Australian institutions. This was based on preliminary discussions with students which revealed a desire to delve into more abstract matters of republicanism and what it might mean for Australia. For instance, the opening sequence asks, What is a Republic? This issue was considered important, and as the genuine republican debate that occurred later in the year demonstrated, it was an issue Australians were clearly poorly equipped to deal with. Rather than seeking to clarify this matter, or provide a clear-cut answer to this question, the film highlighted the point that a clear majority of the nations in the world are republics; yet finding many similarities between them is difficult. As the students agreed, they are certainly not all democratic. An Extension Activity in the Support Notes pursues this theme in the following exercise:

Research the political system of one world country that is a republic. Find out the following information:

- What is the formal name of the country?
- Who is the Head of State, and how are they appointed?
- Who is the Head of Government, and how are they appointed?
- Describe the process by which this country became a republic.
- Can this country be described as a ‘democracy’? Why? (VEA 1999b)

This sought to advance consideration of the relationship between republicanism and democracy. Of course, in a sense this became the key aspect of the republican debate in Australia. Due to its method of presidential appointment, the minimalist model on offer in the referendum was considered by many to represent a further weakening of Australian democracy. As noted earlier, opinion polls consistently demonstrated a majority of Australians wanted to directly participate in the election of a president. Far from endorsing the republican model supported by the ARM, the film implies that Australians need to have a more extensive discussion about just what a republic is, and what type of republic Australian could become.

Albeit in an elementary manner, it seeks to demonstrate the ability of Australian citizens, including younger Australians, to engage in dialogue about such matters. As Hogan notes, schools should provide students with opportunities to frame their
civil and civic interests in ways that are public, deliberative and political in character (2000b: 164). It was argued earlier in this Chapter that an absence of meaningful debate on the type of republic Australia should be, and the method of presidential appointment can be seen as major contributing factors to the failure of the referendum to pass. An unwillingness to consider a broader range of republican models and other aspects of constitutional reform became apparent at the Constitutional Convention held in February 1998.

This Convention was charged by the prime minister with the task of reaching consensus on a model that could be taken forward to referendum. At the end of the Convention a very dubious form of consensus emerged, with 73 of the 156 delegates voting in favour of the minimalist model. A majority of delegates voted against the model, or abstained from casting a vote at all. Arguably, the referendum was doomed at this point as this voting pattern closely patterns that produced by the nation's 12 million voters 18 months later. As I have argued earlier in this Chapter, a significant factor in the voting patterns at the Convention, and in the subsequent referendum, was the way in which many Australians felt their voice had been excluded from the debate. The structure of the Convention, the method of appointment of delegates, and most importantly, the very limited time allowed for consideration of the issues can be seen as significant factors contributing to a sense of alienation and disenfranchisement.

As Turnbull (1999a) now acknowledges, for Australia to reconsider the issue of republicanism in the future, a method must be found of allowing greater participation in the debate, including serious consideration of a broader range of models. School education certainly has a role to play in that process. Most important, it is the capacity of schools to draw people into debate and discussion rather than shutting them out, which provides a model of how such civic participation might proceed. By excluding, patronising or even ridiculing the voices of those proposing constitutional reforms deemed to be outside the realms of conventional practice, the Australian republican debate effectively compounded those aspects of the civic deficit linked to cynicism and alienation.
Discussion of the production, *Should Australian be a Republic?* is not presented as exemplary pedagogy or teaching practice. Nor is any claim made that it is a unique or original approach. Indeed, the Constitutional Centenary Foundation (CCF) has sponsored an extensive network of regional, state and national Schools' Constitutional Conventions in the years since the CCF was established in 1991. A key aspect of the Constitutional Centenary Foundation’s mission is to provide an opportunity for the wider Australian community to participate in constitutional debate. While the CCF does aim to educate Australians about their Constitution, it does not demand a certain level of knowledge before any active involvement in conversation and deliberation can take place.

These Conventions provide a valuable opportunity for secondary students from a range of schools to meet, and discuss aspects of the Australian constitution, including republicanism. When employed appropriately, they allow students the chance to engage in the principles of citizenship presented in Chapter Seven. Importantly, students can adopt and defend stances on contentious issues; and construct their own meaning of citizenship in a democracy, rather than simply be prescribed a role.

Student Constitutional Conventions present an interesting example of Craven's knowledge/participation link referred earlier in this Chapter. The CCF's mission is to encourage Australians to understand and discuss their Constitution and system of government (Constitutional Centenary Foundation 2000). Each Regional Convention is organised by an individual school that invites a number of neighbouring schools to send delegates to attend the one-day Convention. A typical Convention comprises about one hundred student delegates drawn from Years 10 - 12 at about ten separate public and private schools. Each Convention considers one or two significant issues relating to possible reform of the Australian Constitution. These issues include the proposal to introduce a constitutional Bill of Rights in Australia, the incorporation of a new preamble to the Australian Constitution, and future directions for Australia's head of state. Prior to the Convention, each delegate receives printed materials prepared by the CCF outlining key issues and arguments. Delegates are asked to read these materials prior to attending the Convention, although there is no guarantee they will have done so. In Victoria, as there is
virtually no mandated requirement of core education in civic, citizenship or political education in secondary schools, a single Convention is likely to include students who have quite extensive knowledge of the Australian Constitution (for instance students of Unit 3 and 4 Victorian Certificate of Education Political Studies), while other students may have completed no formal study of Australian government or the Constitution beyond an elementary middle school course. However, this does not preclude groups of students discussing aspects of Australian constitutional affairs, and formulating and presenting their ideas for possible reform. A strength of these Conventions is their endorsement of the idea of 'knowledge-in-use' so that citizen participation is 'not postponed to dutifully, and wrongly follow knowledge acquisition' (Parker 1996: 197).

Nevertheless, Conventions can reflect several of the problems of deliberative democracy identified by O'Loughlin (2000). The ideal of citizens engaged in open and equal discourse about their democracy is clearly fraught with difficulties. O'Loughlin draws on the work of Iris Marion Young in identifying a range of shortcomings of deliberative models, most obviously the disadvantages some participants experience in lack of skills and confidence in debating and public speaking. Too often, argumentative and combative modes of deliberation are dominant. O'Loughlin recommends a form of 'communicative democracy' that, in her view overcomes some of the problems of the deliberative model. O'Loughlin places particular importance on the capacity of communicative democracy to address the loss of meaning characteristic of contemporary liberal-democratic societies.

Students often take a far too passive role in Constitutional Conventions. The recommended format it to invite a group of speakers to address students on aspects of the Australian Constitution (for instance, the proposal to incorporate a new preamble to the Constitution), and then have students break into discussion groups to consider the matters raised. However, too often the invited speakers have poorly developed skills in communicating with adolescents. They adopt the role of 'experts', speak at excessive length (Gastil and Dillard 1999: 20) and apparently forget that they are addressing 16 or 17year old students rather than law or politics undergraduates. They often place greater emphasis on addressing the civic deficit
by means of knowledge provision, rather than using the Conventions as opportunities to allow genuine participation to occur. This reduces the potential CCF Conventions have for adding to the authenticity of democracy. As Dryzek notes, a public meeting that is conducted in intelligible language and that offers comprehensive and clear information on the issue at hand, is more authentically democratic than one arranged according to legalistic rules and procedures in which information is presented in a highly technical fashion to ‘non-experts’ (1996: 5-6). This can be seen as replicating the central problem of the broader republican debate in Australia, that of treating too many citizens as uninformed and in need of careful instruction before they can be considered ‘fit for democracy’. As I have argued, this can have a further deleterious effect on citizenship and by implication the state of Australian political culture.

Conclusion

The debate surrounding the proposal for Australia to become a republic encapsulates several important aspects of the state of Australian democratic citizenship, and what roles education may play in enlivening it. The conduct of much of the debate displayed an elitism characterised by the view that many Australians are ill-equipped to take part in such debates because they lack the civic knowledge of the Australian Constitution or institutions of government deemed necessary to reach an informed view. Yet such a view is exclusionary, and is of itself, a denial and discouragement of active citizenship in Australian democracy. The suggestion that citizens cannot take part in civic conversation until they reach a certain level of knowledge is inherently anti-democratic.

In a paradoxical sense, the republican issue made Australians both more disillusioned with the state of democratic citizenship in this country, and also re-established their faith in their civic efficacy. It both drove them further away from their role and democratic citizens, and drew them back to it. Denied a chance to become engaged in a deeper public conversation about what Australia might become, a majority of citizens voted against the model offered to them in the 1999 referendum. While regarded by minimalist republicans as a negative response, the
outcome of ignorance, and showing a susceptibility to exaggerations and distortions, the referendum result can be seen as a reaction to a style of 'politics as usual' in which government becomes the province of specialists, and the effectiveness of the citizen voice becomes increasingly marginalised. As a strand of anti-politics, it revealed a growing anger with the way in which public policy and administration is considered to be too complex for most citizens to actively participate in or even have a valid point of view about. In an effort to 'keep it simple', advocates of the minimalist model failed to convince most Australian voters of the merits of its case.

Although this thesis has conducted extensive investigation of the problematic nature of the Australian civic deficit, it has not denied large gaps in civic understanding do exist. However, it is ignorance narrowly defined. To then seek to exploit this deficit by blaming Australian citizens for their failure to support a particular model of a republic is a hostile device unlikely to increase Australians' willingness to adopt a more expansive role as democratic citizens. Moreover, the nature of this civic 'ignorance' was on display in the republican debate. It demonstrated the vaguely absurd notion that Australian citizens become experts in constitutional matters, and that unless they do so, Australia is trapped in its current system of government.

Education has a strong role in promoting Australian citizenship. It can do this by modelling the ways in which Australians can participate in democracy in the more deliberative and discursive manner implied by the principles of persistence, inquisitive turbulence and defensible stances considered in Chapter Seven. Freed from the expediency and pragmatics of conventional government practice, schools have the opportunity to engage young people in genuine conversation of how Australia might be. Other than the government itself, the single most important institution for making democracy more deliberative is the education system (Gutmann and Thompson 1996: 359). However, little progress will be made on this front if it is implied that there is no choice in such matters, because it has all been determined by, in Wark's words, the abstract plans of experts. The Australian republican issue provides a perfect opportunity for young Australians to conduct some persistent questioning about their nation and its future. It provides a perfect
opportunity to deepen Australian democratic citizenship. Fortunately, given that Australians voted against change in 1999, that rare opportunity still exists.
Chapter Nine
Deepening Democracy

Introduction

On one level, this thesis leaves itself open to the accusation it has consistently
levelled at many of the statements and proclamations about civics and citizenship
education it has examined. In advocating an education in, and for democratic
citizenship, it can be accused of enveloping itself in the same grand rhetoric that
characterises so much of the literature on the subject. After all, who could argue
against such a wholesome sounding notion as ‘democratic citizenship’? It carries
the same benign and sanitised tone characteristic of much of the language of
democracy. In consistently advocating democracy, the thesis appears to dutifully
fall in behind the ranks marching towards the democratic objective right around the
globe. Yet, it will be apparent that my idea of citizenship for deepening democracy
is a rather more challenging one than some policy makers and educators may feel
comfortable with.

I willingly acknowledge that it may be almost directly opposed to the type of
citizenship endorsed by many advocates of a civics and citizenship education in
Australia. Active, democratic citizenship may simply be regarded as too risky to
present to young Australians. In a sense, the thesis deliberately aims to stop at least
some of the heads nodding in solemn, but vaguely understood, assent about the
importance of reinvigorating Australian citizenship and civic life. Yet, at the same
time, it aims to have other heads nod with even greater and more clearly defined
agreement at the style of citizenship it presents.

This concluding Chapter has two major components. First, it seeks to summarise the
ways in which this work re-interprets the concept of an Australian civic deficit, and
what school education can do to address it. Chapter One established a Research
Question, and four subsidiary questions emerging from it. The first section of this
Chapter (9.1) answers these questions. It highlights the numerous tensions the thesis has identified and emphasised in relation to the civic deficit, and the roles Australian schools could be expected to have in addressing it.

The second section of the Chapter (9.2), considers two significant limitations of the approach I have adopted. In establishing the contexts of the project, Chapter One noted the ways in which this thesis narrows the interpretation of citizenship. A focus on democratic citizenship may be regarded as diminishing the significance of a range of other interpretations of citizenship. It argued this interpretation is justified as it most closely resembles the style of citizenship alluded to in the most influential Australian civics and citizenship education documents released in the past decade. However, it could be argued it pays insufficient regard to the increasingly diverse ways in which citizenship is defined, and places too much importance on the Australian nation-state as a focus of citizenship activity. It is this argument that is addressed in this Chapter.

Chapter One also explained that this thesis would not discuss in any detail the notion of democratic schools in Australia, which could also be regarded as a limitation. The powerful logic of education for democracy taking place in democratic institutions was acknowledged in the opening Chapter, yet it was argued that the possibility of democratic schools is problematic, and an issue that extends beyond the bounds of this project. By establishing the educational context broadly as the Australian secondary school sector, the thesis is clearly including an enormously diverse range of educational settings. For instance, it draws no distinction between the public and private sectors, nor does it address the broad range of socio-economic, geographic or cultural circumstances from which school communities emerge. It would be easy to simply contend that a widespread move to democratic schools is not going to happen in Australia, and leave matters as that point. This Chapter resists that temptation, and the second section closes with some further comments on the nature of education for democracy, and democratic schools.
9.1 The Research Question and core matters for investigation

Chapter One introduced the Research Question as:

What is the nature of Australia’s civics and citizenship deficit, and what roles can school education play in addressing it?

From this, a series of subsidiary questions was presented. Although this thesis is not structured around these questions, it is appropriate to now re-state them, and draw together the findings and evidence which provide answers to them. Each answer is most succinctly stated in a box located at the completion of the discussion pertaining to each question. The answer to the primary Research Question is embedded in the answers to each subsidiary question.

- What points of tension can be identified between alternative ways in which citizen participation is defined, practised and enhanced in contemporary Australian liberal-democracy?

As representations of the way government is conducted, the realist models of Weber and Schumpeter described in Chapter Three certainly have some appeal. They portray a type of politics in which citizens participate as mere spectators. It is certainly not democratic citizenship, as it is elite groups who practise the art of citizenship, while the people revert to the role of subjects in the manner suggested by John Ralston Saul. Viewed normatively, these models describe a situation in which civic participation is low, but also suggest this how it should be. Following the realist school, the more recent identification by Dye and Zeigler (1987) of democracy’s fundamental paradox reinforces the undesirability of extensive citizen participation. In effect, nosey, prying inquisitive citizens are a nuisance and an impediment to effective government and their active participation is to be discouraged.

I have argued that much of the current interest in civics and citizenship education in Australia at the policy level springs from a quite contradictory motivation which, on
the one hand, openly advocates and applauds greater citizen participation, but on the other, has a fundamental fear and mistrust of it. Hannam is optimistic that democratic citizenship can be advanced in schools. He cites politicians’ enthusiasm for citizenship education as a major justification for his optimism. Yet Hannam immediately adds a postscript that casts profound doubt over his optimism by noting, ‘Whether they (politicians) always say what they mean is another question!’ (2000: 25). Unlike Hannam, who does not seriously explore this matter, I have dwelt on it in some detail. As the thesis has asked on several occasions, given the culture of contemporary government, just why would government be interested in promoting greater citizen participation? This question is based on an understanding that a more substantive style of democracy that could conceivably emerge from a dedicated effort to deepen Australian democracy presents a real threat to the symbolic form of democracy currently practised.

The arguments presented in the thesis demonstrate a profound disingenuousness in the calls by government for more active participation in Australian democracy. Rather than a meaningful, maximal form of participation, I argue that policy makers envisage a citizenry well versed in the institutions and symbolic operations of Australian government. An important element of the Australian civic deficit is a detachment from this narrow, minimal form of citizen participation, one that inadequately meets the diverse needs of contemporary Australian society. In other words, the civic deficit reflects a distaste for a minimal view of citizenship, yet many policy makers merely want to replicate it, and they see civics and citizenship education as a useful tool in that process.

To divide Australia into politically literate, and politically illiterate, classes, merely reinforces the negativity and cynicism displayed towards the conduct of contemporary politics. This thesis has devoted considerable attention to styles of anti-politics practised by a disparate group of citizens variously described as anti-elitist, anti-intellectual or populist. It would be naïve not to acknowledge the ability of self-serving interests to cynically manipulate the views of those angered and alienated by the political process. It is also willingly acknowledged that many people see such anti-politics, both in Australia and elsewhere, as presenting a direct threat to democracy. However, this thesis agrees with Brett (1998) that these forms
of politics provide a warning about the way government is conducting its affairs in contemporary liberal-democracies. I argue that these forms of anti-politics represent a legitimate participatory desire by those who have felt shut out of their system of government.

In striving to take seriously a maximal, nosey style of citizenship in which all citizens are encouraged and skilled in the practice of active civic engagement, I am acutely aware of the risks involved. Specifically, there is a danger of opprobrium by association with some of the less savory views linked to counter elitist, anti-politics. In her book, *The Great Divide*, Katherine Betts (1999) describes the divisions between the intellectuals of the ‘new class’, and the uneducated parochials in Australia. The focus of her argument is the constricted debate she believes has taken place in relation to Australian immigration levels in recent decades. Betts goes to some lengths to disassociate herself from the racist or discriminatory views linked to those questioning levels of Australian immigration. On one level, that she feels the necessity to do so is a sad reflection on the state of democratic conversation in Australia. However, it is difficult to separate Betts’ broader argument from the specific issue she is most concerned about. In other words, is she most concerned about reinvigorating the state of Australian democracy by drawing attention to the exclusionary tactics of elite groups both within and outside government, or is she simply using the idea of a great cultural divide in Australia as a means of breathing new life into the immigration debate itself? The first is entirely worthy; the second is fraudulent and self-serving. Betts’ admission that ‘population growth is not in the interests of people who are already settled in Australia and intend to stay’ (1999: 20) certainly clouds the issue, yet her concluding comment is more encouraging. She disapprovingly quotes a letter to *The Australian* newspaper that reads, ‘The only way to deal with people who think like Pauline Hanson is to completely deny them a voice’. Betts calls into question the health of a democracy that would endorse such a view, and then argues,

The way to approach [‘people who think like Pauline Hanson’] is the way in which we should approach any citizen in a democracy. We should listen, debate, persuade and together arrive at sound and unprejudiced policies. (1999: 323)
The style of democratic citizenship advocated in this thesis is one that draws what Wooldridge (1998) calls, the ‘policy culture’ and the ‘community culture’ back together. It envisages citizenship as a site within which genuine conversation can take place that appeals to the broadest possible constituency across vastly different cultures. The range of topics and participants is not limited in this conversation, nor is it necessarily designed to reach an end-point or consensus in which difference and contention have no place (Higgins and Ramia 2000: 142). A democratic community permits an identification with others that is compatible with political liberty (Barber 1992: 245). It must canvass all modes of communication (O’Loughlin 2000: 62), not just the style of critical and cultural discourse practised by the policy culture, but one in to which all Australian citizens feel able and welcome to contribute. It sees schools as an important site in which that style of inclusive discourse can be practised.

‘Weak’, ‘minimal’ and ‘prissy’ are some of the terms that have been used throughout the work to describe a form of citizenship that is deemed inadequate, and will do little to address an Australian civic deficit. To restrict citizens’ role in the way these expressions imply is likely to compound the problem, and to educate in it lacks Crick’s ‘inquisitive turbulence’. An elitist conception of civics and citizenship education will merely reinforce the mistrust and cynicism many Australians feel towards their governments. To a significant degree, a disengagement from civic participation reflects a perception that Australian democracy is increasingly a symbolic affair. Democratic government is something that is practised by experts and specialists, by those who, as Weber noted, have chosen politics as their vocation. It is not something to be practised by citizens. To reinforce this notion by employing the education system as a means of producing what Pratte (1988) calls ‘doctrinaire democrats’, is to simply reaffirm, rather than address the civic deficit.

There is significant inconsistency between policy makers’ exhortations for greater citizen participation, and that implied by true democratic citizenship. This creates a tension that is characteristic of the way contemporary politics is practised, which in turn characterises the Australian civic deficit. Democratic citizenship seeks to reactivate a deeper level of civic participation than the symbolism of much prevailing practice. Calls for a deepening of democratic citizenship often induce accusations of populism or demagoguery, yet while these are sometimes justified, they do not
constitute a legitimate argument against strategies to build a more substantive democratic model in Australia. I advocate this 'maximalist' form of citizenship.

- *What are the ideological forces shaping a renewed interest in civics and citizenship education in Australia, and what implications do they hold for the implementation of this education at school levels?*

The ideological intent of the civics and citizenship education revival in Australia is generally subtle and abstruse. At one level, it is an attempt to elevate education and citizenship above the grimy political world, while on another, seeks to appropriate schools as a place of socialisation and politicisation. Keating's statement, referred to in Chapter One, that citizenship education should be no more political than Maths or Woodwork, while also seeking to reinvigorate the civics curriculum as a means of hastening an Australian republic, would be amusing if it were not so revealing.

To de-politicise civics and citizenship education is a disingenuous process, that can lead to some curious outcomes. In his efforts to discourage the undue influence of educators coming from what he calls 'the left', Kevin Donnelly (Interview 2000) effectively becomes a strong advocate for a balanced approach to the teaching of topical and contentious matters, insisting that both sides of the matter under consideration must be heard.

Australian educators interested in democratic citizenship enjoy a major advantage in that there is no national curriculum in which specific content can be mandated. The Commonwealth may allocate extensive resources to civics and citizenship education projects such as *Discovering Democracy*, but there is no obligation for teachers to use the materials. Indeed, many of the Blue and Green boxes distributed to all Australian schools in 1998 are likely to have already disappeared into musty school storerooms. Moreover, John Hirst, Sue Ferguson and Libby Tudball all confirmed to me that many of the teachers who are using *Discovering Democracy*, are doing so selectively, even subversively, taking the parts they 'like', and dispensing with those they do not. Any overt ideological intent of the program is blunted by Australians teachers' ability to ignore, modify or change the emphasis of
materials. However Tony Abbott’s desire that the program be presented in a text book that all Australian students would study, or Greg Craven’s observation that teachers would ‘slavishly follow’ (Ferguson, interview 2000) the materials presented to them, provide a useful clue that at the policy level, such teacher autonomy may seem as undesirable.

The major forces driving a revival in Australian civics and citizenship education are political, rather than educational. Although many educators, including myself, are clearly interested in promoting civics and citizenship education, this thesis took as its starting point the Report of the Civics Expert Group, a Report commissioned by an Australian Prime Minister. Some may disagree that this constitutes the real genesis of the current interest in civics, yet it is difficult to dispute that both the Keating government, and its successor, have been central participants in the Australian civics education revival. It is arguable whether Australian schools would now be introducing and promoting civics and citizenship education had the Commonwealth government not allocated significant funding to the project in 1995. Equally, it is unlikely this interest would have been maintained had the Howard government declined further funding when it was elected in 1996. If the initiative, and more significantly, the resources not been maintained at the Commonwealth level, civics and citizenship would not be attracting the attention it has received in recent years. All this points to the political imperative behind the ‘civics revival’.

That many educators, some of whom clearly have vastly differing notions of what education for democracy and citizenship might entail, then enthusiastically took this up, merely highlights the problems analysed by this thesis. In a sense, it was no surprise that the Howard government continued with the civics education initiative commenced by Prime Minister Keating. Although there were changes of emphasis, the overall objective remained largely the same. To the government and policy makers, civics and citizenship education is designed to restore citizens’ interest and knowledge of the public administration of their nation consistent with McAllister’s suspicion that such programs tend to be initiated by politicians ‘who wish to be noticed and gain esteem’ (1998). It is a celebratory device that aims to draw Australian citizens back into participation in their polity. However, that
participation is in the form of informed and engaged *spectators* of the system.

In posing Wood’s (1984) question as to whether education makes young people fit for the system, or does it help young people re-make the system to fit them, the thesis recognises a basic tension within pedagogy in general, and civics and citizenship education in particular. Although this thesis clearly advocates the second possibility raised in Wood’s question, Chapter Six recognised that this is not a view shared by all. The versions of schools as places of social reproduction presented in that Chapter cast a shadow over the notion that school education can be employed as a means of advancing democratic citizenship. If the function of schools is to perpetuate the accepted or prevailing culture, or the more ominous and overtly indoctrinatory role presented by the conflict theorists such as Bowles and Gintis, there is a danger that schools will in fact perform this functionalist role, and reproduce the sort of passive citizens Barber claims are a danger to what he calls ‘strong’ democracy. If a passive, minimal citizenry present a threat to the health of democracy, then we should be striving to produce a maximalist, active citizenry possessing the skills and attitudes needed to engage in a process in which democracy is discovered and rediscovered, remade and reorganised (Dewey 1961).

So, in advocating a maximal, inquisitive and persistent form of citizenship more consistent with a strong or deep democracy, this thesis is more attracted to the critical theorists and pedagogues discussed in Chapter Six. This appeal is based on a willingness by criticalists such as Giroux to use education as a means of developing civic courage and confronting the structural nature of society at large. The ability of critical pedagogy to identify the conflicts and contradictions within society provides a useful basis upon which to ascertain those aspects of prevailing government practice and political behaviour deemed to be unsatisfactory, even anti-democratic. In other words, before we can make the system right, we have to isolate its faults and flaws. Giroux’s reference to ‘the façade of elections and plebiscites’ is a powerful reminder that symbolic styles of democratic government have largely subsumed more substantive values of meaningful participation and civic engagement.
There are profound ideological forces driving calls for greater attention on civics and citizenship education in Australia. Much of this comes from policy makers and their selected advisers and experts who seek to promote a minimal form of citizenship that is emblematic of the civic deficit they decry. Australian educators need to recognise this, and appreciate and develop their capacities to advance democratic citizenship by providing students with learning opportunities that critically examine the nature of contemporary Australian government, highlighting its points of conflict and contradiction, and seeking, not so much to discover Australian democracy, but remake, rediscover and reconfigure it using the skills such as persistent questioning presented in Chapter Seven. I have used some of my own curriculum and pedagogical contributions to the field to demonstrate the basis upon which this may proceed.

- *What is the nature of civic knowledge, and what is the relationship between such knowledge and citizens becoming more engaged in Australian democracy in a meaningful manner?*

As noted at the start of this Chapter, in an effort to shake off the malleability of such terms as ‘citizenship’ and ‘democracy’, I have endorsed a form of citizenship some may find unsettling. Yet, ultimately, it is the only one that is consistent both with my views as an educator and an advocate of democracy. It sees democracy as a form of government where issues of public concern are open for debate and discourse. It heartily condones Wark’s style of ‘virtual republic’ that is slave to neither past habits nor master plans, but represents the potential to make things other wise, not by the impositions of experts, but through the conversation that is Australia (1997: xviii). It sees genuine democratic citizenship as a desire, and a willingness to take part in that discourse, not for reasons purely linked to a noble Athenian ideal, but rather a recognition that such participation will contribute towards the sort of society citizens want to live in.

Once again, few may argue with these sentiments. However, such agreement may come with a range of qualifications and provisions. The most obvious of these in terms of the educational component of this thesis is that citizens be adequately informed about their political system, that is, they ‘know what they are talking about’. There is strong evidence this is a major motivating factor in the revival of civics and citizenship education in Australia, particularly under the Civics
Education Group. Greg Craven, a member of that Group, reflects this view when he notes that, 'participation that is not based on knowledge is ignorance'. Chapter Seven discussed the importance the Group's Chair, John Hirst, places on restoring the level of civic knowledge within the Australian population. Despite this, and to its credit, the Curriculum Corporation was able to adhere to its determination that the materials would not contain excessive slabs of lifeless knowledge in the style of Alice Hoy's, pre-war Civics for Australian Schools (Ferguson, interview 2000).

The notion that educators can be seen as operatives slavishly following a prescription by which they address the civic deficit via increased instruction in civic knowledge displays a distorted view of what Australian teachers do, and how they see their role. It also shows a misunderstanding of the relationship between knowledge and participation. Of course, the education system provides an obvious recruit in the process of addressing the civic deficit. It is easy for policy makers to imagine classes throughout the nation busily acquiring a stock of civic knowledge in an instrumental process akin to Abbott's vision of students methodically working their way through a civics and citizenship education textbook.

For Craven, Abbott, Hirst et al to be confronted with views such as those of Ferguson may have disturbed their notion of what civics and citizenship education should be. To be told by the pedagogical experts that under a traditional 'textbook' approach 'the kids won't learn' (Ferguson, interview 2000), may have been somewhat unsettling for those so deeply immersed in what Colebatch describes as the 'institutional myths' of Australian government. For those inside the 'belt-way' of Canberra politics, participation in civic matters is scarcely conceivable without a detailed understanding of Australia's constitutional and administrative arrangements. Yet as Chapter Five demonstrates, the link between civic knowledge and participation is extremely dubious. That Chapter casts doubt over the simplistic assertion that greater civic knowledge, narrowly defined as the ability to score well in a test of political general knowledge, will lead to greater citizen participation, or greater citizen efficacy. Furthermore, by considering the nature of civic knowledge deemed necessary for active citizenship, it suggests that much of the type of knowledge assumed to be vitally important for effective Australian citizenship by people such as Abbott or Craven may not in fact be crucial, while suggesting that
the civic deficit may be more closely associated with what Australians know about their political system, than what they do not.

As an educator, it may seem curious that I am prepared to question the level and style of knowledge Australians citizens should be acquainted with. Surely, in relation to civic knowledge, 'enough is never enough'? Surely, Craven is correct that participation without civic knowledge is simply ignorance? As noted earlier, I am well aware of many Australians' poorly developed understanding of the subtleties of the Westminster, or 'Washminster' system of government. Indeed, I have spent the best part of the past quarter of a century educating Australians about that very system. However, it is too easy for educators to be lulled into an elitist position that accepts the view that schools have a responsibility to produce citizens who conform to a model most likely to serve the interests of privileged sections of society. In Chapter Eight it was shown how the Australian Republican Movement (ARM) saw it as the role of teachers to educate for the republic, and more particularly the minimalist style of republic advocated by elite groups within the Australian population.

The argument that citizens need to have an adequate civic knowledge before they can be considered 'safe for democracy' is both elitist and anti-democratic. It is a view that effectively adds to the alienation of sections of the Australian political community, dividing the population into the politically literate and illiterate by adopting very narrow definitions of civic knowledge and understanding. It is extremely problematic as to what constitutes an adequate level of civic knowledge, and the relationship between such knowledge and greater citizen participation is dubious at best. Rather than placing undue attention on acquisition of 'hard' civic knowledge, democratic citizenship can be advanced by the promotion of civic skills and values so that citizens' participation will be regarded both as sought after by policy makers, and of efficacy by citizens themselves. Greater civic knowledge will follow in the path of greater civic participation performed by maximal democratic citizens.
- Does Australia's civic deficit have its origins in the education system, or the culture and practice of the political system at large, and what can schools do to promote a deeper sense of democratic citizenship in young Australians?

This thesis argues that the relationship between the Australian civic deficit and the education system is distorted and poorly conceived. The civic deficit is something that extends far beyond the education system. It is the outcome of a range of factors that have caused many citizens to turn their gaze away from their nation's public administration. The origin of the deficit cannot simply be located in a lack of civic instruction, and so the solution to the problem is not simply a re-activated program in civic instruction.

It is too convenient to shift the responsibility for an Australian civic deficit onto schools. This comment should not be simply construed as a teacher's defensive plea of, 'It's not our fault'. Rather, it seeks to place the responsibility where it rightly belongs. Australia's civic deficit is a far more complex matter than one that can be attributed to a lack of civic information administered to Australian school students. There are more profound explanations for a lack of civic engagement in Australia than simply an inability to recall civic facts and figures.

To disguise these deeper attitudinal problems within the civic deficit is to miss a crucial point, one that highlights a further paradox in relation to the contemporary interest in democratic forms of government. At a time when democracy as a political principle reaches its height of popularity, democracy as a basis for administration may be becoming less feasible and attractive to governments. Just as democracy enjoys its high point in world history, and governments are increasingly obliged to recite its grand rhetoric, so government in many Western liberal states has been reinvented. The art of government is increasingly regarded as a process of rational and strategic planning which is incompatible to what occurs in a strong or deep democracy. Democracy implies a style of discursiveness and deliberation largely antithetical to efficient management. The pressure to endorse the messiness of democracy, while at the same time striving to reinvent modern government to meet new standards of efficiency, accountability and flexibility presents a
considerable dilemma. So in a sense, contemporary government is trapped by its own rhetoric and is compelled to play a shoddy hoax on its citizens.

In 2000, the MHR for Fremantle, Carmen Lawrence, released a set of recommendations for improving the operation of the Commonwealth parliament that reflect this element of discursiveness. For instance, Lawrence suggests that community and expert representatives be invited to address parliament when it is in session, and engage in debate with members of parliament on particular issues (Lawrence 2000). Such a proposal clearly has merit for those interested in making parliament a more relevant and democratic institution, yet, how 'practical' is it? It contains an element of messiness and lack of order unlikely to gain much support from supporters of the existing Westminster model. Rather than being told that in Australia, politicians, rather than citizens rule as Hirst (1998: 1) does, Lawrence's proposals reflect the element of persistence and inquisitiveness implied by democratic citizenship.

Education for minimal citizenship can be regarded as a process of 'letting citizens down easily' whereby attention is focussed on a grand democratic narrative safely viewed through the veil of history, a strategy designed to restore spectator interest in the sport of symbolic democratic government. It reinforces the notion that under existing arrangements there is the government, and there is the governed. However as established in Chapter Seven, education for democracy can be viewed in an entirely different light. Rather than a program designed to bolster prevailing arrangements in which only the elected practise the arts of citizenship, it can be employed as a means of not merely 'discovering' democracy, but appraising its performance and achievements in the style of the true democratic citizenship this thesis advocates.

*Discovering Democracy*, the major Australian national civics education program goes some of the way towards educating in democracy. In important ways it does allow young Australians to uncover a deeper form of democracy. However, ultimately it falls well short of what is required because it remains under the control of a group of policy makers with a narrow view of what citizenship involves.
Such a view sees Australian citizenship through the safe veil of history. Civic involvement is modelled in the democratic traditions and struggles of the past, and it is the role of contemporary citizens to understand and maintain that tradition. However, this view takes insufficient account of the paradox of modern democracy identified by Anthony Giddens. Just as the democratic struggle intensifies around the world, so the citizens in many of the older democracies such as Australia are profoundly disillusioned by the state of their public administration. As Giddens points out, an important aspect of this ill-feeling is contemporary citizens’ ability to know just how much they don’t know. This is not ignorance of say, the achievements of the Chartist movement, or the events lying behind Australian federation, but a growing awareness of the gulf that exists between the government and the governed. Modern media techniques and the empowering effects of technology allow citizens to recognise how disempowered they are. So in advocating education for democratic citizenship, this thesis argues that educators need to confront what it is that citizens find unsavoury about the practice of contemporary government, and develop methods of changing it. This cannot be achieved by adopting the largely celebratory approach favoured by *Discovering Democracy*. The use of history as a learning strategy can be extremely valuable as it can demonstrate how society has arrived at its present condition. However, the timeline of Australian democracy continues. More entries wait to be added, and an historical account can effectively show how democracy is not a static idea, but one that is in a constant state of moving forwards or backwards.

An Australian civic deficit is not simply a reflection of inadequate formal instruction by Australian schools. Such a view is based on the dubious claim that increased education in the history and institutional structures of Australian government will necessarily lead to greater citizen engagement. Yet this is not an argument against more attention being given to civics and citizenship education in Australia. Part B of the thesis has demonstrated that in fact, schools have a vital role to play in addressing the Australian civic deficit. However, such education needs to adopt a more critical and persistent approach by scrutinising the nature and practice of Australian politics and government and showing that the health of democracy demands nosy and inquisitive citizens.
I have argued that despite their apparent pessimism, realist theories of democracy left the door ajar for education. By portraying citizens as being too gullible and ill-informed to be trusted with a leading role in democracy, the realist theorists clearly allow the possibility that citizens could be otherwise. In other words, instead of citizens being manipulated by the distorted claims of political operatives, they are capable of exercising reasoned judgement and discretion. The concept of education for democratic citizenship proceeds on the basis of that possibility. It recognises that citizens are often disillusioned and disengaged from their democracy. However, rather than adopting a conventional position that says these undesirable civic traits can be effectively ‘educated away’, and people can be made ‘safe’ for democracy, democracy can only be deepened if it is seen to take on more of the authenticity Dryzek (1996) refers to. Taking their democratic role more seriously has to involve more than citizens simply having an ability to recall information. They have to feel that their participation will make a difference.

9.2 Limitations of democratic citizenship

By taking as its starting point the civic deficit as identified by the Civic Expert Group, this thesis has concentrated on the nature of Australian civic engagement and what schools may do to strengthen civic participation. It has narrowed and deepened the interpretation of citizenship to the notion of ‘democratic citizenship’ in a way some may see as overly restrictive. However, as Chapter One made clear, this interpretation holds more in common with the way the civic deficit was defined by the Civics Expert Group than many of the uses civics and citizenship education has been put to under its revived banner. This thesis has endeavoured to take seriously a desire to re-engage a broader sweep of Australian society in deeper and more active participation in their polity, not the more diverse concept of ‘community’. To that end, the thesis reflects a strongly political bent.

Despite this advocacy of ‘deepening democracy’, I recognise some limitations of my view of citizenship. Two of these will be considered, one broadly reflecting Part A, and one Part B of the thesis. The first is that democratic citizenship, as it is defined here, is too influenced by modernism. As a result, it pays inadequate regard to more contemporary views of citizenship in which the political system of the nation-state assumes diminished importance and the style of political engagement implied by ‘democratic citizenship’ is of reduced relevance.
Secondly, the suggestion that this thesis pays insufficient regard to the importance of democratic practice in schools is considered. The argument that education for democracy should take place in democratic schools was raised in Chapter One, and some additional comments addressing this argument are certainly justified.

**Democratic citizenship and postmodernism**

A major charge that may be levelled at democratic citizenship is that it takes insufficient account of the influence of postmodernist thought on the way citizenship is viewed in contemporary life. The democratic citizen has been portrayed as one who is an active participant in the affairs of their nation-state. This citizen agrees with Kane (2000) that for the foreseeable future, national government will remain a significant focus of citizenship. It lends support to the view that citizenship requires some sense of belonging to a political community which is not manifest in an empty cosmopolitanism. Democratic citizens are concerned with a greater sense of responsibility than that implied by a global citizen who, by being everywhere, is nowhere at all (Beilharz 2000: 42). However, a portrayal of citizenship as an inherently political process linked to the nation-state may be regarded as too narrow and nostalgic. It could be argued that this view of democratic citizenship is too dependent on modernist, progressive ideals of both democracy and education, and the notion that the school could be used as a means of reactivating Australian democracy in the way proposed here is increasingly unlikely to be successful. In other words, that a modernist view of citizenship will not make much sense in a postmodernist world in which what Laidi calls, ‘the cult of progress’ has been rendered increasingly meaningless (1998: 2).

Although Chapter Two declared that this thesis is not a piece of postmodernist analysis, frequent references are made throughout the work to the increasingly diverse ways citizenship is seen, many of which (for instance, the ‘global citizen’, or the ‘consumer citizen’) are influenced by postmodernist thinking. So, the impact of postmodernism cannot be lightly dismissed, and nor would a sensitivity to democratic diversity wish it to be lightly dismissed.
However, some postmodernist influences have the potential to severely undermine the competence of the democratic citizen. Hindess argues (see Chapter Five) there are serious limitations on the significance of Australian citizens in relation to their capacity, via national government, to shape the sort of society they live in. In such circumstances, one is tempted to conclude that the idea of the maximal, inquisitive form of citizenship advocated here is an archaic illusion. In these circumstances, the answer to the educational component of this thesis, (‘What Can Schools Do?’) must necessarily be, ‘Not Much’. The idea of reconnecting Australian citizens with their national polity is a redundant idea, and schools would better serve their students by educating in aspects considered to be more relevant and applicable to contemporary society. In this case, schools should equip young Australians with the attributes of Gibbins and Reimer’s expressivists of the New Class discussed in Chapter Three.

While this thesis does not argue against postmodernism per se, it does contend that, by taking as its point of provocation the Australian civic deficit, it is, in a sense, committed to modernist notions of education for democracy and citizenship. In this way it falls in behind an extensive body of contemporary Australian literature in the field that largely acknowledges the concept of a civic deficit, and that schools should be more active in their efforts to address it. As we have seen, while enormous differences emerge as to how policy makers and educators may envisage that education, a review of contemporary Australian writing on citizenship education reveals little support for the idea that Australian citizenship is now so devoid of meaning that schools should abandon any efforts to educate in, or for it. In fact, like this thesis, most endorse a need to reconfigure our understanding of citizenship, and re-new our educative efforts.

Some of these recommended reconfigurations are clearly influenced by postmodernist thinking. Many call for greater emphasis on differentiated, differential, pluralist or multiple citizenship, and less on an immutable Australian civic identity. This thesis does not argue in opposition to these proposals for to do so would constitute an unreasonable denial of the changing state of Australian society and its increasingly diverse composition.
However, the notion of a 'community of communities' is based on more than passive inclusion. Democratic citizenship is a site that encourages what Stokes (2000) calls a 'discourse ethic', in which citizens debate and deliberate on issues that affect their society. As Mouffe argues, it is not a community organised around a substantive idea of the common good, but 'a form of association that can be enjoyed among relative strangers belonging to many purposive associations' (1993: 67). Ultimately, this thesis advocates just one fairly unremarkable value: the style of citizenship that will sustain and strengthen Australian democracy. It does not conceive of citizenship education as a means of celebrating Australia the nation. It offers no normative or prescriptive view on neo-liberal Third Way social policy; on globalisation or nationalism; on an Australian republic, or on environmentalism. Such matters are for deliberation by democratic citizens. The role of Australian schools in enhancing democratic citizenship is to prepare young Australians with the confidence to assume a role as participants in the construction of this value. That is why the concepts of persistent questioning, and an ability to shape defensible stances are important, and form reciprocal components of such preparation.

Democratic citizenship and democratic schools

In establishing the contexts of the research, Chapter One explained that the democratic school is not given significant attention here. Those introductory comments hint that this may be construed as a major limitation of the research. Interestingly, the more recent instalments of the Discovering Democracy Program appear to more strongly acknowledge the relationship between democratic theory and school organisation. A Case Study entitled, 'How is our school ruled?' invites students to research the administration and government of their own school (Discovering Democracy 2000: 169) although in no way could it be seen as an endorsement of greater school democracy or student government. Indeed, the fact that a significant component of the 2000 materials are in the form of Assessment Resources (Discovering Democracy 2000c italics added) is illuminating of the overall nature of the program. Australians students will be now tested on the democracy they have discovered, and their discoveries will be graded from
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'Sophisticated', to 'Inadequate'. This obsession with measuring anything that moves in the classroom (Apple and Beane 1999: 120) reflects the very essence of the privatised, weak form of democracy this thesis argues against (1999: 120).

More pointedly, a secondary school principal informed a major forum on the implementation of *Discovering Democracy* at the end of 1999 that 'often we are pursuing a democratic ideal within systemic models that are not themselves democratic' (*Discovering Democracy* 1999: 25). This comment is indicative of the significant body of opinion that sees a strong parallelism between democracy in a national polity, and democracy within schools. Many educators and pedagogical theorists emphasise the importance of democratic practice in schools themselves (see for instance, Apple and Beane 1999; Pearl and Knight 1999).

So the matter can be posed with brutal frankness: How can undemocratic organisations credibly preach a democratic message? Although this thesis has primarily been concerned with improving the state of Australian democratic citizenship, rather than making schools more democratic, the force of the argument in favour of democratic school is willingly acknowledged. Despite this, I have not pursued the matter in any serious way, and the reasons for this warrant some brief clarification.

Starting with the most obvious, the widespread introduction of democratic schools is simply unlikely to become a reality in Australia in the foreseeable future. The principal who pointed to the inherently contradictory nature of teaching democracy in undemocratic institutions confessed, somewhat apologetically, to being an 'idealist' (*Discovering Democracy* 1999: 25). Staunch advocates of democratic schools, Pearl and Knight, acknowledge the difficulties in establishing democratic schools in practice, ultimately suggesting that it is likely democratic education will develop in a single classroom and 'hopefully spread from there' (1999: 307). Torney notes that 'perhaps a hierarchical organisation such as the school is not the right setting for inculcating democratic values' (1975: 21). Such evidence abounds, and it is rather pointless dwelling on it. It is more important to recall the argument presented in Chapter Six, that is, that the idea of democratic schools is far removed from what many see the school as being designed to achieve. This thesis argues that
the revival in civics and citizenship education at the public policy level is primarily designed to bolster prevailing political cultures rather than cause any fundamental re-assessment of it.

Second, and far more significantly, this thesis argues that Australia’s civic deficit is directly related to the state of contemporary Australian government. It is a symptom of the broader national polity, not simply due to deficiencies in civic knowledge. The civic deficit runs far deeper than uninformed citizens. Now of course, advocates of the democratic school will argue that modelling genuine participatory decision making at the school level, will in turn lead to a deepening of democratic citizenship in the broader community as young people take the values of democracy into the adult world. Ideally, that certainly could be the case. However it is argued here that this invests too much in the pedagogy of hope, and avoids the main issue. A critical examination of the existing practice of Australian democracy needs to be undertaken. The idealism created by the practices of a democratic school will be quickly soured by the conduct of government in a weak, privatised form of Australian democracy.

To re-iterate the main thrust of my answer to the primary and subsidiary Research Questions, the role of schools is to advance the critical analysis of Australian democracy, rather than avoid recognition of its shortcomings in the spirit of celebratory triumphalism. Despite some relatively minor concessions, Discovering Democracy is not prepared to adopt this strategy largely because is it the creation of policy-makers who are themselves part of the prevailing political culture. I advocate, and show in my own contributions to curricula and pedagogy, this more educationally authentic and vivid approach.

**Conclusion**

Typically, an education thesis which finds fault with aspects of current policy and practice, and advocates a ‘better way’, will talk of the challenges facing educators. This work certainly adheres to this pattern. The challenges presented here are considerable. My ‘maximalist’ approach recommends Australian educators engage
young Australians in consideration of the meaning of their democratic government. I have argued that the Australian civic deficit is the product of a political culture that provides inadequate opportunities for citizens to participate in their democracy, and that the education system can play a vital role in addressing that. However, this will not be achieved by merely celebrating the Australian democratic achievement. Throughout this thesis, I have referred to the way in which the rhetoric of democracy can get heads nodding in unison. In addressing a *Discovering Democracy* forum in 1999, the Honourable Trish Worth (MHR), the Parliamentary Secretary for the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, quoted Dewey’s rather clumsy metaphor that ‘democracy has to reborn anew in every generation, and education is the midwife’ (*Discovering Democracy* 1999: 7). My interpretation of that wholesome-sounding comment is that the birth can produce either a strong, vigorous infant, or a weak and sickly one. The Australian civic deficit is emblematic of the latter, and as midwife, education must try to ensure democracy is reborn in a way that more truly reflects its underlying principles of civic participation based on maximal, activist and inquisitive citizenship.

It could be argued that such a view is likely to entrench the disenchantment and alienation many Australians feel towards their political system, and that instead, educators should be enthusing young Australians about the possibilities Australian democracy, in its current form, offers for citizen participation and engagement. However, to do so runs the risk of perpetuating a type of civic ruse that on one hand, advocates more active participation, but on the other, really aims to reproduce an informed spectator, rather than a real citizen. As Pearl and Knight argue, a lack of knowledge coupled with growing disrespect for political institutions, are the logical consequences of an education that not only does not prepare for democratic citizenship, but works in ways that discourages interest in either democracy, or participation in politics (1999: 86). As Mellor’s work mentioned in Chapter Five ably demonstrates, by the time they reach Year 11, many Australian students typically harbour some extremely negative feelings towards government and politics. For this reason, education must be prepared to address the source of this negativity, rather than believe it can ‘educate it away’ in a program celebrating a political system from which many young Australians (and their parents) clearly feel far removed. Schools can become crucial in furthering a more contractivist
style of citizenship by helping young people question and challenge the nature and future of weak, privatised democracy (Sehr 1997: 171). Educators who find this concept attractive will consequently need to re-conceptualise and reconfigure much contemporary policy and practice in civics and citizenship education. By regarding a deficit of Australian civic knowledge, understanding and engagement as something that cannot simply be sheeted home to inadequacies in the education system, educators need to be prepared to more closely examine the ways in which schools can be used either to re-produce prevailing political, social, economic and cultural practices, or act as agents of change, emancipation and transformation.

The civic deficit is symptomatic of a legitimacy crisis located within the Australian political system, and government at large. That deficit is a manifestation of a style of public administration in which the gap between the government and the governed has become too great. If citizen participation and civic understanding diminishes in circumstances in which citizen efficacy is seen to be low, then any meaningful attempt to reduce the civic deficit must confront the reasons large numbers of citizens are alienated from their political system. However, this necessitates a critical examination of the nature and practice of government and politics itself. In turn, this prompts the immediate question of how likely it is that the governments will be keen to subject themselves to critical inquiry by young Australians. The opening Chapter drew attention to Keating’s observation that the civic deficit was the fault of the education system, and more broadly, ‘the modern condition’. He was less eager to nominate the political system itself as a key component of the problem. Former Minister, and now lowly backbencher, Andrew Thomson (2000) was closer to the mark in his comment that if Australians believe that the existing system is bad, and the people in it are not trustworthy and deserve no respect at all, then let’s figure out how to make this thing a little better - it can’t just keep getting worse. This thesis has shown how schools can play a vital role in making this happen.
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