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• The overlapping crises humanity faces
• Greta Thunberg’s challenge
• The goal of governing for health
• Case studies of urban planning, environment and energy sectors: do they represent healthy public policy?
• Elephant in the room: profits versus health and sustainability
• Conclusion
Overlapping Crises: need joined up responses

**Health** – inequities increasing, chronic disease, mental illness, emerging infectious diseases
Falling LE

**Ecological and climate crisis** – increasing disasters

**Financial crisis**
Austerity politics: low wage growth, high profits
Growing wealth inequities

**Institutional malaise crisis**
Restructuring, redundancies, Banks untrustworthy, profits before people, harshness, uncaring

**Political Leadership**: neo-liberal, pro-profit not health, privatising
Declining trust, fake news, politics of fear

**Social crisis** – isolation, declining social capital. Lack of community and solidarity, Terrorism, fundamentalism

Unfair global economic and political system:
- Growing inequities
- Excess wealth for some
- Over-consumption and under consumption
- Focus on profit above all else
“Climate change is the defining health issue of the 21st Century. . . . A ruined planet cannot sustain human lives in good health”

Dr. Margaret Chan, Former DG WHO, 2016

the odds “are no better than fifty-fifty that our present civilization on Earth will survive to the end of the present century”

Prof Martin Rees, Former President of the UK Royal Society, 2003

"We can wreck it with ease. We can wreck it without even noticing we're doing it. And if we wreck the natural world, in the end, we wreck ourselves."

David Attenborough, WEF, Davos, 2019
Greta Thunberg on the crisis
Greta Thunberg on the crisis
“.....the present levels of economic inequality are intrinsically inconsistent with the conception of a good society.”
Anthony Atkinson
Inequality (2015: 301)

In 2016-17 the wealth of just 42 people equals that of the 3.7 billion in the poorest half of the world’s population
“Governing for health is about designing, crafting, drafting, and implementing policies that will result in healthy, equitable, and sustainable societies in which well-being is enhanced. These policies need to be present in every sector. They need to both direct government actions toward well-being and provide a regulatory framework for the private sector” (p.13).
Healthy Public Policy

“Healthy public policy is characterized by an explicit concern for health and equity in all areas of policy and by an accountability for health impact”.


Nancy Milio (1988) described HPP as ecological in perspective, multi-sectoral in scope and collaborative and participatory in strategy. (HPI: 2,3: 263-74)
Qualitative protocol for understanding the contribution of Australian policy in the urban planning, justice, energy and environment sectors to promoting health and health equity
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ABSTRACT

Introduction: A well-established body of literature demonstrates that health and equity are strongly influenced by the consequences of governments’ policy and resultant actions (or inactions) outside the health sector. Consequently, the United Nations, its agenda and its agencies have called for national leadership and whole-of-government action to understand and address the health impacts of policies in all sectors. This research responds to that call by investigating how policymaking in four sectors—urban planning, justice, energy and environment—may influence the social determinants of health and health equity (SDH/HE).

Methods and analysis: The research design is informed by a critical qualitative approach. Three successive stages are included in the design. The first involves analysing all strategic policy documents and selected legislative documents from the four sectors (n=50). The document analysis is based on a coding framework developed to identify alignment between the documents and the SDH/HE. Two policies that demonstrate good practice in regard to SDH/HE will be evaluated from each earlier edition.

Strengths and limitations of this study

• A census of all relevant policies will be analysed, allowing a comprehensive view of the policy landscape across and within the four sectors.
• Data collection is bounded by set time periods so will not include new documents as they are released.
• The embedded case studies focus on examples of good practice, facilitating learning about how strong policy can be developed to improve health and equity.
• The design of the study will not allow direct evaluation of the population health impacts of policy interventions, instead causal links between policy implementation and improvements in health will be theorised.

setbacks, including the HIV/AIDS crisis in Africa, people are generally living much...
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Healthy Public Policy?

1. **Energy** 132 policies – policy and legislation on energy generation, distribution and retailing

2. **Environment** 178 policies – policy and legislation on environmental protection, natural resources, fishing, waste, and land management

3. **Urban Planning** 108 policies – policy and legislation on planning, infrastructure, transport and essential services

- Little attention to prevention of problems before they occur – downstream rather than upstream
- Some focus on health and sustainability but scope for much more action
- Little sense of climate crisis
Key Findings: Environment sector

- Explicit & implicit commitment to promoting social well-being
- Strong commitment to protecting designated areas to preserve biodiversity & create sustainable employment
- Emphasis on Indigenous co-management
- Advocacy for expansion of renewable energy & innovative waste management
- Emphasis on climate change adaptation & resilience, rather than mitigation
- Few intersectoral partnerships evident
- Tensions between land conservation and economic use
- Weak environmental protections against economic interests
Key findings: Urban Planning sector

- Active transport promoted because of health and environmental benefits
- Affordable housing targets in some suburbs,
- Less emphasis on achieving overall housing diversity
- Infill prioritised, offering environmental benefits
- Emphasis on accommodating economic growth

- Conflicts between expansion of road infrastructure, preservation of green space & providing public transport
- Mental well-being seldom discussed
- Discussion of equity focused on ‘access’
- Limited regulation of private developers
Key findings: Energy sector

- Intergenerational equity prioritised, with some explicit links to health
- Acknowledgement of climate change, but responsibility deferred, & leadership weak
- Variable commitment to renewables
- Support for a range of fuels but not much account of vastly different contributions to pollutants, climate risks and health risks
- Focus on secure & affordable energy supply via subsidies and educational strategies with few structural interventions
- Current fee structures discourages energy conservation
- Current processes discourage community-led decision making
Goodish Practice Case studies

**ENVIRONMENT**
Interviews (n=11)
- Parks Victoria Shaping our Future
- ACT Climate Change Adaptation Strategy

**URBAN PLANNING**
Interviews (n=21)
- SA 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide
- NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan

**ENERGY**
Interviews (n=11)
- SA Our Energy Plan
- NSW Renewable Energy Plan
Barriers to healthy public policy

- Narrow framing of core business ("not our problem")
- Policy fragmentation across sectors
- Health sectors not able to advocate for health because hospital concerns dominated
- Turbulence/instability in political and bureaucratic environments which narrows core business
- Tokenistic or no community engagement
- Belief tackling complexity is too costly (short-termism)
- Vested interests which impede change
Tool to help achieve Healthy Public Policy: Health in All Policies

Health in All Policies is an approach to public policies across sectors that systematically takes into account the health implications of decisions, seeks synergies, and avoids harmful health impacts, in order to improve population health, health equity and sustainability.

SA HiAP activities

• Utilisation of governance systems to support social determinants of health, equity and sustainability
  • Strategy Plan
  • Public Health Act
  • SA: State of wellbeing

• Development of relational systems to support action on social determinants of health and sustainability
  • Public Sector culture: more collaborative, less siloed, co-benefits

• Joint problem identification and decision making between HiAP and other sectors
  • Literacy & parent engagement
  • Sustainable regional development
  • Health & wellbeing of international students
  • Healthy weight
  • Aboriginal road safety
  • Healthy transport, less carbon dependent city
  • Health into 30 year plan for the city
  • Healthy parks, healthy people
  • Local government: regional public health planning
  • Greening the city despite infill development
  • Food security increasing access to nutritious food
  • Housing and homelessness - applying a public health approach
  • Increasing focus on health promotion and prevention in the mental health sector
  • Improving the nutritional content of food provided to Prisoners
  • Strengthening the Connection to country for Aboriginal communities
Good Urban Planning –
Good Health & wellbeing

- Encourage green space
- Community engagement
- Physical activity
- Active transport
- Low carbon environments

In all suburbs – not just the more affluent
“In the 30 Year Plan [for Greater Adelaide] and the South Australian Strategic Plan, HiAP provided the opportunity to ask for each of the general policy propositions ‘what’s the overall health impact of this?’ which would not necessarily be asked otherwise.”
(Interviewee – public sector evaluation of HiAP).

Source: Baum (2017) PMC Public Health doi:10.1186/s12889-017-4821-7
Healthy Public Policy means overcoming government silos

“...what I had seen before was always this incredible frustration of things being done in silos and being treated as symptoms... This was to get them from thinking narrow ‘this is my empire’ to thinking about ‘this is – we’re all in it together’”. (Former Premier, June 2013).

Source: Baum (2017) PMC Public Health doi:10.1186/s12889-017-4821-7
Translating our research: Rapid summaries for busy policy actors

https://www.flinders.edu.au/healthequity-southgate
Governing for Health: Elephant in the room
Health and Sustainability versus profit

• Profits increasing, people’s wages static
• Business tax rates reducing
• Little signs of ecological responsibility in face of the hunt for profits maximisation
• Focus on consumerism despite ecological cost
“When public health policies cross purposes with vested economic interests, we will face opposition, well-orchestrated opposition, and very well-funded opposition”
Examples

• **Urban Planning**: Air pollution – hard to get on WHO agenda because of oil and car industry opposition, developers pursue profit at expense of healthy environments

• **Environment**: desire to exploit natural eco-systems for profit and reduce biodiversity – no value given to healthy environments – externalise costs of impacts

• **Energy**: fossil fuel industry very powerful influence on national debates
Trans-national corporations

• By 2015 31 of the world’s largest 100 economies were countries and 69 were corporations (World Bank 2016.)
• Unprecedented growth from 7000 TNCs in 1970s to 79,000 parent companies with 790,000 affiliates (UNCTAD, 2008)
• TNCs shape the world, influence the physical & natural environment, food & energy systems, working life, systems of governance, leisure, and even ideas.
How TNC power is maintained

- **Institutions**: WTO, IMF, World Bank
- **Regulatory support**: laws (personhood), trade agreements
- **Norms**: primacy of the profit motive, capital accumulation, competition, GDP as measure of well-being
- **Actors**: use strategies to create, sustain or challenge desired practices
- **Expressions of power**: political access, media, agenda setting, tax avoidance
Need for TNC Accountability

“The lives of 21st century citizens are often more influenced by the activities of and decisions made by TNCs than they are by national governments. Yet TNCs are not exposed to the same democratic control that seek to align governments with the wishes of national populations …….TNC decision making is rarely exposed to the same standards of transparency and public scrutiny that often apply to government decision-making”

(de Jonge and Tomasic, 2017: 1)
**Corporate Health Impact Assessment**


| A: How do regulatory structures facilitate and constrain TNC practices? |
|---|---|---|
| **Global/regional:** | **National:** | **Sub-national/local:** |
| Regulatory environment | Regulatory environment | Regulatory environment |
| Political & economic environment | Political & economic environment | Regions or population groups especially affected by TNC |
| International institutions | Status and capabilities of national government | |
| | Social & economic inequalities | |

| B: What are the practices and products that impact on health and equity? |
|---|---|---|
| **Political practices:** | **Business practices:** | **Products and marketing:** |
| Actions to influence: | Control over supply chain | Product types, trends, proportions |
| • Global regulatory or political Environment | • Labour practices | • Marketing methods & Strategies |
| • National regulatory or political environment | • Use of self-assessment | |
| • Role of industry bodies | • Taxation payments/profit shifting | |
| • Taxation structures | • Use of litigation | |
| | • Use of trade/investment treaties | |
| | To influence national regulations | |

| C: What is the direct impact of corporate practices on living conditions? |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Workforce conditions** | **Social Conditions** | **Natural environment** | **Health related behaviours** |
| Workforce | Local goods & Services | Ecological Systems | Food Consumption |
| Wages | Local community life | Land, water, pollutants | Cost of goods |
| Health & safety | | | |
| Living conditions and family | | | |

Analysis of data to assess cumulative health and health equity impacts of the TNC on specified populations or environments.
CHIA: RioTinto

• A: How do regulatory structures impact on TNC practices?
Workplace fatalities in South Africa’s mining industry are four times higher than those in Australia
ATO auditing Rio Tinto profiting shifting through Singapore

• B. What are the TNC practices that impact on health & equity
Member World Coal Association observer UNFCCC and lobbies to undermine renewables

• C: What is the direct impact of TNC practices on the daily living conditions in countries?
Provide employment
Increasing use of labour supply company workers
Environmental pollution and externalization of costs
Rio Tinto: Many impacts on local communities from mining

- We’ve become experts in fields that we never dreamt of being experts in...We know that we are in the right but the dealings of these multinational companies, they’re so powerful with the government and we just see that – you get that feeling that you just don’t matter. You feel like collateral damage basically. (Hunter Valley)

- They use a lot of water in a water scarce country. They demand one third of Namibia’s total water usage and that’s a lot one third. That’s the same with electricity. Then there is ground water contamination which is very, very serious and the ground water is flowing very slowly so it did not reach the coast (Rio Tinto Rössing uranium mine)
Taming the Profit Beast:

- Regulation
- Advocacy
Civil society and TNC accountability

• Civil society groups are critical monitors of TNCs.

• Public health alliances act within a global network seeking social justice (Wiist, 2010). Focus on linking local and global issues.

Civil society analysis

Changing track: putting people before corporations
August 27, 2018 by Anneleen

Every year, governments are diverting $1 trillion dollars away from people and public services into the hands of big companies, whilst across the world, hundreds of millions of people are denied their basic rights.

Corporate subsidies: $1 trillion p.a.

Where the $1 trillion comes from:

- $33 billion Agricultural subsidies
- $122 billion Excessive corporate profits
- $500 billion Corporate tax dodging
- $374 billion Fossil fuel subsidies
- $11 billion (at least) Illegal fishing

Adoption of UN Binding Treaty is vital for human and ecological health
“We need to address the societal well-being of our nation, not just the economic well-being.”

Jacinda Ardern
Prime Minister

National Health and Wellbeing Outcomes

First Minister
Prime Minister
Conclusion

- Multiple and overlapping crises face us.
- Examples of urban planning, environment and energy sectors show we could be doing much more to promote environmental and human health.
- Focus on profit rather than health, equity and sustainability is a major threat to us all but we can make decision to focus on well-being.

The future holds only two possibilities. First ecological destruction; the second, radical, systemic, transformative, epochal change.

Del Weston (2014: 197)
So please, allow this old man in front of you to insist that unless we all become partisans in renewed local and global battles for social and economic equity in the spirit of distributive justice, we shall indeed betray the future of our children and grandchildren.

Dr. Halfdan Mahler, DG Emeritus WHO
Are we prepared to become partisans in the battle for our future and our children and grandchildren’s future?

Twitter: @baumfran
#G4H
Aging and Declining Populations: Good for Us, Good for the Planet

Jane O’Sullivan
University of Queensland and Wakefield Futures Group

Bob Hawke Prime Ministerial Centre, 6 August 2019
We've got to either:
(A) Let more people into N.Z. or
(B) Have more babies.

Tick (A).
What has ageing got to do with sustainability?

• Population ageing is the main reason countries give for trying to boost their population growth.
• All environmental challenges are escalated with more people.
• Population growth can’t go on for ever.
• The sooner population growth ends, the more resources for each person.
• If we’re going to prolong population growth deliberately, we need a very sound reason.

“All of our environmental problems become easier to solve with fewer people, and harder – and ultimately impossible – to solve with ever more”
– David Attenborough
Ageing alarmism is contagious:

- A significant shift in policy in the past 25 years:
  - Concern about population growth replaced by concern about ageing.
  - Low fertility nations have promoted births and immigration.
  - High fertility nations have reduced family planning.

---

Tanzanian President tells women to 'set their ovaries free' to birth economic prosperity

Women’s bodies have become a battleground in the fight for Iran’s future

A regressive law to boost the population has restricted the reproductive choices and rights of all Iranian women. Though some suffer more than others.
Ageing alarmism is contagious:

• A consequent resurgence in global population growth.
  • Globally, fertility decline virtually stalled.
  • Since 2000, each year has seen a bigger increase in population.
  • The UN’s estimate for population in 2100 has increased > 2 billion.
Depopulation Dividends

Could a shrinking, ageing population be:

• **Cleaner?** - fewer greenhouse gases and pollution.
• **Greener?** - natural environments recovering.
• **Smarter?** - more education & experience.
• **Richer?** - better infrastructure, more inheritance.
• **Safer?** - less crime, better facilities.
• **Fairer?** - job security and higher wages.
• **Healthier?** - greater proportion of life in good health.
• **Happier?** - more choices and leisure in the life cycle.
Ageing myths:

• That a shrinking workforce will stifle the economy.
• That increased healthcare and pensions will be unaffordable.
• That boosting population growth will solve ageing.
• That we just need to (and can afford to) spend more on infrastructure.
The great triumph of the modern era: most people born will lead long and healthy lives.

Absolutely essential for sustainable development – population growth must end.

Globally, we’re in a protracted Stage 3.

– There is nothing inevitable about reaching Stage 4 – We have to make it happen.

The risk is that resource limits will cause mortality to rise, before fertility has fallen sufficiently. We may return to Stage 1 – a brutal future.
Ageing is an inevitable consequence of the demographic transition.

- It is self-limiting – it stabilises at a new steady-state.
The Demographic Transition:

B: Representative age profiles:

C: Fertility, longevity and age structure:
Reimagining our society and life course

Remeasuring Ageing

- Chronological age is retrospective (number of years lived in the past).

- “Prospective age” is the years of life expectancy remaining.

- While Europe has become older chronologically (median age), it got younger prospectively (median remaining life expectancy).

Older people are getting healthier

Since 2000, in each age group over 65:

• Disability rates fell

• Proportion in residential care fell
  • (currently about 5% of over-65s are in residential care)

• Proportion with dementia fell

• Proportion in the workforce increased
Remeasuring Ageing

Health and disability needs are more related to proximity to death than to age.

Support Ratios: the fallacy of age-based dependency

• Age dependency ratios don’t reflect who is actually working, nor who receives welfare.

• All economic models that anticipate workforce shrinkage assume that the proportion of each age group in work or in welfare are unaffected by either ageing or population growth.

• This defies economic theory: in a tightening labour market,
  • more people will find work;
  • wages tend to be higher and less unequal;
  • more investment in technology to raise productivity of labour.
The real world is defying the models

• Ageing has not reduced employment – it has reduced unemployment!
• High population growth has suppressed wages of low-paid workers, increasing inequality.
• Low wages and high mortgages mean less saving for retirement – a pension time-bomb (the cure is much worse than the disease!)
Retirement age is increasing, voluntarily.

The policy response - population growth

**Treasury’s Intergenerational Reports**

- Introduced in 2002 to build public support for accelerated population growth.
- Advanced two myths:
  - Ageing as an economic disaster,
  - Immigration and baby bonus as a means to “rebalance” our demography.
- Exaggerate the costs of ageing,
- Completely omit the costs of population growth.
Immigration is particularly ineffective at reducing ageing.

- UK projections for the year 2100.
- Fertility, immigration and longevity are varied separately.
- Line slope indicates “cost” of population increase against “benefit” of reduced ageing.

Can Immigration Solve the Problem of an Aging Society?
Estimating the impact of post-1990 immigration

By Steven A. Camarota and Karen Zeigler

We estimate that immigration between 1990 and 2017 added nearly 43 million people to the population, but had a minimal impact on the share of the population that is of working age. This is because immigration added to both the working-age population and to those outside of the working-age population in nearly equal proportions. We also find that post-1990 immigration had a somewhat larger impact on the ratio of workers to retirees. However, raising the retirement age by one year has as large an impact on the ratio as do the nearly 43 million post-1990 immigrants and their progeny.
But the Productivity Commission* said...

... that GDP per capita will be 7% higher in 2060 if we have high population growth and less ageing

- *If* ageing actually causes the workforce to shrink proportionally;
- *If* investment keeps pace to create jobs and infrastructure with only a short lag;
- *If* that investment doesn’t divert funds from the services we need.

“Many assumptions underpin the analysis and, as such, the projections should be treated as illustrative only.”

- Even so, the average person would earn less over their life course.
- More of our GDP would flow back to foreign investors who provide the capital to absorb the extra labour.
- And we’d still be living in tower block apartments, rationing water and drowning in debt.

*Productivity Commission (2016). Migrant Intake into Australia*
The Productivity Commission* also said...

- “[immigration] delays rather than eliminates population ageing.”
- “GDP per person is a weak measure of the overall wellbeing ...”
- “Broadly, incumbent workers lose from the [high immigration] policy, while incumbent capital owners gain.”
- “Technological solutions [to environmental pressures of higher population] come with higher costs.”
- “There are also impacts on the price of land and housing ...”
- “people over 65 years ... make valuable social and economic contributions in other ways.”

*Productivity Commission (2016). Migrant Intake into Australia
What about the cost of growth rate?

- Quality of life depends on the quantity and standard of durable man-made assets (in addition to natural resource endowment) *per person*.
- Including infrastructure, equipment, vehicles, trained professionals etc.
- Because these things last for many years, we enjoy many years’ accumulation of them, while only paying for the fraction of them that need replacing.
- A cost-weighted average lifespan is around 50 years.
- So in a stable population, we need to finance 2% of them per year.
- But **if population grows at 1% per year**, we need to increase the stock of everything by 1% in that same year, or we go backwards.
- 2% for maintenance + 1% for expansion: **we pay 50% more**.
- But we only get (at best) 1% more GDP and government revenue to pay for it.
What have we actually been spending on infrastructure?

Based on 4 decades of actual expenditure,

• Adding capacity for 1% population growth per year costs: 6.5–7% of GDP.
• So 1.7% growth costs >11% of GDP: >$200 Billion per year.
• That’s around: $500,000 per added person.
• Public burden is: >$100,000 per added person.
• Nature is displaced, non-renewable resources consumed, and pollution increased – for no per capita gain.
• Land prices inflate, raising housing unaffordability, household debt and inequality.
Diseconomies of Scale

Diseconomies of Scale

“...construction of new infrastructure is often more expensive, due to the need to tunnel under existing structures or purchase land at higher costs.”

– Infrastructure Australia (2018)
“Unprecedented infrastructure spending by states and territories is largely responsible for a $106 billion decline in their finances since 2006 ...

“after a threefold increase in capital spending over the last 10 years, states are paying 3 per cent more of their revenues in interest and depreciation.”

Grattan Institute “Budget pressures on Australian governments 2014”
How would you spend an extra $50 Billion per year?

• If we encouraged small families and reduced immigration, Australia’s population growth could end in a few decades.

• What we don’t have to spend on infrastructure for extra people would easily cover extra pensions.

• The rest can be spent on other things:
  • Restoring welfare and community services
  • Universal dental health
  • Restoring university funding
  • Environmental rehabilitation programs
  • Transition to renewable energy
  • More public transport
  • And much more...

What’s your preference?
Sustainability and the Law: Professor Rob Fowler

Tuesday 10 September, 6.00pm
Bradley Forum

There is mounting evidence that a transition to sustainability is required in the coming decades if we are to avoid some form of significant collapse on a global scale. This transition will require multiple responses across different disciplines and stakeholders and must encompass all three “pillars” of sustainability (economic, social and environmental).

This presentation, delivered by Adjunct Professor Rob Fowler, will consider the role of law as an instrument to support and facilitate this transition, acknowledging at the same time that law alone cannot deliver it.

Presented by The Bob Hawke Prime Ministerial Centre and Wakefield Futures Group