

ST GEORGE'S HOUSE CONSULTATION

A TALE OF SEX AND MONEY:
THE 21ST CENTURY POPULATION
CHALLENGE ISSUES

WEDNESDAY, 12 – THURSDAY, 13 MARCH 2014

In partnership with



CONTENTS

Contents	2
Report	6
Participant List	14
About St George's House	15

BACKGROUND PAPER

The historically unprecedented rise in the number of people alive on Earth from 2.2 billion in 1946 to today's 7 billion is in one sense a great success story. Success in avoiding death, whether at the hands of predators (including microbes), malnutrition or other perils of being born is rightly a matter of celebration. Though improved longevity is unevenly applied across the globe, the lifespan of even sub-Saharan Africans has improved.

By contrast, the story from the other end of the demographic equation is not so happy. No Nobel Prizes have been won for stopping birth, not even for Carl Djerassi, inventor of the contraceptive pill. Instead, the act of conception continues to stir up all sorts of prejudices and complexes – mostly amongst men – in most cultures, affecting leadership organisations: governments, religions, development banks and even UN supported family planning programmes, as well as how individual men behave to women, even in marriage. As a result, women in too many places have little choice in when or how many children they conceive.

On top of squeamishness and worse around the mechanics of conception, is the now globally adopted notion that the only possible economic logic is one based on more people, consuming more 'stuff'. Thus, the bigger a population the better, with the downside of longevity (dependency) resolved through more people being born.

If the years following WWII may be thought of as an empirical testing of this logic, then some results may be considered. First, the growth in 'material consumption' cannot be disputed. But it has happened in a dismally unequal way: the richest 1.75% of the world's population generates 20% of global income, while it takes 77% of the poorest to do the same.

Meanwhile, there is no correlation between happiness and great material wealth.

Secondly, the evidence that nature cannot support the more-people-consuming-more economic logic is irrefutable. Not only by hard calculation of resources extracted (mineral and biological) or tonnes of waste and pollution, but also by clear signs of system failure. Nature is no longer in control of the great life-essential cycles like climate or water and the mightily interconnected chemical and biological interactions that operate them. Attempts to curb human impact have been undone by the simple arithmetic behind more people, consuming more: electricity demand has risen from 1300 to 2800 kWh/person since 1972, a period when the population doubled – a double doubling. And despite a halving in percentage terms of the number of hungry people over the same period, the actual number (c. 900 million) has barely moved. As David Attenborough points out, there is no problem that is not made worse by a growing number of people.

So what is to be done? From the point of view of nature, we humans are out of our niche – large aggressive predatory mammals are supposed to be rare. But if we leave it to nature to put us in our place, it will be a brutal experience. As former Chief Scientist Sir John Beddington pointed out, a 'perfect storm' is approaching in which our soaring demand (through rising consumption per person as well as from population growth) for water, food and energy is heavily compromised by climate change.

The need for a new economic logic based around fewer people, consuming less is now widely discussed, with economists Amartya Sen and Joseph Stiglitz exploring ways of measuring its progress now and for future generations. Building natural, human and social 'capital' *could* provide livelihoods involving less resource use and pollution, while finance *could* return to its original purpose of 'lubricating' the economy. Some see such a shift underway already. Nevertheless, if we avoid nature's remedy for our excesses, then urgent attention to the front of the demographic equation is needed as well.

First, some fables need to be dismissed. Women have always wanted to enjoy sex without risk of conception (Cleopatra used half oranges as womb caps) and contraception should have nothing to do with coercion; access to it is a basic right for women in particular. Also wrong is the view of some development specialists that lower birth rates are only for high consuming societies. Because the poor impact less on the environment, they argue, it is alright for poor women to have larger families. Indeed children are needed to work the land. What is this but coercing women into un-wished-for pregnancy when life is already hugely difficult? More children means more mouths to feed – a vicious circle that condemns the poor to eternal poverty and their children to a hope-free life.

Better to look at the UN's 2010 population projections to 2100 which reveal that between its high–medium and medium–low projections is an average difference of

People	Estimated tonnes CO2e
High 15.8	72
Med 10.1	46
Low 6.2	28

½ child per woman. Moreover, and adjusting for the different emissions between rich and poor, aiming for a population of 6.2 billion by 2100 would be a huge multiplier for lowering greenhouse gas emissions.

With today's population figures heading above the medium projection, would such an 'ecological demographic transition' be possible? In hard numbers – yes. Sixty years ago women had, on average, 5 children each. Now it is 2.5, although with three times the number of women starting families. However, in both rich

and poor countries around 40% of conceptions are unplanned. The number of poorer women who want reliable contraception but cannot get it is thought to be over ¼ million, while in the UK all primary care trusts have been criticised for substandard services. With the right investment, tailored to local circumstances, the lower projection of 6.2 billion is practically achievable.

Culturally, however - and politically - richer countries like the US and UK will have to show leadership to send the right message to the poor. Competition in the more people-more consumption economic logic has led already to 'land grabbing' in poor countries and conflict over resources. This is unsustainable, even in the medium term, especially in the 50 poorest countries (hidden by averages) on track to triple their population.

Of course, that last paragraph carries a horrific truth. What will happen in India, for example, when its population overtakes China (at around 1.45 billion each in 2030) or in Africa where the continent's population is projected to rise from 1 to 4 billion by 2100? The impossibility of this, like the impossible promise that the poorest now can one day consume at US/European levels is a tragic global confidence trick. The 'Arab Spring' was triggered by rising food prices and populations where over 50% are under 25.

Using what The Economist calls the deceleration of the global economy as an opportunity to accelerate change to a logic where fewer people live comfortably and fairly by consuming less, what intervention point would speed things up most? Surely it is with those who give birth – women. If they are in control of their own fertility (when and how often they conceive); if they are confident the children they do have will survive and thrive; if they feel free from violence (personal and globally) and if they have sufficient power over the resources they need (including how society is run) to maintain this way of living, then a world population of 6 billion by 2100 – an ecological demographic transition – is entirely possible.

Among the questions our Consultation will cover are:

- Working back from the ecological demographic transition proposed at the end of this piece, what key policy changes are needed?
- Assuming one relates to the structure of the global economic system, what would shift it from a more people-consuming more logic to one that has fewer people-consuming less as its dynamic?
- There are huge numbers of young (particularly men) in poor countries, who see little hope for their future. How to offer that hope in a way that removes the temptations of extreme violent and/or religious groups?
- How to mobilise female leadership at all levels of society – in rich and poor countries – in a way that accelerates their ability to secure the destiny of their families into the longer term?
- Are the current institutional arrangements (organisations and process) sufficient unto the challenge? If not, what should change, and how?
- Although David Attenborough and Melinda Gates are gaining headlines, how to mainstream the public debate on population as a critical 21st century challenge? How to make it a normal policy area for rich and poor countries alike?

REPORT

The consultation brought together representatives of various affiliations and contrasting viewpoints to discuss population issues today. Although there was some disagreement about approaches, participants agreed on the whole that:

- more, coordinated action is needed to help bring population into mainstream awareness and policy-making around the world and that the 2012 London Summit on family planning was a good start;
- it is still possible that the Earth's human population could stabilise and reduce without a sharp increase in deaths, given urgent further efforts;
- past myths and arguments must not be allowed to obstruct effective communication on the topic;
- education and reliable access to contraception, especially for women, is absolutely essential in all countries;
- messages about population and demography should be tailored for different audiences;
- more public conversations are needed, to help people understand the environmental and other impacts of continued population growth stressing that we are already breaching critical environmental limits;
- population should be discussed more widely with and by political, religious, and community leaders, who ideally should be better informed about its materiality to decision-making today;
- positive messaging (without ignoring the need for urgent action) is the most effective way to change attitudes.

IPAT, the perfect storm

A key starting point is understanding the relationship of population numbers in relation to other factors. The now famous equation – $I=PxAxT$ tries to do just that. I represents impact on nature which is caused by a multiplication of P (number of people) by A (the level of consumption of those people, usually represented by GDP) by T (the technology, or efficiency, of that consumption) Today, rising numbers of people and a rising demand for food, water and energy (as well as other resources) has led to what former UK Chief Scientific Advisor John Beddington has called a 'perfect storm' where the earth simply can no longer 'supply' – all compounded with the negative effects of climate change.

The potential for catastrophe is obvious, However, it was noticed that past forecasts of planetary catastrophes have not been borne out, though for some this was a matter of timing only (the Limits to Growth predictions were not for the 20th c as detractors insisted, but for this one, the 21st century. Nevertheless the danger is that such projections can be dismissed too easily by those with a major stake in maintaining the *status quo* (an economy dependant on increased consumption/affluence). This too easily obscures the evidence that we are living unsustainably. Too often attempts to assign precise numbers and dates to what will always be an uncertain future undermine attempts to communicate effectively the extent of the danger caused by increasing damage to the planetary systems - something that is essential if behavioural change is to be stimulated. Change that includes not only the consideration we give to the number of children we have, but also the lifestyles to which we aspire, all to be communicated to younger generations as positive, rather than negative, choices.

Talking up the 'Depopulation Dividend'

A good example of the challenge comes from the debate around the notion of the 'demographic dividend'. In conventional economic terms this is the increase of young people moving into a country's productive workforce. Growth in a population is usually likened to growth in an economy (more people to consume more 'stuff') and therefore portrayed as a universally good thing.

Which is why in countries where populations are reducing, governments talk anxiously about the 'ageing crisis', and some are actively trying to stimulate increased birth-rates. Who will look after the elderly (financially and practically) if we run short of young people? This, even though these countries are already heavily ecologically 'overshot' (living beyond their own renewable ecological capacity).

Less well researched, discussed and promoted are the many benefits from reducing birth rates and transiting to a 'flatter' demographic profile – the 'Depopulation Dividend'. For example the cost of providing infrastructure, schooling, health care, housing and so on for a growing population tends to far outstrip and gains in economic productivity. Children, as Adair Turner, Chair of the Pensions Commission, pointed out, are way more expensive for the state than the elderly.

Population, consumption, and resources

Many countries of the developed world already show birth rates below replacement rate: Europe, North America, Russia. In much of the world, population growth has declined to not very far above replacement, as in most of Asia and Latin America. The main areas where the birth rate remains high are sub-Saharan Africa, and India and Pakistan.

Population levels cannot be separated from consumption in assessing human ecological impact. Poor people clearly have a much smaller footprint (impact on the environment) than the rich, though their footprint rises as they become richer. Obviously consumption of the very poor will – and should - increase, but it remains difficult to arrive at agreement about how much that should be (and how much the rich should 'contract' their consumption to arrive at an equitable and ecologically sustainable economic system. Participants discussed the extreme 'either/or' terms in which this is currently often discussed – ranging from hunter-gatherer lifestyles to cornucopian levels of consumer 'growth'. The mixed views driving this particular discussion hid the fact that the calculation may not be possible, but that, given it was possible to reach the lower UN population projection by 2100 and without a scintilla of coercion, we should probably just aim for that with some vigour.

Developed world over-consumption

There are obvious political and practical challenges to reducing consumption in richer countries and in promoting sustainable resilient economies that support a high quality of life for people and the rest of nature. .

It was recognised that a surge of interest and interesting initiatives was beginning to attract attention. A very few examples: new economic models are gaining ground (Ellen Macarthur Foundation, the Centre for the Advancement of the Steady State

Economy's "Enough is Enough", the Manchester University Post Crash Economics Society, New Economics Foundation), demand-side energy sector efficiencies and transitions to renewable sources; campaigns to end waste in the food industry. Leadership, however remained sparse, and neither bottom-up nor top-down approaches will be entirely successful, so both are needed along with political and community support, and international agency work.

Changing National population profiles

Differences in the shape of the population age graph (e.g. bulges caused by larger numbers at different ages) can affect how messaging about family planning ought to be presented. For example, Ghana has a bulge in its young population, who will themselves soon have children. However a leading family planning organisation is promoting contraception to African leaders as part of a bigger political picture. Instead of the usual more people, more economic growth message, a stabilising and then dropping population is where the real demographic dividend lies. More benefit accrues from building a powerful economy in which GDP *per head* is more meaningful than GDP in aggregate. The argument is that a lower population means less poverty and famine and if it is well made it is one which politicians can support.

Especially if the argument – relevant to both developed and developing countries - is bolstered by evidence that infrastructure investment purely to meet the needs of a rising population results in no improvement in quality of life and carries a high opportunity cost. (see paragraph 3 in Talking up the Depopulation Dividend)

Therefore getting the messaging about the importance of 'family planning' out of the 'health only' bracket (where it gets little funding and attention) and into the rest of government is crucial; infrastructure development, poverty reduction, national security, education, energy, water, food security and so on, are all directly affected by the numbers of people there are. So talking about overcrowding, rising costs, food shortages, pollution, congestion, slums and other immediate, concrete problems can be more real to people (and policy-makers) than more abstract debates about carbon footprints and global conditions.

Several countries in East Asia made demographic transitions in a way which offers an attractive example to other countries – rich and poor, and their example should be used more often. Moreover, developed nations cannot avoid setting an example of how to lower their consumption levels as well as their own populations for reasons of justice in relation to poor countries (and the huge inequalities that exist). The UK has a real opportunity to take a lead in this, given that England is the most over-crowded country in Europe, and 80% want a smaller population.

Leading for family planning

It is sometimes hard to be sure what the *desired* (rather than actual) birth-rates are in many poorer countries, because women (and men) living there cannot access reliable supplies of effective contraception. But it has been shown repeatedly in different cultures that women have fewer children when they have access to contraception and education about its use and benefits. There is considerable unmet need around the world for contraception – in rich as well as poor countries.

When it comes to having a family and health, human rights are paramount. And so much more could be done to demonstrate that population considerations are not incompatible with upholding human rights; even rights of unborn generations are legitimately involved. However, the debate can become skewed. 'Many children'

may seem like an investment for the future for parents who fear growing old and infirm without support. The need for children to work on the land is often used too as a reason for larger families. But too many mouths to feed can end in tragedy – rising mortality rates, families dispersing in search of work. And what about the right of a woman to choose how many children to have and when? Without access to family planning that right, and her further right to see her children thrive, are removed. There are examples of how people recognise the role of smaller family sizes in securing a family's livelihood. Around Lake Victoria there is a recognised limit to growth of lake-dependent industries and with low infant mortality combined with fewer children who have a better chance of survival – potential parents more readily take up contraception use. Without reliable access however, such examples remain too few. Family planning and contraception have been largely off the public-policy agenda, and short of funding, for twenty years or so. There were various views on why this is the case. As the title of this consultation suggests, the economic case for a growing population had been loudest and the assumption (with a variety of underpinning motivations) that development and education can substitute for (rather than support) reliable supplies of contraceptives trumped consideration of the needs – and rights – of women as well as all environmental considerations. Instead of the advent of HIV/AIDS multiplying the availability of contraceptives (to men as well as women) it instead drew funding away from existing family planning programmes and population became a subset of sexual health. Now could not be a more critical time for family planning to take a prominent place again. Not least as part of the post 2015 proposals for the Millennium Development Goals. However squeamish politicians, community and religious leaders may be when it comes to discussing money and sex, they are nevertheless extremely important allies in making population and high quality family planning services accessible to all, in rich and poor countries alike.

The direct route may not always be the best. For example, the Greenbelt movement set up by the Kenyan Council of Women, led by Wangari Maathai, ostensibly planted trees in very large numbers. An activity not threatening to mostly male leaders. But with the seedlings, the women also transferred knowledge about family planning, nutrition, child health and women's rights. Groups such as these, whose main agenda may not be family planning, but which serve to link communities with the outside world or to promote other projects involving women, can be very useful and effective conduits for both information and contraception.

Religious leadership has a significant role to play. There are in existence many theologies (in several religions) asserting good stewardship of the Earth as a human duty and responsibility, and many religious leaders are sympathetic to family planning, not least because it directly impacts the quality of life of the parents.

Whose problem is it?

The idea of human numbers as a global problem requiring international or supranational control was contrasted with an idea of population per country to be determined by national choices and actions. Population as an issue is included in UNFCCC National Adaptation Programmes of Action on Climate Change and is acknowledged by countries in their own evaluations of development to be important in considering how to adapt to the consequences of climate change. Population growth obviously directly affects infrastructure, water, soil erosion, land shortages, deforestation and migration. Yet, although global organisations do have a vital role to play, it is hard to see how the UN, or even those concerned with health like WHO, could assume overall responsibility for the population levels of individual countries.

Influential people like David Attenborough and Melinda Gates are gaining headlines for bringing population and family planning to the forefront of debates about environmental and human well-being. But there is still a long way to go before public debate on population as a critical 21st century challenge becomes mainstream and a normal policy area for rich and poor countries alike. The UNFPA was felt to be underperforming here, and more effort could be made to get it to lead better. National and local forums and campaigning groups are needed, but aggregating the powers of the UNFPA with other international institutions such as the World Bank will be needed if we are to put contraception firmly back on the development agenda.

Nevertheless population, and how many people are desirable in a country or a locality for what reason, remains a touchy subject for politicians. The pros and cons of opening a public debate around the notion of 'ideal' numbers were argued during the consultation. On one hand, it would quickly bring attention to the topic, on the other it opened up the danger of fixing on irrelevant optimum numbers and associated lifestyles that could become politicised and vulnerable to extreme views.

Despite the difficulties, we should still look for ways to open out the discussion, with some nuance, and allow more public input into choices and policies which politicians may be avoiding. The UK population, for example, is set to grow through immigration although the birth-rate is below replacement rate. UK citizens already describe the island as feeling crowded and do not want more inhabitants. What do we want to do about this? (What are the real options?) How do we envision a 'good' future? Does it include playing-fields, wildlife, low-density cities, meat and fruit in the diet, a sense of not being overcrowded, etc., all of which require an abundance of space? What do we do to achieve our vision while also lowering our impact on nature at home and globally One way is to take a 'neutral' global goal of around 6 billion by 2100 (the UN lower projection) and for the debate to be around what each country could 'contribute' to that exploring culturally specific ways of making every pregnancy a planned one in both rich and poor countries for example.

Incentivisation

Any sort of coercion is unacceptable, would not in any case succeed, and is unnecessary. The logic of offering subsidies for smaller families (and ending subsidies for larger ones) is also criticised as it could result in fewer children among those who most need money, while the better off could afford more (as they can of everything else). Some have raised ethical objections to even voluntary incentives to have fewer children – though oddly none to incentives to have more.

The same arguments for and against incentives for stimulating any kind of behaviour change pertain to population policy. The evidence that finds other incentives than money motivate people to reduce energy use, for example, can inform more subtle policy options when it comes to the number of children women have. Backing the social and practical incentive of high quality and accessible family planning with what is needed to give women confidence that the children they do have will not only survive but thrive should not be discounted.

Options

While only local people have the right to determine local population numbers, national governments and (in poor countries) aid donors can affect reproductive decisions in many ways, including aligning population policies with other health, development and environmental campaigns, the promotion of female leadership, and jobs as an alternative to violence for young disaffected men etc.

Options (equally applicable to rich countries) include:

- Give top priority in aid budgets to family planning and the associated women's education and empowerment schemes, direct and through Marie Stopes International etc;
- Provide access to reliable, first class, family planning facilities (education advice and materials) to every woman and man;
- Invest in projects which build capacity and empower women and youth, such as Tear Fund and Restless Development;
- Research the infrastructure costs of population growth (as mentioned above), and use the results to focus finance, agriculture etc. ministries and culturally male-dominated pro-fertility cultures on the 'Depopulation Dividend' and in doing so escape marginalisation of family planning as an (underfunded) exclusively 'health' problem;
- Encourage local NGOs to break down silo government by promoting inter-departmental dialogue on the multiple advantages of stable or even reducing populations;
- Provide investment in agricultural and industrial development and modernisation to align them with the needs of a sustainable future (needing foreign direct investment);
- Campaign for educational systems geared to future labour market needs especially those that grow natural, human and social capital;
- Campaign vigorously against early marriage (including, for example, supporting issue of birth certificates for proof of age)
- Tackle effectively domestic violence and the coercion of women and girls to have unwanted sex
- Promote an attractive narrative about human relationships – with each other and nature – that does not involve degradation of either.

Messaging

Like any specialist area, advocates of increasing the contribution of P in balancing the $I=PxAxT$ equation are prone to jargon ranging from the impenetrable to the misinterpretable. Similarly, the basic rules of good 'marketing' or even journalism in tailoring the message to the audience tend to be ignored. Without neglecting honesty about the risks of failure in reducing human impact on the natural world and the dangers of the fast approaching 'perfect storm', it is possible to make a future of a lower population brought about through fewer births an attractive option – for everyone - especially the world's young people and the policy-makers.

Far better for us to become better prepared for rapid change and for possible success. What would we do if population issues were at the top of the agenda? How would we help, advise, what would we prioritise, and so on? Working from a positive position works better, particularly for younger people who are building their life and thus want societal goals about which they can be optimistic and thus want to seek alignment. There are many local initiatives that can help to provide learning

about using this sort of approach to changing behaviour – tending to focus on process, which is transferrable, rather than outcomes, which are usually specific to locality or culture.

Just one example: 'we need to reduce our numbers' is a phrase which might be taken to invite a cull or championing higher death rates! A more collaborative and less controversial approach would be to invite ideas, activities, processes that would enable birth rates to contribute to achieving as near as possible, the lowest UN projected figure for world population for 2050.(8.3 billion). Furthermore, lots of conversations are needed, to help people understand factors affecting migration, particularly where population growth and its impact on the environment are concerned. Significant movements of people may be inevitable and the quality of our response will be directly related to how well we are prepared.

As discussed already, actions could include excising jargon, using technology and innovative processes to get people on board, judicious use of international organisations to aggregate local and national effort and share examples of good practice; plus supporting political, religious, educational and community leaders and youth as problem-solvers through training in the topic in general and in communication techniques in particular.

Engaging people for change

It is clear that many individuals - especially the young - do recognise that our impact on the environment and each other (poverty, inequality of all sorts of opportunity) is not sustainable. And, many polls say that they want to do something. However, there is a gap between that and having the knowledge and skills to behave differently, something compounded by low confidence in the capacity of leaders to make much difference. So, while, naysayers do need to be countered, and marginalised, one of the best ways to do this is by showing the possibility and the desirability of shifting from a global economic system addicted to an 'ever-more-people-consuming-more-stuff' logic to one motivated by 'fewer-people-consuming-less'.

The key policy shifts needed to make an ecological demographic transition to a world population of 6 billion by 2100 will be profound, and wide-reaching; but without them, we will face a population 'asteroid strike' (rapidly rising death rates); so we need to convey the urgency.

Thus, the global discussion needs to:

- be held with the widest range of people possible with sensitivity to culture, language and age;
- avoid absolutism, unite people around possible goals, embrace many ways of achieving them (that don't involve coercion etc.), celebrate success, and share learning;
- become broader than metrics, to include aesthetics and subjective views on the relationships between population numbers, density and activity, and their impact on nature;
- include positive visions and opportunities as well as challenges;
- contest pro-consumption growth economics; promote growth of quality of life;

- constantly underline the need for universal provision of reliable family planning services and education and empowerment schemes, especially for women and youth.

Postscript

After this consultation, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change published its Working Group II report Summary for Policy Makers. On page 7 it noted: "Globally, economic and population growth continue to be the most important drivers of increases in CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion", providing a histogram that showed that population growth more than negated gains from increased energy intensiveness of GDP. While the report offered many examples of energy policy it offered not one regarding population.

PARTICIPANT LIST

Name	Organisation
Mr Jamie Agombar	National Union of Students Ethical and Environmental Manager
Dr Blake Alcott	Retired unaffiliated scholar Writer on Ecological Economics
Mr Leo Bryant	Marie Stopes International Senior Policy Manager
Professor John Cleland	London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine Emeritus Professor of Medical Demography
Professor David Coleman	Oxford University Emeritus Professor of Demography
Mr Patrick Elf	Forum for the Future
Professor Stephen Emmott	Microsoft Research, Head of Science
Professor Eric Kaufmann	Birkbeck College, University of London Professor of Politics
Mr Andrey Kuvshinov	London School of Economics and Political Science Research Officer
Professor Aubrey Manning	University of Edinburgh Emeritus Professor of Natural History
Mr Roger Martin	Population Matters Chair
Mrs Ruth McNeil	Population & Sustainability Network
Ms Karen Newman	Population & Sustainability Network Network Coordinator
Ms Sara Parkin, OBE	Forum for the Future Founder Director
Ms Jo Royle	Common Seas Director
Katharine Scarfe Beckett	Consultation Rapporteur and Researcher
Mr Shaun Spiers	Campaign to Protect Rural England Chief Executive
Dr Elaine Storkey	Church of England President of Restored
Sir Crispin Tickell	Oxford Martin School

ABOUT ST GEORGE'S HOUSE

St George's House was founded in 1966 by H.R.H The Duke of Edinburgh and the then Dean, Robin Woods. Their intention was to establish a safe physical and intellectual space where people of influence from right across society could come together to debate and discuss issues of national and international importance. Then, as now, it was hoped that the Wisdom nurtured through dialogue could be put to use for the good of our society. The House is a constituent part of the College of St George together with St George's Chapel and St George's School.

The physical House, located on Denton's Commons forms part of the fourteenth century foundations of the College of St George. It has been through many refurbishments since then and now provides accommodation for our guests, offices for our staff, breakout rooms for Consultation work, and of course dining facilities. If you eat in the House you will do so under the watchful gaze of our two founders whose portraits adorn the walls of the Dining Room.

The heart of the College of St George is St George's Chapel, where three times a day, every day, prayer is offered for the Sovereign and the nation, a tradition established in 1348 by King Edward III. It is precisely this tradition that gives the House its impetus and its wider theological context. The offering of prayer in the Chapel finds a practical expression in Consultations, where the House offers space for nurturing Wisdom.

Our Consultation programme has three distinct strands: social and ethical work on topics of national and international importance; Clergy Courses; and Consultations brought to us by external groups who understand and are in sympathy with the ethos of the House. Taken together our annual programme is varied, rich, and intellectually challenging.

We welcome people who are prepared to speak cogently and listen carefully, people prepared to persuade and be persuaded. The essence of a good Consultation is not necessarily consensus, welcome though that is but equally valuable is high quality disagreement, an open, honest interrogation of the issue to hand.

Our hope is that all our visitors will leave a St George's House Consultation thoughtful, questioning, refreshed and optimistic about their part in enhancing the world they inhabit and influence.

To this end the values of the House are openness, honesty, trust and respect. People from all areas of society, holding diverse views, opinions and beliefs come here to debate freely. The art of Consultation seeks to nurture Wisdom and open up the possibility of a different and better world.

ST GEORGE'S HOUSE



For more information about
Consultations at St George's House
visit www.stgeorghouse.org



St George's House, Windsor Castle, Windsor SL4 1NJ

T +44 (0)1753 848848 E house@stgeorges-windsor.org F +44 (0)1753 848849