

REAPRA ROUNDTABLE SERIES

Australia's Identity & Co-creating for Generational Impact

Melbourne Roundtable

Thursday 28 May • 5:00–8:30 PM (AEST)
lyf on Elizabeth Melbourne, Melbourne VIC

Introduction

Preface

In this Reapra Roundtable, we conducted a deep dive into the identity of Australia, the contexts and development of worldviews (lenses), tendencies, and the tensions between them—almost as if Australia were a person itself. By unpacking its complex identity, we sought to better understand the nuances of its cultural landscape, the social and economic systems that support it, and therefore the challenges and systemic problems that arise from it.

Beyond this, the discussion informed how we might choose to interact with Australia in ways that co-create generational impact and deep systemic change.

Throughout this two-part conversation, a number of themes emerged that helped frame the discussion. Participants drew widely across fields of knowledge, bringing together professional expertise and personal experience to enrich the dialogue.

Dialogue

The dialogue was largely phenomenological, meaning that it was neither intended to establish factual accuracy nor place a value judgment on one opinion over another. Rather, participants adopted a meta-observational approach to explore how Australia and its people have experienced their story, in order to better understand why its identity is perceived the way it is today. Participants embraced tension, respectfully tolerated differing perspectives, and channelled that energy toward the co-creation of change.

The Roundtable brought together invited speakers with unique perspectives, alongside members of the general public who had registered to participate. The discussion was facilitated by James Bitanga from Reapra, who opened each theme and invited reflections from participants throughout the sessions.

Intended Outcome

The outcome of this Roundtable is to create a dynamic draft of Australia's identity (as-is) as a starting point to discuss its future aspirational identity (to-be). This paper is not meant to be academic in nature, but rather a synthesis of experiences from a diverse set of individuals, that can serve as a launchpad for future research and community collaboration in several forms.

Facilitator & Speakers

Facilitator

James Bitanga

Next-Gen Leadership, REAPRA

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/jamesbitanga/>

As a reformed lawyer and angel investor in the media and tech space, James has completely reoriented his career towards addressing social systemic issues that may take decades to transform. His mastery is to co-create next generation leadership and inspire more people to integrate business with well-being over longer time horizons.

Speakers

Scott Ko

Founder, Curiosity Mindset and ColourSpace Gallery

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/thescottko/>

Scott Ko is a leadership strategist, social entrepreneur, and ex-CEO who helps people work within systems, to change systems. With a portfolio career spanning over 20 years across the public sector, multi-national corporations, and social enterprise, Scott is sought after for his ability to achieve clarity through chaos.

Jess Price

Founder, Paradigm Makers

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/thejesspricelist/>

Jess Price is founder of Paradigm Makers, a company committed to implementing system-level change at work. She believes the systems aren't broken—they are working as designed, and that's the problem.

Lavinia Kanagandran

Founder, Good Humans Venture Studio

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/laviniak/>

Lavinia Kanagandran is a social impact and technology leader who works at the intersection of systems, community, and innovation to help create a fairer world. Through Good Humans Good Work, she explores how we create more human, inclusive, and sustainable systems—helping founders, communities, and organisations build things that prioritise trust, belonging, and long-term collective wellbeing alongside growth.

Max McCallum

General Manager, Dukes Coffee

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/max-mccallum/>

As General Manager of the beloved Dukes Coffee Roasters, Max McCallum is on a mission to lead the global coffee industry in the transition towards regenerative agriculture, coffee agroforestry and certified organic farming standards. He has a keen interest in sustainability, technology and communication—particularly when these intersect with high-quality food and beverage products—and is proud to represent Dukes as the only 100% organic specialty coffee company in Australia.

Belinda “Bee” Murray

Founder, Bee Formless

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/belinda-bee-murray/>

Belinda “Bee” Murray is a strategic shape-shifter and founder of Bee Formless, helping leaders to strategically shape-shift life, leadership, and business at moments that matter, so people, purpose, presence, and performance move as one. She believes success and soul are not opposites, but force-for-good multipliers, and that sustainable growth only works from the inside out, where identity, energy, and strategy align before expansion begins.

Part 1: Australia's Identity

Indigenous History

Speakers agreed that a discussion of Australia's identity cannot begin without acknowledging an Indigenous perspective. The discussion emphasised the necessity of "truth-telling" regarding Australia's history, specifically addressing the displacement of First Nations people.

The discussion included a timeline of history, beginning in 1835 with the proclamation of New South Wales and the implementation of the legal principle of "Terra Nullius". Speakers cited subsequent milestones, including the 1991 Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, the 1992 Mabo decision regarding land rights, the 1995 national inquiry into the separation of Aboriginal children and the 2008 formal apology to the Stolen Generations.

Identity Crisis

The group discussed that Australia is going through an identity crisis and has a need for "inside-out" transformation, where individuals and organisations reorient themselves to address systemic, long-term problems rather than relying on short-term, external solutions.

Participants suggest that Australia is experiencing an identity crisis. Australia was once an interconnected ecosystem, known as the "Lucky Country", but factors such as technology and politics have disrupted that ecosystem. Australia is currently in survival mode, and rather than looking for external solutions, we need to look inward and examine what is fundamentally broken and how we can put ourselves back together.

Australia is at an inflection point. The focus should not be solely on short-term solutions, but rather, we need to consider the sources of disconnection within society, within ourselves as individuals, and within businesses, both in the present and throughout history. If we want to move forward and enable Australia to become more regenerative and interconnected, some important questions include: What do we need to subtract or let go of? What do we need to hold onto? What is no longer serving us?

This change would need to involve society, communities, businesses, and individuals as we reimagine and reshape what comes next. While there are certain things we can build upon, we also need to consider what must be removed so that Australia can be transformed from the inside out.

The Inside Out approach centres on transformation from within, where leaders and businesses are reshaped from the inside out. A key belief is that nothing is static, and that during transformation we are continuously shaping and reshaping ourselves. This fluidity is also reflected in the ongoing formation of identity.

Myths and Grand Narratives

Participants highlight the role of foundational myths, such as "Terra Nullius", in shaping national identity and suggest that Australia is currently grappling with unresolved conflicts and repressed trauma.

Australia has long struggled with questions of national identity. Like most cultures, Australians seek stories, myths, and grand narratives that can unite people and create a shared imagination. However, in the post-colonial period, attempts to construct Australian identity have often relied on myths that

overlook earlier parts of Australia's history and focus primarily on events after 1901. The challenge, therefore, is how to create myths and narratives that are built by communities rather than imposed upon them.

Australia often avoids or conceals conflict and perceived incompatibilities. One example is the lack of clear representation of Indigenous experiences. The conflicts and protests that arise around certain public holidays can be seen as micro-representations of larger traumas that have not yet been acknowledged or addressed.

The Australian society we see today did not emerge through conflict in the same way as many other nations. As a result, while there are important legacies that persist, there has also been a lack of catharsis. This has contributed to a sense of repression and an ongoing series of unresolved conflicts that continue without being openly discussed or addressed.

Australia is an extraordinarily privileged place, and it is easy for Australians to overlook that privilege. Rather than over-engineering a grand national narrative, it is important to allow communities to tell their own stories. The question of what constitutes Australian identity is difficult to answer because we have not yet settled on a shared imagination of what that identity might be. However, the process of working through and defining that identity is itself an important journey for Australia to undertake.

Lack of a Unified National Identity

Participants observed that Australia encompasses multiple identities. Much like an individual experiencing a split personality, the nation is influenced by a hierarchy of messengers that prescribe how Australia "should" be. This uncertainty can contribute to a sense of anxiety in everyday life.

Participants also noted a striking irony regarding Australia's seven official values: they are almost entirely unknown to the local population. As these values are typically acknowledged only during the visa application process, Australian citizens are rarely required to learn, reflect on or actively practise them.

Participants discussed the tension between individual agency and a unified national identity. Australia places a strong emphasis on individual freedom, yet a national identity requires some degree of collective unity. How Australia will reconcile these tensions remains an unresolved question.

For example, China was discussed as a nation with a clearer and more unified sense of national identity. In contrast, there is a paradox in encouraging Australians to define national identity for themselves, similar to asking a child what they want to do before they have a clear sense of direction. Australia is only 250 years old, which is very short compared to other countries. Australia is a multicultural country that seeks to encourage freedom and self-expression, but this can also result in vague ideas of national identity. A point of comparison is Queen Elizabeth, who was seen as embodying an idealised image of British identity. This serves as an example of soft power, providing a recognisable model of what the "ultimate" British person might represent.

One fear that some Australians may have, which prevents a national identity, is that if there is one singular representation of Australian identity, then they fear they may not fit in the box and may not fit in with others. Everyone has their own story, and our individual identities are not shared enough. A question for the future would be how do we pull individual stories out, to shape a collective identity? An approach to creating a unified identity where Australia can be one and interconnected is to begin with individual stories, then move from an individual level to a collective identity.

The “Lucky Country”

Australia is often referred to as the “Lucky Country”, a phrase that is commonly shared and celebrated in a positive light. However, the full original quote from which the term originated stated that “Australia is a lucky country, incredibly privileged but run by idiots.” Participants suggested that this quote is symbolic of some of the tensions Australia may be grappling with today.

Australia is a privileged nation, but that privilege can also bring certain challenges. As an island nation with abundant resources, Australia enjoys many advantages. However, participants argued that this can also create a lack of pressure for change. Pressure can be a catalyst for transformation, much like diamonds are formed under pressure. A point of comparison is the Silk Road, where countries from the East and West experienced a rich exchange of ideas. Australia, by contrast, has been geographically separated from many of these exchanges. At the same time, this separation can also be viewed as a strength, as it provides Australians with the opportunity to build upon what already exists. In this sense, Australia remains an ideal place where people can do anything.

Participants also discussed the presence of both old and new forms of trauma in Australia. Old trauma refers to deep historical trauma, while new trauma includes issues such as poor mental health, COVID-19, and the impacts of war. Participants suggested that racial exclusion continues to exist in Australia, although marginalisation may often go unnoticed. They discussed the idea that the White Australia Policy was so effective in excluding Aboriginal people from public life that many Australians rarely encounter Aboriginal individuals in workplaces, leadership positions or decision-making spaces. In this view, the government historically contributed to the erasure and invisibility of Aboriginal people.

Participants noted that, for Aboriginal people, Australia is the only homeland to which they belong, and they argued that governments have not adequately addressed the long-term consequences of historical dispossession and exclusion. One manifestation of these unresolved issues, they suggested, is the disproportionately high incarceration rates in Aboriginal communities.

Participants also discussed the experiences of migrants in Australia. Some immigrants continue to struggle with feeling accepted and may feel pressure to assimilate into Australian society. There is a perception among some migrants that their cultural identities are less accepted, while Western cultural norms are more readily embraced. Participants argued that Western culture is often more widely promoted and normalised, whereas other cultures, such as Islamic culture, may not receive the same level of acceptance. In this view, there are double standards regarding which values and identities are publicly normalised.

On several levels, Australia might be going through a serious paradigm shift. It may take years and years, but ego loss is happening to Australia, in the big picture with global paradigm shifts happening. In the past, people did not talk about trauma or identity, but in recent years, people have been talking about topics like trauma and identity more.

How Do Australians Perceive Themselves?

Participants suggested that Australians tend to have a low appetite for risk and are often reluctant to invest in the long-term. One example discussed was the research sector. Australia is regarded as being strong in research, but less effective at commercialising research and translating it into outcomes when compared with countries such as the United States. Participants noted that many researchers move to

countries such as the United States or Britain to pursue academic opportunities and publish their work because they perceive greater support and investment overseas.

Participants also discussed the limitations of Australia's relatively small market. Compared to larger economies, Australia has fewer companies with the capacity to invest in new infrastructure. As a result, it can be easier for Australian founders to seek opportunities elsewhere. In some cases, Australian companies may be based locally while the majority of their customers are located in the United States. Participants observed that much of the world's cutting-edge technology and innovation ecosystems are concentrated in the United States, reinforcing the perception that success often requires access to the American market.

Participants argued that Australia's tendency towards risk aversion can contribute to short-term thinking and a focus on immediate results. This raises the question of whether these patterns are driven primarily by economic realities or by broader cultural attitudes.

The concept of tall poppy syndrome was also raised during the discussion. Participants suggested that it influences how Australians talk about work and success. In Australia, people are often reluctant to openly discuss their achievements and may prefer to present themselves modestly. By contrast, in the United States, people are generally more comfortable speaking openly about their successes and accomplishments.

Participants suggested that some Australians may become stuck in existing ways of thinking without realising it, preferring stability over change. They contrasted this with cultures where success is viewed as something from which others can learn. In Australia, there is a strong cultural affinity for the underdog, which can reinforce values of humility. As a result, Australians may remain modest about their achievements, even when they achieve significant success.

Extractive vs Regenerative

Participants described Australia as operating within an extractive system, suggesting that meaningful change is difficult within a structure that is primarily focused on extraction. This creates a sense of pressure, particularly for those who want to pursue entrepreneurship or create new pathways. Some participants expressed feeling as though Australia is "strangling" their potential in a limiting way, despite a desire to direct their energy toward contributing positively to the country. This tension also extends to broader questions of how people feel and move through life within such a system.

It was suggested that Australia is largely built on short-term extraction, which makes it less conducive to long-term or future-oriented thinking. As a result, Australia was described as not being a particularly "ripe" environment for imagining or building the future, with some participants expressing the belief that Australia does not have clear regenerative models to support sustained innovation beyond extraction-based thinking.

At the same time, participants noted that Australia may be less extractive than some other countries and could be considered a middle ground. There was also recognition that some level of support exists through safety nets that assist lower-income or vulnerable communities.

Further Reflection Points

The discussion raised a number of tensions and unresolved questions that warrant deeper exploration in future dialogue. While no single answer emerged regarding Australia's identity, several themes repeatedly pointed towards areas requiring continued inquiry and collective reflection.

- What should Australia preserve as part of its identity, and what may need to be reimagined or released?
- How does Australia's position as a relatively privileged nation influence its willingness to pursue change?
- How can Australia encourage long-term thinking, experimentation and investment in future possibilities?
- What conditions would enable Australians to feel supported in pursuing innovation and entrepreneurship?
- What would a regenerative Australian system look like in practice?
- What examples or models could Australia draw from when imagining more regenerative futures?

These reflections are intended not as conclusions, but as invitations for ongoing dialogue. Rather than resolving tensions immediately, they encourage deeper questioning and create opportunities for more nuanced understanding over time.

Part 2: Co-creating for Generational Impact

Impact of Information Overload on Learning

Participants reflected on how Australia's historical and geographical context may shape the way Australians learn, think and engage with the world. Australia has largely existed as a peaceful nation and, due in part to its geographical position as an island, has experienced fewer historical exchanges of knowledge, values, and systems with other cultures compared to regions that were more interconnected. Today, Australians have unprecedented access to information, answers and solutions through technology. However, participants questioned whether this abundance of information has reduced the need for deep thinking and inquiry. Rather than first asking whether we are pursuing the right questions, answers are often immediately available.

The discussion also explored the impact of technology on younger generations. Participants noted that much of Gen Z's learning occurs through digital platforms and raised concerns about whether easy access to information can create an illusion of knowledge. Assignments, tests, and other forms of assessment may not always reveal whether students genuinely understand what they are discussing. Similarly, the anonymity of social media interactions can make it difficult to determine who you are talking to. Participants expressed concerns about a lack of transparency online and the challenge of navigating an environment in which people are constantly bombarded with information.

Participants suggested that this information-rich environment leaves little time for individuals to slow down, remain curious and engage in deeper reflection. Knowledge has become readily accessible, but so too have ideas about who people should be and how they should live. Participants questioned whether Australians are being encouraged to make their own meaning and connections or whether they are simply consuming information and predetermined narratives. One participant compared Australians to domesticated cows that are not happy when they get introduced to a field, suggesting that while people may be comfortable within familiar systems, they may not thrive when exposed to unfamiliar challenges and opportunities.

Participants asked what it means to take someone on a journey where they can connect the dots for themselves, rather than simply providing answers. They questioned how learning and knowledge should be defined, and how people can be encouraged to navigate knowledge independently, make mistakes, and learn through experience rather than constantly relying on existing solutions. Participants explored how societies might create environments that provide a safety net while still allowing for meaningful stakes, tension and opportunities for growth.

Participants discussed a perceived mindset within Australia that "ignorance is bliss". They suggested that many people do not want to engage with difficult issues because doing so can be uncomfortable, and there is often a belief that individuals have little power to change the situation. Participants argued that society has not been designed to adequately accommodate many of the changes and challenges currently being experienced. They also returned to the theme of extraction, suggesting that wealth and resources flow disproportionately in a small number of directions rather than being distributed more broadly across society.

Linear and Nonlinear Thinking

The discussion explored the idea that co-creating change may require a nonlinear way of thinking and organising, while many aspects of society currently operate through linear systems and structures. Participants identified a disconnect between the complexity of contemporary challenges and the models commonly used to address them. They emphasised the importance of remaining open to different ways of thinking, creating, and imagining new possibilities.

The discussion suggested that there is a need to envision economic systems that are more reflective of, and responsive to, the people participating within them. At the same time, many people appear to be grappling with the same underlying issues from different perspectives, environments and angles, all attempting to address what was described as the “elephant in the room”.

The discussion also explored systems shaping and human behaviour. Participants noted that people generally follow the path of least resistance and tend to choose what is easier and more convenient. This raised questions about responsibility within system design: is it the responsibility of individuals to change their behaviour, or should systems be redesigned to make more desirable pathways easier to follow? Participants observed that once systems are established, they often become linear and self-reinforcing.

Several metaphors were used to describe different perspectives on systems. One participant referred to the distinction between the “balcony” and the “dancefloor”, suggesting that it is difficult to simultaneously participate within a system while also observing it from a broader perspective. Another comparison was made between Google Maps and Google Street View. Participants suggested that most people operate at the equivalent of Street View, focused on immediate surroundings rather than the larger landscape. While there are different ways of gaining perspective and orientation, they argued that it is difficult to hold both views at the same time.

The conversation included a question about systems thinking itself. Participants wondered whether systems thinking can sometimes become limiting, placing people within another conceptual framework or “box”. This tension was captured in the phrase “forever in a day”, reflecting the challenge of balancing long-term systemic thinking with the realities of immediate experience.

Participants discussed the distinction between analytical and creative approaches to thinking. Analytical thinking was described as largely linear, while creative thinking was characterised as nonlinear. One participant reflected on bridging the two approaches as a challenge they had been working through for several years. The participant suggested that, throughout life, creative capabilities are often discouraged. One example raised was the tendency to view changing one’s mind negatively, rather than as part of an adaptive and creative process. The ability to think nonlinearly, move between different perspectives, and reconsider assumptions was seen as an important capability that is not always supported by existing systems and expectations.

At the same time, participants acknowledged that some aspects of life and society require linearity. Looking towards a long-term vision, they suggested that flexibility should be nonlinear, while structure should remain linear. In this framing, linear systems provide the boundaries, frameworks, and constraints within which people operate, while nonlinear thinking enables creativity, exploration, and adaptation.

Participants proposed that nonlinearity is particularly important for human development and interaction, whereas linearity serves a functional role in creating structure. Within clearly defined boundaries, people should have the freedom to experiment, play and explore different possibilities.

Progress in Long-Term Thinking and Systemic Change

Participants discussed the need for more regenerative businesses and organisations, suggesting that meaningful change requires systems that are sustainable, future-oriented and responsive to broader social and environmental needs. They noted that conversations about regeneration and long-term responsibility have been taking place for a long time, although progress is not easy to measure. Change may come through top-down leadership in some cases, and participants also observed that many organisations are catching up or beginning to properly address these issues.

The discussion explored how impact-oriented thinking could emerge through areas such as ESG frameworks and long-term planning. Participants emphasised the importance of thinking 40–50 years into the future and argued that this kind of perspective could play a significant role in solving systemic problems. Superannuation was raised as an example of a longer-term structural implementation designed to address future needs. However, participants also suggested that there is now an excess of capital inflow relative to the number of meaningful opportunities available to deploy that capital effectively, contributing to the sense that more and more problems continue to emerge despite the availability of resources.

Participants noted that there is a movement towards regenerative thinking that has progressed in recent years. They observed that corporate marketing and public-facing sustainability initiatives target young people in their development. However, there is a growing sentiment among younger people that older generations do not adequately consider the interests of future generations. Despite this tension, participants pointed to relatively new developments in education as signs of change, including programs such as regenerative futures at RMIT and master's degrees in sustainability in many universities. These initiatives were seen as evidence that institutions are beginning to think more seriously about the future and the next generation.

The conversation also touched on how social and cultural change occurs over time. Participants noted that Australia's rapid population growth over recent decades has created conditions in which new ideas and practices often emerge in small pockets before gradually becoming more widely accepted. They described this process as one involving friction, framing and reframing.

Leadership and authoritative power were seen as important factors in shaping public behaviour. The introduction of plastic bag bans was discussed as an example: it initially created friction and resistance, but over time people adjusted to the change and it produced significant environmental benefits. This led to a broader reflection on friction itself. Participants suggested that technology increasingly removes friction from everyday life, but without friction there may also be fewer opportunities for learning. The challenge, they argued, is how to reintroduce constructive forms of friction that encourage learning.

Finally, participants reflected on the importance of teaching critical thinking and metacognition. One anecdote described how a teacher asked students to research connection points between two things that are seemingly unrelated. The bias that different students hold will lead them to find different links online, highlighting how cognitive bias and digital systems shape the way information is discovered and interpreted. Participants suggested that when research is conducted from a predetermined starting point, it can influence the information that becomes visible and the conclusions that are drawn. This was described as a kind of meta-exercise in examining not just what people think, but how they are thinking.

Ways to Co-create for a Better Future

Participants discussed what they described as a growing loneliness epidemic and explored some of the factors that may be contributing to it. Topics raised included toxic positivity, conversations around AI ethics, dopamine-driven technologies, cognitive offloading and the role of social media. Participants suggested that while technology has made many aspects of life easier and more convenient, it may also be contributing to disconnection and loneliness. This led to broader questions about how society can move back towards greater interconnection and genuine happiness. Participants also wondered what the next forms of coping and adaptation might look like as these challenges continue to evolve.

Several examples of alternative approaches were discussed. One participant referenced cafés that do not allow phones, creating spaces where people are encouraged to be fully present with one another. Another participant noted that Denmark has moved away from some forms of digital learning and is returning to more traditional educational approaches, reflecting a desire to rebalance technology and human development.

Participants also reflected on the nature of community and relationships. One perspective offered was that the “cost” of community is annoyance. Meaningful relationships inevitably involve inconvenience, disagreement, and moments of friction. However, choosing to work through those challenges and continue caring for others is what gives relationships their depth and significance. In this view, friction is not something to be eliminated entirely but can be an important part of building genuine connection. Participants suggested that rather than continuing to pursue technology solely as a means of making life easier, there may be a need to find a healthier balance between convenience and the challenges that make relationships and communities meaningful.

Participants discussed the idea that good faith is driven by constant, lifelong learning and an ongoing awareness of one’s environment. The discussion suggested that shared terminology is important in enabling effective problem-solving, as agreed definitions provide a common framework within which solutions can be evaluated and understood. In this context, the use of proxy terminology was raised as an example of how language can be standardised so that participants can remain aligned in their understanding. Participants also reflected on how language itself shapes meaning-making. One example involved the use of clear definitions when working with AI systems, including the creation of glossaries to establish shared understanding between humans and machines.

The discussion extended to education and knowledge development, particularly the importance of scaffolding and layered explanations. Participants questioned whether students always understand the content they include in their work or whether there is sometimes an illusion of knowledge. This raised concerns about how discernment can be developed in future generations, particularly when they are still forming their understanding of what knowledge itself is.

Participants also emphasised the importance of returning to foundational experiences and simplicity, including cultural identity expressed through basic human experiences such as camping, nature and food. One participant reflected on a perceived lack of community, vibrance and connection in society.

The conversation further explored the tension between complexity and simplicity. Participants suggested that one of the key opportunities in contemporary society is finding ways to cut through complexity and return to more fundamental ways of understanding, while still acknowledging the need to integrate both linear and nonlinear thinking. They noted that complexity cannot be fully controlled, and instead raised the question of how individuals and systems can hold themselves within complex environments while still reconnecting with basics.

It was suggested that the ability to explain concepts in simple terms, often described as “explaining like I’m five”, can be an indicator of true understanding, and participants noted that society does not always prioritise simplicity in how it structures knowledge.

Finally, the discussion brought up that reconnection to nature plays a role in co-creating for generational impact, noting how technologies created greater distance between people and their natural environments.

Further Reflection Points

1. How can systems balance structure with flexibility, allowing both stability and creativity to coexist?
2. What forms of constructive friction are necessary for learning, growth and human development?
3. How can society rebuild meaningful connection and community in an increasingly digital world?

The discussion raised broader questions regarding loneliness, belonging and whether future progress should focus not only on efficiency and convenience, but also on strengthening human relationships and reconnection with each other and the natural world.

This roundtable highlighted the complexity and interconnectedness of questions surrounding Australia’s identity, systems and future. While many tensions and challenges were explored, the discussion was not intended to provide definitive answers, but rather to surface important questions and perspectives. In doing so, it created a valuable foundation for continued dialogue, deeper reflection and future conversations that can further shape understanding and collective action.