Not In My Backyard: How globalisation can be harnessed to support local equality, inclusion and community

Communities in Control Conference
Melbourne, 16 June, 2008

Presentation by

Professor Fran Baum

Head of the Department of Public Health, Flinders University

It's fantastic to be here and it's just wonderful to see so many people here. I was telling people in my office there were going to be about 1500 people and they said, "It sounds more like a rally" – and I think it is more like a rally than a conference, which is fantastic.

I'd also like to acknowledge that we're meeting on the land of the Kulin nation and pay respects to their Elders, past and present.

And also to pay respect to Pat Turner who has just given us such a wonderful insight to what kind of passion can help you live with such horrible injustice. It was just fantastic.

What I want to do this morning is first of all talk a little bit about local and global experience, then look a little bit at some of the ideas and principles and theories underpinning what I say. I want to give you some practical examples, and then finally I just want to suggest what are the new ways of thinking.

In lots of ways they're not new ways, they're a return to old ways of thinking about how we can get a sustainable, healthy and convivial future.

The title of my presentation is 'Not in My Backyard.' This term has become somewhat negative hasn't it – we think of people who say, "I don't want this development in my neighbourhood or town," and that could refer to all sorts of things that are being developed.

This morning in the lift I met a man who said, "How are you?" And I said, "It's a good day. I'm going to speak at a conference." He said, "I've got to go and sell wind farms." I said, "That sounds like a really good thing to do." He said, "But nobody wants them in their backyard." That really happened in the hotel lift.

So it struck me that the term 'not in my backyard' does have these kind of negative overtones and selfishness attached to it, but I want to pose the question of whether there are unwanted developments from globalisation that are bad for the health and wellbeing of communities – and I'm going to say yes there are. I don't think that's controversial.

But then I'm going to think about whether local action overcome these, and are there aspects of globalisation that can actually help our local actions? In doing this I'm going to draw on four main lots of experience which are a lot of the things that drive the passion in my life.

One is this commission that I've had the privilege of serving on for the last three years. Just 10 days ago we finally signed off on the final report and I think when it comes out in September people will be very pleased to see that it has such a strong focus on social justice and human rights.

I've also been involved with a group called the People's Health Movement since it was formed in 2000. That's a group that really links local action with global issues and I'll talk a bit about that.

I've worked with the community health movement, looking at research and evaluation and evidence for community health for many years now, since the early 1980s. I think it's a wonderful movement and I think it's got lots to offer us.

And then finally I'd like to talk about my own local residents' association, because I think it's pretty good.

But first of all – ideas, principles and theories. A colleague of mine in Canada has defined an academic as someone who sees something working in practice and wonders if it will work in theory. I hope I'm not going to be too like that, but I think sometimes it is useful; as Kurt Lewin said, "There's nothing so practical as a good theory." So let's just think about that.

In terms of globalisation, there are good and bad things about it. We're all benefiting from global villages – with communications, travel, transport, it's easier, faster and more connected. That may not last with the rise in petrol prices – we may have just been through an era of wonderful ability to be able to travel around the world.

But of course the internet has offered us all sorts of connections. Everyone here would have a story about that. There are fashions, cultures – sharing cultures is wonderful. There are lots of doubts though about what people have dubbed 'Mac-culture', a sort of homogenisation, a North American culture.

There are also many health concerns. I work in a public health department. People are always talking about bio-security, about how quickly a pandemic would go.

There's much global economic integration and there are lots of concerns, I think, about what's happening globally, what's happening to the way in which

we organise our economy and what kinds of ideas about economics are dominating the world.

There are also lots of questions about global regimes of governments and I'll certainly come back to that.

And of course the global environment – whatever happens in our local communities, we cannot ignore the global. We hear all the time about warming of the atmosphere, the way we're degrading our natural environments. As a friend of both Rhonda and I, Ilona Kickbusch, has said, "Good planets are hard to find and there aren't many more of them." So there's absolutely no doubt that we're being strongly linked.

The thing that bothers me most in terms of health I think is this thing called economic globalisation. I haven't got time to do that in detail but it's about trade liberalisation, dropping tariffs. International trade is increasing rapidly, capital is moving very fast around the world, there are huge investments, people moving money around from one market to another speculating. And there's a set of global institutions to regulate. There's supposedly the World Trade Organisation, very complicated international agreements such as a General Agreement on Tariff and Trade and on services, and primarily the net result of all this is that the economy really takes precedence over environmental protection and many social events.

As usual Leunig has captured this very well. We're kind of all expected to march in response to the dollar, but the question is, what room does that leave for community solidarity, conviviality and collective action?

I think there's a lot of unease around the world. As I work in different countries in the world you can hear the same concerns – we're losing control, all our governments are ever worried about is the dollar, why don't we look at happiness rather than wealth, and so on.

And I think it's a really important concern because one of the other things that's happened with inequities is that they appear to be growing around the world, both between countries – so, say, between us and the rich countries and the poor countries, particularly in Africa – and also growing within countries. Sometimes the evidence isn't that clear, but the overall trend is towards an increasing number of inequities.

Of course Raymond Arons, the famous sociologist, has said, "If they get too great then the idea of community becomes impossible." It seems to me that

that's a very strong warning to us all. While people work in a community level, we might think, "What's the economy got to do with me?" It's got very much to do with us. I'll talk a bit more about why that's the case.

I'm particularly interested in health inequities because I work in a school of medicine, I work with public health and health promotion and community health people. Overall, the picture is good in the world. Health is improving in most regions of the world, although in some places in Africa some countries have lost nearly 20 years of life expectancy in the last 15 years as a result of the HIV crisis.

In some of the former Soviet republics, health is going backwards. And for the first time ever last week I read a report from the US in a very reputable journal that showed that in some parts of the US females are now losing years of life expectancy – that's the first time in a rich country since the Second World War. People have been predicting it but we now have the data to show that in some counties in the US, in fact quite a number of counties, women are losing life expectancy. It's not exactly clear why. It's likely to be a range of social determinants which lead to different lifestyle factors.

The distribution of wealth is becoming less equal, and usually when that happens, health will then suffer. It's clear that inequity is bad for social cohesion and wellbeing.

Frank Stillwell and colleagues have said very clearly that when we think about our happiness we judge it as relative to other people – that's what we do, I think, as people. We're always making relative judgements. If there is widespread economic inequity then it's a recipe for widespread social discontent. They conclude that the redress of economic inequality is central to the achievement of a good society.

I think the important message there, and one that we've taken on board on our commission, is that equality, equity is good for all of us. It's good for rich people, it's good for poor people. In the long term it's going to be good for rich countries and poor countries.

I didn't want to go through a lot of statistics but I think this is a fairly telling one – this is the CEO cash remunerations compared to average adult earnings. What you'll see is in around 1990 there was a ratio of 18:1 between full-time rates and those that a CEO got. By 2004/2005 that difference was 63:1.

This is where I think I would say to our corporate colleagues that philanthropy is great, but what about these figures? And I think we have to think about that too.

It's a bit like how Pat said the problem for indigenous people is a problem for non-indigenous people. I worry that the community sector always puts the lens on poverty. For me, poverty is the end result of a mal-distribution of wealth, so why don't we put the lens on wealth and think about wealth in its distribution? It's a crucial question of how equal we are.

In public health there's an increasing, what I'd call an epidemiology of inequality. And generally that epidemiology is showing that the more equal a society, the healthier they are. Now that's at a population level. If a country distributes its income more equally it seems to lead to better health outcomes.

And that's probably, although there's big debates about it, because it also goes along with better social policies. They're a result of that.

But those societies that are more equal have less crime and appear to have more cohesion. So this isn't just something that's about a nice warm fuzzy feeling. It actually affects when we live and die, so it's pretty crucial.

The other thing that I think is a crucial part of this theory in thinking about equity is the whole question of empowerment. One of my fellow commissioners is Amartya Sen, who of course won the Nobel Prize for Economics. Amartya's career has been thinking about how we develop countries, particularly the poor countries of the world, and in his case particularly India.

He says very clearly that it's not just about having a successful economy. It's also about people having control over their lives.

Of course the work that you're all doing is about exactly that. What's the name of this conference – Communities in Control. Well that isn't just about 'Yes it feels good to do that.' It also is absolutely essential to your health.

Now I just want to look at three bits of evidence on that. The first bit is about British civil servants. The next bit is about Indian children. And the third bit is about indigenous people in Canada. They sound a bit strange but they're just to show you that this control works in different settings.

The first is based on the research that was done in fact by Sir Michael Marmot, who's the chair of our commission. He and his team have followed British civil servants over many years and looked at what they die of and what factors seem to be related to what they die of.

What he shows is that those that have high job control die less than the rest, but those who have intermediate job control or low job control are much more likely to die.

So what they're suggesting is that something like that, seemingly removed from whether or not you have a heart attack, as to how much control you have at work actually works its way through yourselves and predicts when you're going to die. That was done longitudinally, so they measured the job control before the people died obviously. So there's one bit of evidence.

The next bit is from an Indian study where they got children to solve mazes, children aged 11 to 12. In one example they didn't announce the caste of the children – they were just children; nobody knew. In the other example the lower caste kids were identified and asked to do the same test. Look at the difference in results – just the simple recognition that you are in the lower caste. Just think about how powerful that is when we think of that translating into educational achievement.

The third example is from Canada where there was a consideration of why some bands of Canadian indigenous peoples had higher rates of suicide than others. And everybody knows that suicide in Australia has a similar high rate for indigenous people.

The researcher, based in British Columbia, looked at all of these factors, whether they had what they call cultural continuity factors. I won't read them out; you can see what they are. So for instance with number five, did the community have control of the police and fire and so on.

Then they correlated that with the suicide rate. If you've got four or five of those factors present, your suicide rate dropped. By contrast, if you had none of those cultural continuity factors present, you had an incredibly high suicide rate.

So I think that makes it very clear, as Pat said this morning, that it's not a problem of indigenous Australia's suicide, though it's so often presented as that. Why do those Aboriginal people have a high suicide rate? It's actually about the most private act. Taking a life is actually the result of a public

policy, and I think those data show it's about control. How much control does the community have? I think that's important to remember that when we're arguing for the type of public policy that we want.

In terms of the Northern Territory Intervention, as Pat mentioned this morning, it seems to me that it's worth reading what Pat Anderson and Rex Wild said in their original report *Little Children are Sacred* because basically they were saying these are the kinds of reforms that you need to protect children. And of course the Intervention instead moved in with what Pat described as an invasion, and really that could be seen as undermining many of those cultural continuity factors. I think it's really important that Jenny Macklin and Kevin Rudd go back and really study that *Little Children are Sacred* report.

If you haven't read it I'd really recommend people download it because it's got so much wisdom in it. It's a fantastic report.

What I want to do now is give you some practical examples which I think are about shaping our own backyards through local action. They draw on things that I've been involved in.

The first one is about that issue of economic globalisation, us all marching to the tune of the dollar. It's about global resistance to that. It seems to me that the only way that that's going to turn around is through local solidarity being built and then strengthened globally.

There are some very key local global issues. For me they're about things such as the privatisation of essential services, particularly health, water, power. It's about corporate wealth and power. Some people are suggesting there's a kind of new feudalism which takes power from local communities. And when you hear stories from farmers, whether it's in India or Australia, you can certainly feel the power of those corporations.

I've already mentioned global inequities, and it's also of course about environmental sustainability. It's about issues of development versus the environment, of global warming, pollution and the reduction of wild places. Those are the kinds of issues that are at stake that are inevitably global issues but which have a really strong local face.

All around the world there are challenges to this economic globalisation. Through the People's Health Movement I get to hear about many of these and I think we can say in every country, even where freedom of expression is

quite severely constrained, you will find people raising questions, asking how this really benefits my local community and what would the alternatives be.

I think the power of local groups is that they can tell local stories of this impact. They organise and mobilise and you can link globally. I think that for the community sector, as Communities in Control shows very clearly, the power of the internet is fantastic.

I think those local stories are one of the reasons the people I've been speaking to say, "I wouldn't miss this conference for quids." People keep coming back every year, and I presume that's because you get inspired by other people's work in other communities. That's a really important thing to do.

One example of social movements was in Cancun when one of these amazing World Trade Organisation conferences took place. This must be amongst the most boring treaties in the world because they're full of thick pages and pages of conventions, but in fact they have a huge impact, particularly on poor countries around the world.

Through the 1990s in lots of ways the World Trade Organisation carried on with very little protest. But gradually people have organised and said, "We don't want these talks to take place in secret. They affect our lives too much. We should be in there."

What happened in Cancun was that the African delegation really ensured that those ministerial talks collapsed. And that started from networks of people in their local community building up, linking with other networks. It didn't just happen because of things at Cancun in that meeting, it happened because of years and years of mobilisation and action at the local level.

That has really led to a movement, the World Social Forum. How many people here have been to a World Social Forum? A few. They're really exciting events. It really began as a space to debate ideas, to look at alternatives to neo-liberal globalisation and capitalism.

And all the events, whether they're regional or local, they all have an international dimension. The idea is you look at local issues, local events and say, "How does this link through to those global factors?"

I was lucky enough to go to one in India and it was just amazing to watch the passion of people when they talked about all these global economic forces that were having such a devastating impact on their life.

I think what's also very powerful about the world social forum is that it has this great slogan, "Another world is possible." It offers an alternative. That really contrasts with so much of the rhetoric of the neo-liberalism that that is no alternative – 'We have to do this. It's the only way we can guarantee prosperity.' So it really offers us a difference.

My next example is about this commission that I've been working on. What the commission was tasked to do by the World Health Organisation was to put social determinants on the international agenda, to look at ways of improving health globally, but also to do that in a way that reduced inequity, and perhaps most crucially, creating a social movement.

We recognised, as Rhonda said in her introduction, that it's not a new message that is created from social factors. I know that very well from my work in Noarlunga with the healthy cities movement. Local people know that it isn't necessarily health services and hospitals that are making them healthy. It's about whether they have a job, whether they've got good friends and so on, whether they've got access to education.

The basic logic of our commission is, what good does it do to treat people's illnesses but give them no choice to go back to the conditions that make them sick? A fairly simple logic.

Last night during Community Idol we heard about the mental health support. What's the point of giving someone good treatment in a hospital or a care facility if when they leave hospital the pets that were so important to them are gone or there's no-one they can talk to? We see that all the time. We know that.

If we had a dollar for every time one of us at the Commission has said we don't just want a report that's left on the shelf – we realised very clearly that if we were going to do that we had to create a social movement. And we hope we've sown the seeds of that over the three years of the Commission's life.

One of the most important ways in which I think we've done that is by welcoming in civil society as partners in our process. We think we're the first UN commission to so fully embrace community groups, having them actually

coming to the meetings, being commissioned to gather testimonies from people in different regions of the world.

When we visited countries, we tried to meet by and large in poor countries. This is an example from when we were in India. We met with SEWA, which stands for the Self Employed Women's Association, in India which really is a trade union for the poorest of the poor.

They started with vegetable sellers in Ahmedabad, who were completely unorganised, who were unable to buy from the big wholesale vegetable markets that were by and large, I think, run by men. So they organised themselves micro-credit so they could set up their own wholesale market. They had to fight for the legal right to sell vegetables as women.

They then realised they needed child care, so the women organised their own child care. They then realised they wanted their own health service. So they organised through a self-insurance scheme to have their own health service.

Then they thought, "We need better housing," and SEWA women organised their own housing. Then as they got older they thought "We need pensions".

And then finally we went to a meeting of the bank, where these women who really are the poorest of the poor in Indian society, were the Board of Directors of the bank.

At the moment, perhaps most crucially, they've been advocates and sponsors for a social security bill that's going through the Indian parliament so that women won't have to keep fighting for these rights but they'll be guaranteed by the state.

So we really sought out examples like that to look at and say, "What's the key issue there?" And of course once again one of the key issues was about control of women, women being given control over their lives.

So in September our report will be published, called *Closing the Gap in a Generation: Equity Through Action on the Social Determinants of Health.* And we say very clearly that health is important because it's a human right. Not as many UN and World Bank reports have said in recent years health is good because it's good for economic development. We actually say that's true too. But we also say that it's a fundamental human right that people have to the conditions that create health.

We have a section called ‘Money, Resources and Power’, where we recognise that achieving that right is going to require reallocation of money, resources and power. And I think that’s going to be quite challenging for some agencies. Our report is going to need a lot of support and a lot of voices from those voices that are usually unheard to make sure that it keeps coming up in UN circles.

We’re very aware that it’s going to be local social movements like many of you here that are going to support that shift.

My next example is from Adelaide, from my local residents’ group. I live in a suburb called Henley Beach. We have a very active group called the Western Coastal Residents’ Association. I want to recognise that I’ve picked this group because I know them because my partner is the vice-president and at the weekends I spend time with this group. But I know that many of you come from similar groups in your local community and that you’re all busy taking action too.

What I want to do is just give you four examples of work that this group has done because I think when you only give one you don’t get a sense of the holistic. I think in each one you’ll see that they do relate to these global issues.

The first one was an unsuccessful protest against changes to the coast. The next one is about community arts. The next one is about a general move to protect the Gulf of St Vincent, which is where Adelaide is based. And the third one is about electricity prices in the era of privatisation.

Those of you who know Adelaide probably know Glenelg, where the tram from the city goes. The proposal was to build a sea outlet from the Patawalonga out to West Beach and so take a lot of polluted water, and then just by that sea outlet build a boat harbour.

Just to show you, there’s the coast before the boat harbour and there’s West Beach also before the boat harbour. And notice what a lovely wide beach it is.

Here’s that same coast after the boat harbour, as predicted by the residents’ association. Here’s another view and here’s another view. There’s a final view.

So you get the picture of what we were fighting for – that effect on the coast. The residents' association listened to the many expert reports. The experts who were believable were predicting that outcome.

We had a community campaign. We did awareness raising, lots of media. We had a blockage of the boat harbour building site. We had a tree of local people that started with the sea eagles, down to the pelicans, down to the sea gulls, down to the terns, who would use a phone tree to ring each other every night and say, "The building workers are coming tomorrow so you have to be down there."

We had a clock in Henley Square which was counting down to when the community action was going to be needed to stop the outlet from being constructed. We organised residents to make a big 'No' and this was photographed from the *Advertiser* helicopter. There were a series of community blockades.

You can see there the police cars lined up to control us, protesters being dragged away. You see from that crowd that there are children, older people, every age. Our president, a guy called Jim Douglas who's a real local hero, made sure everybody was trained in non-violent resistance and there's a good example of it.

At the time, John Olsen was Premier – you can see there people had John Olsen masks on with that dollar sign.

So you can see how those issues of economic rationalism have come down to very local issues.

Here's our community idol, Jim Douglas, who's our president. That's a story that was run in our paper on one of the worst days when that beautiful beach had so clearly been destroyed.

It's interesting I think to look at global links. We were supported in the campaign by David Suzuki. You can see there that in the *Advertiser* headline of that story, he said Australia's stance is embarrassing and he expressed horror at what was happening. It didn't actually make any difference, but I think it was quite reaffirming for the community to have that happen.

Then in terms of what it achieved, well we didn't stop the boat harbour, we didn't stop the outlet. But there was a lot of education I think in the community. We did expose the lack of democratic process in dealing with

those decisions. Many, many skills were developed, friendships formed. It was very uniting for the community in a way that still carries through today. And I think people still talk about that protest, even though it's 10 years on, and still feel that even though we failed, it was good that we made such a point about it. Probably also because we were proved right – it's always a good feeling isn't it.

Just to give a more positive, more recent view, South Australia has a living arts festival every year. The residents' association led a group in making mosaic sea creatures which involved a lot of children and their families in the community. Those mosaics were then placed on the sea front and make for a very nice walk and a very nice reminder that community arts have an important place.

That's quite a statement that the snapper is under threat in the Gulf. So there we go.

And then again a global local link – World Environment Day 2006. Gulf St Vincent has a very fragile eco-system that's being increasingly threatened. We used the occasion of World Environment Day to organise a sort of public fair that enabled people to come and hear about that pollution, hear about the threats. That was very important.

Then finally electricity privatisation. The residents' association organised a 'Power to the People' – what a great title – to look at that issue. South Australia was promised when we privatised our electricity supply that electricity prices would go down. Can anyone guess what's happened? No prizes for that one.

So we had a great community meeting again. We had the Minister, Jay Weatherill was there, a local Member. He used it as an occasion for advertising, to sell the story. Probably many of you would be aware of this impact. We were particularly responding to a report that had been written about the impact of those electricity price rises, particularly on people with chronic illness and disability and the way they weren't able to heat their homes or keep cool in the summer. It actually documented how that increased hospital admissions – so the effects of the privatisation in some ways was to shift the cost onto the state by people not being able to afford local electricity.

So just in terms of those local environment campaigns, they really gained strength I think from global movements, being part of a network of local

activists. Information sharing was made possible by the internet. I know my partner at the moment has a complete bee in his bonnet about jet skis and he's always on the internet looking at what other local groups are doing and linking up with those.

It really builds grassroots support for these global issues. That eventually trickles through to movements like the World Social Forum. It's because people are active locally that those big global events happen. And of course it builds those local networks.

My final example is the People's Health Movement. I'm currently co-chair of our global committee. It's really a network of networks of organisations around the world. We were formed in 2000 after the first People's Health Assembly. We currently have a secretariat based in Cairo. We have very many country circles who are advocating for health as a human right. You can see the web address but if you put the People's Health Movement into Google you will also find it.

At the moment we have a particular focus against privatisation of services essential to health.

The basic philosophy is specified in the People's Charter for Health, which we've had translated into 33 languages so it's as accessible as possible. That's been a really important tool for lobbying and advocacy because it makes a very strong statement about what conditions make for health.

We clearly take a strong view on health as a human right. Most often when we meet we'll combine people's stories about their lives with academic analysis of what's happening in the world. It's very often an alternative story.

That People's Health Charter was developed in Bangladesh in December 2000. But through the whole year there were debates, discussions going on in countries through Latin America, in community health centres in Nicaragua, Ecuador, Mexico, Indian villages without any electricity, South African townships and so on. Everyone came together in Bangladesh and endorsed that charter.

We had another health assembly in Ecuador in 2005 that again was about solidarity building and people building their fortitude for those struggles.

We currently have a Global Right to Health campaign and that's very much not just about the right to health services but about the right to the conditions

that make health. Cape Town in South Africa had a great launch for their campaign. People are very clear that it is factors such as housing that will make them healthy or not healthy.

At that launch they had a speaker who came from the Indian People's Health Movement who was able to talk about their campaign in India where they've held a series of tribunals, putting the Indian Government on trial in terms of how well they have met human rights obligations in terms of health.

For me, and I was glad to hear Pat mention primary health care this morning, that whole movement was inspired by Alma-Arta which was a combination of WHO and Unicef, producing the wonderful vision of health for all by the year 2000 and talking of the importance of community health services and primary health care services.

One of my great heroes is Halfdan Mahler, and I'm going to quote from him again in a bit. I was so delighted to finally meet him in 1998 when we had a 20th anniversary of Alma-Arta. This year it's the 30th anniversary. I think Halfdan would say we're as far away as ever from health for all. When do we say now – health for all – when? The People's Health Movement says very clearly health for all now. We don't want to wait any longer.

In Australia I think one of the best examples of comprehensive primary health care are the Aboriginal controlled health services. I do work with the Central Australian Aboriginal Health Congress, which I think is a model primary health care service.

What I find frustrating about a service like this is they have to spend so much of their time being micro-managed by OATSI in Canberra, and I'm sure many of you have that experience too. The accountabilities are ridiculous for the kind of services that you're offering. I think we've really got to get away from that and start funding services like this, which are community controlled, based on trust, not regulation.

Then finally my vision of community health, which I think would do a great wonder for all of us, is services with local management that are multi-disciplinary, where people are seen as citizens rather than consumers – so we don't use the market model, it's a place where we have debates about how we want to spend our health money, rather than on the front page of *The Age* or the *Advertiser* or the *Sydney Morning Herald*.

When one person can't get access to a service why don't we have debates about what's good for the whole community? They'd be able to act on the social and environmental causes of ill health. They would look for collective rather than individual solutions. They would focus on local action and advocacy. And they would be supported by a public sector that was committed to empowerment and a citizen's voice, rather than committed to just regulating and watching.

Imagine if we could have that as the basis of our health system. It would be wonderful.

Finally, to conclude, I just want to think now about what the new agenda needs to be. And here allow me to quote from one of my heroes, Halfdan Mahler, when he was speaking at the World Health Assembly last month.

I think he's becoming very worried. He's saying that we all have to become partisan in renewed local and global battles for social and economic equity in a spirit of distributive justice.

I think that's a very powerful message from someone who'd hoped they'd done that 30 years ago and feels that the world has gone backwards in those 30 years.

In terms of Mandela's words, inequity and poverty are not part of how the world is. It's not inevitable, it's actually a consequence of the decisions that we make. I think that's a very powerful message.

So it seems to me that we've really, in the 21st Century, got to accept that an interventionist state that controls markets and regulates threats to health and wellbeing is essential. We've got to look at global governance to control the market and we've got to look at creating conditions for local democracy and the exercise of citizenship, whether that's public spaces to meet, whether it's internet spaces and the protection of rights of citizens to do that.

We have to support poor communities to develop skills and abilities with a range of resources. We have to remember that inclusion is about sharing power more equally, not just the fuzzy feeling. Exclusion often benefits the included and changing that would be a struggle. It's nothing new to you guys I'm sure.

What seems to be new though is the urgency of responding to these growing inequities and the environmental threats. I've got no doubt that we can do that

struggle in our collective backyards. Globalisation can be harnessed to support local struggles, just as it also poses great threats.

But most crucially communities need support from governments, both globally and locally, to address those power imbalances. With this support a more sustainable and just world is possible – a world in which communities really do control their destinies.

Thank you.