Hugh Stretton Oration
18 February 2021

THE UNIVERSITY of ADELAIDE

On Life's Lottery

Glyn Davis

Let me begin, as is owed, by joining our hosts to acknowledge the Kaurna people, the traditional custodians on these ancestral lands.

This campus, and the parklands which embrace it, were the Kaurna Dreaming, an open grassy plain of red kangaroos, of ceremony through generations. The Kaurna share a complex culture in which authority derives from knowledge, from lessons which begin in childhood and deepen through life.[1]

This is country never ceded but lost to the Kaurna when the new colony of South Australia was founded in December 1836. Together we pay respect to those elders, past and present, who nurtured their tradition despite displacement, and acknowledge the young Kaurna leaders who now rise to take their place.

Let me recognise too the commitment of the University of Adelaide, which encourages South Australian Indigenous school students to consider tertiary study, supports them on campus through Wirltu Yarlu, and works to recruit, train and employ Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander researchers.

Reconciliation is a slow process. It can never address every historic injustice, only strive toward a better, fairer future. The essential spirit of reconciliation is alive in this place.

Finally in opening, it is with sadness I speak with you remotely. There are friends and colleagues in the audience I dearly looked forward to seeing again in Adelaide. Covid-19 delayed this Oration for nearly a year until finally rescheduled for this day. And it all looked so promising until late last week when a new cluster of Covid cases in Melbourne saw the South Australian government close the border with Victoria.

I appreciate your patience with an imperfect medium and can only hope the second Hugh Stretton Orator - and all who follow - will speak in happier times.

But at least Hugh Stretton knew he was a lucky man – someone born well in the lottery of life.

He came into a thoughtful family with a strong record of public service. He was educated at fine private schools and excelled in his arts and legal studies at the University of Melbourne. When war intervened Stretton served in the navy for three years without suffering injury, and then won a Rhodes Scholarship before completing his undergraduate qualifications.

The golden thread continued at Oxford – a student so clever he was awarded a college fellowship before taking his final exams, a scholar so magnetic he was offered the Chair of

[1] A description of learning, structured around ever greater revelation of moiety knowledge derived from Margo Neale and Lynne Kelly, 2020, *Songlines: the power and promise*, Thames & Hudson, Melbourne.

History at the University of Adelaide before he turned 30, though he had neither a doctorate nor a book to his name.

Hugh Stretton returned to Australia the youngest professor in the nation, took on a role he enjoyed, developed new interests in city planning, and became a valued adviser to governments and oppositions. Within two decades Stretton was presenting the Boyer Lectures. In Peter Beilharz's assessment, Stretton was now 'widely recognised as Australia's leading democratic thinker.'[2]

When in 1968 the administrative burden of being Chair of the Department of History became too much, Stretton simply demoted himself to Reader so he could focus on teaching and writing. He donated all the royalties from his most successful book, *Ideas for Australian Cities*, to the Brotherhood of St Laurence to support its charitable work. At the Brotherhood he began a friendship with future Science Minister Barry Jones that would endure for decades. A collection of their correspondence is now held by the National Library of Australia.

Yet, says Graeme Davison in his perceptive introduction to Stretton's *Selected Writings*, throughout a long and active public life Hugh Stretton remained modest, self-deprecating and generous 'almost to a fault.'[3]

We each respond to luck in ways that reveal our underlying character. Good fortune invited Hugh Stretton to reflect on his values. Since education opened up opportunities for him, Stretton wanted others to enjoy the same privilege. He advocated urban planning that avoided sharp class barriers, and public spaces which encouraged people to mix, as he mixed with men from very different backgrounds during his time below decks in the navy.

A tenured academic, Stretton wanted more jobs with security so Australians could build lives not blighted by capricious economic disruption. A practical man, he did not seek to remake cities – or societies – with a wave of the hand, but rather to build on what already worked well. It is wonderful there are members of the Stretton family, and many of his friends, in the audience tonight.

Hugh Stretton preferred pragmatism over ideology, experiment over economic orthodoxy. He valued culture with emphasised solidarity in a political system which 'encourages individual difference and non-conformity.' This eminent public thinker refused to be typecast, variously describing himself as a 'moderate socialist' or a 'radical conservative.'

The University of Adelaide was far-sighted in recruiting young Hugh Stretton in 1954, as it is wise now to establish an Institute in his name.

The Stretton Institute will bring an abiding interest in people to a new generation of public challenges. The choice of Professor Adam Graycar as Inaugural Director ensures leadership in Stretton's mould – a fine scholar with a strong record advocating and implementing policy to make life better for citizens.

Like Hugh Stretton, this Institute will become an influential voice. In interests and range the Institute will, I am confident, touch on the question which always shadows good fortune:

---

[2] Peter Beilharz 'Hugh Stretton – Social Democracy in Australia', *Thinking the Antipodes: Australian Essays,* Monash University Press, 2014.

[3] This description of Hugh Stretton is indebted to Graeme Davison, 'Introduction' in his edited *Hugh Stretton: selected writings*, La Trobe University Press 2018.

when life is generous to me, what is my responsibility toward those for whom fate is not so kind?

For birth is the great gamble. We take a ticket and are born into bodies, families, health and societies we do not choose. A random roll of the dice can shape an entire life – into love and security, as Hugh Stretton experienced, or into hardship and poverty.

The role of chance continues through life. We find the right partner, write the book that captures the public imagination, win an unexpected election, and everything follows a new and exciting direction.

Or a ship load of new settlers arrive to seize country from the traditional custodians. An obscure corona virus mutates and prosperity ends suddenly. Life can be nonlinear and our fates arbitrary.

This inescapable lottery imposes a moral challenge. Our starting points are inherently unequal. Some enjoy privilege while others struggle. Birth is always a lottery – must life be one also?

It is hardly an original question. Making sense of chance in life has been a preoccupation of religion and philosophy for millennia.

Some creeds call for calm acceptance of unfairness as we await rebalancing of the scales in an afterlife. Inequality can seem sad but unavoidable – 'there will always be poor people in the land' says Deuteronomy (15:10-11), before exalting the faithful to be generous toward the needy.

The unfairness of birth can also inspire acts of grace and charity, a fierce belief in caring for the less fortunate.

My focus today is the uncomfortable dilemma poverty poses for every liberal democratic society. What do we owe our fellow citizens who suffer deprivation? We expect government to address economic distress, but we, the voters, also put firm boundaries around our generosity. Much is left to charity, or seen as essentially a private concern, outside political discussion.

Let's explore the choices we make collectively about poverty in our midst – not because I know the answers but because, as Hugh Stretton taught us, there some questions always worth asking.

Millions of Australians accept a responsibility to help those facing difficulty. Some 80 per cent of adult Australians make charitable donations each year, and millions invest time helping charities and voluntary organisations.

Charities appeared early after European settlement in Australia, long before democratic governments or public welfare programs. The Benevolent Society began in 1813 to help distressed families, the elderly and people facing a disability. Eliza Darling launched the Female Friendly Society in 1826. The nation's first foundation was founded here in Adelaide in 1886, to assist South Australians experiencing hardship.

Yet charity was always going to struggle on its own. It can never command the resources required to deal with entrenched disadvantage.

We have a fond image of Australia as the land of the fair go, the place where hard work, determination and talent allow people to find their way in the world. And so it proves for many.

Yet the scale of disadvantage in our community remains confronting. The most recent available data says 3.24 million Australians live below the poverty line. This represents more than 13 per cent of the population, including three quarters of a million children.

Australian levels of poverty are slightly above OECD averages, and have changed little over the past decade. The cost of housing, declining incomes and modest benefit payments are key drivers.

Single parents, recent migrants and refuges, Australians living alone or outside a major urban area, people emerging from the criminal justice system, those with less education qualifications, and people on social security benefits such as the elderly are particularly at risk.

Disability has been a persistent marker of disadvantage, linked to limited employment, housing and transport options.

Above all, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians face poverty levels almost double that experienced by other Australians.

It is nearly two centuries since the Kaurna people were displaced from Adelaide, yet across this nation the descendants of the first Australians remain those most likely to experience economic hardship – a compelling reminder that poverty is often intergenerational, a cycle that proves difficult to escape.

To express disadvantage through numbers conveys nothing of the lived reality. A static picture provides little feel for patterns.

So let's start from a different point: if you are born into one of the poorest households in Australia, what are your chances of breaking out, of achieving a more prosperous life as adults? Can we predict likely outcomes for young children born into poverty?

Sadly we can. A detailed 2020 study by the Melbourne Institute confirms that most children born into extreme economic disadvantage struggle to prosper in adulthood.

On average, the more years a child spends in poverty, the worse their likely socio-economic outcomes. A child from an impoverished background is five times – *five times* - more likely to suffer adult poverty.

We are proud of Australia as a meritocratic society, a place where talent and ambition can thrive. Yet this fond image hides an underlying truth: entrenched poverty is handed down from parent to child. Poverty begets poverty.

For the most disadvantaged in our society, social mobility is highly constrained. Examples of rags to riches are the exception, all the more remarkable for their rarity. For more than one in ten Australians a lifetime of economic struggle beckons.

It is easy to look away, to accept the world as we find it. Yet how we respond to misfortune in our midst says everything about us.

This line of reasoning is captured with particular clarity by ethicist Peter Singer. He speaks of an obligation to assist. If we encounter a child drowning in a pond, says Singer, we

should put aside concern for our clothes and swim to the rescue, because the harm we can avert is so much more important than the cost to ourselves.

Peter Singer expresses this as a simple principle: 'If it is in our power to prevent something very bad happening, without thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it.'

The caveat about 'comparable moral importance' is important.

Our obligation to others is not an absolute moral imperative but a judgement about consequences. If responding requires us to be unjust to others, or to accept an unreasonable burden, then the calculation shifts. But if the cost is small in comparison to the difference we can make, our responsibility is clear.

Singer believes the requirement to assist applies 'not just to rare situations in which one can save a child' but to helping those who live in extreme poverty. If an affluent society can help, it should.

This turns a philosophical point into an issue of public policy.

We can tell the Australian story of addressing poverty in different ways. One narrative would stress a record of innovation in caring for others. The Commonwealth of Australia, created in 1901, acted quickly to introduce a basic living wage and social security. National senior and invalid pensions began in 1909. An arbitration system ensured workers could support a family. Unemployment benefits followed, along with pensions for veterans, support for mothers and children. In time we acquired workers compensations schemes, Medicare and the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

Yet the Australian settlement never pursued a radical redistribution of wealth. So an alternative reading would stress that social benefit payments remain modest. The Henderson poverty line, first published in August 1975, made evident that even with child endowment and other benefits some Australian families could not achieve a reasonable standard of living.

Of course, Australians have never demanded their governments solve the challenge of disadvantage. Almost every election is a referendum on how much tax we are willing to pay, and the answer is usually the same. We seek a trade-off between helping others and limiting demands on ourselves. Our electoral decisions limit the scope open to any government.

This means we expect much from charity in mitigating life's lottery.

Individual Australians donate more than $12.5 billion to support everything from child protection and emergency relief to programs for refugees. Business contributes a further $17.5 billion annually in charitable donations.

We support some 56,000 registered not-for-profit organisations across the nation, employing more than 1.3 million Australians part and full-time.

Yet, apparently impressive figures can mislead. Overall, charitable income remains small compared to government. Combined state and federal spending on education, health and welfare dwarf the resources available to charities. Government remains the most significant player in addressing disadvantage. The charitable sector sits around the edges of public investment, often in those spaces where government is absent.

‘Charity’, British Prime Minister Clement Attlee reputedly said, ‘is a cold grey loveless thing. If a rich man wants to help the poor, he should pay his taxes gladly, not dole out money at a whim.’

Attlee believed that public policy, funded by appropriate levels of taxation, is the most effective way to address disadvantage. Only government, Attlee argued, can address causes and not just symptoms of social problems.

This was never the Australian path. The welfare state Attlee championed in Britain was not contemplated in this nation. Government never acquired the scale, nor the taxation, to transform society through public provision in the way Attlee proposed.

Which leaves something of a dilemma – if charity is too small, and government too limited, can anything change the equation for those who draw a blank in the lottery of life?

How *do* we meet an obligation to assist if charities lack the money, and governments lack the appropriate design, local engagement and commitment to provide viable pathways from disadvantage?

Yet there are some reasons for quiet optimism. Promising projects can redraw the separation between government and charity. What happens if communities and government agencies, charities and foundations combine their intelligence and resources around an agreed goal?

Two examples show such collaboration in practice: one helping children prepare for and succeed in school; the other keeping young people out of jail.

In each case the collaboration addresses a cycle of disadvantage, a trap that leaves people otherwise unable to escape the cumulative effects of poverty. Each offers an ‘off-ramp’, to use the expression proposed by Dr Jeni Whalan at the Paul Ramsay Foundation.

An off-ramp is a way to help people step outside endless repetition and setback. A cycle of disadvantage has many on-ramps that push people into difficulty and keep them struggling. The challenge is to find off-ramps that help people escape.

Since many factors push people into a cycle of disadvantage, many different off-ramps are required.

For governments the task can be daunting. Public agencies must deploy standardised approaches and treat everyone equally, though every disadvantaged person lives with different personal circumstances.

Charities know more about possible off-ramps, but they rarely command enough money or people to tailor programs appropriate for each individual and family.

But … put the two approaches together and new possibilities open. In an ideal setting, pre-school and education support, health services and transition to work programs, whether provided by government or charity, would be linked so a child at risk has consistent encouragement and support all the way through to adult life.

Such an integrated service would be based locally so individual needs and aspirations are heard. It would ensure continuity of friendly faces and understanding through the journey.

This is the approach adopted by Our Place, a Victorian initiative which began at Doveton College in 2012 and now extends to ten sites across the state. Using a local primary school

as the hub, Our Place coordinates service delivery for children and their families in disadvantaged communities. It has inspired relevant government departments to pool their expertise, and foundations to make long term funding commitments.

Our Place believes that 'education is the key to transforming the life chances of children and creating the conditions for families and communities to flourish.'

One Our Place facility involves a partnership between the Carlton Primary School, the City of Melbourne, and the Carlton housing estate. The school sits adjacent to public housing, a pocket of disadvantage in an otherwise affluent suburb. Only two per cent of students at the school come from English speaking backgrounds.

This is a linguistically and culturally diverse gathering of migrants and refugees in one community, sharing ageing buildings which were locked down – with the residents inside – during COVID-19.

Investment by the state government includes a former school building refurbished to provide education facilities and funding for an early learning service, community spaces, health consulting rooms, and a mother and childcare service. Gowrie Victoria operates the early learning centre, while the YMCA offers after school activities, all linked by a dedicated community facilitator.

The Our Place model argues that programs should focus not just on children but also on their families. Attention is paid to adult education, recognising that getting unemployed parents into work brings broader benefits for their children. Our Place calls this 'reshaping the service system' to provide wrap-around support.

A second example of collaboration addresses a very different cycle of disadvantage.

There are 77,000 Australian children with parents currently in prison. Too many are from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families, the most incarcerated peoples in the world. Indeed, a 2017 report by PWC Indigenous Consulting found that 'an estimated 20 per cent of Indigenous children have at least one parent in prison at any time' – one in five, a profoundly shocking statistic.

Children with incarcerated parents are among those Australians most likely to suffer financial hardship and developmental challenges. Most people in jail have led disadvantaged lives, and this affects their children too. Entrenched poverty can mean poor health and wellbeing, incomplete high school education and, in time, a risk that children follow their parents into the cycle of disadvantage.

Here is intergenerational transmission of disadvantage at its most stark. A *majority* of Australians in custody are the child of a parent jailed in the past.

And of all young people now in jail, 53 percent identify as Aborigine or Torres Strait Islander. That is an incarceration rate 21 times higher than experienced by non-Indigenous young people.[4]

[4] Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, *Youth detention population in Australia 2019*, Bulletin 148 February 2020, accessed at https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/c3ba6d29-7488-4050-adae-12d96588bc37/aihw-juv-131.pdf.aspx?inline=true

For one community, enough was enough. The Maranguka Justice Reinvestment project in Bourke in far-west New South Wales challenges this long-established pattern. Maranguka strives to end the incarceration of young Aboriginal women and men, and with it the intergenerational trauma of early encounters with the justice system.

For a long time Bourke held the dubious distinction of the highest conviction rate for Aboriginal youth under 17 in New South Wales.

Sentencing did little to change behaviour – 90 per cent of young people released from custody were in trouble again within a year.

Local Aboriginal leaders decided it was past time to end the cycle of children taken from families, youth crime, and high rates of imprisonment. Activists such as Alistair Ferguson looked for inspiration to justice reinvestment programs in the United States, which urge government to keep people out of prison, and invest the savings in the community.

The justice reinvestment model sees prisons as a policy failure, an expensive option that achieves little for society or those incarcerated. Better to reduce criminality at source.

In this spirit a coalition of Aboriginal leaders, law reform advocates, professional service firms and foundations agreed to work together on a plan for Bourke. Community designed and led, the project now embraces local and state governments.

The goal is to empower individuals. The intervention can be simple, such as supporting people to get birth certificates so they can access services - an estimated 200,000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people across Australia lack this basic documentation.

In Bourke, an early win was teaching Aboriginal youth to drive and obtain licences, which of course requires a birth certificate. Some 236 young people accepted the challenge, so reducing a common source of early conflict with local police.

Attention then turned to ambitious further targets: alternatives for young people to avoid offending, broader options around sentencing and initiatives to reduce reoffending. Local Aboriginal leaders looked unflinchingly at causes alongside solutions. This required difficult conversations around ‘early life, education, employment, housing, healthcare, child safety, and health outcomes including mental health and drugs and alcohol’.

Often answers involved working with authorities, but sometimes change was needed closer to home. The Men of Bourke group confronted the high rates of domestic violence in their community. A Men’s Space, built on the site of an old prison, became a symbol of taking ownership. As journalist Robert Milliken has reported in detail, the proportion of adult men charged with domestic violence subsequently fell by almost half.

Reaching out to the police took time, with much mutual distrust to address first. But once established, the link allows for a conversation every morning between police and youth workers about what happened in the town overnight, whether young people are in trouble, and how they might be encouraged to return to school. A youth council advises the project and works with school principals and officials from the Bourke Shire Council.

Here is a significant departure from traditional patterns of service delivery. Community sets the agenda, governments share authority, and charities become part of the policy process, not just a means of distributing aid. Maranguka is a significant and enduring achievement by everyone involved.

The results so far are promising. Nearly a third more students are completing Year 12 in Bourke and juvenile offences have fallen by a similar amount. Days spent in custody have declined by nearly half. A KPMG assessment suggests improved justice outcomes should save around $7 million over five years in Bourke – money to reinvest in the community.

Well-led partnerships transform lives.

This collaborative has a name: *collective impact*. It suggests the best chance of social change is when communities, government and for-purpose organisations work towards a shared goal. Collective impact requires a common agenda, a shared measurement system, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous dialogue and a backbone organisation.

Collective work imposes uncomfortable demands on everyone. Communities are asked to acknowledge and take ownership of local problems. Government agencies are expected to collaborate, pool funding, and work to someone else's priorities. Local business must accept a role in securing outcomes for the neighbourhood. Collective impact demands charities and foundations be patient while community leaders and their public agency partners experiment, fail, and then fail better.

It is hard for government to delegate control of expenditure. It is challenging for charities to fund programs with long timelines and high risks of failure. Yet the collective impact model now has an established history across Australia with programs such as the Cape York Partnerships and the empowered communities movement. The approach has inspired place-based initiatives including Logan Together in south-east Queensland and the Hive at Mt Druitt in Sydney.

Here in South Australia the collective impact philosophy has inspired Adelaide Zero, a project to end homelessness in the inner city. The state government supports SA Together, a program to support communities which tackle complex social problems.

Former Secretary of Prime Minister and Cabinet Terry Moran argues we need to tie together at local level the strands of service delivery across three levels of government along with philanthropic and community organisations.[5] This is challenging but the alternative is an inadequate status quo.

Policy innovation should not end with collective impact – not every problem is based in a community, or amenable to collaborative responses. There are other significant responses worth considering, including social impact investing. This raises and deploys private capital for ventures which combine some profit with social outcomes.

[5] Personal communication. Former Secretary Moran was reflecting on the thought of Hugh Stretton, but also offering his own analysis. He went on to wonder whether an integrated local delivery model might prove more effective than recent practice of providing citizens with small credits to buy services from profit driven companies operating to out-sourced delivery contracts. A regional and community jobs deal approach, Terry Moran notes, is being tested by the Centre for Policy Development, and is described at https://cpd.org.au/2020/09/new-cpd-blueprint/

The Aspire Social Impact Bond, again based here in South Australia, is Australia's first social impact program with homelessness as its primary focus. It aims to generate a competitive financial return while 'making a lasting difference to the lives of people experiencing homelessness in Adelaide.'

We need all these innovations, and so many more. In the tradition of Hugh Stretton, let's welcome policy experiments which build on what works.

Policy is never final, but a series of continuous tests and occasional improvements guided by experience and evidence. As the British Cabinet office likes to say, we must 'Test. Learn. Adapt.'

That poverty endures despite much public and private investment, despite people and agencies committed to its eradication, despite generations of social science research and policy proposals, points to the implausibility of swift solutions.

We know what failure looks like – think, sadly, of our national inability to Close the Gap. Yet we can hope that a process which begins with community voice, and goes on to ask individuals and communities, charities, businesses and foundations to work as partners might provide new off-ramps to address disadvantage.

The most promising initiatives are always the most time consuming. Collective impact involves long timelines and endless perseverance to work through each cycle of disadvantage, understand it, and create new off-ramps. We learn from what works, and what does not, and do better next time.

Our obligation to assist does not diminish because the task is hard. The persistence of inequality should leave few illusions about the structural nature of disadvantage. It is not only a matter of funding but of acknowledging and addressing racism, isolation and cultural barriers.
Australians are inventive and independent. Those living with disadvantage want change, not charity. Give people a viable off-ramp and they will take control of their lives. Cycles of disadvantage are dogged and entrenched but not impervious.

And when existing policy does not solve the problem of intergenerational poverty, new thinking is essential. Thinking from public intellectuals such as Hugh Stretton, from institutes such as this one, from everyone committed to better outcomes.

Policy ideas take time to find their moment. Often necessity provides a powerful nudge for change.

Think of the standard policy settings at the beginning of 2020.

Then COVID-19 arrived and governments suddenly experimented with some wild policy ideas floated over the years but never before adopted.

Ideas such as a form of universal basic income through JobKeeper, free childcare, doubled social security payments, hotel accommodation for people living on the streets, guarantees of employment, and a moratorium on rent payment and eviction – all implemented in just weeks when means must.

The temporary rise in social security benefits, resisted for many years, suddenly lifted hundreds of thousands of Australians above the poverty line. It was a reminder that policy is not fixed and immutable, but choices we make – and can change.

Let this liminal moment prove more than a flash of summer lightning. Community, charity and governments, working together, can succeed where each alone will falter. A nation that saves its people from calamitous health outcomes and deploys vast reserves to soften economic distress can also address poverty.

Since Australians show little inclination to embrace the Attlee approach to welfare, our past will likely also be our future: a combination of public and private spending to address disadvantage. So let's urge the players to work together, direct money where it makes a difference, combine talents, encourage social investment and dissolve old assumptions about welfare.

The hardest part of change is not embracing new ways but abandoning old ideas. These possess a deadly undertow, dragging us back.

Our responsibility for others remains compelling. The lottery of life means some people will be born and die, whatever their merit or talent, without sufficient opportunity for dignity and fulfilment. The measure of justice is whether our society empowers individuals – you, me, everyone – to find the life we want.

The randomness of life is with us forever but the outcomes remain our choice.

Australians know this: look at how enthusiastically we volunteer and donate.

So the challenge is entirely our own. One of the richest societies on the planet once stared down a global financial crisis and now protects its population from pandemic. Such a nation can end poverty among its own citizens if it chooses. The effort needs a grand coalition of community, charity and government. It requires a tolerance for failure, an ability to recognise and celebrate success. Waiting somewhere in a myriad of experiments, of small local victories, are the models that can work.

We start as helpless participants in a blind lottery. Let our beginning not also prove to be our end.

Acknowledgements

With thanks to Professor Adam Graycar for the invitation to deliver this lecture, and to Barry Jones for sharing memories of Hugh Stretton which go back to 1970. It arrived, characteristically, with an impressive portrait of Hugh Stretton, photographed by Barry in Adelaide on 14 August 1990.

It was a pleasure to read the account of Hugh Stretton from Graeme Davison, published in *Hugh Stretton: Selected Writing*s, edited by Graeme Davison (La Trobe University Press, 2018). I also learned much from an essay by Peter Beilharz 'Hugh Stretton – Social Democracy in Australia', published first in 1994 and collected in *Thinking the Antipodes: Australian Essays* by Peter Beilharz, Monash University Press, 2014.

I appreciated advice and comments from Terry Moran, drawing on his lifetime of state and Commonwealth public service.

While citations specific to Hugh Stretton are included in the text, the broader statistic and other material are drawn from *On Life's Lottery* (Hachette, 2021). A full set of references can be found at https://paulramsayfoundation.org.au/2021/02/18/on-lifes-lottery-notes/