

-----Original Message-----

From: Stuart Hill [SMTP:s.hill@uws.edu.au]
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2000 6:38 PM
To: jsct@aph.gov.au
Subject: TREATIES SUBMISSION

Australia, more than nearly any other country, needs to sequester carbon in both living (growing plants, ground cover, forests, non-row crops, pasture - ecologically managed) and dead organic matter.

The Kyoto Protocol is a minimalist agreement that can support this and so should be supported as an initial stage towards a more responsible and comprehensive plan of action.

BUT, we must be proactive in going much further. This will involve us engaging both experts and the population at large in an ambitious, collaborative project that will require the reconceptualisation of many of our ideas and the planned and progressive REDESIGN of most of our institutions, processes, resource management systems and lifestyles, with ecological sustainability, wellbeing and social justice as the tripple bottom line.

The following outline provides more details of such a broader approach to the necessary fundamental change that is required if we are not to severely disadvantage future generations (how could we ever have come to be so arrogant to assume that we have this right?).

Professor Stuart B. Hill, Foundation Chair of Social Ecology, Faculty of Social Inquiry, University of Western Sydney - Hawkesbury, Richmond, NSW. 2753.

TWELVE 'SOCIAL ECOLOGY' TESTING QUESTIONS FOR EVALUATING HEALTHY CITY INITIATIVES

Prior to planning Healthy City initiatives and at several stages throughout their implementation, to aid relevance and sustained effectiveness and efficiencies, it is helpful to consider a range of mutually supportive "testing questions". The twelve questions that will be discussed (listed below) were designed to broaden considerations by including concerns in the personal, social and environmental domains. This social ecology approach (Hill 1999) acknowledges the complex interrelated nature of the processes involved in both the fostering of health (Williamson & Pearse 1980) and of sustainability and change. The idea of using testing questions grew out of their successful use by Holistic Resource Management practitioners to improve landscape, community and enterprise health in agriculture (Savory & Butterfield 1999).

Personal

1. Does it support: empowerment, awareness, creative visioning, values clarification, acquisition of essential literacies and competencies, responsibility wellbeing and health maintenance, vitality and spontaneity (building personal capital - personal sustainability)?
2. Does it support: caring, loving, responsible, mutualistic, negentropic relationships with diverse others (valuing equity and social justice), other species, and place and planet (home and ecosystem maintenance)?
3. Does it support: positive total life-cycle personal development and change?

Social

4. Does it support: accessible, collaborative, responsible, creative, celebrational, life- promoting community structures and functions (building and maintaining social capital - cultural [including economic] sustainability)?
5. Does it support: the valuing of 'functional' high cultural diversity and mutualistic relationships?
6. Does it support: positive cultural development and co-evolutionary change?

Environmental

7. Does it support: effective ecosystems functioning (building and maintaining natural capital - ecological sustainability)?
8. Does it support: 'functional' high biodiversity, and prioritised use and conservation of resources?
9. Does it support: positive ecosystem development and co-evolutionary change?

General

10. Does it support: proactive (vs reactive), design/redesign (vs efficiency and substitution) and small meaningful collaborative initiatives that together you can guarantee to carry through to completion (vs heroic, Olympic-scale, exclusive, high risk ones) and their public celebration at each stage - to facilitate contagion - thereby making wellbeing and health contagious?
11. Does it focus on: key opportunities and windows for change (pre-existing change 'moments')?
12. Does it explain: how it will effectively monitor and evaluate its progress (broad, long-term, as well as specific and short-term) by identifying and using integrator indicators and by being attentive to all feedback and outcomes (and redesigning future actions and initiatives accordingly)?

Hill, S. B. 1999. Social ecology as future stories. *Social Ecology Journal*, 1: 197-208.

Savory, A. & J. Butterfield 1999. *Holistic Management: A New Framework for Decision Making* (2nd edn.). Island Pr., Washington DC.

Williamson, G. S. & I.H. Pearse 1980. *Science, Synthesis and Sanity*. Scottish Academic Pr., Edinburgh.