



Mr Richard Eckersley

Fellow, National Centre for
Epidemiology and Population
Health, The Australian National
University, Canberra

Email:

richard.eckersley@anu.edu.au

Note: also includes a Powerpoint presentation

TALES OF THE FUTURE: HUMAN OBSOLESCENCE OR TRANSFORMATION?

Abstract

The human condition today is marked by paradox and contradiction. This situation reflects not just its inherent complexity and our incomplete understanding of it, but also parallel processes of cultural decay and renewal, a titanic contest as old ways of thinking about ourselves fail, and new ways of being human struggle for definition and acceptance. The dominant worldview of material progress, which gives priority to economic growth and a rising standard of living, is being challenged by a worldview based on sustainable development, with its aim of balancing social, economic and environmental goals to create a high, equitable and lasting quality of life. Our growing understanding of the social basis of human health and happiness can make an important contribution to this contest by allowing different priorities to be measured against a common goal or benchmark – improving human wellbeing.

Introduction

Those who debate the future of the world and the fate of humanity are usually divided into optimists and pessimists. They might better be labelled linear optimists and systemic optimists. Linear optimists believe we are 'on track' to a better future, and that the problems we face are mere 'glitches' we can iron out of the system. Systemic optimists, on the other hand, argue that we are straying ever further off the track and that current problems are symptoms of a deeper condition which must be addressed through whole-system change.

The Spectator magazine recently claimed that 'we live in the happiest, healthiest and most peaceful era in human history' (Hanlon, 2004). And if now was good, the future would be even better. The belief that we live in the best of all times has been most famously articulated in recent years by Bjorn Lomborg (2001) in *The Skeptical Environmentalist*. That we live in such 'blessed' times is usually credited to material prosperity resulting from economic growth. Economist Diane Doyle (2004), writing in *New Statesman* recently, said that since the dawn of capitalism, this had been the big question: 'Why do capitalist economies grow? What can people do, collectively, to

encourage economic growth, given that it brings benefits such as longer life expectancy, better health and improved opportunities for personal development?’

However, I want to explore the question of progress – of making life better – from the perspective of quality of life and human wellbeing. I define the quality of life of a place as how well it provides the social, economic, cultural and environmental conditions that are conducive to total wellbeing – physical, mental, social, spiritual. The quality of life of people refers to their opportunity to experience these conditions.

Australian governments give over-riding priority in public policy to economics, believing economic growth to be the basis for improving the wellbeing of the Australian people. This position is regarded as a ‘policy constant’ that is largely beyond scrutiny or debate. The Prime Minister John Howard (2004), in his ‘Getting the big things right’ speech in July, said: ‘Maintaining a strong dynamic and growing economy is the...overriding responsibility of government’ (along with, now, national security and defence). At a World Economic Forum dinner in Melbourne in 1998, Howard (1998) said: ‘The overriding aim of our agenda is to deliver Australia an annual (economic) growth rate of over four per cent on average during the decade to 2010.’ This is reflected in the Government’s overall policy objective for Treasury: ‘strong, sustainable, economic growth and the improved wellbeing of the Australian people’ (Henry, 2004). Indeed, Treasury’s mission statement is ‘to improve the wellbeing of the Australian people’.

Material Progress

There are, on the face of it, good grounds for the equation of more with better. Today, many more people are living much richer, longer lives than ever before. In the year 1000, there were about 270 million people in the world who, on average, could expect to live about 24 years and earn US\$435 a year (in today’s dollars) (Maddison, 2001).

Today there are over 6 billion people on earth who, on average, can expect to live about 67 years and earn almost US\$6,000 year. All parts of the world have shared in the gains. In the developed world in the past two hundred years, per capita GDP has risen about twenty-fold, and life expectancy has more than doubled. In the rest of the world, per capita GDP has increased more than five-fold and life expectancy has also more than doubled.

The primacy of growth is at the heart of the concept of material progress, which regards economic growth as paramount because it creates the wealth necessary to increase personal freedoms and opportunities and to address social and environmental problems such as unemployment, poverty, crime, pollution, land degradation and

global warming. In public policy terms, economic growth means more revenue, bigger budget surpluses, and so more money to spend on more or bigger programs on social welfare, industry support and environmental protection.

John Howard (2004) said, in his 'Getting the big things right' speech: 'If we can sustain our overall growth rates...we will be a \$1 trillion economy in around seven years time [compared to more than ten years at previous rates]...By 2015, the difference in national income would be about \$135 billion a year in today's dollars. That's a difference of an extra \$12 billion a year for health and more than \$8 billion for education at current spending patterns...'

This approach effectively treats growth processes as, at worst, socially and environmentally neutral. But if, in creating wealth, we do more damage to the fabric of society and the state of the natural environment than we can repair with the extra wealth, it means we are going backwards in terms of quality of life, even while we grow richer. Furthermore, it is doubtful that we can compensate for the costs of growth in this way. The costs are not just material or structural – social inequality or environmental degradation, for example – but also cultural or ethical. In other words, material progress depends on the pursuit of individual and material self-interest that, morally, cannot be quarantined from other areas of our personal and social lives.

Qualifications and Costs of Growth

There is growing evidence that quality of life is not the same as standard of living, and that how well we live is not just a matter of how long we live, especially in rich nations such as Australia (Eckersley, 2004). Against the gains we have to set the following qualifications:

- The benefits have been unevenly distributed globally, and there have been recent reversals in both per capita income and life expectancy in some nations.
- The benefits of rising income to quality of life diminish as income increases, and in rich nations health and happiness are at best only weakly related to average income levels.
- Economic growth is not the only, or perhaps even the main, factor behind improving health and wellbeing. Increased knowledge, better education and institutional reforms have also made major contributions, even in the absence of sustained growth.
- Increases in life expectancy partly reflect biomedical advances and individual lifestyle choices that say little about changes in social conditions and may be offsetting adverse health impacts of these changes.

Beyond these qualifications of the benefits of material progress, we must also acknowledge several formidable and growing costs related to sustainability, opportunity and meaning, all of which have real and potentially immense implications for human health and wellbeing, and so for quality of life in Australia.

- The destruction of the natural environment of which we are an intrinsic part. However much we seem to be able to address local and regional impacts through increased wealth and technological innovation, the evidence suggests we are disrupting planetary systems on a scale that grows ever greater and more

pervasive.

- Increasing inequality, sustained high unemployment, the growth in under-employment and overwork, pressures on public services such as health and education, and the geographic concentration of disadvantage, leading to deeper and more entrenched divisions within society.
- Psychosocial costs that relate to what might be called meaning in life - a sense of purpose, autonomy, identity, belonging and hope.

I have focused in my own work on the last point. The costs to wellbeing of these psychosocial impacts are evident in: public perceptions of quality of life in Australia; trends in the psychosocial health of young people; and the effects of cultural qualities such as materialism and individualism on psychological wellbeing.

Evidence on Psychosocial Costs

Public attitude surveys show that many people are concerned about the materialism, greed and selfishness they believe drive society today, underlie social ills, and threaten their children's future (Eckersley 2004). We yearn for a better balance in our lives, believing that when it comes to things like individual freedom and material abundance, we don't seem 'to know where to stop' or now have 'too much of a good thing'. For example, an Australian study found over a half of those surveyed felt quality of life was falling, with the most common reasons given being, in order: too much greed and consumerism; the breakdown in community and social life; too much pressure on families, parents and marriages; falling living standards; and employers demanding too much (Pusey, 2003). Most people believed family life was changing for the worse, citing the breakdown of traditional values; too much consumerism and pressure to get more money and buy things; a breakdown of communication between family members; and greater isolation of families from extended family networks and the community.

While most young people are resilient and are adapting to changing social conditions, adjusting goals and expectations to suit their times, an increasing proportion of young people are suffering, with one fifth to one third of young people experiencing significant psychological stress and distress at any one time (Eckersley, 2004). The adverse trends in young people's health range across physical problems such as obesity to psychological illnesses such as depression, and from relatively minor but common complaints such as chronic tiredness to rare but serious problems such as suicide.

The psychological literature suggests powerful effects of culture on psychological wellbeing. Take materialism – attaching importance to money and possessions – which underpins our consumption-based economy. Materialism (or consumerism) breeds not happiness but dissatisfaction, depression, anxiety, anger, isolation and alienation (Kasser, 2002). Human needs for security and safety, competence and self-worth, connectedness to others, and autonomy and authenticity are relatively unsatisfied when materialistic values predominate. In short, the more materialistic we are, the poorer our quality of life.

Individualism – placing the individual at the centre of a framework of values, norms and beliefs - is another cultural quality with profound significance for wellbeing, but here the evidence is contradictory (Eckersley, 2004). Wellbeing is associated with

several qualities that individualistic societies should encourage, notably personal control and self-esteem; individualism is, after all, supposed to be about freeing us to live the lives we want. The reality, however, may be very different.

Individualism's downsides are described in different ways (not all of which are necessarily compatible or reconcilable). There is a heightened sense of risk, uncertainty and insecurity; a lack of clear frames of reference; a rise in personal expectations, coupled with a perception that the onus of success lies with the individual, despite the continuing importance of social disadvantage and privilege; a surfeit or excess of freedom and choice, which is experienced as a threat or tyranny. One of the effects of these developments is that individualism not only reduces social connectedness and support, but also diminishes personal control, including through confusing autonomy with independence, the creation of a separate self. The more narrowly and separately the self is defined, the greater the likelihood that the social forces acting on us are experienced as external and alien.

An important means by which cultural qualities such as individualism and materialism affect wellbeing is through their influence on values (Eckersley, 2004). Most societies have tended to reinforce values that emphasise social obligations and self-restraint and discourage those that promote self-indulgence and anti-social behaviour. 'Virtues' are concerned with building and maintaining strong, harmonious personal relationships and social attachments, and the strength to endure adversity. 'Vices', on the other hand, are about the unrestrained satisfaction of individual wants and desires, or the capitulation to human weaknesses.

In undermining, even reversing, these 'universal values', we weaken the personal relationships, social roles and spiritual beliefs that are central to wellbeing. In making meaning in life more individualised and materialistic, we reduce social cohesion, confidence, trust and stability, and leave ourselves personally more isolated and vulnerable. This, in turn, reduces the hold on people of any moral code, which depends critically on these ties for effect, for tangible expression in behaviours. So there are complex feedbacks in the social effects of growth.

Thresholds and Overshoots

These issues have led some researchers to propose a threshold hypothesis, which states that for every society there seems to be a period in which economic growth (as conventionally measured) brings about an improvement in quality of life, but only up to a point - the threshold point - beyond which, if there is more economic growth, quality of life may begin to deteriorate (Eckersley, 2004).

The threshold hypothesis has been supported in recent years by the development of indices, such as the Genuine Progress Indicator, that adjust GDP for a range of social, economic and environmental factors that GDP either ignores or measures inappropriately. These include income distribution, unpaid housework and voluntary work, loss of natural resources, and the costs of unemployment, crime and pollution. These 'GDP analogues' show that trends in GDP and social wellbeing, once moving together, have diverged since about the mid-1970s in all countries for which they have been constructed, including the United States, United Kingdom and Australia.

Government policy gives priority to high, sustained economic growth but leaves the content of growth largely to individuals, whose personal consumption makes the largest contribution to growth. This ever-increasing consumption is not just a matter of freedom of choice; it is culturally 'manufactured' by a massive and growing media-marketing complex. For example, big business in the United States spends over a US\$1000 billion a year on marketing – about twice what Americans spend annually on education, from kindergarten through graduate school (Dawson, 2003). This spending includes 'macromarketing', the management of the social environment, particularly public policy, to suit the interests of business. This conjunction of government policy and corporate practice is distorting personal and social preferences. So the core issue is not a question of being pro-growth or anti-growth, but of seeing that growth itself is not the main game.

In academia and public-policy NGOs, within supra-national bodies such as the UN, OECD and World Bank, and among the public - if not within national governments - there is a growing, and more critical, examination of the role of growth in human development. In recent years, both the OECD and the World Bank have acknowledged the need to place more emphasis on the quality – or content – of growth. As Vinod Thomas, the lead author of a 2000 World Bank report on *Quality of Growth* (Thomas et al, 2000), remarked at its launch: 'Just as the quality of people's diet, and not just the quantity of food they eat, influences their health and life expectancy, the way in which growth is generated and distributed has profound implications for people and their quality of life'.

Sustainable Development

For all these reasons, then, material progress is increasingly being challenged by a new view of the world based on sustainable development. Sustainable development does not accord economic growth 'overriding' priority. Instead, it seeks a better balance and integration of social, environmental and economic goals and objectives to produce a high, equitable and enduring quality of life. We can also characterise the change as replacing the outdated industrial metaphor of progress as a pipeline – pump more wealth in one end and more welfare flows out the other - with an ecological metaphor of progress as an evolving ecosystem such as a rainforest –

reflecting the reality that the processes that drive social systems are complex, dynamic, diffuse and non-linear.

The key challenge of sustainable development has usually been seen as reconciling the requirements of the economy – growth – with the requirements of the environment – sustainability. However, our growing understanding of the social basis of health and wellbeing can shift this perspective, so making an important contribution to working towards sustainability. It provides a means of integrating different priorities by allowing them to be measured against a common goal – improving human wellbeing. While human health is not the only consideration here, it is critical to achieving a real political commitment to sustainable development.

When I ask very different, but mostly well-educated, professional or student audiences about how they line up on this issue, the proportions choosing sustainable development over material progress usually range from a large minority to a substantial majority (in several audiences, the vote has been unanimous, or close to it). People are relieved that these big issues are being examined and discussed, so affirming their own deep doubts about society's direction. Many feel isolated because they don't see these doubts echoed in the mainstream media and in political debate.

Behind such anecdotal evidence is a growing body of research findings and scholarship suggesting that the challenge to material progress is both deep and wide. Studies by American researchers Paul Ray and Sherry Ruth Anderson (2000) reveal that a quarter of Americans are 'cultural creatives', people who have made a comprehensive shift in their worldview, values and way of life. Surveys in European Union countries suggest there are at least as many cultural creatives there. 'They are disenchanted with "owning more stuff", materialism, greed, me-firstism, status display, glaring social inequalities of race and class, society's failure to care adequately for elders, women and children, and the hedonism and cynicism that pass for realism in modern society.' Instead, they are placing emphasis in their lives on relationships, communities, spirituality, nature and the environment, and real ecological sustainability.

Cultural creatives represent a coalescence of social movements that are not just concerned with influencing government, but with reframing issues in a way that changes how people understand the world. Ray and Anderson say that in the 1960s, less than five per cent of the population was making these momentous changes. In just over a generation, that proportion has grown to 26 per cent. 'That may not sound like much in this age of nanoseconds, but on the timescale of whole civilisations, where major developments are measured in centuries, it is shockingly quick.'

The 'cultural creatives' trend is consistent with the views of American sociologist Ronald Inglehart (2000). Drawing on surveys of people in the United States and several European nations since 1970, he found a pronounced shift from 'materialist' to 'postmaterialist' values. The trend is one aspect of a broader shift from modern to postmodern values taking place in advanced industrial societies. Postmaterialists are still interested in a high material standard of living, but take it for granted and place increasing emphasis on the quality of life. 'The economic outlook of modern industrial society emphasised economic growth and economic achievement above all,' Inglehart says. 'Postmodern values give priority to environmental protection and cultural issues, even when these goals conflict with maximising economic growth.'

While Australians haven't yet been measured for their 'cultural creativity', a study by the Australia Institute (Hamilton and Mail, 2003) suggests the proportion of cultural creatives here is likely to be similar to that in the United States and Europe, perhaps even higher. It found that 23 per cent of Australians aged 30-59 had 'downshifted' in the past ten years: that is, voluntarily made a long-term change in their lifestyle that had resulted in their earning less money. This proportion excludes those who retired, returned to study, set up their own business or left work to have a child. If some of the excluded are included as legitimate downshifters, along with those who have opted for a 'cultural creative' lifestyle from the beginning, the proportion of Australians who are challenging the dominant culture of our times is likely to be substantially higher.

Still, these civilisational shifts are not necessarily straightforward and one-dimensional. We don't have a fixed quantum of social energy so that if pressure mounts in one area, it must ease in another. Pressures can rise in several conflicting realms, increasing social tensions. More people are disenchanted with consumerism, yet we continue to consume more. There are contradictions in the evidence about social preferences and directions. These reflect the inevitable incompleteness of any study, a focus on only part of the story; they also reveal the very real ambivalence in people's minds and the state of flux in modern societies. All in all, most people may still be obeying the cultural imperative to consume, but growing numbers are opting out of a way of life they feel is becoming increasingly destructive to health and wellbeing, both personally and socially.

The sociological literature suggests an emerging moral autonomy lies behind this cultural transformation. One of the most exciting ideas to emerge from recent postmodern scholarship is that we have the opportunity, however small, of becoming truly moral beings, perhaps for the first time in history. That is, we have, each of us, the opportunity to exercise genuine moral choice and to take responsibility for the consequences of those choices, rather than accepting moral edicts based on some grand, universal creed and handed down from on high by its apostles.

British sociologist Zygmunt Bauman (1995: 43) writes: 'The denizens of the postmodern era are, so to speak, forced to stand face-to-face with their moral autonomy, and so also with their moral responsibility. This is the cause of moral agony. This is also the chance the moral selves never confronted before.' This seems close to what theologians call the doctrine of 'primacy of conscience'. It presents us with an immense challenge, and it may well be asking too much of us. But the ideal is there, if often hidden, in both religious teaching and science.

Linked to this new moral autonomy may be the emergence of a more socially responsible and engaged individualism. Action is still a form of self-expression, but it is framed and shaped by a wider social context. These new orientations create 'something like a cooperative or altruistic individualism,' say German sociologists Ulrich Beck and Elizabeth Beck-Gernsheim (2002: 162). 'Thinking of oneself and living for others at the same time, once considered a contradiction in terms, is revealed as an internal, substantive connection. Living alone means living socially.'

Conclusion

The many paradoxes and ambiguities we encounter when we examine ‘the big picture’ of human life today reflect not just its inherent complexity and our incomplete understanding of it, but also parallel processes of cultural decay and renewal, a titanic struggle as old ways of thinking about ourselves fail, and new ways of being human strive for definition and acceptance.

In essence, this struggle involves a shift away from the current worldview framed by material progress and based on self-interested, competitive individualism, which has created ‘shallow’ democracy (for example, voting every few years for whoever promises the biggest tax cuts) and reduces social cohesion, weakens families and communities, and so diminished quality of life and wellbeing. Replacing this construction is a new worldview framed by sustainable development and based on altruistic, cooperative individualism, which will give rise to ‘deep’ democracy (embodied in all aspects of our lives), greater social cohesion, strong communities and families, and so heightened quality of life and wellbeing.

Achieving this transition boils down to this: nourish your heart, mind and soul, not just your body. Cherish intimacy, participate socially, engage politically and believe spiritually. Apply what a colleague calls the grandchildren test: how will what you do shape the world they inherit. Vote in the national and global interest, not your own. Be discerning in your use of the media. Consume modestly; regard flaunted wealth and extravagant consumption as poor taste. Obey the golden rule of treating others as you would have them treat you. Beware of simple solutions. Think for yourself.

To be more specific about how we can achieve this transformation, here is a set of goals for action that impressed me with its simplicity and comprehensiveness. Fairshare International (www.fairshareinternational.org), an Australian-based global community group, has come up with a formula - 5.10.5.10 - for people who want to take actions that matter:

- Give at least five per cent of your gross income to organisations that assist the poor and disadvantaged and help to protect the environment.
- Reduce use of resources, including water and energy, to at least ten per cent below the national per capita average – and preferably by more.
- Spend at least five per cent of your leisure time in voluntary work helping others or tackling social and environmental challenges.
- Take significant democratic action to correct bad practices at least ten times a year, including writing letters to politicians, the media or corporations.

The worldviews we hold, the political stands we take, the moral choice we make, matter – not only to ourselves and our children, but to the destiny of humankind and the future of the planet.

References

Bauman, Zygmunt 1995 *Life in Fragments: Essays in Postmodern Morality* Blackwell, Oxford.

Beck, Ulrich & Beck-Gernsheim, Elizabeth 2002 *Individualization* Sage, London.

Coyle, Diane 2004 'Welcome to post-autistic economics' Australian Financial Review 30 July Review p. 9 (from New Statesman).

Dawson, Michael 2003 The Consumer Trap: Big Business Marketing in American Life University of Illinois Press, Champaign. Cited in York, Richard 2004 'Manufacturing the love of possession - The Consumer Trap: Big Business Marketing in American Life – Book Review' Monthly Review, February.

Eckersley, Richard 2004 *Well & Good: How We Feel & Why It Matters* Text Publishing, Melbourne.

Hamilton, Clive & Mail Elizabeth 2003 'Downshifting in Australia: A Sea-change in the Pursuit of Happiness' Discussion paper no. 50 January, the Australia Institute, Canberra.

Hanlon, Michael, 2004. 'There's no time like the present' Spectator, 7 August.

Henry, Ken 2004 'Enhancing freedom, generating opportunities – challenges for governments, chances for citizens' Address to Institute of Public Administration (Victorian Division) 20 July.

Howard, John 1998 Address to the World Economic Forum Dinner, Melbourne, 16 March, News Room, Office of the Prime Minister, Parliament House, Canberra.

Howard, John 2004 'Getting the big things right: goals and responsibilities in a fourth term' Address to Enterprise Forum lunch, Adelaide, 8 July, News Room, Office of the Prime Minister, Parliament House, Canberra.

Inglehart, Ronald 2000 Globalisation and postmodern values Washington Quarterly 23 (1), 215-28.

Kasser, Tim 2002 The High Price of Materialism MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Lomborg, Bjorn 2001 *The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Maddison, Angus 2001 The World Economy: A Millennial Perspective Development Centre of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and

Development, Paris.

Pusey, Michael 2003 The Experience of Middle Australia: The Dark Side of Economic Reform Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ray, Paul & Anderson, Sherry Ruth 2000 The Cultural Creatives: How 50 Million People are Changing the World Harmony Books, New York (quotations are taken from extracts available at www.culturalcreatives.net).

Thomas, Vinod et al 2000 The Quality of Growth World Bank and Oxford University Press, Oxford.