

# Appendix B: 21st century thinking and research

This document is part of our main submission, summarised below:

**1. Main submission:** Inquiry into the Future of Australia's aged care sector workforce.

**2. Appendix A: A Community Aged Care Hub**

This document is derived from our website that describes how the proposed *Community Aged Care Hub* might be structured.

**3. Appendix B: 21st century thinking and research**

This document addresses the need for an effective customer. It discusses and supplies links to modern thinking about the provision of social services including personalisation, citizenship and community involvement. It examines 20<sup>th</sup> century failures before addressing the 21<sup>st</sup> century movement for open government, participatory democracy and a rebuilt civil society. Our proposal can be seen as lying within these movements and to meet their objectives.

**4. Appendix C: Why aged care is a failed market**

In this document we have simply tabulated our criticisms and assessment of our political system, our providers and other participants as they impact on aged care and address most of these issues in greater depth and support our argument with quotes and references to a large amount of material. We list the large numbers, but largely ignored market failures where vulnerable customers or employees have been ruthlessly exploited. We argue that aged care is a vulnerable market and that the volume of criticism and information is so great that, in the absence of any other reliable data, it must be accepted and acted on. The reasons why it is a failed market are quite clear. This is only a small representative sample of the material we have collected over the years.

**5. Appendix D: Community integration**

Our proposal is a wide ranging one which sees aged care integrated at a community level and not at a government level. Government will work through and with the community. This will vastly improve its utility to serve the community and its seniors. We have made submissions to other inquiries including those below. These illustrate the manner in which our community proposal will enable all of these services to be integrated and work together. It would also facilitate integration with the health care services and the NDIS locally. It may be possible to reduce the costs by sharing staff.

Please consider our submissions at these links as supporting evidence to your committee:

- **Review of Aged Care Advocacy Services:**  
ACC feedback form questions and our responses (web page): <http://bit.ly/25tqXxK>  
ACC supplementary submission (pdf): <http://bit.ly/1PCdyaY>
- **Inquiry into elder abuse in NSW**  
ACC submission (pdf): <http://bit.ly/1RMaEZ0>

## *Contents*

<b>1. Creating a customer to correct market failure .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Developments in social thought .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Examples:.....</b>	<b>4</b>
International articles .....	4
Australian articles .....	7
<b>2. Open government, participatory democracy and civil society .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>20<sup>th</sup> century failures .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Moving into the 21<sup>st</sup> century .....</b>	<b>11</b>
The Open Government movement .....	11
Participatory democracy .....	12
<b>3. Relevance to our proposal for aged care .....</b>	<b>15</b>

## **We have argued two key points in our main submission to this Inquiry:**

1. The market has failed because its customers are vulnerable and lack the knowledge and power to make it work for them and because many employees are also vulnerable.
2. We developed a market like this because civil society failed and did not meet its responsibility to control the excesses of markets and politicians.

Our proposal seeks to create an effective customer and to rebuild civil society. In doing so it can be seen to be a part of a number of 21<sup>st</sup> century movements including personalisation, citizenship, open government and participatory democracy.

# 1. Creating a customer to correct market failure

**Why it is failing:** The top/down managerial model of social services including aged care has failed because it provided the sort of care that management thought was needed and those requiring care became the objects to whom care was provided. In many ways it became a process in which those receiving care had no or little role.

Reform was seen as empowering the person and putting them in charge of their own care and this was done in the UK and is now being introduced in Australia. It has failed in the UK and is not really working in Australia for at least 3 reasons.

- a. It fails to adequately recognise and take account of the vulnerability and incapacity of a large number of the aged citizens it expects to take control.
- b. It has tried to squeeze the empowerment of frail citizens into the free market belief system and the two are not really compatible.
- c. It has ignored the fact that the frail aged are part of a community and it is the community that relates to them and is ultimately responsible for and to them. The community gives their lives meaning. Community services are most successful when the community has ownership and responsibility and in the UK and Australia the community have largely been excluded.

## **Developments in social thought<sup>1</sup>**

Twenty-first century buzzwords in providing services to the vulnerable include “personalisation” and “citizenship”. The aim is to empower the vulnerable consumers so that they can control their lives and the care they receive, and so that they can realise themselves as citizens to the limit of their ability. The ideas are sound but the implementation has been fatally flawed. To attain these objectives you need knowledge and power and in a free market system without an effective customer this cannot work. People and families without prior experience who are facing one of the most challenging crises in their lives do not qualify.

Consumer Directed Care (CDC) has been introduced into Australia in a top down centralised manner exemplified by the ill conceived [www.myagedcare.gov.au](http://www.myagedcare.gov.au) website. It is closely following the UK where this approach has clearly failed<sup>2</sup> (although the UK government has not yet accepted this).

---

<sup>1</sup> Developments in social thought - Aged Care Crisis - <http://www.agedcarecrisis.com/solving-aged-care/part-4/developments-in-social-thought>

**Excluding communities:** The problem here is that the context within which care is provided has been ignored. It is being introduced into communities and those communities have been excluded from its design and from its implementation. Community discussion was tokenistic. It has simply been sold to them as if they were customers to be tempted into buying. Not only that but they have had no say or involvement in what was happening.

What we got was a highly controlled and complex centralised bureaucratised system designed by committees in Canberra. It is confusing for customers and community and so inefficient, that it is likely to cost more and recipients get less care.

Growing experience in the provision of services to communities has revealed that programs that are not embraced by the community, and that they do not control, fail. Where communities themselves are involved in developing programs and are put in charge of them, they succeed. The best example of this in Australia is aboriginal health. Vast sums have been wasted on health care projects that did not work. It is only since the aboriginal communities themselves took control of their health care programs that significant progress has been made.

Advocates for this approach claim it will be far less costly because much of the care is provided by networks of peers and by volunteers<sup>3</sup>.

It is revealing that volunteer organisations (Submissions 65 and 108) seem to feel that their interests are not being addressed and that the important role that they play has been overlooked. These are the community groups that currently support aged care and that the proposed proposed *Community Aged Care Hub*<sup>4</sup> will be looking to include and build on.

**Our proposal:** Our proposal creates a community organisation that will support and empower the vulnerable customer, restructure the market and change it to make it work in this sector and give the community ownership. This proposal can also be seen as a project in participatory democracy and open government.

There has been a considerable amount of attention given to the ideas of personalisation, citizenship and the role of the community in managing services. The examples below are some of these.

## Examples:

### Some articles that look at community projects and citizenship

### International articles

- **Community Sourcing and Social Care:** by Chris Yapp and Chris Howells from the Centre for Welfare Reform. *"This new (2013) report offers an alternative to privatisation and the hollowing out of local government"*. Instead the authors propose that commissioners work with and support local communities. <http://www.centreforwelfareform.org/library/by-date/community-sourcing-and-social-care.html>

---

<sup>2</sup> Further lessons from the continuing failure of the national strategy to deliver personal budgets and personalisation - Colin Slasberg, Peter Beresford and Peter Schofield Research, Policy and Planning (2014/15) 31(1), 43-53. <http://ssrg.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Slasberg-et-al3.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Social services are broken. How we can fix them: a talk by Hilary Cottam RED website [http://www.ted.com/talks/hilary\\_cottam\\_social\\_services\\_are\\_broken\\_how\\_we\\_can\\_fix\\_them](http://www.ted.com/talks/hilary_cottam_social_services_are_broken_how_we_can_fix_them)

<sup>4</sup> The essence of a "Community Hub": <http://www.agedcarecrisis.com/solving-aged-care/part-2>

## Appendix B: 21st century thinking and research

[www.agedcarecrisis.com](http://www.agedcarecrisis.com)

Inquiry - Future of Australia's aged care sector workforce

---

- **Joining Up Community Involvement: by Gabriel Chanan and Colin Mille.** This paper acknowledges that privatisation discourages community and user involvement. It examines the important role of government in working with and rebuilding communities.  
<http://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/library/categories/community/joining-up-community-involvement.html>
- **Citizenship Council: Slide show by Simon Duffy, Centre for Welfare Reform:** *"The future for local councils is to radically rethink their role. It no longer makes sense to simply serve central government, this has led to cuts that target local government and the on-going failure of the system to transfer more power to local communities. Instead councils need to start focusing on promoting citizenship, family and community"*.  
<http://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/library/categories/community/citizenship-council.html>
- **Positively Local:** John Gillespie, with Susanne Hughes 2011: *"In the fourth joint policy paper with the University of Birmingham, John Gillespie argues that communities are best served when government and local services begin to believe in them, when they look for and help unleash capacity, rather than assuming that failure is endemic. Positive change begins with positive thinking"*.  
The authors argue that communities are best served when government and local services begin to believe in them. They suggest that *"If privatisation was the key focus of the 1980s - - - then personalisation could be the key focus of the early twenty-first century"*. Personalisation is the process which the centre promotes to give people and their communities the power and resources they need to reclaim their identities as effective citizens. In referring to the disabled they claim that *"The model support residents to reclaim their capacity to direct change for themselves"*.  
<http://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/library/type/pdfs/positively-local.html>
- **Community Engagement:** by Kate Fulton and Claire Winfield 2011. What is required is a process of real community engagement in order to identify and support their involvement. I quote "This discussion paper aims to explore and support the development of community organisations and support services as an intrinsic element of the community model of support."

The article promotes the idea of Community Brokerage which they indicate will enable the following:

- Starts by assuming and encouraging the capacity of citizens and families by enabling access to a wide information network
- Facilitates the early use of peer support for everyone
- Ensures access to community supports from organisations and associations within their community
- Enables citizens to work with support services directly and to explore with them what options are available
- Puts in place sufficient professional advisors, such as social workers or other specialists, so that everyone can get the help they need

They also state that *"It is important to remember that the community-based support system to brokerage starts with the assumption that people can plan and organise things for themselves if we keep the process simple to navigate and access."*

<http://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/library/type/pdfs/community-engagement.html>

- **Change Agents: The Older People's Participation Co-operative** is a driving force for community participation and innovation in the UK. What they are doing is interesting. They interviewed Simon Duffy on their radio program. That interview [Growing Older](http://www.growingolder.org.uk/)<sup>5</sup> is on the Centre for Social Welfare's website. It discusses some of these issues and is worth listening to.  
[http://www.changeagents.coop/Change\\_AGEnts/Welcome.html](http://www.changeagents.coop/Change_AGEnts/Welcome.html)

- **Hilary Cottam: Social services are broken. How we can fix them:** There is an inspiring and fascinating talk by [Hilary Cottam](https://www.ted.com/talks/hilary_cottam_social_services_are_broken_how_we_can_fix_them)<sup>6</sup> on the TED website. She is very critical of social services in the UK which she claims are failing those they try to serve. Her focus is on building self supporting communities by building relationships between people. This is an interesting talk which also addresses aged care issues. It is highly relevant to what we are doing wrong in home care. It is another and far cheaper way of addressing home care in Australia and we should think about it. It fits in well with what Duffy and his group are saying.

[http://www.ted.com/talks/hilary\\_cottam\\_social\\_services\\_are\\_broken\\_how\\_we\\_can\\_fix\\_them](http://www.ted.com/talks/hilary_cottam_social_services_are_broken_how_we_can_fix_them)

- **Criticism of the home care system in the UK**

Perhaps even more interesting is the determination with which personal budgets have been pursued by all major political parties, despite them having the most limited evidence base.

-----  
Self-directed support - - not only is it failing to deliver its intended function, it is having a seriously deleterious effect on social care field-work services.

-----  
Simon Duffy is the acknowledged architect of self-directed support — he says the RAS (Resource Allocation System) has become "a disaster area".

He believes the RAS has become needlessly complex, "using questionnaires, points, weightings and formulas" where it should have been something simple.

**Source:** Colin Slasberg, Peter Beresford and Peter Schofield [The increasing evidence of how self-directed support is failing to deliver personal budgets and personalisation](http://ssrg.org.uk/members/files/2013/09/SLASBERG-et-al-7Jan14.pdf) *Research, Policy and Planning* (2013) 30(2),91-105 <http://ssrg.org.uk/members/files/2013/09/SLASBERG-et-al-7Jan14.pdf>

- **Further lessons from the continuing failure of the national strategy to deliver personal budgets and personalisation** Colin Slasberg, Peter Beresford and Peter Schofield *Research, Policy and Planning* (2014/15) 31(1), 43-53. This recent study in the UK reveals that personal budgets in the provision of services have often not worked as claimed and suggests this is largely the result of the way that it was introduced. This has relevance to the introduction of Consumer Directed Care in Australia because the manner of its introduction is likely to create similar problems here. There seems to have been little community control or involvement in planning or delivering the service in either country and unwanted advice has been ignored.

<http://ssrg.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Slasberg-et-al3.pdf>

---

<sup>5</sup> Growing Older: The Centre for Welfare Reform <http://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/library/type/audio/growing-older.html>

<sup>6</sup> Hilary Cottam: Wikipedia [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hilary\\_Cottam](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hilary_Cottam)

## Australian articles

These articles examine the importance of community and community projects:

- **Partnering with consumers: national standards and lessons from other countries**  
Stephen D Gill and Melinda Gill. Med J Aust 2015; 203 (3): 134-136  
<https://www.mja.com.au/journal/2015/203/3/partnering-consumers-national-standards-and-lessons-other-countries>
- **Planning, Implementation and Effectiveness in Indigenous Health Reform** The Lowitja Institute July <https://www.lowitja.org.au/sites/default/files/PIE-Report-PB-FINAL2.pdf>
- **Empowered communities: Review of the empowered communities design report** Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research ANU College of Arts & Social Sciences CAEPR Topical Issue No. 1/2015 by E. Klein (This is a criticism of the Abbott governments implementation of empowerment)  
[http://caepr.anu.edu.au/sites/default/files/Publications/topical/TopicalIssue1-2015\(31Aug15\).pdf](http://caepr.anu.edu.au/sites/default/files/Publications/topical/TopicalIssue1-2015(31Aug15).pdf)
- **Community Connections Vulnerability and Resilience in the Blue Mountains** Project Report for Blue Mountains City Council  
<https://www.csu.edu.au/research/ilws/publications/technical-reports/Community-Connections-Report-March-2015.pdf>

*This study “demonstrates that vulnerable people typically relate to various community services and Non Government Organisations (NGOs) in the first instance, rather than friends, neighbours or family”.*

*The report considered that it was “imperative that existing community services and NGOs are maintained and resourced appropriately within the Local Government Area. To support enhanced approaches to accessing and supporting vulnerable people within the community, Neighbourhood Centres need greater recognition as trust builders with vulnerable residents”.*

## 2. Open government, participatory democracy and civil society

Our adoption of a simplistic free market belief that fails citizens in multiple sectors of society where they are vulnerable can be seen as a consequence of the failures of democracy during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The great weakness of democracy is our weakness for ideology. Ideology succeeds to the extent that it can control the minds of citizens and so of civil society. It does so by simplistic ideas that create certainty and promise utopia. They are built on illusions.

It is the repeated and ongoing renewal and reinvigoration of democratic ideals by an actively involved civil society that protects democracy from ideology. This requires courage by citizens who need to recognise complexity, accept uncertainty and understand the responsibilities of citizenship.

### 20<sup>th</sup> century failures

We can look back at the 20<sup>th</sup> century as a century where we made enormous technological advances but where our understanding of ourselves, our society and our involvement lagged a long way behind. We “trained” our citizens to participate and succeed in this technological world and build their lives there.

In doing so we did not have time for and neglected their “education” in the knowledge and skills they needed to be effective and responsible citizens. Civil society became complacent and indolent and did not keep up with the challenges that were created. It lost power and credibility.



## Appendix B: 21st century thinking and research

Inquiry - Future of Australia's aged care sector workforce

---

Technology provided the means of controlling what people saw and heard and what they thought about that. Technology and propaganda enabled ideologies to dominate and impose their ideas on civil societies and so emasculate them.

Even the very basic technology of the 1930s enabled an ideology to take control of the minds of a whole nation. This resulted in millions of deaths and a brutal world war. Talking afterwards about what happened Albert Speer a high ranking official in Nazi Germany indicated "through technical means like the radio and the loud-speaker, eighty million people were deprived of independent thought". Joseph Goebbels who was minister for propaganda and largely responsible for this said "It is not propaganda's task to be intelligent, its task is to lead to success." He explained that ""They are mere words, and words can be molded until they clothe ideas and disguise."

The power and sophistication of the media has grown rapidly since then. The battle between ideologies, which seek to use the media to promote simplistic ideas and so control the minds of citizens, and civil society, which seeks to use it to challenge ideology and beliefs, and stimulate the imagination, continues. The former trades on our fear of uncertainty and our weakness for simple ideas. The latter challenges us with uncertainty and the excitement of constructing new ways of understanding.

The multiple social disasters of the 20<sup>th</sup> century culminating in the terrorism of the 21<sup>st</sup> can be seen as the ability of ideologies to catch the imagination of our populations with simplistic ideas and the failure of civil societies to restrain them. The power of blind belief whether religious or secular is revealed in our willingness to engage in indiscriminate mass slaughter.

Nearly 70 years after Albert Speer Canadian critic John Ralston Saul writing about the late 20<sup>th</sup> century in the grip of ideology was saying the same things.

For the ideologue, language itself becomes the message because there is no doubt. In a more sensible society, language is just the tool of communication. p 42

The sign of a sick civilization is the growth of an obscure, closed language that seeks to prevent communication. p 57

It is the intent that is in question -- the intent to use language to communicate, or alternately, through control of it, to use language as a weapon of power. p57

Rhetoric describes the public face of ideology. Propaganda sells it. They are both aimed at normalization of the untrue p 63

**Source:** John Raulston Saul " *The Unconscious Civilization*"-*The Massey lectures Penguin books 1997*

A few years later Saul wrote more about ideology looking at what it is in us that makes us so vulnerable and how we might use our many qualities together so that they balance and control each other and make us less vulnerable. The proposed hub seeks to bring data and experience together with multiple points of view in our communities and the many different qualities of the participants so that there are many points of view and many qualities to limit our vulnerability to ideology.

And so we slip into ideologies. Strangely enough, there are often several at a time. Overarching truths and tiny truths. Certainties at all levels (Page 15)

-----  
The answer (to the problem of conflicting "truths") over the last two centuries has been a



## Appendix B: 21st century thinking and research

[www.agedcarecrisis.com](http://www.agedcarecrisis.com)

Inquiry - Future of Australia's aged care sector workforce

---

gradual move towards a civilisation of structure and form over one of content and consideration. The way we come at every point is structural, managerial.

Much of the last two decades (*now three*) has been taken up by precisely this view. The idea, for example, that we are driven by self-interest is the natural outcome of believing in competing certainties (page 7)

-----  
-- qualities are most effective in a society when they are recognised as of equal, universal value and so are integrated into our normal life.

**Source:** *On Equilibrium* John Ralston Saul Penguin Books 2001

The multiple ideologies that caused so much havoc in the 20<sup>th</sup> century did so by selling illusionary ideas and then discrediting and destroying their civil society critics – sometimes with violence.

Technology has advanced throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century offering opportunities for both advancement and for ideologies. Groups in society have obtained control of and used this technology to support their beliefs. Civil society has lacked the sophistication needed to free itself from the barrage of rhetoric.

In the late 20th century free market ideology tried to discredit their critics and when unable to do so simply ignored them. Marketplace success and not logic or evidence of benefit for citizens was what drove the changes.

In the 1980's and 1990s civil society was so indolent and disinterested that it did not bother to engage with the critics in its midst nor force the ideologists to confront their critics. They ignored over 200 years of knowledge about markets and allowed this to happen.

“The interest of [businessmen] is always in some respects different from, and even opposite to, that of the public ... The proposal of any new law or regulation of commerce which comes from this order ... ought never to be adopted, till after having been long and carefully examined ... with the most suspicious attention. It comes from an order of men ... who have generally an interest to deceive and even oppress the public.

**Source:** *Adam Smith in The Wealth of Nations* (18th century)

The balance of power between markets, politics and civil society has not been there and has not worked. Civil society's controlling role in capitalist democracies declined throughout the century.

It may seem illogical to put a belief in free markets into the same bracket as genocide. It is the total conviction in what they are doing in the face of evidence that is the reason for doing so. It does seem to have increased our overall financial wellbeing. If we ignore the role of the arms industry then free markets have not obviously resulted in piles of bodies or mass graves. Its victims are the vulnerable it preys on who are scattered and less visible. It is an ideology because it is incapable of seeing its failings and addressing them.

**Hopes dashed:** At the start of the digital age there was a vision that technology would relieve us from the burden and pressures of the workplace so that humanity could escape the treadmill of endless labour and be released to learn, grow and realise its potential in many different ways. People would have the time to live and grow in multiple ways and utilise the increase in intelligence that each new generation has been given. Many innovators imagined a future but were unable to realise it. Technology would spread knowledge and enlightenment – both the enemies of ideology and the friends of tolerance.

## Appendix B: 21st century thinking and research

Inquiry - Future of Australia's aged care sector workforce

---

Instead, the ideology of the late 20th century turned self-interest and work into an end in itself – the purpose of life became focussed on personal performance in the workplace. You became what your work was and there was little life after that. Life was driven by the imperative of greater and greater competition. Instead of widening our horizons they were constrained and limited.

We might even make a case that those who cannot find employment or are made redundant have difficulty in realizing themselves and their potential. The young who have difficulty in imagining a future for themselves in the the workforce, particularly if for other reasons they struggle to be included socially, might easily become alienated and even radicalised.

**Hope for the future:** The 21<sup>st</sup> century has seen a great leap in technology and bizarre ideologies have seized on this to foment violence and terror. It has also been seized on by a “look at me” generation that seems to be focusing entirely on itself. The selfie focusing on beautiful individuals standing in the world creates an image of our times. Hopefully we will tire of this and turn around to see what the world around us actually looks like and is doing. We might not like what we see.

**Imagining:** Change comes from imagining the future, finding ways of realising it and then having the collective courage to go there.

Technology has opened up enormous potential for civil society by putting all of us in a position to engage using technology. There is potential for communicating in multiple ways and so for creating a new and more relevant democracy. It puts information at everyone's finger tips and makes lifetime education and growth a possibility for everyone if they can escape from the treadmill.

Constructivist approaches in education are based on an understanding of our existential nature, the way we use real life or mimicked real life situations to stimulate and engage us. This leads us to explore knowledge to help us understand those situations and imagine something better. We then use that knowledge, or else imagine a future using it as we each realise our human potential. We can use our life experiences to grow our society and our democracy.

If we can successfully re-engage our citizens in the affairs of the nation and induce them to enlarge their horizons, they will be challenged by having to understand themselves, our human potential and the society we live in. Imagining a possible and better future for our world is the first step in developing our society.

Rewarding and successful human endeavour is not constrained by borders. Digital technology is now global. Education and knowledge with the insight it brings can put ideologies across the world under pressure.

We can imagine a future but it remains imaginary unless we can find ways of making it become real. Currently we have a hollowed out society that is disengaged and more interested and excited by “footy” than where our society is going. But if we look we will see that there are people who are thinking and planning a better 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## Moving into the 21<sup>st</sup> century

Twenty first century thinking embraces total transparency and in doing so attempts to reinvigorate democracy by partnering with civil society, engaging it in decision making and so rebuilding it. The four pillars of the global open government movement are Transparency, Accountability, Citizen Participation and open access to Technology and innovation.

We now have the technology and the ability to embrace many of the basic tenets of Athenian democracy – government for the people by the people. There have already been several trials of participatory democracy, some in Australia. These show that citizens who have no preconceived ideas or even knowledge are capable of working together to learn about and examine complex issues then come up with sensible policies. Given the opportunity our community can and will embrace participatory democracy.

Australia was a leader in the open government movement and it is probable that members of both parties participated until free market believers realised that their core beliefs would be challenged.

## The Open Government movement<sup>7</sup>

Tony Abbott led a savage attack on the labour party and when he gained power he set about reversing the changes that had already been made but the electorate rebelled. While Malcolm Turnbull has used a softer approach, free market beliefs still dominate the liberal party and policies have not changed.

To save the embarrassment of Australia being expelled from the Open Government movement, the Turnbull government has tentatively started on the first steps of the open government process. But it is so tentative and so low key that hardly anyone knows about it. It is no more than tokenistic and no attempt is being made to embrace the participatory democracy part of this movement<sup>8</sup>.

### Open Government links



#### Government Websites

- **Open Government Partnership** – Australia November 2015 - *Asking for Comment*  
<http://ogpau.govspace.gov.au/>
- **OGP Australia National Action Plan: Background:** <http://ogpau.govspace.gov.au/background/>
- **OGP Australia National Action Plan: Consultation:** <http://ogpau.govspace.gov.au/national-action-plan/>
- **OGP Australia Consultation Stage 1: Preparation, Framework and History:**  
<https://ogpau.govspace.gov.au/consultation-stage-1-preparation-framework-and-history/>

---

<sup>7</sup> Part 4 - Developments in social thought - the open government movement:  
<http://www.agedcarecrisis.com/solving-aged-care/part-4/developments-in-social-thought#the-open-government-movement>

<sup>8</sup> Open Government Partnership – Australian government website, November 2015 - <http://ogpau.govspace.gov.au/>

**i** Websites for information

- **Open and Shut Blog** <http://foi-privacy.blogspot.com.au/2015/12/open-government-partnership-activity.html>
- **PM Turnbull on the road-an opportunity to stand with the Open Government Partnership 11 November 2015** [http://foi-privacy.blogspot.com.au/2015/11/pm-turnbull-on-road-opportunity-to\\_11.html](http://foi-privacy.blogspot.com.au/2015/11/pm-turnbull-on-road-opportunity-to_11.html)
- **Australia, Open Government Partnership and Declaration of Open Government 18 November 2015** <http://foi-privacy.blogspot.com.au/2015/11/australia-open-government-partnership.html>
- **Government senators claim strong FOI record-don't mention the bill to abolish the Australian Information Commissioner 30 November 2015**  
<http://foi-privacy.blogspot.com.au/2015/11/government-senators-claim-strong-foi.html>
- **The Australian Government - Can we afford it?** The author of this blog, Steve Davies, is an ardent advocate of open government and participatory democracy. He is an active contributor to the government OGP web page discussion. He has been a particularly strong critic of our public service and its culture. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5xslkhEJa1kRGV3dERmVERQVmM/view?pli=1>
- **The paranoia that will 'shut' government** by Steve Davies Sydney Morning Herald 8 March 2012 <http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/the-paranoia-that-will-shut-government-20120306-1uh86>
- **Aged care - Are you next?** Steve Davies realises how the things that he writes about impact on aged care and has been talking to Aged Care Crisis. Here he writes specifically about aged care. <http://ozloop.org/profiles/blogs/aged-care-are-you-next>

**i** International Web sites

- **What is the Open Government Partnership?** (a map shows how far Australia lags behind the rest of the western world) ----- <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/>
- **The OGP Declaration on the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals** Australia is not on the long list of participants ----- <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/SDGsJointDeclaration>
- **The Open Partnership Blog** ----- <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/blog>
- **The OGP Civil Society Hub** ----- <http://www.ogphub.org/>
- **UK Open Government Civil Society Network:** <http://www.opengovernment.org.uk/>

## Participatory democracy

The broad focus of this diverse global 21st century movement is to find ways of involving a truly representative selection of citizens including, when needed, a random selection of those with expertise. They would play a vital role in every sector of government and in those community activities that need to be protected from groups with special interests. They see citizens as engaged in, controlling and managing their society at every level – a rejuvenation of a responsible civil society - a new ideal and a new goal.

## **Community engagement**

Developments and pilot studies in this broad movement have flourished since the turn of the century. Participants in these global developments in Australia include organisations like [21st Century Dialogue](http://www.21stcenturydialogue.com)<sup>9</sup>, [New Democracy Foundation](http://www.newdemocracy.com.au)<sup>10</sup> and [Mosaic Lab](http://www.mosaiclab.com.au)<sup>11</sup>. They each have a number of examples on their web sites where genuine citizen engagement has made important contributions.

The wide-ranging projects use terms like [participatory democracy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Participatory_democracy)<sup>12</sup>, Citizens juries (community decision making tribunals), deliberative democracy, generative democracy, community governance, crowdsourcing, citizen's senate, electronic town hall, co-design, etc.

## **Citizen's Juries**

A group of citizens without any prior ideological commitments drawn from diverse backgrounds are supplied with all the information available and then given as much time as they need to come up with a recommendation that will be implemented. They engage in robust discussion working through the issues and coming to a consensus view. To be successful it is essential that there be a genuine commitment by the politicians to implement all or most of the recommendations made. Citizens Juries can be used at all levels of government.

- **Citizen juries - leadership for a new democracy** ABC Radio National, 9 Jun 2015 - An example of a very successful project was the 10 year financial plan adopted by Melbourne City Council: <http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/bigideas/citizen-juries--leadership-for-a-new-democracy/6477686>
- **10 Year financial plan 2015-2025:** <http://apo.org.au/research/10-year-financial-plan-2015->
- **Melbourne citizens' jury success offers fresh hope for democratic renewal** ABC Sunday Extra Friday 3 Jul 2015: <http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/sundayextra/citizens-jury-success-offers-fresh-hope-for-democratic-renewal/6589630>

Bodies that have been involved in similar projects of various sorts include:

- Melbourne City Council
- Victoria Council of Social Services,
- New South Wales Independent Local Government Review Panel,
- The Local Government Association of South Australia's Expert Panel,
- Council on the Future,
- Local Government New Zealand,
- Marion City Council in South Australia,
- Mitchell Shire in Victoria and
- The Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government.

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.21stcenturydialogue.com>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.newdemocracy.com.au>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.mosaiclab.com.au>

<sup>12</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Participatory\\_democracy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Participatory_democracy)

### ***Participatory Democracy - democratising democracy***

The [New Democracy Foundation](#) is a group supported by large numbers of past and some present politicians from all parties. On its web site there are links to papers proposing many different ways of moving towards the Athenian citizen's model of democracy - one where citizens themselves and not trained politicians have decision making powers. The ideas on its web site include

- **A Citizens Senate:** A random group of citizens would be stratified for age and income to match census data on the makeup of the society it governs. It would either replace our senate or be a third house.
- **The Electronic Townhall:** This proposal would select one fiftieth of the voting age population each year and engage them in discussion and subsequently in online voting. This citizens voice would constitute an additional house in the parliament.
- **Demarchy:** This idea is based on a network of numerous decision-making groups. Each group deals with a specific function (i.e. transport, land use, parks) in a given area – so it's not a "generalist" system. Groups are created by randomly selecting from a sector with the required expertise.
- **Sortition:** A scientific method for selecting a group of people that will look like society as a whole. It seeks to address the problem of money in politics. Another model seeks to divide the activities of lawmaking among several randomly selected groups with different functions and different characteristics.
- **The popular branch:** proposes a randomly selected 3rd house of parliament, the popular house.
- **Consensus conferences:** Bring together lay people and experts to debate and resolve issues

### ***Crowdsourcing***

[Crowdsourcing](#)<sup>13</sup> is a very broad process in which opinion, assistance or funding is sought from a large number of people. [Governments are now using crowdsourcing](#)<sup>14</sup> to reach out and leverage citizen knowledge and energy and so tap into the talent base in the community.

- **Crowdsourced policymaking - The motivations, expectations and profile of the crowd.** audio of lecture by Tanja Aitamurto Swinburne Institute Seminar Series  
<https://commons.swinburne.edu.au/items/74d5f22c-8b6e-4e2d-b708-9e5d72cf0cc8/1/>
- **Crowdsourcing for Democracy: A New Era in Policy-Making** by Tanja Aitamurto Publication of the Committee for the Future | 1/2012 Parliament of Finland  
[https://www.dropbox.com/s/kqpn2dfi2rjpbdr/Crowdsourcing\\_for\\_DemocracyF\\_www.pdf](https://www.dropbox.com/s/kqpn2dfi2rjpbdr/Crowdsourcing_for_DemocracyF_www.pdf)

### ***Breadth of this movement***

These schemes and proposals cover a broad range of citizenship projects addressing issues in international trade, government (national to local) and a number of other sectors like science - even self-advocacy where disadvantaged groups form associations. Information and communication technology are integral to many projects.

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crowdsourcing>

<sup>14</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Government\\_crowdsourcing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Government_crowdsourcing)



## Examples include:

- **Beyond Trade: Getting Economic Integration Right:** ANU Centre for European Studies Policy Notes Issue 1, 2015  
<http://politicsir.cass.anu.edu.au/sites/politicsir.anu.edu.au/files/documents/ANUCES-Policy-Notes-2015-1.pdf>
- **Building Australia through citizen science** - Occasional paper series Issue 11 July 2015  
Australian government : Office of the Chief Scientist [http://apo.org.au/files/Resource/citizen-science-op\\_web.pdf](http://apo.org.au/files/Resource/citizen-science-op_web.pdf)
- **Self-advocacy and inclusion: a summary of the study 'What can be learned from speaking up over the years'** Christine Bigby, Living with Disability Research Centre (LaTrobe) published on Australian Policy Online 21 July 2015  
<http://apo.org.au/research/self-advocay-and-inclusion-summary-study-what-can-be-learned-speaking-over-years>
- **ICT, open government and civil society** John Restakis, Daniel Araya, Maria José Calderon, Robin Murray Journal of Peer Production ISSN: 2213-5316 July 14, 2015  
<http://apo.org.au/files/Resource/ict-open-government-and-civil-society.pdf>
- **Democratising the data revolution: A discussion paper** by J Gray for Open Knowledge July 2015 - this paper, which is part of the "Open Data Movement" looks at the enormous potential for an informed civil society. Not only will information be available but there will be new ways of analysing it. New forms of measurement will be developed. The paper raises issues and links to a discussion forum. <http://apo.org.au/files/Resource/democratisingdatarevolution.pdf>

One of the consequences of participatory democracy will be a greatly enlarged community of knowledgeable, interested and well-balanced citizens with the skills needed to enter our parliaments and contribute fully there. In doing so they will be there to represent a broad civil society and not a political ideology. The community will know of them and judge them by their contribution to community affairs and not because of their ability to sell themselves

## 3. Relevance to our proposal for aged care

**Developments in social thought:** Modern thinking and evidence suggests communities should play an important role in community services and particularly social services. Our proposal is built around the creation of local community structures and fits well with this.

**Open government:** Our proposal creates an aged care system that ensures total transparency in an area where there are no security implications. It fits well within the open government movement.

**Participatory democracy:** Our proposal gathers information from data, debate and opinion in local communities and aged care facilities, then funnels that through a central representative organisation which is well equipped to work closely with government and other bodies participating in the democratic process and contributing to decisions. It falls within the participatory democracy movement and contributes to the rebuilding of civil society.