Series Synopsis

Living With The Enemy examines six issues currently polarising Australians in a unique way by getting participants to live with people whose lifestyles and opinions directly contradict their own. The issues included are same-sex marriage; African refugees and immigration; asylum seekers and detention; hunting and animal rights; decriminalisation of marijuana; and Islam.

The cases for and against are argued in the voices of the people involved, in their homes and at their places of work – a gay couple who are engaged to be married live with an Anglican minister opposed to same-sex marriage; a devout Muslim couple live with an Aussie ‘patriot’; a Sudanese former refugee lives with an ultra-nationalist; a former ‘boat person’ lives with a woman who believes he should be deported; a former drug user lives with an old-school hippy who has smoked his own body weight in marijuana; a hunter who owns 280 guns lives with a vegan animal liberationist.

Each pairing has never met each other before they spend ten days together. Five days in one world, then five days in the other. By the end of the ten days each side will have argued their case via a series of immersive situations. Will they find a greater understanding of one another?

Curriculum links

This study guide, which covers widely divergent topics and issues, is mainly aimed at middle and upper secondary school levels, with relevance to English, Media Studies, History, Health and Human Relations, Social Studies, Current Affairs, Environmental Studies, Philosophy and Ethics.
Episode 1: SAME-SEX MARRIAGE

SYNOPSIS

Gregory and Michael are gay activists, atheists and engaged to be married. David is a husband, a father of three and a conservative Anglican minister who believes sexually-active gay people do not have the right to marry. Gregory and Michael stay with David for the first five days of the experiment, and they're in for a series of surprises starting with being banished to sleep in a caravan rather than under the same roof as David's children and ending with the discovery that David has a genetically identical twin brother who used to be gay. Then the experiment swaps and David attends Greg and Michael's wedding in New Zealand before marching in Melbourne's Gay Pride parade.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

Carry out the following activities on the issue of same-sex marriage. (For further information, see ‘Same-sex marriage’ in website references.)

- First, discuss in class what you take to be the meaning of the word, ‘marriage’, both in the Australian context and around the world, from one culture to another. Has the meaning of ‘marriage’ remained constant, or changed over many centuries of history. If it has changed, or is in the process of changing, what might be the historical forces driving this change?
- We see during this episode of Living With the Enemy that same-sex marriage is legal in New Zealand. Carry out some research to find out when New Zealand enacted the right for same-sex couples to marry, and the reasons the New Zealand parliament passed the bill.
- Following on from the previous activity, draw up a list of other countries around the world where same-sex marriage is currently legal. Which was the first country to legislate same-sex marriage, and when? What is Australia’s current position on the issue, and what are the range of problems and questions that parliamentary politicians in the short-term and long-term, no matter what party they represent, must contemplate when deciding how they should vote?
- Why was same-sex marriage legalised in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) in 2013 then ruled shortly afterwards by the High Court to be invalid?

THE PARTICIPANTS

Carry out the following activities on the main participants in this episode.

- From the program write a short description of the following participants, showing not only who they are, but also their stance, their beliefs and opinions on the issue of homosexuality and same-sex marriage.

Was the parliamentary vote close or did the move win by a large majority?
Discuss how David’s chosen vocation and religious beliefs inform his views on life in general, and homosexuality and gay marriage in particular. When he says that his world view is ‘biblical’, what might this imply? Can his life choices allow him any freedom to depart from his stated position?

Explain what you think are Gregory and Michael’s views on church and Biblical-based beliefs in general.

Comment on whether it is possible to detect any difference in attitude and response between Gregory and Michael on David’s stated beliefs.

THEMES AND ISSUES

Carry out the following activities arising from your viewing of this episode.

Discuss the reasons as to why David provides Gregory and Michael with a backyard caravan, rather than allowing them to sleep in the house. Comment on what this decision not only tells us, but tells the two ‘house guests’ about his views in general, and his attitude towards the two men. How might you feel or react to this, as a guest, if you were in either Gregory or Michael’s position?

Explain how the factor of the presence of children is an essential plank in David’s concept of marriage. With this in mind, why does he later refer to Gregory and Michael’s marriage ceremony in New Zealand as ‘self-centred’? Do you think the two men are ‘self-centred’ in marrying each other, more self-centred, perhaps, than a male-female couple who wish or decide to marry each other?

Following from the previous question, examine both Gregory and Michael’s observations of their own past, as young people growing up, and what they endured. Why does Gregory refer to ‘secrets’, having to lie, and feeling ‘shrivelled’, and Michael recall religion, in part, as having a ‘catastrophic’ effect on him?

You may wish to plan and write a series of personal diary entries about someone in Gregory or Michael’s position growing up through their adolescent years and into their adulthood.

Explain the problems that arise for David should he march with Gregory and Michael at Melbourne’s Gay Pride parade. What might the friends and associates in his circle of influence think of him? What would you have done, in his situation, and why? Do you think Gregory and Michael ‘ambushed’ him unfairly on this issue, or not? What was Michael’s response to David’s discomfort, and was he justified? When David argues the difference about having been an ‘observer’ not a ‘participant’, what does he mean?

Why do you think the filmmakers included the sequence near the end of the episode where David met a drag queen? Do you think, for example, they were making fun of him to a wider viewing audience?

At the end of the episode the narrator asks, ‘But has anything changed after ten days of living with the enemy?’ What has changed in their attitudes towards each other, and the interrelated subjects of homosexuality and same-sex marriage? Anything? Why does David immediately respond that ‘enemy’ is not a helpful word to use? What does he suggest in its place, and why?

David suggests that he will now return home to talk to his peers and friends about what he has learnt. Discuss what you think he will tell them, and why, and how they might respond. You might even consider working in pairs to plan and write a dramatised play script of dialogue and stage description you could read to the class.

Comment on whether you think the three men are ever likely to meet each other again.
Episode 2: DETENTION CENTRES

SYNOPSIS
Morteza is a 30-year old, former ‘boat person’ who landed on Christmas Island after fleeing Iran. He spent four uncertain years in detention during which he converted to Christianity, escaped from Woomera Detention Centre, sparked the riot that burned down the Port Hedland Detention Centre and famously sewed his lips together in the Villawood Detention Centre. He is exactly the sort of asylum seeker Jenni from Queensland says should not be allowed to stay in Australia. However, Jenni had never met a ‘boat person’ until she met Morte. Living in each other’s worlds is an explosive and emotionally draining experience for both of them. However, neither Jenni nor Morte, could have predicted the way the experiment would end.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY
Carry out the following activities on the issue of refugee and asylum seeker detention centres. (For further information, see ‘Detention centres’ in website references.)

- First, the term ‘boat people’ is used during this episode of Living With the Enemy. Define ‘boat people’. When did this term originate, and why? Is it merely a descriptive term, or does it carry with it a deeper range of meanings and attitudes? For example, is it used as an epithet, a term of criticism – and if so, by whom, and why? (See ‘Boat people’ in website references.)
- Define what you take to mean by the term, ‘detention centre’. Who is sent to detention centres? Why are they sent? Does being sent to a detention centre imply or even prove criminality?
- Explain what it means to be ‘screened’ and ‘processed’ at a detention centre. What is the process, who carries it out, and how is it carried out? What are those carrying out the process attempting to find out? Comment on the results of screening and processing, and how this effects the lives of those who are held in detention centres.
- Carry out some research then write a short report on when refugee detention centres were first instituted in Australia, and where they were situated. Explain the events that brought about their introduction. Why and when did the Australian government make the decision to set up detention centres off the mainland? Where have these off-shore centres been operating?

THE PARTICIPANTS
Carry out the following activities on the main participants in this episode.

- From the program write a short description of the following participants, showing not only who they are, but also their stance, their beliefs and opinions on the issue of refugee or asylum-seeker (or boat people) detention centres.
  o Jeanette (Jenni)
  o Morteza (Morte)
  o Dr Zachary Steel
• Early in the episode Jenni refers to refugees attempting to enter Australia by boat as ‘illegal’. Discuss whether she is correct, by international and Australian law. Explain her apprehensions and fears about the arrival of boat people. She and her friends at the local bowls club believe that if asylum seekers keep arriving, the nature of Australian society will change. Discuss what you think they regard as typically their ‘Australian’ culture. What kinds of changes do they fear will happen to it, and upon what evidence do they make these statements? We are told that Jenni has never met an asylum seeker, nor never been to a detention centre, therefore where might she and her friends derive their views and assumptions?

• On the way to Jenni’s house, early in the episode, Morte compares his feelings at that moment to his feelings of having been an asylum seeker. Explain why, as an Australian citizen, he now draws this comparison. What feelings is he experiencing, and why?

• Comment on the function and relevance of Zachary Steel’s relatively brief participation in the program.

THEMES AND ISSUES

Carry out the following activities arising from your viewing of this episode.

• Comment on Morte’s opinion that, ‘Detention centres are not designed to process but to punish’. What evidence, in the form of a comparison, does he offer to Jenni and her friends at the bowls club to demonstrate this claim, and why are they immediately unable to accept his statement, with cries of, ‘Rubbish’? In what way is Morte challenging their deepest-held beliefs about the nature of Australian society, its people and its government?

• Explain what Jenni is attempting to prove to Morte when she shows him photos of both the refugee camps that exist in other parts of the world, and the detention centre on Christmas Island. Why does Morte reject her assumptions about what the images in the photos suggest?

• Jenni suggests that for their sake and their safety the children of asylum seekers held in detention centres should be removed and placed in foster care. Is she correct? What might be the ramifications of this procedure were it to be enforced?

• Why does Jenni think the inmates in detention centres riot, set fire to buildings and commit acts of violence? What is Morte’s response to this? Comment on whether Dr Zachary Steel’s observations later in the episode support either Jenni or Morte’s opinions.

• Explain Jenni’s purpose in taking Morte out in a boat to gaze upon the pristine beauty of the Whitsundays coast. Why does this end in a devastating argument between the two? Comment on Jenni’s views as to what might eventually happen to her locale, and whether they based on fact, logic and rational argument. Is she being ‘selfish’, as Morte asserts – or do her feelings run deeper than this?

• While on the boat, Jenni claims the statistic that, as a ‘compassionate’ country, Australia is ‘second in the world per capita in the number of refugees we take into here’. Is she correct? You may wish to research the figures on intake.
of refugees. See, for example, the last-listed site under ‘Detention centres’, in website references.

- What do we find out about Morte’s past life as an asylum seeker and an inmate of detention camps when Jenni visits him at his home in Sydney?
- Following from the previous question, explain why you think the filmmakers have blurred the vision of the video that Morte shows Jenni on his laptop computer. What is he hoping she will learn and appreciate from viewing the footage, and how does this compare with how she actually interprets the footage?
- View the sequence in which Morte and Jenni visit clinical psychologist Zachary Steel. Define the characteristics that Zachary believes causes self harm and outbreaks of violence not only in Australian detention centres but in similar institutions elsewhere around the world.
- Distinguish between what Morte says about ‘physical torture’ and ‘mental torture’, and why he believes that what occurred in Australian detention centres was worse than being tortured in Iran.
- Discuss in class the processes that lead to Jenni changing her mind about asylum seekers being held in Australian detention centres. Why does she now draw a distinction, in her education, between the abstract or ‘big picture’, and what Morte calls the ‘human life’?
- When Morte takes Jenni to Villawood, she refers to the detention centre’s presence in ‘tranquil suburbia’. Explain what she mean by this observation. You might consider using this implied juxtaposition of imagery to compose and draft a short poem, in any way you see fit, on this topic.
- Read the same book that Morte asks Jenni to read, Asylum: Voices Behind the Razor Wire, by Heather Tyler. Write a review of the book, offering a reason as to why the book has helped to change Jenni’s opinions.

### 3 Episode 3: IMMIGRATION

**SYNOPSIS**

When Abraham arrived in Australia he knew two words in English, ‘yes’ and ‘no’, and he consistently confused the two of them. He is now the Slam Poet Champion of Victoria and recently came third in the national titles. He is also about to have his second book published and to perform at the Glastonbury festival. However, he still can’t get a job, gets called ‘nigger’ and won’t travel on the train after dark. Nick is the founder of a fledgling political party who says allowing Africans like Abraham into Australia is asking for trouble. He believes they can’t assimilate, are a welfare drain on the economy and have nothing to contribute to a society built on Anglo-Celtic foundations. This is one of the most explosive and moving episodes in the series.

**BACKGROUND AND HISTORY**

Carry out the following activities on the issue of Australian immigration. (For further information, see ‘Immigration’ in website references.)

- This episode examines issues relating to,
and arising from, the migration of Sudanese Africans to Australia, particularly those granted refugee status. Carry out research then write a short account of when and why Sudanese migration to Australia began. To which parts of Australia have Sudanese migrants largely settled?

• From your research draw a graph showing the numbers of yearly arrivals of Sudanese immigration to Australia. Comment on what you think the graph and the statistical information tell us. For example, have the numbers of arrivals risen yearly, decreased or remained constant, and what might be the reason for this?

• Examine and comment on the issues Sudanese migrants contend with on arriving and settling in Australia. Look, for example, at whether there are language barriers, and if so, how? What is the extent of Sudanese arrivals’ formal education and schooling history, and is this a contributing factor to their lives in Australia? Do Sudanese, in particular, experience difficulties in interrelating with the Australian lifestyle, culture and customs that other migrant groups do not, to the same extent?

• The issue of Sudanese criminality and gang behaviour is raised during this episode of Living With the Enemy. Find out more about the extent of this, and discuss the relative accuracy or untruth of these accusations and assertions. Comment on possible reasons and factors that might cause or provoke such behaviour.

THE PARTICIPANTS

Carry out the following activities on the main participants in this episode.

• From the program write a short description of the following participants, showing not only who they are, but also their stance, their beliefs and opinions on the issue of black African immigration to Australia.
  – Nick
  – Abraham (Abe)
  – Drew Fraser

• Nick says during the program that he is not a racist. Explain how he attempts to justify, then, his view that black African immigration to Australia should not continue.

• From the program explain the events that led to Abe’s family leaving Sudan and eventually arriving in Australia.

• Examine Drew Fraser’s comments about the possibility of walking towards a group of ‘young black males’. What are his assumptions about these young men, and what evidence are these assumptions based on? Comment on the validity of his argument in which he compares them to ‘sharks’.

THEMES AND ISSUES

Carry out the following activities arising from your viewing of this episode.
• As a class, discuss and define what you take to be racism. Explain whether you perceived any incidences of racism from your viewing of the episode.
• Explain Nick’s ‘economic’ argument about government welfare for black African migrants. What does he mean, referring to taxation, that, ‘every week I go to work and every time I get a dollar, I throw 35 cents down the drain’? First, is he correct that 35% of his income – and, we assume, the income of every other employed Australian – is wasted by the government? Further, in a democratic society built on social responsibility, what is the purpose of income tax? Should we, as individuals, only choose to pay tax to fund those things that we personally prefer or gain advantage from, or should our taxes pay for the greater good, even though they may not directly and personally favour us? For example, should your taxes fund the purchase of military aircraft or art works, the training of swimmers and footballers, or the construction of a highway you may never travel on? Do you think it is selfish, or acceptable, to complain about where and how your taxes are spent?
• Nick takes Abe to a meeting of the Party For Freedom. What does this political group stand for, and why? In about 200 words of ‘stream of consciousness writing put into words what Abe might be thinking and feeling as he observes the meeting and hears the speakers. In response to their views Abe tells them that a refugee has only two choices. Explain those two choices.
• Abe has a brother in Australia who is a medical doctor. Discuss Drew Fraser’s response that Abe’s brother is therefore a ‘moral cripple’. Why does he claim that Abe will never be an ‘Australian’? What constitutes and identifies an ‘Australian’? Is Professor Fraser ‘Australian’?
• Following from the previous activity, imagine that you are one of the rap musicians seen later in the program. Compose a short rap poem in which you respond to Drew Fraser’s comments.
• During a backyard BBQ Nick discusses the significance of 26 January 1788, with reference to Aborigines, colonisation and the birth of the Australian nation. Examine his speech then discuss whether his view of Australian history, and of the right to colonise Australia. Listen to what he says about the existing inhabitants of the land then ask whether, for example, he subscribes to the argument, held by the British in 1788 and later, that the Australian landscape was ‘Terra Nullius’? What is the accepted view held by Australian academic historians today, of Terra Nullius, and why? (See ‘Terra Nullius’ in website references.)
• On the route from Sydney to Melbourne Nick and Abe visit a small rural town called Uranquinty. Explain why this is significant to Nick. Comment on whether, through your viewing this sequence of the episode, Nick and Abe have anything in common in their respective family histories. In what sense does Nick later deny they have anything in common in their respective histories? Discuss from an historical perspective whether Nick is correct to claim that whereas his own grandparents and parents came to Australia and ‘contributed’, Abe and other Sudanese refugees rely on government ‘welfare’. For example, you might compare the historical reasons for immigration and the availability of employment and labour in 1951 to the situation in Australia today.
• Explain the purpose and significance to Abe of the chess game. Comment on why Nick equates Abe’s prowess at chess to his own views on government welfare spending for African refugees.
• We are informed that Abe’s family are part of a ‘persecuted minority called the Dinka. Carry out some research then write a short account of who the Dinka are, why they have been persecuted, and why some were forced to flee their homeland. How might this historical background help to explain the problems young Sudanese men experience today in Australia? (See ‘Dinka’ in website references.)
• Comment on whether the conclusion of this episode was satisfactory to you in terms of whether Nick and Abe had come to any agreement, a meeting ground, on their respective positions about black African immigration and the question of what constitutes an Australian. After ten days, what have they learnt about each other, and of Australia?
Episode 4:

ISLAM

SYNOPSIS

Almost half the Muslims in Australia live in south-western Sydney. The majority in just five suburbs centred on Bankstown. Ben was born and bred in Bankstown, he’s seen his world change as Arab Muslims have stamped their identity on his home suburb, and he doesn’t like what he sees. Ahmed and Lydia are a devout Muslim couple living in western Sydney. Ahmed is from Egypt, Lydia is a convert who grew up in a country pub. Lydia converted as a result of the September 11 terror attacks. She wanted to find out why they had happened, what motivated the hijackers. Instead of discovering a religion of hate and war, she says, she discovered a religion of peace and justice. Ben believes there is no such thing as a moderate Muslim. Can Lydia and Ahmed convince him otherwise?

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

Carry out the following activities on the issue of Islam in Australia. (For further information, see ‘Islam in Australia’ in website references.)

- First, what does the word, ‘Islam’, mean?
- Carry out research then write a brief account of the history of Muslim people in Australia. Include references tracing the arrival of Muslims back many centuries before British colonisation. Why did some Muslims settle in ‘outback’ and remote rural Australia in the 19th century, and what is their legacy today? When and why did the main 20th century immigration of Muslims begin?
- Draw charts or graphical displays to show the approximate number of Muslims now living in Australia, indicating the breakdown of countries they have come from (by birth or heritage), the numbers of those born in Australia, and the makeup of groupings (or sects) within the Muslim population; for example, Sunni, Shiite etc. In which regions of Australia do most Muslims now live?
- Describe the events in the USA on September 11, 2001 (the events that introduce this episode of Living With the Enemy). Discuss how you think these events may have affected and impinged upon both the wider Australian community and the Muslim populace within that community. Comment on the role the general mass media of TV, daily newspapers and radio may have played in creating and informing public opinion on these issues.

THE PARTICIPANTS

Carry out the following activities on the main participants in this episode.

- From the program write a short description of the following participants, showing not only who they are, but also their stance, their beliefs and opinions on the issue of the existence of Islam in Australia.
  - Ben
  - Lydia
  - Ahmed
- At the beginning of the program, what are Ben and Lydia’s greatest fears about meeting each other, and are those fears borne out by the conclusion?
- We are told that Ben was raised in the Sydney suburb of Bankstown. Explain and comment on his view that ‘Bankstown today is Beirut’. As well, comment on his generalisation that the Quran (or Koran) ‘is why they hate us’. Who are ‘they’, and who are ‘us’? Discuss the evidence Ben offers about the Quran’s content and messages.
- Explain why Lydia, raised in a Roman Catholic family, converted to Islam. How did her family react to this? Although we don’t see her parents during the program, comment on what you think her present relationship is with them now.
• From viewing the episode, discuss whether you consider Ahmed as an Australian – an ‘Aussie’.

THEMES AND ISSUES

Carry out the following activities arising from your viewing of this episode.

• The relationship between Lydia and Ben does not start very productively, as a result of Lydia not shaking Ben’s hand. Discuss the cultural conventions and assumptions of what offering a handshake means. Should Lydia have been more accepting of Ben’s handshake, especially as, being raised an Anglo-Australian, she would be more aware of another Australian’s expectations upon being introduced? If Lydia had been a migrant, perhaps from the Middle East (like Ahmed), might this situation have arisen at all? You may wish to compare this situation to what happens later when Ben is introduced to Marlene.
• Comment on why you think the filmmakers chose to select an Anglo-Australian Muslim convert from Christianity for Ben to meet, rather than someone raised as a Muslim who has emigrated from a country where Islam is the dominant cultural and religious practice and way of life.
• This episode includes a sequence about halal. Explain what halal is, it’s purpose, and how it is carried out. (See ‘Halal’ in website references.) Discuss Ben’s objections to the certification of food as halal, and carry out appropriate research to ascertain whether he is correct?
• Comment on Ben’s misconceptions when Ahmed takes him to a local mosque. What is Ben critical of, at the mosque, and why? Are his criticisms justified, or do they arise from a lack of understanding of a culture different from his own?
• Summarise the arguments Ben raises about Muslim women wearing the niqab in public places. How does Lydia respond to this? When Ben says that if he cannot walk into a bank with his face covered by a balaclava, women should not be allowed to wear a niqab while in a bank either. Respond to this argument. Should Muslim women be allowed to carry out their religious and cultural practices in Australia?
• Explain why you think Ben becomes very angry, and walks out on the filming of the episode, when Lydia offers to take him to visit her parents in the New South Wales countryside. Is he justified in this behaviour and decision-making? You may wish to offer a possible scenario, or a choice of scenarios, as to what might have happened had Ben agreed to meet Lydia’s parents, and the outcome of this.
• Later, Ben meets Lydia and Ahmed in a Bankstown street. Explain the purpose of this meeting. What is Ben attempting to convey or prove to Lydia and Ahmed about this part of Bankstown, the people who inhabit it, and particularly the environment he highlights, a Muslim bookshop? Do you think he has stated his case satisfactorily? What do you think Lydia and Ahmed have learnt from meeting Ben in this sequence of the episode?
• Imagine you are writing personal diary entries from two different viewpoints. Write a set of entries as though you were Ben, reflecting on your experiences of meeting and associating with Lydia and Ahmed, and write another set of entries from Lydia’s viewpoint, about having met Ben. What will they have learnt and newly appreciated from their experience? Will they show compassion and tolerance for each other?
• Discuss whether the range of issues raised throughout this episode – such as the conversations Ben has with the scholars in the mosque – are satisfactorily explained and resolved, with all questions answered. Comment on whether you have further questions to put to any of the participants who appear on-camera during this episode.
Episode 5: HUNTING

SYNOPSIS

Steve owns nearly three hundred guns. He thinks animals have a right to life and humans have the right to shoot them. The most pigs he’s ever shot in one day is 70. Felicity is a vegan and an animal liberationist. She is so committed to the cause she even lives at Animal Liberation Victoria’s headquarters. Which is where Steve spends the first half of the experiment going on a duck hunting protest and meeting animals Felicity has ‘liberated’ from battery farms. The second half of the experiment takes place at Steve’s in central western NSW where Felicity goes on her first-ever pig hunt with every Australian animal activist’s public enemy #1, Robert Borsak, head of the NSW Shooters and Fishers Party.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

Carry out the following activities on the issue of hunting. (For further information, see ‘Hunting’, ‘Animal liberation’, ‘Feral pigs in Australia’, ‘Shooters and Fishers Party’ in website references.)

- Carry out relevant research then discuss the following questions. When, where and why was the animal liberation movement in Australia founded? What are the essential beliefs and aims of the movement? Discuss connections between the movement and the political Greens party, and personal life choices such as vegetarianism and veganism.
- Examine the history of the politicisation of recreational and professional animal hunters in Australia, such as the formation of the Shooters and Fishers Party. What are its aims? Where is this party mainly active in Australia? Does it have representatives elected to parliament anywhere in Australia?
- What are the various state and territory laws regarding duck shooting in Australia? For example, can shooters hunt birdlife at any time of the year, and time of day, or are there specific restrictions on time, place, quotas, size and species. If so, why?
- Carry out research then write a brief account on the extent of the proliferation of feral animals (concentrating on introduced species such as pigs, foxes, rabbits), and the damage they inflict on the natural environment, farming properties and livestock, and indigenous wildlife. How many feral pigs are there estimated to be in Australia, and where, mainly, are they found? What are the laws surrounding the culling of feral pigs, and what are the allowable methods of culling? Are all farmers, for example, allowed to kill feral pigs, or must hunters be licensed? Are the laying of metal traps and the use of poison permissible?

THE PARTICIPANTS

Carry out the following activities on the main participants in this episode.

- From the program write a short description of the following participants, showing not only who they are, but also their stance, their beliefs and opinions on the issue of animal hunting and shooting.
  - Felicity
  - Steve
  - Robert Borsak
- Explain what you think Felicity means by laws that ‘enslave’ animals. Might this include, for example, using animals to pull wagons and other heavy objects such as felled logs and soil tillers, and using animals for sports events such as horse racing.
greyhounds and equestrian events?

- Felicity refers to animals as ‘individuals’. Discuss the connotations suggested through the use of this wording. How is she insisting on referring to animals, and for what purpose, and how does this compare to Steve’s language usage when speaking of the animals he hunts?
- Felicity also suggests, early in the episode, that she has a ‘moral obligation’ to ‘challenge’ laws that allow for animals to be hunted and shot. Discuss the ramifications of this stance. Do your moral beliefs, for example, take precedence over government laws?
- Steve mentions his ‘Christian’ beliefs. Explain how these beliefs relate to his views on hunting and killing wildlife.

THEMES AND ISSUES

Carry out the following activities arising from your viewing of this episode.

- One of the episode’s participants refers to the shooting of animals as ‘murder’. Discuss the implications of this terminology. Why do you think she uses this word, and what does it suggest? Is she correct? Is it merely emotive, to express a feeling rather than an intellectual proposition? Why does Steve find the word ‘offensive’ to duck shooters? Why or why not would you use this word when referring to the killing of bird life, feral animals or even of a pet dog or cat?
- ‘It’s just a duck… a dead duck’. View the sequence where Felicity takes Steve to an Animal Liberation duck rescue day at Reedy Lake. Imagine you were a journalist reporting on what you see and hear, noting the differences in perspective, emotion and attitude between Steve and the Liberationists. Write your news story and format it as a standard layout newspaper page, using headlines, columns, photographs or illustrations, and captions.

- When later viewing footage of a duck shooter filmed at Reedy Lake we see widely divergent interpretations of the event and of the shooter’s behaviour, from those viewing the footage, as well as the behaviour of those present during the filming – the Liberationists and the shooter. Comment on the way the Liberationists view the footage, and the way Steve views it. Explain your own reaction to the entire sequence.
- Explain the circumstances as to how and why the Animal Liberationists took two sick pigs to an animal sanctuary. Discuss how this event raises questions about whether one’s sense of moral outrage outweighs the law – both the law regarding trespass of private property, and what Steve refers to as ‘stealing’. Steve suggests a different way of approaching the problem. What is his approach, and would it be practical? Would it have been successful?
- When Felicity visits Steve on his farm at Parkes, she is taken to his trophy room. Describe what happens at the trophy room, and how Steve later reacts to it. Why do you think he showed her the room? What does this sequence tell us about both Steve and Felicity, and their own world views? Discuss her accusation that it’s ‘a serial killer’s room’. Is she, for example, going ‘over the top’? Describe your own reaction to the contents, the purpose and the meaning of
Comment on the success or otherwise of the pig shooting excursion. Explain the wider, underlying reasons behind the excursion, and whether Felicity understood the reasons. Should Steve have taken her pig shooting? Do you think she learnt anything valuable from the experience?

Why, in Steve’s opinion, does he hunt and shoot animals? Why, in Felicity’s opinion, does Steve hunt and shoot animals? Explain what she means by ‘conditioning’. Is the entire issue a simple matter of city perceptions versus rural attitudes?

Steve tells Felicity that her position on the subject of hunting and of animal rights can only bring her long-lasting ‘sorrow’. Explain why he says this. Why does Felicity say that she will persist with her campaign to ban the hunting of animals, even though it ‘is not going to happen in my lifetime’? By the end of the program, have either of the two altered their views, or compromised on the overall issue? Discuss whether there is any way the two opposing views might come to a meeting place, an agreement.

What was your view on this issue before you viewed this episode? Comment on whether your viewing of the episode changed any of your perceptions and opinions, or merely strengthened and confirmed them.

Kerryn introduces Michael to doctors who have proved its negative effect on the brain and parents who have lost children and family members to the drug.

Episode 6: MARIJUANA

SYNOPSIS

Michael is Australia’s public advocate #1 for smoking marijuana. He is ambassador for life at Nimbin’s Hemp Embassy, co-creator of Australia’s annual celebration of all things cannabis, Mardi Grass, a foundation member of the Help End Marijuana Prohibition (HEMP) political party and a man who has smoked his own body weight in marijuana over the course of his lifetime. Kerryn is a former drug user who is now a drug educator and a woman who believes marijuana is the potential gateway to a lifetime of addiction and ruin. Michael introduces her to maverick marijuana growers, to people who smoke it recreationally and epileptics who use it medicinally. Kerryn introduces him to doctors who have proved its negative effect on the brain and parents who have lost children and family members to the drug.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

Carry out the following activities on the issue of the prohibition or legalisation of marijuana in Australia. (For further information, see ‘Marijuana’ in website references.)

- Carry out research then write an account of what marijuana is, and the plant from where it is derived. Where has the plant from which marijuana has been derived originally come? Historically, over many hundreds and possibly thousands of years, what have been its uses and purposes? Are those uses the same today? At what point did marijuana become known as a ‘recreational’ drug, and why? Is marijuana derived as a substance intended for recreational purposes a drug of addiction, and if so, what are the effects of this upon the user?
- When did it become illegal for Australian citizens to grow, buy, possess and use marijuana, and why? Explain whether the marijuana laws
throughout the states and territories of Australia identical or whether there are specific differences. In general, what are the range and levels of penalties as they relate to marijuana?

• Discuss the difference in meaning between the decriminalising of marijuana and the legalising of marijuana. Comment on whether either of these choices have been enacted into law anywhere in Australia.

• Plan and write a short history of the town of Nimbin, in New South Wales, explaining the events that led to the nature and population make-up of the town changing in the early 1970s. Why, how and when did it attain the reputation as Australia’s ‘drug capital’? Is there more to Nimbin than this? You may wish to include a map of the eastern side of New South Wales showing where Nimbin is, in relation to Sydney and to the border with Queensland. (See ‘Nimbin’ in website references.)

THE PARTICIPANTS

Carry out the following activities on the main participants in this episode.

• From the program write a short description of the following participants, showing not only who they are, but also their stance, their beliefs and opinions on the marijuana debate.
  o Kerryn
  o Michael

• Comment on Kerryn’s own personal life story and the extent to which it explains her present stance on marijuana and other forms of ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ drugs.

• Explain why Michael is totally in favour of decriminalising marijuana.

• From the episode and perhaps from further research, comment on Michael’s own situation in Nimbin – his role in the town, and the type of home life he has set up for himself and family.

• Since this episode of Living With the Enemy has been filmed, Nimbin suffered a major setback in August 2014 which has affected Michael and other residents and local business people. Find out what happened, what may have been the cause, and what the situation is now.

THEMES AND ISSUES

Carry out the following activities arising from your viewing of this episode.

• At the Nimbin museum, Michael tells Kerryn that, ‘People take drugs to feel better, for pain relief’. Discuss the accuracy or the over-simplistic nature of this statement. You may wish to define what ‘to feel better’ means, and whether ‘pain relief’ applies only to physical ailments, accidents and disease.

• One of the arguments raised by Michael and his Nimbin associates in favour of decriminalising or legitimising marijuana is that it is less harmful than other drugs, including ‘legal’ drugs, and as such it doesn’t kill anyone. By examining the difference between direct and indirect causal influences, explain how Kerryn attempts to counter this argument.

• Michael argues that legalising marijuana means that the entire industry will be government supervised, controlled and regulated. Discuss how this would – or would not – prove to be a benefit, an advantage, or an improvement, to anyone. Would legalisation and government controls, for example, be a safety net to maintaining and saving people’s health?

• Following from the previous discussion, comment on the arguments raised later in the episode, by Shane Varcoe of the Delgarno Institute, about the legalisation of the prostitution industry. Is this in any way relevant to the legalising of marijuana?

• View the sequence in which Michael introduces Kerryn to Aboriginal ‘medicine man’, Tony Bower, and to an epileptic teenage girl and her parents. First, what did you learn from this sequence? Comment on whether the entire situation being portrayed is an argument in favour of broadly
legalising marijuana or not. For example, explain the difference between marijuana used for ‘recreational’ purposes, and marijuana provided to the epileptic teenager and to cancer sufferers.

- Continuing from the previous questions, Tony appears to be offering a health, medical and pharmacological service free of charge in unsupervised, uncontrolled and unlicensed circumstances. Do you consider that what he is doing is potentially dangerous and unsound, or should he be encouraged to continue? If his services were to be legitimised, what might be the end results of this? For example, would Tony, himself, not be allowed to practise without undergoing courses of further study to gain academic qualifications? Would the service no longer be free? Would the service ultimately be taken over by existing pharmaceutical corporations and the medical profession?

- Discuss whether marijuana should be decriminalised or not for medical purposes. (For further reading, see the third-listed website under ‘Marijuana’, in website references.)

- From the website references link provided in this study guide, read the online news item on Nimbin, the town where Michael lives, then discuss the vision of the town, its reputation, inhabitants and tourists as painted by the news report. Is it fair, balanced, and informed? Comment on what Michael’s and Kerryn’s reaction to the report might be. (See the third-listed website under ‘Nimbin’, in website references.)

- Kerryn takes Michael to meet Dr Murat Yucel, a medical researcher looking into what the narrator says are ‘the long-term effects that marijuana has on the brain’. (See ‘Medical research – marijuana’, in website references.) First, from the program and elsewhere if necessary, describe the ‘hippocampus’, the part of the brain that Dr Yucel is researching in relation to the effects of marijuana. Also explain what the Latin term, ‘hippocampus’ means in English, and why it is so-named. Why is the hippocampus of importance in Dr Yucel’s research?

- In the hippocampus there are ‘cannabinoid receptors’. Explain what these are, and what their relationship is to cannabis (or marijuana). Dr Yucel asks Michael to undertake an MRI scan of his brain. What is the purpose of the scan, and what are the eventual findings of the scan? What do they tell us of Michael’s long-term use of marijuana, and the effect it has had, and is having, on him. Why hasn’t his long-term use of marijuana placed him into the ‘abnormal’ category, as defined by Dr Yucel’s research, and why is this different from the findings generally related to other long-time marijuana users? Explain the relevance of these findings for Michael into the future.

- By the end of the program, where do Michael and Kerryn stand on the issue of marijuana use, and the current laws surrounding it? Have their views changed at all? Have they reached any common ground?

- After viewing the entire episode, write a commentary on whether marijuana should at least be decriminalised or even legalised in Australia, or whether the laws should remain the same, or even toughened so that Marijuana use is banned.
Living With the Enemy: an overview

Carry out the following activities (see also questions on the full series from a Media Studies perspective, below):

• Discuss what you believe to be the overall purpose of the series.
• Write a commentary on what you learnt or appreciated from the series.
• Do you think a second series of the program is warranted or not? If so, which topics should the series pursue, and why?

Media studies

Carry out the following activities.

• Discuss why the producers considered that Living With the Enemy was a suitable title for the documentary series. If you were asked to give the series an alternative title, what would you call it, and why?
• Examine the introductory sequence in terms of camera shots and their content, use of editing and pacing, prior to the appearance on-screen of the program’s title. What do all of these together suggest about the episode we are about to see?
• Discuss in class and write an analysis of the consistency of approach to the format, construction and patterns of narrative of each of the six episodes.
• Write a commentary on the role and the general style of approach of the voice-over narrator, drawing on examples from any of the six episodes. Consider, for example, the purpose of the narrator’s melodramatic ‘voice of God’ approach.
• Writing about the series, the producer states that Living With the Enemy, ‘…captures a moment in time by recording and reflecting the opinions of the person in the street without taking sides or telling viewers how to think’. Discuss whether this is an accurate summation of the program’s choice of on-camera participants, and their portrayal. Do you think they would all be content with the way they’ve been constructed, through the general filmmaking process, as television subjects?
• Plan and create a promotional advertisement poster display for the series. Consider carefully your thematic approach, and use of image, colour and text.
• Draft, edit and proofread a review of the series in 250-300 words for a weekly TV magazine. Take into account the style and approach you will take in the review for your assumed reading audience. An alternative may be to work in pairs to plan, rehearse and present a review in the form of a videod discussion for a TV popular arts ‘magazine’ program; you will require an adequate setting for filming, suitable equipment and editing software.
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