anger, circumstances will be different but the mantra will be similar. Don’t give way to harsh words or violence.

Listen—Understand—Tolerate—Respond with reason and respect.

Security officials, police, public officials who frequently deal with these kinds of situations are well-trained. It would help the rest of us if educational courses contained a segment on how to listen and respond calmly when others are agitated and how to deal with our own emotions when we are agitated. There is no way of knowing when we will walk into a highly emotional situation and being prepared is half the solution.

If we could help each other respond calmly we would be spared much of the ‘King hit’ phenomena; ‘on-field’ attacks; ‘domestic violence’; ‘Road rage’; ‘out-bursts at family gatherings’; ‘lashing out at children’s misbehaviour’ etc.

Obviously, alcohol must be considered. It is difficult to respond calmly and reasonably when affected by alcohol. Some individuals have higher tolerances than others but young people may need to be protected by regulation from obtaining more alcohol than they can manage. Most teen-aged brains are still maturing at 18. In the USA, 21 is the legal drinking age. At 21 there might be more chance of youngsters moderating their drinking and thereby avoiding unreasonable responses. Changing the Australian standard would need to be a slow process accompanied by educational programs about its validity.

Male aggression was sometimes allowed to flourish because ‘that is just how men are’. We won’t accept that any longer in Australia. Male aggression against other men and against women and children is facing social disapproval. But while public opinion and the law is turning against such violence, there is still a long way to go before it is eliminated. I have discussed elsewhere what I think are the underlying factors leading to much male aggression (See Chapter 6: Husbands and wives) and the change required I propose is a move to a partnership society where men and women are equal in all respects.

Meanwhile, we must do our best to bring up children, and particularly our boys, to respect others and to understand that we do not want ‘hitting back’; ‘being combative’; ‘fighting to be the top-dog’; ‘dismissing girls as lesser’ to be part of Australian society.

Female actions can change also. Many women have learned passive aggression. In the face of inequality and being treated as ‘sex objects’ for thousands of years, females have responded by competing with other women and by sometimes masking their anger and frustration with ‘snide’ remarks. They can be ‘bitchy’, ‘unclear’, ‘nagging’. It is obvious how this emotional distortion came about. The solution is the same as that for male aggression—try to bring about a social and political framework where male and female are equal and co-operate to improve each other’s lives.
From the beginning, at home and in school, we will educate our girls to be strong but reasonable—to express their feelings honestly and to communicate fairly. Many women are good with language and many of our men are not. This imbalance sometimes causes communication difficulties. Such difficulties can only be managed by patience, understanding and respect.

Misunderstandings are bound to occur between individuals and between groups as no individual or group is the same. We are unique. Improving relationships is a constant journey of discovery which will include improved communication skills and better knowledge of ourselves and of others.

In the case of entrenched aggression there is little to be done. My own view is that I am responsible for my own behaviour and can change it but not that of others. Sometimes people will just not speak reasonably or respond respectfully.

We can grow stronger in dealing with aggression but may not be able, immediately, to find a way to bring it to a halt. It can be helpful to ensure others are aware of what is happening and perhaps social disapproval will modify the harm caused. This is particularly the case with family violence.

Our ethical framework needs attention. I have just mentioned one or two items and a few solutions. We need as a nation to devote much more attention to the way we get along with each other.

There are many books written about improving communication skills. A couple I have found helpful over the years are Understanding Stress breakdown and People skills—How to assert yourself, listen to others, and resolve conflicts.³ [Note 3: Details of books]

The above-mentioned books were not written recently. No doubt, with a little patient looking, other helpful books could be discovered in libraries or bookshops.
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Note 1: The Golden Rule or ethic of reciprocity is a maxim, ethical code or morality that essentially states either of the following:

- One should treat others as one would like others to treat oneself (directive form).
- One should not treat others in ways that one would not like to be treated (cautionary form, also known as the Silver Rule).

This concept describes a "reciprocal", or "two-way", relationship between one's self and others that involves both sides equally, and in a mutual fashion.

This concept can be explained from the perspective of psychology, philosophy, sociology and religion. Psychologically, it involves a person empathizing with others. Philosophically, it involves a person perceiving their neighbor also as "I" or "self". Sociologically, 'love your neighbor as yourself' is applicable between individuals, between groups, and also between individuals and groups. (For example, treating all people with consideration, and not just members of an own in-group.] Religious thought figures prominently in the history of this concept of how to love others. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Golden_Rule]

Note 2: Post Modernism includes sceptical interpretations of culture, literature, art, philosophy, history, economics, architecture, fiction and literary criticism. [http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Post_Modernism. April 29, 2015]


Bolton, Robert. People skills—How to assert yourself, listen to others, and resolve conflicts. Published by Simon & Schuster Grosvenor Place, Brookvale NSW 2100. 1988.
Australia’s future role in the world community

Good global citizenship
Australia has a reputation as a good international citizen. It was a founding member of the United Nations since its inception in 1945 and has been active since then. H. V. Evatt, a former Opposition Leader of Australia and prominent figure in the Australian Labor Party, was President of the United Nations General Assembly in 1948. Australia has been an elected member of the United Nations Security Council on four occasions in the past (1946–7, 1956–7, 1973–4, and 1985–6), and was elected to serve a term in 2013–14.¹ [Note 1: United Nations]

As a partnership society our compassion and our contribution as international citizens will rise. We will increase our aid budget even if it means we must do without something ourselves. We will co-operate with countries in our region to find homes and worthwhile work for many more refugees and displaced persons. And when we have, together, discovered a way to resolve the problem in our own region, we will increase our efforts to find ways to do like-wise for other regions.

Australia’s aid program leads the way in the fight against preventable disease in our region. Australia’s aid effort has wiped out polio from the Pacific. Australia has also funded measles and polio immunisations for more than 1.5 million children in Papua New Guinea.

AusAID works to improve the quality of basics services. Water supply and sanitation programs are providing fresh water for nearly 500,000 people in Tanzania, South Africa, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. AusAID funds projects such as the Mỹ Thuận Bridge in Vietnam’s Mekong Delta region. The bridge now benefits more than three million people living below the poverty line. ² [Note 2: Australian overseas aid]

We will increase our immigration intake and ask incomers to devote some time (three months?) to improving the environment in Australia, perhaps in small towns or in areas where tree planting and habitat renewal is vitally required. When immigrants spend time on these tasks, they will be joined by Australian volunteers and by working together on socially useful tasks the newcomers and the old-timers will be bonded into common citizenship. While working together they will be offered an introductory program to help their transition to the Australian lifestyle. There will also be shared entertainment—music, food and games.

International links will be extended. We will make it easier for young people to visit and share their knowledge and traditions. Government grants will fund meetings where Australian youth and overseas visitors can meet. Students in their funded Gap Year will participate and will also assist in the organisation of these meetings.

Peace-keeping
Members of The Australian Defence Force will become peace-keepers. Their overseas role will be defensive and they will engage in warfare only when circumstances are exceptional and with the approval of the Australian Parliament.

When not engaged overseas, they will assist with Nation-building projects—bridge building, environmental projects and working with indigenous people to improve their communities and to establish suitable businesses. They will also go to neighbouring countries to assist with development. Every member of the Defence Force will be highly educated and trained for this changed role.
**Trade practices**

Trade agreements will be renegotiated to ensure that Australian quality standards are met when overseas products are imported. Pest controls as well as the well-being of the Australian producer will also be reconsidered to ensure the continuance of sustainable Australian production.

**Population**

Across the world the rate of population growth has begun to decline. It is anticipated that by 2100 actual numbers will begin to fall and population will be on the road to balance. While this is, no doubt, a success story, there are consequences of lower birth-rates which will need responses. Ageing populations are becoming an issue. Without an equivalent replacement of younger people to work and contribute taxes, there will be difficulty in providing sufficient resources for aged-care and pensions. Migration is one sources of younger individuals, however most migration will be from countries with a growing population and these are often Islamic. With the rise of extreme Islamic terrorism, this becomes a problem of assimilation.⁴

[Note 4: Mike Seccombe article]

It will be important that Australian Aid continues programs leading to population reduction in overseas countries. This will happen as more families have sufficient income and security and access to birth control services. Improving agricultural methods and supporting education is important but reducing the strain on the environment will not occur only by population reduction, it will also be necessary for people in developed countries such as Australia to *reduce our consumption*. This is not an option. It is essential. While encouraging population reduction overseas, we could conduct an educational program about *Australians living simply*. Perhaps we could also offer tax incentives to people who build smaller houses, share rental houses, reduce reliance on fossil fuels, make donations to environmental groups, volunteer for nation-building activities etc.

**Sharing the knowledge of a Partnership Society**

Australia will become a successful model of how a society can operate—an excellent problem-solver because we operate with the best strengths of both men and women. We will enjoy a secure and happy society because our focus as a society will be on just that. Women will be honoured and children cared for. Men will be at peace. Our country will prosper beyond imagining because we will have achieved *The Dream*. And we will be happy to share our good fortune with the rest of the world.
NOTES: Chapter 15

Note 1: Australia was a founding member of the United Nations (UN) in 1945 and has been actively engaged in the organisation since its formation. The UN is seen by the Australian Government as a means to influence events which directly affect Australia’s interests but over which they have little unilateral control.

Australia is the twelfth largest financial contributor to the UN. Australia contributed more than US$87 million in the years 2004 to 2006, with a regular budget of US$22.9 million, peacekeeping costs of approximately US$60 million, and over US$4 million contribution to International Tribunals.

Australia is the twelfth largest financial contributor to the UN. Australia contributed more than US$87 million in the years 2004 to 2006, with a regular budget of US$22.9 million, peacekeeping costs of approximately US$60 million, and over US$4 million contribution to International Tribunals.

Australia has been an elected member of the United Nations Security Council on four occasions in the past (1946–7, 1956–7, 1973–4, and 1985–6), and is currently elected to serve a term in 2013–14. H. V. Evatt, a former Opposition Leader of Australia and prominent figure in the Australian Labor Party, was President of the United Nations General Assembly in 1948.

Australian involvement in UN peacekeeping operations

Australians were the first peacekeepers to serve under United Nations auspices when they sent military observers to Indonesia in 1947 during the independence struggle. About 65,000 Australian personnel have partaken in more than fifty peacekeeping operations, in about 25 different conflicts. Operations include military observation, monitoring cease-fires, clearing landmines, humanitarian aid and the repatriation of refugees.

Since 1947 Australians have joined peacekeeping operations in Cambodia, Korea, Namibia, Rwanda, and Somalia among others. All three services of the Australian Defence Force, as well as police officers and civilians, have been involved in peacekeeping activities.

The most significant recent involvement from Australian peacekeeping troops is in the newly formed country of East Timor. Australia initially offered between 1,000 and 1,300 infantry, three Royal Australian Navy ships (HMAS Manoora and HMAS Kanimbla already stationed nearby, and HMAS Tobruk) along with other support capabilities. Australia’s involvement in East Timor is through UNMISET, the United Nations Mission of Support to East Timor, and UNOTIL, the United Nations Office in Timor Leste and UNMIT, the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste.

Australia also has peacekeepers from the Australian Defence Force participating in the United Nations Mission in Sudan, to support the African Union’s Mission in Darfur. Seven Australians have commanded or led multinational peacekeeping operations. Nine Australian peacekeepers have died on UN missions. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australia_and_the_United_Nations]

Australia’s aid program leads the way in the fight against preventable disease in our region. Australia’s aid effort has wiped out polio from the Pacific. Australia has also funded measles and polio immunisations for more than 1.5 million children in Papua New Guinea.

Note 2: AusAID works to improve the quality of basics services. Water supply and sanitation programs are providing fresh water for nearly 500,000 people in Tanzania, South Africa, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. AusAID funds projects such as the Mỹ Thuan Bridge in Vietnam’s Mekong Delta region. The bridge now benefits more than three million people living below the poverty line.

AusAID funds supporting microfinance a in Vietnam, 2005. Over the past 40 years:

- average life expectancy in developing countries has increased by 20 years
- adult illiteracy has almost halved
- maternal mortality has decreased by 50 per cent.

Most importantly, despite a rapidly growing world population, the number of people living in poverty has fallen by 200 million since 1980.
Australian aid has contributed to these achievements. By promoting sustainable development, Australia continues to improve the lives of our neighbours as well as make a major contribution to growth and stability in our region.

In 2011, AusAID signed a multi-year agreement (2011-2013) with the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme in support of the Online Volunteering service. The substantive financial contribution of AusAID enabled UNV to further promote online volunteering with the aim of increasing the number and diversity of organizations, opportunities and volunteers, as well as to respond to the continued growth of the user base and activities. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australian_Agency_for_International_Development_April_9, 2-15]

Note 4: Mike Seccombe article ‘People who need People’. The Saturday Paper October 17-23, 2015.
Have I convinced you a partnership society is coming to Australia—is more than half-way here? Not yet... then let me sum up the arguments and the evidence.

• I started with the assumption that in 3500 BCE there was a rudimentary partnership society built around the original agricultural co-operation between men and women. It was supported by Goddess worship, reverence for the female and the good earth.

• This original social arrangement was over-powered by masculine force which changed belief systems to the worship of male gods.

• Through successive millennia, the partnership model, has struggled to re-emerge.

• I interpret biblical mentions of ‘The Garden of Eden’ and the responsibility of ‘Eve’ for the downfall as scraps of memory of the original participatory system.

• Historically, the ‘feminine’ and the ‘masculine’ have been at odds. For thousands of years, masculine values have ruled and the ‘feminine’ has been suppressed.

• A partnership society will only reassert itself when the ‘masculine’ and the ‘feminine’ merge and learn to support each other. This has clearly begun in Australia.

• Interestingly this is also, according to Jung, the task individuals must tackle in order to become fully mature. Jung called this merging ‘androgyny’. It is the ability to recognize traits of each aspect of the personality and learn to use them appropriately as required.

• Evidence is everywhere that in Australia the aggressive ‘masculine’ is giving way to a better balance with the nurturing ‘feminine’.

• I have given examples of changes to laws, of changing attitudes towards the environment, of increased freedom, support and opportunities for women, better work-place laws, changing attitudes to raising children and many other positive changes.

We sometimes get swamped by day-to-day impressions and can’t see the forest for the trees. Australians are among the richest people ever to have lived on earth. We have access to a level of education and health and modern conveniences previously unknown and have experienced only a fraction of the disruption and heart-ache of people in many other countries of the world. Yet we may not have understood the significance of our good fortune. We are on the way to becoming a model of the partnership society. I wish I could say we had arrived but it isn’t a reality—just yet!

[See APPENDIX B: Bringing about a partnership society]

NOTES

End-piece

APPENDIX A: Gladiatorial and Partnership systems compared

The partnership model
The partnership model is a mediator model rather than a gladiatorial model. People who support this model are active peacemakers. They believe in participation, compassion, inclusiveness. They are kind-hearted and thoughtful. Their role is to take care of children and the family. From early childhood, they develop nurturing skills. They have a full emotional range and use it in their role as peacemakers. Around them develops a system where everyone is valued for themselves without a need to prove their worth. Their role is a virtuous and beautiful one. More females than males are in this category but there are also many males.

Equality for females is extremely important to social change as women are more closely aligned to the partnership model of life and when their voice is truly heard and respected then society is more likely to change for the better.

The gladiatorial model
The role of gladiators is to fight. They are reared knowing they will be gladiators and are trained for their role. They are competitive, heroic and tough. They must be courageous and have an intense will to win. In times of war they are in the forefront of the battle and keep the rest of their community safe. The most successful gladiators develop leadership skills, are decisive and good in crises. They learn to guard their emotions and to switch them off when hard decisions are required. Around them develops a hierarchical system where they test their strength and courage against the next gladiator on the ladder. The hierarchical system is valued also for its ability to instil obedience to commands as well as ensuring quick and effective responses to dangerous situations. Gladiators are generally male although not always.

However, if the role is distorted, domination, brutality, war and destruction ensue. Weaker individuals are crushed. There is poverty and misery. Technology is turned from peaceful goals to war-like goals. Free speech becomes difficult. The arts and gentler pursuits are corrupted.

Followers (I sometimes call them ‘Obediators’)
A significant proportion of people in society like to follow rather than lead. They learn obedience from childhood. Whether male or female, their role is to be helpers. They give their allegiance to a group then follow without resistance. This is the natural order of things for them and helps maintain social stability. If they are silent, cowed or careless, society is led by the dominant group. Science and reason and compassion no longer have a role to play in the decisions they make about who they will follow.

My preferred model is one where a partnership style (represented visually by a circle) encloses the gladiatorial style (represented by a pyramid). Thus, a partnership model would appear as shown in the attached diagram and a Gladiatorial model as the reverse with the pyramid enclosing the circle.
Hierarchical and Flat management styles

In modern management terminology, hierarchical¹ [Hierarchical organisation] and flat management² [Flat organisation] styles are analogous to gladiatorial/ partnership models but different as they refer mainly to productive activities rather than models of social organisation.

NOTES:

APPENDIX A: Partnership and gladiatorial systems compared

Note 1: A hierarchical organization is an organizational structure where every entity in the organization, except one, is subordinate to a single other entity. In this organizational style, the hierarchy usually consists of a singular/group of power at the top with subsequent levels of power beneath them. This is the dominant mode of organization among large organizations; most corporations, governments, and organized religions are hierarchical organizations with different levels of management, power or authority.

Members of hierarchical organizational structures chiefly communicate with their immediate superior and with their immediate subordinates. Structuring organizations in this way is useful partly because it can reduce the communication overhead by limiting information flow; this is also its major limitation. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hierarchical_organization]

Note 2: A flat organization (also known as horizontal organization or delayering) is an organization that has an organizational structure with few or no levels of middle management between staff and executives. The flat organization model promotes employee involvement through a decentralized decision-making process. By elevating the level of responsibility of baseline employees and eliminating layers of middle management, comments and feedback reach all personnel involved in decisions more quickly. Expected response to customer feedback becomes more rapid. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flat_organization]
APPENDIX B: Bringing about a partnership society

Now, in the 21st century, we can ask ourselves another important question. Are we really moving from a hierarchical, competitive, male-dominated society towards a partnership society? Is Australia a peaceful country where men and women are equal? Does everyone have shelter and sufficient food? Are children surrounded by love and fun and wisdom and are women and children protected from violence and given opportunities to reach their full capacity? Not yet but we are making progress.

Mediators have been mocked and denigrated by the ruling ideology. They are at the bottom of the pile socially and receive fewer benefits than its rulers. What can be done to enhance their status?

Encouraging mediators to believe in their mission In a world of hatred and violence it is sometimes difficult to believe that love and compassion can win through but time and again the power of reason and good sense can achieve what a violent response cannot. We need to value the mediator role. We also need to increase the ranks of the mediators.

Winning people over to the idea of a mediator society This might be achieved in a multitude of ways. Journalists and writers can promote the ideas. Mothers and fathers can inculcate the mediator culture within their children. Teachers can do likewise. Politicians can give an example of the importance of mediation in public affairs. In fact, winning people over to the mediator role can be done by anyone, anywhere. We are on the cusp of a change in the world order and now is the time to act.

Engaging with gladiators to win them over Most people involved in the gladiator role are males. Many are participants because they have been trapped into the hierarchical system. True gladiators relish their role but many males find it a tense and unpleasant way to be. They must fight continually to retain the respect of other males. They are denigrated if they ‘let the side down.’ If appealed to with reason and emotion many males will join the ranks of the mediators or, as obedienters, change sides. If you have been on the winning side for thousands of years, it will be difficult to change. Society is changing but there is resistance from the ‘old guard’. They will fight to the end and die rather than concede. The community will need to band together to curb them.

Curbing the unrelenting gladiators They have been encultured with a violent and self-centred outlook. It is a ‘win or lose’ mentality—a ‘them or me’ mentality. They were taught their role is to fight and never give up—that their whole being depends on the defence of their ‘masculinity’, where masculinity equals being a gladiator. Their violence against society must give way to public opinion and the law. Occasionally it will need to be curbed by a measured act of violence. It is a great sadness this should be necessary as such individuals are a casualty of the gladiator system. They believed in it faithfully, but when society began to change they were unable (or unwilling) to change.
Redefining masculinity and femininity

What does it mean to be a boy or a girl? Our definitions need to change. In a mediator system, there is equality. Neither is better or worse. This does not mean they are the same. It is still the role of a male to protect and defend. But it can also be the role of a female. In dangerous situations, it is often males with the capacity to react quickly and do what is needed. Their nature, their strength, their relative lack of emotional involvement makes this possible. However, this depends on the individual male or female and individuality must be considered. In situations involving interpersonal relationships, females are often at an advantage but not always. Once again it needs to be determined based on individual abilities and leanings.

So, the point we have reached is one where we must consider the leanings, the training and capacity of everyone. This coincides with changes occurring throughout the world in recent decades. Individuality is prized. To date, it has been a rampant form of individuality which often forgets its responsibilities to society or to evolution however it is not impossible to believe it could become a force for a future return to a mediator society.

Training children differently

This will be difficult but not impossible. Young minds are malleable, but they (particularly male children but also females) have been influenced at every point of their lives by the ruling mentality. They will need to be taught (and to understand) the reason they are being asked to behave differently.

Commandments for Kids
1. Use words not violence to solve problems.
2. Look after the elderly and people with a disability.
3. If someone is bugging you, use words to defend yourself—calm words, reasonable words.
4. Try to solve problems. If words don’t work, don’t hit anyone just walk away. Aggression often makes matters worse.

What will change if we achieve a mediator society?

There will be equality of opportunity. There may be hierarchies in some circumstances. These will occur where there is a need for clear decision-making and quick action—for example within the defence forces or emergency response groups. Hierarchies will not rule society as they do at present.

Gladiators will no longer be the main ruling force. Their skills will be used for the common good, for defence and not for control. They will be contained within the bounds of the partnership model to secure the society from a return to warfare and violence. Mediators will not be higher or lower than anyone else in society but they will be respected and emulated.

General education

As these changes take place it will be increasingly important that the great bulk of the community (who are mainly followers) understand the values of a mediator system and also the lesser role of gladiators within a changing society. This is likely to be a slow process but is important none-the-less as it is the ‘Followers’ who will eventually determine the future of humanity. They are the swinging voters, the tail that will wag the dog.
Our perceptions will change  It will no longer be adequate to fill a role we were trained for. We will need to break out of the mould. A woman will defend herself and her children and her society. A man will weep over the damage done by hatred and violence. It will no longer be acceptable to act by rote. We will need to respond in appropriate ways according to the situation and our capacities. This revolution is already well under way, but not yet well understood. Violence or selfishness will no longer be an acceptable first response to a situation. We will learn to moderate our responses; to mediate; to conciliate and to consider others first.

Must we be perfect?
The short answer is ‘Not yet.’ We still have a long journey ahead and need to feel our way through trial and error towards the golden goal.

What we do need is the realisation each one of us, has a role to play in making the dream a reality.

We can make a difference. All we need to do is to consider how best we, individually or communally, can help bring about a partnership society and then set about doing it.

We can change the world—at least our little part of it.

and… as Barack Obama would say:

Yes, we can!