Editorial: Dick Jones

Dr. Richard (Dick) Jones gave some very thought-provoking election speeches. For example, following his 1975 Senate Election speech in an Editorial The Examiner commented that UTG had produced more ideas relevant to Tasmania than have all the other parties combined.

In this speech Dick pointed out that:
Tasmania’s own party represents no sectional interests; (and) unlike some independents, we wear no disguises.

The United Tasmania Group became a political party because the two major parties were putting aside democratic principles, in Tasmania.

The United Tasmania Group works and breathes by a New Ethic, which binds our members to work together without fear or favour for the benefit of all citizens... Our Ethic condemns the misuse of power. No other political party gives you this guarantee of ethical behaviour from your representatives. (A revised, redesigned A New Ethic will be available soon).

Also, there are extensive arguments in this speech that present politicians could use to defend Tasmania in the debate about the GST distribution (via Grants Commission) to Tasmania.2

With the forthcoming state elections another comment that Dick made, which is just as relevant today, Don’t be disturbed by silly arguments that the U.T.G. kept so and so out of Parliament and aren’t we ashamed! (tut!) - The same misleading argument is being used today; in fact, we have been lobbied by Tasmanian Green supporters not to reform as a political party.

UTG has changed since the 1977 UTG State Conference, following 10 election campaigns over 5 years (1972-77), Dick declared at this conference that: Our business is to fight elections.

The fact that the newly re-formed UTG has not formally re-registered as a political party does not mean we are not political - we are even more so than before and, depending on the outcome of the next State election, we may register again, particularly as we now have financial backing.

The United Tasmania Group is Tasmania’s (only) own party. We have produced more ideas relevant to Tasmania than have all the other parties combined – and it is toward that end that UTG will continue to maintain the best evidence-based social, environmental and economic policies for Tasmania. In this issue of the journal two such policies are presented: Preventing child abuse and neglect, and Youth Justice Reinvestment. The Editorial Committee for this issue of the journal has been expanded to accommodate these policies.

---

1 The Examiner, Launceston, Editorial, 26 August 1976

2 Full transcript of this 14-page speech will be published as an article on our main facebook site.
Also, as should be clear from the content of The UTG Journal, we will continue to present historical accounts of the original development of Green politics and the conservation movement in Tasmania – something that has been sadly lacking to date.

**Correction to photo caption on page 8 of The UTG Journal #1:**
Caption should read: ‘Early photo of some UTG activists taking a campaign break (there were 10 election campaigns over a period of 5 years)’ - NOT 6 years, in fact it was almost exactly 5 years, March 1972 – April 1977.

---

**All parties are responsible for our protected areas**

*Kevin Kiernan*

To those generations who have not had to fight to create our national parks and reserves they perhaps seem as if something that has always been there, much like a mountain or a river. But these places were hard won, and at great personal cost to many people.

Increasingly we see the consequences of successive generations having assumed that the degraded environmental inheritance left to them is the norm, and, having been successfully convinced that it would be unreasonable not to let just a little more of all they have ever known slip away, hand on that inheritance just a little further depleted. Only one outcome is possible when successive generations behave in this way. No candidate or party that aspires to political leadership should want to be part of this insidious process, and nor should they be permitted to be part of it.

The environment affects us all, and the responsibility to protect it rests with all, not just with those politicians who might wear it on their sleeve. It is past time that the major parties acknowledged this reality, ceased using it as a weapon against political opponents, and started honouring all those among their own supporters who consider conservation to be just as important as do members of the Greens.

To occasionally mouth platitudes about climate change is not enough. Climate change is obviously a big and over-arching concern that demands urgent attention, but it does not negate all the other environmental issues that confront us. Increasingly, the burden of that global task is casting a shadow that is obscuring all the other challenges right here on our doorstep, and blinding us to the old adage about the need to think globally but to act locally, the only place where we really can.

How long will it be before vested interests start trying to bluff us that we have a global responsibility to flood the Franklin River after all, arguing that it is preferable to burning coal for power, as if coal was the only alternative energy source, and drowning yet more of the Earth’s green lungs as if they need not be factored into the equation? I bet that will happen far sooner than our political leaders will acknowledge, the impact upon the global environment of the billions of tonnes of carbon released into the atmosphere in order to transport to this island ever-increasing multitudes of tourists with money in their pockets.

As prices rise to match what tourists will pay rather than what the goods are really worth, our kids’ hopes that they might ever afford a house of their own grow
dimmer. Meanwhile a relative few benefit financially from the consumption of our communal natural inheritance and effective free use of the infrastructure for which we fool taxpayers must alone foot the bill. Those who prosper dangle the carrot of public support and campaign funds for aspirants to new or continuing political office, provided only that they allow the doors of our national parks and other protected areas to be battered down in order to permit their ransacking through conversion into industrial scenery mines.

Of the more than 1,000 areas around the globe that have now been formally recognised as World Heritage Areas, most have achieved that designation on the basis of meeting just one of the ten possible criteria under which designation as a World Heritage Area can be assigned. The Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage area (TWWHA) is one of only 29 sites worldwide that have qualified under both natural heritage and cultural heritage criteria. It qualifies under an incredible seven of the ten possible formal criteria. Only one other site on Earth meets this many criteria, and none exceeds this number.

This status is the considered opinion of a representative body of assessors who are able to draw upon a worldwide network of specialist advisors, and who do so as a matter of course before arriving at any decision.

Hence, the TWWHA is not some trivial confection by conservationists dreamed up in a bid to frustrate developers, or some plaything conjured up by one side or other of politics in order to chase votes. In living in Tasmania, we enjoy an extraordinary privilege that ought not be taken for granted, just because it is in our own backyard rather than in some seemingly exotic and romanticised place beyond the horizon.

Moreover, we live on an island, and in a country, that is by no means so impoverished as to be unable to properly tend this Eden with which we have been gifted. Look beyond if you think otherwise. Much of what you will see will be a wounded, beleaguered and shell-shocked world where poverty and real human needs make all but impossible protection of such green lungs as cloak our hillsides. Yet we lay waste to those lungs to manufacture paper litter then pay rates and taxes to have it picked up, and convert our national parks into scenery mines for the benefit of tourism entrepreneurs, more out of sectional avarice amid generalised disinterest than for any real need.

Some seek to excuse our profligacy by arguing that we are already leaders in conservation, because we have a larger area of intact Nature in protected areas than do those places where any hope of doing likewise has long ago already been eaten, over-populated, bombed or napalmed out of existence. But we have a responsibly to safeguard our protected areas, and we can afford to live up to that responsibility.

Those who aspire to political office share that responsibility. And as the forthcoming state election approaches, the electorate has a responsibility to hold them to it.
Preventing child abuse and neglect

Geoff Holloway

Twenty-three years ago I had a stand-up verbal fight with the Minister for the Family and Children’s Services in Western Australia, Mr Roger Nicholls, 1995. What the fight was about was his refusal to accept the figures I had collated on the incidence of child abuse in Western Australia. He stormed out of the parliamentary office; I was determined to show that the data was correct and proceeded to augment the data with reports from domestic violence refuges. At that time I was part of a multi-university Western Australian Consortium for Social Policy Research. We had been commissioned by the Minister to write a report on ‘the state of the family in Western Australia’. We almost did not get paid. The full report was never published. Since the time of that anecdote little has changed anywhere in Australia – in fact, the incidence of child abuse and neglect has continued to rise. And governments have continued to try to address the problem by pouring increasing amounts of money into the wrong end of the violence cycle – the incidence (the number of new cases over a given time period) end, like having ambulances at the bottom of the cliff to collect people falling off, rather than doing something to stop people from falling off the cliff in the first place – the prevention strategy.

I was teaching a university course on the sociology of the family at that time, and for every lecture on child abuse I would have counsellors ready to address the line of students coming to me confounded by their own experiences. Jump forward eight years, working in child protection in the Tasmanian bureaucracy compiling figures on child abuse. My manager refused to accept that the number of unallocated cases of child abuse had reached 800. I was told to change the figures. I was bullied, and eventually had no choice but to resign. After my resignation the number of unallocated cases continued to rise and reached about 1,600.

The message is clear – no one really wants to know the incidence and prevalence of child maltreatment. In fact, there has never been a prevalence study conducted across Australia. Prevalence means how widespread it is – there is a myth that child abuse only occurs in working class or single parent families, which is far from the truth – I won’t go into the reasons for this misconception here (that would take another article). According to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, a family member or close family friend perpetrates 90% of child abuse.

From the accumulated experience and research over ten years or so, and many conversations with frontline child protection staff, I began to formulate a different strategy for addressing child maltreatment. I moved to Canberra, was working with the Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth (ARACY) and presented a one-page proposal to the instigator and Chair of ARACY – Professor Fiona Stanley AC, FAA. She responded enthusiastically which set in motion a long series of investigations and reports, which I won’t go into detail here. Sufficient to say, at last a prevention strategy was being developed, and some $2 million has been spent evaluating (formative and
summative) and testing this strategy by my rough calculation, including seminal work\textsuperscript{ii} by the Allen Consulting Group and evaluations by the University of NSW. I was Research Manager for ARACY overseeing all this work. Two of the key people involved in this research are now living in Tasmania, Pam Muth and Michael White.

That all began 12 years ago (2006) and then recently, in March 2016, the State Liberal Government announced the implementation strategy for the redesign of the child protection system across Tasmania\textsuperscript{iii} - that was two years ago (but the actual redesign was announced in August 2015, eight months earlier).

Since then there have been no reports forthcoming as to how this transformation has been progressing. Neither the Labor Party nor the Tasmanian Greens have been asking any questions – largely because their policies are still focused on ‘ambulances at the bottom of cliffs’.

This prevention strategy is called the Common Assessment, Referral and Support (CAARS), now simply referred to as the Common Approach. The Common Approach is a prevention-focused and flexible way of working to help everyone have quality conversations with young people and their families about all aspects of their wellbeing. These aspects fall into six wellbeing areas that align with: Loved and Safe, Healthy, Participating, Positive Sense of Culture and Identity, Material Basics, and Learning.\textsuperscript{iv} The Common Approach is a practical tool that can be used across a variety of professions (e.g, teachers, social workers, medical staff, police, bureaucrats, etc.) using a common language for initial assessments of children at risk, who are then referred on for support and other specialised services according to need. It is designed to prevent the occurrence of child abuse or neglect.

In answer to a parliamentary question asking, ‘…how the Child Protection redesign statement has been received in the community?’ the Minister for Human Services, the Hon. Jacqui Petrusma MP responded, ‘…the redesign of Tasmania’s child protection system, led by Professor Maria Harries, finally provides Tasmania with a framework to fundamentally improve the lives of vulnerable children, young people and their families. This report and the Government’s response addresses the issues that have plagued the child protection services in this state for far too long – decades. We are determined to rebuild this system and support and protect Tasmania’s vulnerable children and young people.” (16 March 2016)\textsuperscript{v}

There is a common misconception - that implementing a prevention strategy will take much-needed money away from investigation and support services. As some highly regarded experts have acknowledged, implementing the Common Approach may involve, in effect, ‘double budgeting’ for an initial period.\textsuperscript{vi} Once the prevention strategies take effect it will no longer be necessary to keep increasing the amounts going into the ‘pointy end of the system’ (tertiary services). This strategy is what is known as the public health model, a concept originally developed by Prof. Dorothy Scott.\textsuperscript{vii}

It is difficult to assess how the redesign process and the uptake of the Common Approach are progressing, as there have been no public reports. However, in the Implementation Plan it is stated that, “The Common Approach is currently being
implemented across education, health, allied health and social service organisations throughout Australia. Take-up in Tasmania has, however, been limited." viii Meanwhile, the redesign process aside, caseloads remain very high and ‘staff morale has never been lower ’. As for the Common Approach, it is clear that there is much confusion and frustration about what it actually entails.

How do governments get away with not addressing child abuse (child protection services alone cost Australia $1 billion every year3 according to the Productivity Commission, 2017)? – easy, just hold another inquiry. Over the past twenty years there have been two inquiries on average every year into child protection somewhere in Australia. In Australia there have been more than 42 state and territory inquiries into child protection services since 1997 and each have identified ongoing and chronic systemic problems (see report referenced above, page 13).

Why are the hundreds of recommendations from these enquiries never implemented? Complex (‘wicked’) problems involve complex solutions, but there five main reasons for the lack of implementation of recommendations:

1. Lack of political will, besides the voting public is not very interested - ‘it happens in other people’s families, not mine’ (by far the majority of abuse is emotional abuse).

2. Short-term focus by political parties (a common problem).

3. Resistance (‘organisational inertia’) within child protection bureaucracies, especially by upper management (‘I am about to retire, don’t rock the boat…’). Included in this is the difficulty of changing organisational/professional cultures – as pointed out in the 2009 ARACY report, Inverting the Pyramid.

4. Wrong focus – the focus rarely, if ever, shifts from reactive to prevention strategies.

5. Some reports are badly written (but possibly the most comprehensive report I have read is that of Robyn Layton QC in 2003 in South Australia). ix

There are other important tools that go with child abuse prevention strategies and one of them is construction of integrated databases for identifying where services are most needed and to track patterns in child abuse and related factors. Tasmania used to have one of the most important such databases in Australia – it was abolished under the State Liberal Government in 2015 (but I think that was a decision made by senior management in the bureaucracy; it was not a political decision). It was called the Data Warehouse, had been initiated under the previous government in May 2012. It was possibly the most sophisticated longitudinal, multi-services database of its type in Australia. Such a database would have been very useful for monitoring the effectiveness of the prevention strategy.

There are also warning signs (red lights) that can be used to identify children at risk – school suspensions (see school suspensions report”). In fact, in the USA school suspensions are referred to as ‘the school-to-prison pipeline’. However, in

---

3 This is does not include other costs, which have been estimated to be an additional $3.3 billion a year (Productivity Commission, 2016).
Tasmania the Education Department has refused to publish such data since a very revealing report in 2003. Once again, people really do not want to know. . .

**Postscript:**
Productivity Commission report just released: Australia spends $1 billion every year on child protection services.

Tasmania spends by far the least amount on family support services:

Cost per child receiving intensive family support services (2016-17).

Source: Report on Government Services, 2017, Chapter 16, page 26, Fig. 16.12.

---

**Hugh Dell: author of A New Ethic**

Hugh Dell was born in Launceston in 1936, where he became ‘very class conscious’ from an early age. But it was not until 1961, when he moved to Hobart to work for The Mercury newspaper as their political commentator that this consciousness really developed, especially as he became involved with the Labor Party at that time. When the ALP was defeated in 1969 he became Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition, Eric Reece. Soon after that he decided to go to university and study political science and administration, in both of which he excelled.

The Labor Party returned to power in 1972. Meanwhile, Hugh’s political vision was beginning to develop, one based on ‘participatory democracy’ and with the objective of stopping the ‘secret favouring of small groups, business men to give them access to state resources (free)’. But it was the proposal to mine Precipitous Bluff that really made Hugh’s blood boil, as he says, ‘tipped him over the edge’.

‘These swine in the Labor Party were actually planning to mine it!’ – so Hugh turned his attention to the conservation movement, which was in its infancy at that stage. He tried to get the Tasmanian Conservation Trust involved in the issue, ‘but no way would they get involved, they wanted to use the old-boy network as they always had done.’

Then, just before UTG was formed Hugh went and saw Dick Jones. Hugh said to Dick, ‘You are the answer to my dreams … ‘They (the Labor Party) would do any dirty deal to stay in power, and that has been the (main) characteristic of Tasmanian politics right from the beginning,’ - and added that Tasmanian politics has not changed.

Hugh went home one afternoon and wrote A New Ethic in just one session on various pieces of coloured paper – ‘It was the culmination of what I had been thinking about for years’.

Hugh gave Dick a copy of A New Ethic, and Dick got back to him some time later. Dick said, ‘We’re going to publish this for the State election’. ‘I was amazed!’ was Hugh’s response!

Hugh explained a couple of aspects of A New Ethic. First, ‘A tyranny of rationality was put in deliberately … you mustn’t let
clever (and corrupt) people take over society at the expense of everybody else’. Secondly, ‘The only way to get people to change is through educating them’ – which is UTG’s main purpose, as declared in the last general meeting in September 2017.

‘But only some people are ready for enlightenment ... (with) the capacity to think in abstract terms (and) not to see themselves as the centre of the universe’.

Finally, ‘The most important problem for the world is over population – stripping the world of its assets and all the areas for wildlife and for nature (which) is being constantly restricted’. ‘We have to develop human consciousness ... and develop the super ego’.

A New Ethic has been updated and will be available soon with a new design.

[Above material based on multiple interviews plus that recorded January 2017 by Karen Dedenczuk].

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Youth Justice: a Justice Reinvestment approach

Geoff Holloway

What is Justice Reinvestment? –The origin of the term has been attributed George Soros (2003). Justice reinvestment is basically a public health model being applied to, in this case, youth justice systems. It is about trying to prevent young people from getting into the justice system, not simply reforming the system once they are in there.

Justice reinvestment asks the question: is imprisonment good value for money? The simple answer is that it is not. We are spending ever increasing amounts on imprisonment while at the same time, prisoners are not being rehabilitated, recidivism rates are high and return to prison rates are creating overcrowded prisons.

It has been advocated in terms of the youth detention system in Tasmania before, in the Children’s Commissioner’s report on the Ashley Youth Detention system 2013 (the ‘Ashley Report’), following very contentious discussions about the terms of reference and access to relevant data that eventually lead to the resignation of the Commissioner, Aileen Ashford. It took four months alone just to sort out the terms of reference. The final report was released mid 2013 under the Acting Children’s Commissioner, Elizabeth Daly.

The Ashley report concluded:

A major Recommendation arising out of this Inquiry is that government considers the adoption of a Justice Reinvestment Framework for the youth justice system in Tasmania. Although definitions of ‘justice reinvestment’ differ in their complexity, a useful one is the following: Justice Reinvestment is now at the heart of debates about criminal justice policy. It describes the process through which resources currently spent on incarcerating offenders in prison can be redirected into community-based alternatives that tackle the causes of crime at source. It is a form of preventative financing, through which policy makers shift funds away from dealing with problems downstream (policing, prisons) and towards tackling them upstream (family breakdown, poverty, mental illness, drug and alcohol dependence).
A justice reinvestment framework is consistent with a public health model or approach and with the rights-based approach espoused in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and other relevant international instruments.\textsuperscript{xii}

While the Ashley report was restricted to the youth detention system, the intention was to apply the principles to an integrated youth justice system. I have reason to believe that the State Government Department responsible for youth justice (D.H.H.S.) completed a report on the whole youth justice system in 2015 that incorporated a justice reinvestment approach, but the report was never published and Right to Information requests through the Tasmanian Greens’ office have turned up nothing. This report was part of the *Youth Justice Continuum of Care Project*, which was to include mapping of the service system – in other words, addressing the continuum of youth justice offending and re-offending.

None of the political parties in Tasmania understand justice reinvestment, even though justice reinvestment has been the National Greens policy since 2010\textsuperscript{xiii}.

However, not all is dependent on a justice reinvestment approach. Tasmania has some excellent systems already in place; I will briefly comment on just a few here.

**Police**

There have been big changes in policing over recent years, perhaps typified by what Dr. Isabelle Bartkowiak-Théron (University of Tasmania) calls ‘policing vulnerability’ \textsuperscript{xiii} or shifting from simply social control agents to social welfare agents as well. It provides police with a dual responsibility or awareness and has positive effects. For example, all police (now) know that the vast majority of youth offenders will only ever commit one crime and that, provided that it is not too serious, an informal or formal caution is much more effective in the long term than opening the door to the criminal justice system with its inevitable consequences. Police are also much more cognizant of cultural and mental health issues today.

**Youth Justice courts**

The first youth court (pilot) was established in Tasmania in January 2011 under Chief Magistrate Michael Hill (retired in 2015) who pioneered what is called ‘therapeutic jurisprudence’ with Deputy Magistrate Michael Daly. Victor Stojcevski evaluated the ‘pilot’ in 2013\textsuperscript{xiv}. He concluded that it had been very effective, but closer alignment of child protection and youth justice data would be very beneficial (there have been major issues here for some time, not to mention Education Department information sharing).

**Support services**

This is a ‘mixed bag’, but particular services stand out as making major contributions in supporting convicted youth offenders in Tasmania. These services include Save the Children (State Manager, Lisa Cuatt) and Whitelion (State Manager, Barbara Walters). Save the Children received a national Australian Institute of Criminology award in 2015 for its success in helping young people as they transition from detention and breaking the cycle of offending in Tasmania. One of the lessons from Save the Children is the importance of beginning the process of evaluation of any program from the beginning of the program, not afterwards (which is what typically happens in the bureaucracy).
White lion has also been a great success across Australia.

Justice Reinvestment

There are certain principles that underlie justice reinvestment. Unfortunately, none of these principles are being applied in decision-making concerning the continuing maintenance of Ashley Youth Detention Centre. As one very highly regarded University of Tasmania criminologist told me, ‘The only way to fix Ashley is to burn it to the ground!’

The key justice reinvestment principles are as follows:

1. Early identification, intervention and prevention are the most effective way of reducing youth offending.
2. Children and young people will be diverted away from the youth justice system wherever possible with custody being used only as a last resort and for the shortest possible time.
3. The developmental needs and risk factors associated with youth offending will be identified and matched with appropriate programs and services.
4. Children and young people will be heard and their views taken into account in all matters that affect them.
5. Families will be supported and engaged to help them meet the developmental needs of children and young people.
6. Community safety will be enhanced by an effective youth justice system that results in better outcomes for vulnerable or at-risk children and young people.
7. Programs and services will be evidence-based and regularly evaluated to ensure effectiveness and efficacy.

Mr Mick Gooda, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, summarises:

I believe that Justice Reinvestment also provides opportunities for communities to take back some control. If it is to work properly it means looking at options for diversion from prison but more importantly, it means looking at the measures and strategies that will prevent offending behaviour in the first place. The community has to be involved and committed to not only taking some ownership of the problem but also some ownership of the solutions... I think we need to change the narrative from one of punishment to one of community safety. Funding people to go to prison might make people feel safer, but a far better way would be to stop the offending in the first place, and Justice Reinvestment provides that opportunity.\textsuperscript{xv}

As pointed out his Social Justice Report 2009, Justice Reinvestment involves [a] holistic analysis of the criminal justice system is a key feature of the justice reinvestment methodology. Consideration is given to policing, judicial systems, probation and parole, prevention programs, community supervision and diversion options as well as the geographic mapping.

Justice mapping provides the means to identify where offenders are coming from (and returning to) by the collection, analysis and mapping of data about crimes, convictions and imprisonment, and identifies locations of high incidence, which may become the focus of increased policing. Justice mapping allows policy makers to design and implement programs to reduce crime, having identified those areas of greatest disadvantage and gaps in available services – factors underlying the causes of crime in these communities.\textsuperscript{xvi}

As can be seen from the following diagram, the number of youth offenders is actually quite small relative to the total
population of young people aged 10-17 years – and this number and proportion has been declining over the past decade.

Diagram 1: The ‘funnel’ of youth offenders in Tasmania aged 10 to 17 years, 2015-16

The good news is that youth offending has dropped by 55% in Tasmania over the past ten years! The population of young people aged 10-17 years in Tasmania has dropped significantly, with a decline of 55% over the past decade.
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